

Techniques for Canadian Practice

Canadian Planning and Policy publishes research relating to the practice of urban and regional planning in Canada, as its title would suggest. This issue addresses the interface between human rights and land-use planning in Toronto, social determinants for health in Vancouver, water governance with First Nations in northern Saskatchewan, increasing income inequality in Halifax, population projections in smaller Canadian cities, the core curriculum in Canadian planning schools and the personal viewpoint of a senior Canadian scholar, comparing Toronto, New York and Los Angeles as multicultural cities. Many of the articles compare Canadian practices or address specific techniques, so we expect that the topics may be interesting to both scholars and professional planners.

In our first paper, Sandeep Agrawal provides specific and useful analysis of a planning issue found in most Canadian communities—how to regulate the impact of group homes upon neighbourhoods without violating human rights legislation. His combination of legal and land-use analysis is unusual for a planning journal, but essential for this topic. Agrawal's brief for a high-profile Toronto legal case recommends that municipalities avoid using mandatory separation distances for regulating activities unless they are based upon specific land-use impacts. This approach may be useful for other planning issues where human rights concerns may be involved.

Planning for healthy communities is now a frequent topic of academic and professional literature and symposia, including the CIP's 2014 Fredericton conference. However, the concept is just beginning to enter municipal plans, somewhat similar to the status of the sustainability concept a decade ago. Patricia Collins finds that the social determinants of health (SDOH) and health equities are hardly addressed in a review of a sample of Vancouver-area Official Community Plans. Most early references to healthy communities relate to the physical environment, similar to early sustainability plans.

Canadian Journal of Urban Research, Volume 23, Issue 1, Supplement pages iii-v.

Copyright © 2014 by the Institute of Urban Studies.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.

ISSN: 1188-3774

Nadine Lemoine and Robert Patrick explore opportunities for better water governance in northern Saskatchewan, a fairly remote region, mainly occupied by Aboriginal peoples. Most Canadian water governance research is focussed upon agricultural regions or river systems connecting large urban populations. But huge proportions of our country's geography have quite different characteristics, with natural resource development issues and Aboriginal peoples seeking greater control over land and water use in their traditional territories. Lemoine and Patrick recommend provincial leadership to improve communication and build technical capacity for water governance in northern Saskatchewan.

Only the largest Canadian cities have the resources to engage in primary data collection and analysis to support planning research. Medium-sized and smaller cities usually make use of data from the national census. Statistics Canada's Census Tracts are particularly popular as proxies for neighbourhoods in many studies. However, Victoria Prouse, Howard Ramos, Jill Grant and Martha Radice demonstrate that using Census Tracts may give misleading conclusions in medium-sized cities such as Halifax, where neighbourhood variations may be too fine-grained to be picked up at that level. Their analysis of the modifiable areal unit problem for Halifax income data suggests that analysis at the Dissemination Area level may be more appropriate for Canada's many medium-sized cities.

Maxwell Hartt and Clarence Woudsma's article on population projections also considers the needs of Canadian planning agencies at different scales. While most provincial and regional population projections use complex and time-consuming models, such as the cohort component method, they find that a simpler share-capture method may be a better solution for small scale projections for local communities.

Tahrana Lovlin and Mark Season's article on the history of the core curriculum in Canadian planning degree programs might seem out of place in *Canadian Planning and Policy*, at first glance, since this journal focuses upon research that is related to planning practice. However, the tension between planning theory and practice is at the very heart of the curriculum debate over the past half century. They find that the proportion of practical subjects (such as population projections and income analysis) has been creeping upwards in the past decades and now occupies about half the core curriculum in most planning programs. This historical analysis will interest the Canadian planning schools and their professional accreditation committees. And since Canadian planning practitioners have never been shy about suggesting educational improvements to the ivory-tower professors, we suspect that they may also find some interest in the article.

This year's CPP issue concludes with Mohammad Qadeer's viewpoint on the multicultural city. Multiculturalism is an important attribute of modern Canadian culture and Qadeer places it into an international context by comparing the experiences of Toronto, New York and Los Angeles. His article draws insights from over twenty years of research on community planning in multicultural cities. Qadeer concludes that the spaces, services and civic culture of a city become the command

ground for integrating urban sub-cultures.

We are fortunate that *Canadian Planning and Policy* continues to attract research from leaders of our national academy such as Mohammad Qadeer, Clarence Woudsma, Mark Seasons, Jill Grant, Robert Patrick and Sandeep Agrawal. However, Canadian planning schools are being recharged with dynamic young scholars, some of whom have been featured in these pages. The Association of Canadian University Planning Programs (ACUPP) proposes to work with the Canadian Institute of Planners to double the frequency of the journal, providing more opportunities for scholars to share research on Canadian planning practice with our profession.

We can hardly expect other nations' planning organizations to make room in their journals for research on Canadian practice, unless it is comparative research aimed to improve practical in their own countries. Practice-related research is useful for a national profession, so this journal is supported by the Canadian Institute of Planners, just as the *JAPA* is supported by the APA, and *Planning Theory and Practice* is supported by the RTPI. A journal of this sort is also essential to Canadian scholars, unless they wish to spend most of their time researching other countries. So CPP is also supported by the Association of Canadian University Planning Programs (ACUPP) and the Institute of Urban Studies at The University of Winnipeg. The scholars who are published here are grateful for their financial and organizational support, and the editors are grateful for the countless hours of research and writing provided by the authors.

We hope to return more frequently in the future.

Dr. David L.A. Gordon FCIP RPP AICP P.Eng.
Guest Editor