



APPROACHES TO SOCIAL
INCLUSION, COMMUNITY
RESILIENCE, AND HOMELESSNESS IN
THE CONTEXT OF EMERGING
ASOCIAL SOCIETIES

Knowledge Synthesis Grant Final Report

Marcus A. Sibley, PhD, Postdoctoral Fellow, Wilfrid Laurier University

Danielle Thompson, MA, Research Assistant, University of Waterloo

Natasha Martino, MA, Research Assistant, McMaster University

Carrie B. Sanders, PhD, Professor, Wilfrid Laurier University

Erin Dej, PhD, Assistant Professor, Wilfrid Laurier University

Samantha Henderson, PhD, Research Associate, Wilfrid Laurier University

**Approaches to Social Inclusion, Community Resilience, and Homelessness in the Context of Emerging
Asocial Societies**

Marcus A. Sibley, PhD, Postdoctoral Fellow, Wilfrid Laurier University

Danielle Thompson, MA, Research Assistant, University of Waterloo

Natasha Martino, MA, Research Assistant, McMaster University

Carrie B. Sanders, PhD, Professor, Wilfrid Laurier University

Erin Dej, PhD, Assistant Professor, Wilfrid Laurier University

Samantha Henderson, PhD, Research Associate, Wilfrid Laurier University

Knowledge Synthesis Grant Final Report

Prepared for the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada

SSHRC Grant # 872-2021-0053

November 7, 2022

The Approaches to Social Inclusion, Community Resilience, and Homelessness in the Context of Emerging Asocial Societies knowledge synthesis is co-funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and Employment and Social Development Canada. *Approches de l'inclusion sociale, de la résilience communautaire et l'itinérance dans le contexte des sociétés asociales émergentes* est cofinancé par le Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines et Emploi et développement social Canada.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
<i>Background</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Objectives.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Methods.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Results.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Key Messages</i>	<i>5</i>
FULL REPORT	6
BACKGROUND.....	6
OBJECTIVES	7
METHODS.....	8
NIMBYISM	10
<i>Defining NIMBYism and Its Core Assumptions</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Dispelling NIMBY Assumptions</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Homelessness/NIMBY Discourse</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>NIMBYism and Inequality</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>The Effects of NIMBY on Public Policy</i>	<i>16</i>
YIMBYISM.....	17
<i>Defining YIMBYism.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>YIMBYism and housing</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Participatory Urban Governance.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Examples of Successful YIMBY Campaigns</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Promoting YIMBYism through Media.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Critiques of YIMBYism</i>	<i>22</i>
COMMUNITY RESILIENCE.....	24
<i>Defining Community Resilience.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Structural Level Construct and Framework.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>individual/community Level Construct and Framework</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Meso-level construct and framework</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Programming for promoting community resilience</i>	<i>29</i>
KEY MESSAGES FOR POLICY, PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH	31
CONCLUSION	32
<i>Core Findings.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Future research areas</i>	<i>34</i>
KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION ACTIVITIES.....	35
REFERENCES.....	36

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

Over the last decade Canada has made significant leaps in its effort to prevent and end homelessness, situating homelessness as a predominantly structural problem rather than one of individual failings (e.g., Housing First model) (Goering & Streiner, 2015; A. Smith, 2022). However, there has been less focus on socially including people who have experienced homelessness. Perceptions of, and responses to, homelessness are deeply contentious and can have a negative impact on community pride, sense of belonging and ability to get along among people from different social locations within the community (Kulig et al., 2013). Ultimately, these tensions undermine the ability of communities to adopt a ‘community resilience’ approach that calls for a collective responsibility framework to address stressors and adapt in the face of adversity.

At the core of these tensions is NIMBYism (“Not in my Backyard”), which is deeply rooted in the idea that people who are homeless ought to be removed from public spaces. NIMBYism contributes to a cycle of stigma, displacement, and disruption of access to services and supports for people experiencing homelessness (Lyon-Callo, 2001), ultimately creating impediments to social change. NIMBYism has been deemed a fundamental challenge to the right to affordable housing, as economic and social policies that are geared towards preserving property values exist at the expense of effective affordable social housing policies (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2012). In part because of these tensions, efforts to advance social inclusion are often secondary considerations for governments. Research conducted on NIMBYism and homelessness are produced in disciplinary silos (Oudshoorn, 2020), inhibiting the development of a comprehensive understanding of homelessness and negatively impacting our understanding of NIMBYism and how discourses concerning homelessness are created, perpetuated, and resisted.

Grassroots and community organizations work to counter NIMBY narratives of homelessness by advocating for compassionate and sustainable approaches to addressing the intersecting and systemic factors that contribute to homelessness (Fraser et al., 2019; Gibson, 2005; Scally, 2013). This movement, coined YIMBYism (“Yes in My Backyard”), centres on policies and practices that promote affordable and equitable housing for all (Stahl, 2018). YIMBYism can help to overcome such contentions and work to facilitate and foster community resilience if they are rooted in a meaningful commitment to diverse communities. Further, resilient communities, those that move beyond an “‘individual community’ and take a ‘holistic view’ toward the ‘global community,’ make it ‘impossible for any individual to believe that they are not worthy of every consideration and support to be fully functioning, empowered community members” (Flaherty et al., 2019, p. 27). In this way, resilient communities and the prioritization of social inclusion can inform, foster, and support YIMBY driven initiatives.

OBJECTIVES

This literature review fills two significant gaps. First, it offers a meaningful synthesis of existing literatures on NIMBYism and YIMBYism that allows us to highlight pragmatic ways communities fight against social exclusion and isolation. Second, it identifies key literature gaps and offers a comprehensive summary of strategies that address social exclusion and promote community resilience. Our scoping literature review sought to synthesize peer-reviewed academic and literature contributions as well as grey literatures in the following three areas related to homelessness: (1) NIMBY discourses, narratives, and policies, (2) YIMBY and social inclusion discourses, narratives, and policies, and (3) current uses, iterations, and conceptual contributions around community resilience.

METHODS

The research team employed a scoping literature review strategy to collect, analyze, and synthesize critical action research on homelessness (e.g., Abramovich, 2017) and practices that both contribute to and counter the narratives associated with NIMBYism and YIMBYism, as well as the development of community resilience. We conducted a search of academic and grey literature using 14 keyword combinations related to our four key terms of 'NIMBY,' 'YIMBY,' 'community resilience,' and 'homelessness.' After removing duplicates and screening papers using a series of inclusion and exclusion criteria, we were left with 191 articles, which form the basis of this knowledge synthesis report.

RESULTS

The NIMBY literature highlighted the adverse effects that NIMBY narratives can have on policies and practices designed to address homelessness. NIMBYism refers to local opposition towards land uses, that generally contribute to the public good but are considered to negatively influence the quality of life of local residents (Christiansen et al., 2019). NIMBYism is predominantly based around concerns regarding declining property values, preserving neighbourhood characteristics, increasing crime, personal safety, and infrastructure strain (Gipson, 2020; Hanson et al., 2015). These attitudes affect public policy decisions by blocking, delaying, and shutting down housing developments (Glovin, 2021). However, these assumptions are largely dispelled in the literature, which demonstrates that NIMBY attitudes reinforce inequality related to class, race, gender, and ability (McNee & Pojani, 2022).

The YIMBY movement, on the contrary, focuses on meeting the needs of all community residents, regardless of social location, and promotes affordable housing (Coy, 2018; Dej et al., 2020). For YIMBY campaigns to be successful, active support from a range of community members is required. According to the available literature, council meetings provide a setting for people to voice their support for, or concerns about, housing developments (Tapp, 2021). Media can be a tool to better educate and build support for housing developments (Dinh et al., 2018). However, a few common critiques of NIMBYism include lacking a standardized approach to address housing shortages, invisibilizing advocacy groups that focus on the displacement of racial minorities, and gentrification (Ford & Scheutz, 2019; Meronek, 2018; Rodriguez-Pose & Storper, 2020).

YIMBY-informed discourses and policies can help facilitate and foster community resilience. Community resilience is described at a structural-level as an individual trait and as a meso-level construct, which focuses on the interplay between structural and individual factors in shaping community resilience (Dej et al., 2021). As such, we highlight the importance of multi-sector cooperation, as well as the inclusion of marginalized populations for developing policies and practices that foster and support long-term community resilience.

KEY MESSAGES

Our review of the literature highlights conceptual and practical approaches that can be used by policymakers, practitioners, and researchers to address NIMBYism, develop inclusive and equitable YIMBY strategies, and promote community resilience and belonging. The key messages from this review include:

- 1) All orders of government should empower community organizations to play a more influential role in shaping YIMBY policies by providing funding and resources to do this work.
- 2) All orders of government must develop housing policies that meet the needs of people from varying ages, races/ethnicities, genders, and abilities and that these factors are given meaningful consideration early on.
- 3) All orders of government must recognize homelessness and housing unaffordability as a crisis to expedite multi-tiered responses and combat NIMBYism.
- 4) Lived experts of homelessness should be consulted at every stage of the urban planning process to inform best practices related to housing, service provision, and infrastructure supports.
- 5) Funding agencies must provide reliable funding streams for programs that foster and promote community resilience, especially into urban design.
- 6) Governments and policy makers must develop creative ways for educating the public on housing and homelessness, which can have a strong influence over public opinion on housing policy.
- 7) Promoting YIMBYism requires a multi-sector coalition, and as such all orders of government should actively consult organizations dedicated to YIMBY principles on the best ways to address community needs.
- 8) Policy makers and service managers must develop holistic responses to address housing need that prioritizes not only building units, but also strategies to foster community belonging and social inclusion

BACKGROUND

Homelessness is a ‘wicked social problem’ in that how communities make sense of homelessness is fluid, multiple positions and stakeholders are involved, the problem is connected with other social problems (poverty, colonization, discrimination, etc.), and solutions are difficult to come by (Skaburskis, 2008). Over the last decade Canada has made significant leaps in its effort to prevent and end homelessness, including funding and prioritizing the Housing First model (Goering & Streiner, 2015), legislating housing as a human right, and increasing federal funding to address homelessness during the pandemic. Despite these gains in situating homelessness as a predominantly structural problem rather than one of individual failing, people experiencing homelessness continue to face social exclusion. People who are homeless face multiple and intersecting forms of exclusion, ranging from criminalization (Herring, 2021; Sylvestre, 2010), to being made to feel unwelcome in private and public spaces through intimidation, to being rendered invisible. As homelessness becomes more visible in communities across the country, we are witnessing a growing divisiveness in the narratives about people experiencing homelessness and city responses (Dej, 2020). Perceptions of homelessness, discussions around who belongs in the community, and the official and unofficial responses to homelessness are deeply contentious. Such contentions have a negative impact on community pride, sense of belonging and ability to get along, and social inclusion (Kulig et al., 2013). Ultimately, these tensions undermine community resilience, that is, adopting a collective responsibility framework to address stressors and adapt in the face of adversity (Buikstra et al., 2010).

At the core of these tensions is NIMBYism (“Not in my Backyard”). NIMBYism is deeply rooted in the idea that homeless and street-involved people ought to be removed from public spaces. NIMBYism contributes to a cycle of stigma, displacement, and disruption of access to services and supports (Lyon-Callo, 2001). NIMBY discourses create impediments to social change. For example, the Ontario Human Rights Commission identifies NIMBYism as a fundamental challenge to the right to affordable housing, citing how economic and social policies geared towards preserving the wealth of existing property owners stifles the prospect of effective affordable social housing policies (Ontario Human Rights Commission, 2012). Yet, efforts to advance social inclusion are often secondary considerations when an overburdened and under-resourced sector struggles to find housing and provide support to people in need. This means that even people who can successfully exit homelessness continue to face isolation and community rejection, which can undermine their housing stability and lead to cycles of homelessness (Kidd et al., 2016; Neale & Brown, 2016; Thulien, 2017; Voronka et al., 2014).

While the intersecting and contributing factors of NIMBYism are documented across various sectors and related to a range of issues, from wind energy to supportive housing development, each discipline produces literature in their respective silos which prohibits information sharing and stagnates the development of evidence-based sustainable practices and policies to address NIMBYism. We also know that research on homelessness helps to inform understandings of NIMBYism. Yet, similar to research on

NIMBYism, research on homelessness is also produced in silos (Oudshoorn, 2020). These disciplinary silos not only inhibit researchers and practitioners from developing a comprehensive understanding of homelessness, they also negatively impact our understanding of NIMBYism and the ways in which NIMBY discourses concerning homelessness are created, perpetuated, and resisted.

OBJECTIVES

While the NIMBY narrative tends to dominate and shape how the public understands and orients towards issues of homelessness (McNee & Pojani, 2022), grassroots and community organizations have countered this by advocating for compassionate and sustainable approaches to addressing the intersecting and systemic factors that contribute to homelessness (Fraser et al., 2019; Gibson, 2005; Scally, 2013). This movement has been coined YIMBYism (“Yes in My Backyard”), and centres on policies and discourses that promote affordable and equitable housing for all (Stahl, 2018). To date, no studies have conducted a comprehensive literature review related to YIMBYism or the techniques for promoting community resilience. Thus, this project will be the first to offer a comprehensive review of multidisciplinary literatures on NIMBYism and YIMBYism in concert with the underexplored areas of promoting community resilience in the face of techniques of social and physical exclusion.

This literature review offers a meaningful synthesis of existing literatures on NIMBYism and YIMBYism that will ultimately allow us to highlight pragmatic ways in which communities fight against social exclusion and isolation. This project also provides an important synthesis of grey literatures produced by community organizations in Canada and internationally, with information on how they complement and contribute to academic and policy research on homelessness and community resilience.

Our scoping review synthesizes peer-reviewed academic and grey literature contributions in the following three areas related to homelessness: (1) NIMBY discourses, narratives, and policies, (2) YIMBY and social inclusion discourses, narratives, and policies, and (3) current uses, iterations, and conceptual or theoretical contributions around community resilience. The following questions guide this knowledge synthesis review:

- 1) How does the literature on NIMBYism articulate the problem of anti-homelessness and how have researchers charted the movement’s effects (if any) on public policy?
- 2) What policies—both domestically and internationally—have been identified in literature as contributing to or challenging social exclusion and how have researchers and practitioners assessed these legal and regulatory frameworks?
- 3) What are effective and promising YIMBY approaches that promote and foster community resilience and what factors contribute to their success?

METHODS

A scoping literature review strategy was employed to collect, analyze, and synthesize critical action research on homelessness (e.g., Abramovich, 2017) and draw upon both academic and grey literatures to analyze evidence-based practices that both contribute to and counter the narratives associated with NIMBYism and YIMBYism, as well as the development of community resilience. Scoping reviews are used to map a body of literature in relation to location (e.g., country), source (e.g., peer-reviewed articles or grey literature), and academic field (e.g., homelessness) (Peters et al., 2015). Unlike a systematic literature review, which synthesizes a substantial amount of literature to answer a specific research question, scoping reviews seek to examine a “broader area to identify gaps in the research knowledge base, clarify key concepts, and report on the types of evidence that address and inform practice in the field” (Peters et al., 2015, p. 142). Scoping reviews are therefore beneficial for informing evidence-based practice and for analyzing bodies of literature that are large, diverse, and complex, or for which a comprehensive review has not yet been conducted (Peters et al., 2015). Implementing a similar method as that outlined by Peters et al. (2015), our scoping review consisted of the following steps:

ACADEMIC LITERATURE SEARCH

We commenced our search by developing a list of search terms related to our four key terms of ‘NIMBY,’ ‘YIMBY,’ ‘community resilience,’ and ‘homelessness.’ Keyword combinations that were searched are overviewed in Table 1, below. Search terms were inputted into OMNI, Laurier’s multi-disciplinary library catalogue which searches across several large databases, including EBSCOHost, Proquest, etc. Corresponding information of all search results were uploaded to a tracking spreadsheet including the search terms utilized, database, author, journal/source, year, and full APA citation. Our search returned over 2,500 results, of which 1,724 remained after the removal of duplicates.

GREY LITERATURE SEARCH

A similar process as above was utilized to search the grey literature. The same search terms as were inputted into Google alongside additional terms such as ‘report’ or ‘not-for-profit’ to return reports and documents produced by research institutes, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and community groups. Corresponding information of all search results were uploaded to a spreadsheet including the search terms utilized, database, author, journal/source, year, and full APA citation. Our search returned 110 results with no duplicates.

ABSTRACT AND FULL ARTICLE SCREENING

Search results (total n = 1829, comprised of n = 1724 from keyword searches and n = 105 from grey literature search) were divided amongst the research team and abstracts were read to determine which articles were relevant, according to our research objectives, for synthesis in the final report. At this stage, duplicates were removed, and articles related to homelessness, housing, NIMBY, YIMBY and community resilience, and published in 2012 or later were included. Articles in languages other than English were excluded. Inclusion/exclusion decisions, including the reasons for inclusion/exclusion, were recorded in

Table 1. Keyword combinations searched

Theme	Keyword Combination	N
NIMBY	“Not in my Backyard” and homeless*	218
	“NIMBY syndrome” and homelessness	84
	“Not in my Backyard” OR NIMBY AND encampment*	73
	“Not in my Backyard” OR NIMBY AND (“grassroots organizing” OR “grassroots movement”)	11
	“Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anything”	105
	“Not in my Backyard” AND homelessness AND policy	176
YIMBY	“Yes in my Backyard”	215
	“Yes in my Backyard” AND public policy	44
	“Yes in my Backyard” AND homelessness	18
	“Yes in my Backyard” AND (grassroots organizing OR grassroots movements)	5
Community Resilience	“Community resilienc*” OR “community belonging” AND homeless*	594
	“Community resiliency” AND encampments	47
	“Community resiliency” AND “housing crisis”	70
	“Asset based community development” AND homelessness	64

the tracking spreadsheet. A total of 1162 records were excluded at this stage, with 562 records remaining.

The remaining articles/reports were then divided amongst the research team for a full article screening. A stricter set of inclusion criteria was employed to ensure that only articles relevant to the research objectives would be included in the synthesis for the final report. At this stage, all articles related to NIMBY and YIMBY in the context of homelessness were included, as well as articles pertaining to community resilience in the context of homelessness or housing. Articles discussing homelessness or housing in general (i.e., unrelated to enhancing social inclusion) were excluded, as well as community resilience articles in the context of disaster management, environmental sustainability, and crisis management (total excluded n = 428).

Following all exclusions, a total of 191 records were read and synthesized in this report (n = 124 from keyword search findings; n = 10 from the grey lit search; and n = 57 from consultations with experts in the field and scanning reference pages of articles selected for inclusion).

NIMBYISM

Ending homelessness not only means providing housing; it requires meaningful social integration. While a sense of social inclusion is unique to everyone, it can be described as a condition whereby people no longer have to live in survival mode, struggling to have enough food on the table and rent at the end of the month, where they have a sense of personal independence and community belonging and overall well-being (Dej, 2020). Arguably, one of the most significant barriers to achieving social inclusion, and thereby preventing and ending homelessness, is NIMBYism. Vocal public opposition to people who are homeless and organizations that serve them has had detrimental effects on support organizations and emergency shelters' ability to deliver services, and affordable and/or supportive housing developments. Most importantly it creates enormous barriers for people experiencing homelessness to find and nourish spaces and people of belonging. Despite calls from the public to "do something" about visible homelessness, attempts to provide housing and supports are often resoundingly objected to by those same community members (Clifford & Piston, 2017). NIMBY rhetoric permeates public discourses about homelessness (Calder et al., 2011) and creates an environment where people who are homeless experience stigmatization, expulsion from community, and even violence.

NIMBYism speaks to the social exclusion of people who have experienced homelessness. When NIMBY rhetoric overwhelms the public narrative, it has detrimental effects on policies and practices designed to reduce, and ultimately end, homelessness. First, it presents the NIMBY narrative as the accepted viewpoint on homelessness in a community, leaving little room for differing perspectives. It also disregards the organizations and people who are making a positive difference in the lives of people experiencing homelessness, including solidarity among people who are homeless themselves. There is a large body of research available on individual experiences of homelessness that is essential for developing a comprehensive understanding of the impact NIMBY discourses have on people's experience of social exclusion, isolation, and community resilience. Research, for example, identifies the negative impact perceptions and experiences of social exclusion, loneliness, and isolation have on people experiencing homelessness and their ability to access and maintain permanent housing (Aubry et al., 2016; Cameron et al., 2016; Nichols, 2019; Perron, 2014). As such, NIMBYism has real and significant

impacts on community and governmental responses to homelessness. NIMBYism discourses pose a significant barrier to passing legislation and investing in and innovating around services that would radically improve the lives of people experiencing homelessness (Brown, 2021). At times, calls for community investment in social inclusion programming (Gidley et al., 2010) is eclipsed by policies that address homelessness through the lens of “public safety” that rely on exclusionary and criminalizing tactics (Gaetz, 2013). In the following sections, we provide a detailed understanding of the core characteristics and rationales driving NIMBY movements and engage in a critical discussion of the impacts of NIMBYism on homelessness, public policy, and social inclusion.

DEFINING NIMBYISM AND ITS CORE ASSUMPTIONS

NIMBYism can be understood as a local opposition towards “controversial land uses” (Costanza et al., 2013, p. 261) that provide useful services and contribute to public good but are perceived to have “detrimental effect[s] on [the] quality of life” of local residents (Christiansen et al., 2019, p. 599; Davidson & Howe, 2014). NIMBY opposition often occurs in response to proposed developments for hazardous waste facilities, needle distribution services and safe consumption sites (Lofaro & Miller, 2021; Oudshoorn & Kirkwood, 2017), power plants or wind farms, and transportation infrastructure (Davidson & Howe, 2014), as well as services that “serve small sectors of the population” such as affordable housing, drug treatment centers, and homeless shelters (Costanza et al., 2013, p. 261). Diverse terminology is used within the literature to characterize NIMBY attitudes towards new land developments including “NIMBY syndrome” (Kolla et al., 2017), “the NIMBY effect” (Christiansen et al., 2019), LULU (Locally Unwanted Land Uses) (Tretter & Heyman, 2022), and BANANA (Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anyone) (Doberstein, 2020)—all of which underscore NIMBYism as an organized resistance to new land developments in their communities.

NIMBYs themselves (i.e., community residents in opposition to development) are described as homeowners or businesses that seek to protect or increase home values through housing supply restriction and land development prevention (S. Miller & Kiernan, 2021; Tretter & Heyman, 2022). McNee and Pojani (2022) describe NIMBYs as “active, vocal, and connected residents” who protest new housing developments even when such developments are believed to be beneficial to their city (p. 555). NIMBY supporters most commonly consist of single-family homeowners, that are older in age, have a higher income, are well educated, live in socially similar neighbourhoods, and are in the immediate vicinity of proposed developments (Gipson, 2020; Hanson et al., 2015). NIMBYs thwart the development of new housing for reasons that range from “aesthetic design to pearl-clutching about crime rates” (Meronek, 2018, p. 30) often under the common discourse of “preserving ‘family’ neighborhoods” (B. Miller & Nicholls, 2013, p. 468).

Nesbitt (2018) outlines the various ways in which economic, political, social, and spatial factors influence NIMBY attitudes. Economic factors largely influence NIMBY attitudes particularly in consideration to homeownership and gentrification. Homeowners, who hold more negative views towards developments, participate more frequently in local debates than renters and therefore are likely to have a larger influence. Politics influences NIMBYism when considering public trust in governments, ideological beliefs, and electoral cycles. The planning process also impacts NIMBY attitudes as such movements can be fueled by the lack of a growth plan. Social attitudes and stigma, racial discrimination and segregation, and media framing have been demonstrated to influence NIMBY attitudes (Nguyen & Payton Scally,

2019). And finally, spatial concerns such as a sense of place, built environment, visibility of homelessness, and proximity of the proposed site to neighbours, schools, etc. have also been shown to have an impact. As such, contextual factors that are likely to exacerbate NIMBY attitudes include: rising house prices which can create concern that one's property may be devalued as a result; neighbourhoods where no precedent has been set for the proposed form of housing; developments that are proposed for rental housing instead of home ownership; and developments aimed at single adults instead of families (Hanson et al., 2015).

At the core of NIMBYism is an overwhelming suspicion and sense of opposition to any development that may negatively (whether perceived or real) impact property values (Jun & Musso, 2013; Keating, 2019). As Nguyen et al. (2013) describe, local residents oppose both the physical infrastructure associated with homelessness programming and support (i.e., shelters, affordable housing projects, and service facilities), as well as the people who occupy those buildings and use those services. Public parks, libraries, and museums are welcomed, but waste dumps, jails, and homeless shelters are met with intense backlash from residents who do not want such facilities in their communities. NIMBYs fear that the presence of such facilities would lower property values, increase pollution, noise, traffic, and crime, and change the demographic composition of their neighbourhoods (Garland et al., 2016, 2017; Halimi, 2019; PIVOT, 2015).

Other common objections to social housing developments include the presence of existing social housing in the neighbourhood, the risk of bringing "bad" people into the neighborhood, a suspicion of renters, concerns about the "best way" to house vulnerable populations, and lack of community consultation (Homecoming, 2016). While opposition to social housing developments are often articulated in relation to design and procedural issues, resistance is sometimes based on fears about the perceived consequences these developments may have on neighbourhoods (HomeComing, 2005). This is often guided by pre-existing assumptions about affordable housing tenants or services who are framed as "freeloaders, antisocial, and even potentially criminal" (McNee & Pojani, 2022, p. 555). In fact, research shows that citizens are more likely to oppose emergency housing shelters if they offer services to previously incarcerated or criminalized people (Dum et al., 2017). The above assumptions related to the social, economic, and spatial consequences of affordable housing developments underscore that the preservation of community character is one of the fundamental driving forces behind NIMBYism (Bates, 2019; Bertrand, 2019; HomeComing, 2005; B. Miller & Nicholls, 2013; Nesbitt, 2018).

NIMBYism that is centered around this notion of community preservation can be understood as the conventional model of risk-aversion in which NIMBYs oppose new developments to maintain aesthetic appeal and prevent congestion in their community (Monkkonen & Manville, 2019). Monkkonen and Manville (2019) contrast risk-aversion NIMBYism with a new dimension that is focused on "enforcing community norms of fairness" (p. 1125) and where development opposition stems from a desire to prevent a developer from earning a large profit. While this latter dimension seeks to prevent another's gain, and is therefore altruistic in nature, risk-aversion NIMBYism is argued to be employed in an attempt to prevent one's own losses. At the same time, Davison et al. (2017) note that these forms of "self-interested NIMBYism" are the most common, and while individuals may indicate support for affordable housing developments within their city, they often oppose these projects if proposed in proximity to their respective residence. Self-interested NIMBYism has been found to present a large challenge to the development of affordable housing. It is therefore crucial to dispel the core assumptions driving

NIMBYism in order to work towards increasing the acceptance of community-based and governmental initiatives that seek to expand social services and housing programming.

DISPELLING NIMBY ASSUMPTIONS

As noted in the previous section, the core concerns of NIMBYism are related to declining property values, preserving community characteristics, increasing crime, personal safety, and infrastructure strain (Gipson, 2020; Hanson et al., 2015; Kolla et al., 2017). According to Davidson and Howe (2014), NIMBYism often stems from the desire of a community to “avoid being ‘stained’ by an association with a stigmatized population” (p. 3). While this may be associated with the concern of NIMBYs to prevent affordable housing from lowering property values, recent research suggests the opposite. As such, this desire to avoid being stained by stigmatized populations may have less to do with protecting property values and more to do with protecting community image from “undesirable neighbours” (p. 13). Therefore, in order to transform public opinions about homelessness and change NIMBY attitudes, an effort needs to be made to alter society’s perceptions of stigmatized groups such as people experiencing homelessness (Grommon, 2017). Education strategies, for example, can be used to “dispel myths, close social distances between social groups, and instill a collaborative sense of civic engagement,” with the goal of challenging and questioning the common NIMBY assumptions (Grommon, 2017, p. 830).

Research currently exists that dispels some of the NIMBY concerns surrounding the development of social or affordable housing and should be used to educate the public and work towards building support for similar developments. A report by the PIVOT Legal Society (2015) offers various suggestions to bust myths surrounding NIMBY attitudes, focusing on providing statistical evidence and facts in response. First, research suggests that affordable housing developments may be related to *increased* property values in neighbouring areas, rather than decreased values (Brunes et al., 2020). The PIVOT Legal Society (2015) draws on studies conducted in 1995 and 2008, in British Columbia and New York, respectively, to debunk the myth that affordable housing decreases property values. In both cases, the presence of supportive housing did not negatively affect the sale prices of homes in the area, nor did people panic sell or have their homes on the market for an extended period of time as a result of the development. Specifically, in New York, researchers found that properties within 500 feet of the supportive housing development saw a steady growth in value, and properties within 500-1000 feet of the development experienced growth, albeit at a slower pace. The size and density of the project had no impact on property values. To manage these concerns, a report from the Canadian Home Builders Association (2013) suggests providing residents with relevant studies, receiving testimony from realtors, and conduct a new property value study. Similar results were found by Brunes et al. (2020) upon the examination of infill developments, referring to the “new construction of multifamily cooperative apartment buildings in urban areas” (p. 57). Thus, research suggests that developments can increase housing prices in nearby areas, specifically in areas with lower incomes, more public housing, and greater density (Brunes et al., 2020).

The Canadian Home Builders Association (2013) also focused on debunking myths related to crime and safety. Although this is a common concern, there is no evidence that criminal behaviour is higher in proximity to affordable housing, group homes, or emergency shelters. Instead, evidence suggests that affordable housing has a ‘stabilizing’ effect on a neighbourhood by allowing people to stay in their

communities, rather than displacing them elsewhere (Hanson et al., 2015). To respond to these concerns, stakeholders should offer evidence to debunk the crime myth, as well as create opportunities for neighbours and new residents to meet, enlist support of community law enforcement, and provide examples of similar developments that have no increase in crime rates.

Other concerns centre around infrastructure strain, focusing on traffic, public services, and public transit (Martin, 2013; Nesbitt, 2018). However, there is no evidence to suggest that residential intensification leads to traffic congestion. Further, higher-density housing requires *less* extensive infrastructure when considering water, sewage, roads, and other services, when compared to planned communities on undeveloped land. High-density housing also “provides a concentration of passengers for public transit, improves efficiency of other neighbourhood services in a compact area, and can be a smart way to take advantage of underutilized infrastructure” (Canadian Home Builders’ Association, 2013, p. 19).

Finally, concerns about neighbourhood character can be addressed by reassuring the community that housing is developed using the same restrictions and design standards as other buildings in the neighbourhood, mitigating concerns about design and aesthetics (Canadian Home Builders’ Association, 2013; HomeComing, 2005). Other concerns about integration of new residents into the community violate human rights codes that are implemented to prevent “people zoning,” referring to the discrimination of certain groups, attempting to stop them from moving into the community. Instead, advocates need to focus on illustrating the advantages of integrating new residents into the community.

When communicating to the public, it is important to share facts and ‘debunk’ the common NIMBY rationales. Public communication is essential to gain support for housing developments, and strategies should be used that focus on dispelling the common myths around housing (Gent, 2022; Grommon, 2017). It is important to emphasize the benefits of affordable housing and communicate how the proposal aligns with the municipality’s vision for the community (Canadian Home Builders’ Association, 2013). Online municipal engagement can also be used as a strategy to ensure residents are informed about housing in the community. Using online engagement is a great way to share education tools through workshops or courses to provide a comprehensive understanding of the development process, while also debunking some of the common concerns of housing developments. Materials could include fact sheets and educational materials that demonstrate evidence of successful projects, providing statistical evidence and examples of public health system benefits (Canadian Home Builders’ Association, 2013; PIVOT, 2015). When mitigating NIMBYism and addressing these myths, the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (2019) suggests including the community in the planning process, using engagement and communication strategies, and implementing policies and measures that support accessible housing.

HOMELESSNESS/NIMBY DISCOURSE

NIMBY discourse is often framed around stereotypes about people experiencing homelessness, fueling oppositions to social housing and services. Gent (2018) claims that the “backyard” is a metaphor for safety, purity, and privacy, which people experiencing homelessness disrupt. The stereotypes that they are “dangerous, impure threats to the neighbourhood” (Canadian Home Builders’ Association, 2013) stunt housing developments based on arguments rooted in stereotypes. According to Davidson and Howe (2014), NIMBYism stems from the desire of a community to “avoid being stained” (p. 3) by an

association with a stigmatized population. Rather than centering concerns around property values, this type of opposition instead focuses on protecting the community image from association with “undesirable neighbours” (Davidson & Howe, 2014; see also HomeComing, 2005). Social attitudes, stigma, racial discrimination, and segregation thus influence NIMBY oppositions that enhance and promote stereotypes about people experiencing homelessness (Nesbitt, 2018). Similarly, Belanger et al. (2019) found that Indigenous renters face direct discrimination from landlords because of common misconceptions and racist stereotypes.

Other NIMBY discourses focus on appropriate land-use. According to DeVerteuil (2013), NIMBYism challenges Lefebvre’s ‘right to the city,’ which maintains that everyone has the right to access, appropriate, and inhabit spaces within the city (see also Meanwell, 2012). However, people experiencing homelessness are excluded from these rights due to land-use debates. Bell and Walsh (2015) claim that NIMBYism is framed as a “contested landscapes debate” that functions as a control strategy for the containment of homelessness and signifies the “powerful symbols of surveillance, hegemony, and control” (p. 1978). Spatial concerns, including the sense of place, growth boundaries, environmental controls, built environment, visibility of homelessness, and proximity of the site thus impact NIMBY attitudes (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2020; Nesbitt, 2018).

In terms of land-use, additional research demonstrates that community members are not opposed to social developments in *other* communities, only ones that affect them. While there is often a public calling to manage homelessness, proposals are often met with opposition and the suggestion to build housing elsewhere (Gent, 2018). According to Davison et al. (2017), self-interested NIMBYism is common, referring to people who are supportive of affordable housing, but less supportive of developments in their neighbourhood. Due to land-use regulations and public opposition, social services are concentrated in high-poverty, minority neighbourhoods, where people experiencing homelessness are “corralled” (Grainger, 2021, p. 4). In these neighbourhoods, residents have less time, money, resources, and political influence to object (Halimi, 2019).

NIMBY attitudes are also tied to political beliefs (Garland et al., 2017). Factors such as public trust in governments, ideological beliefs, and electoral cycles influence NIMBYism (Nesbitt, 2018). According to Smith (2017), the growing political influence of right-wing populist movements indicates a “crisis of legitimacy” (p. 363) for political and economic institutions linked to economic inequality, financial stability, and ecological crises, destabilizing social cohesion and community resilience. Thus, neighbourhood defenders, according to Einstein et al. (2020) tend to be Republican, while Democrats are more likely to support housing developments.

NIMBYism appears across the political spectrum. While NIMBYism defends attitudes that are foundational to their communities and civic engagement, the effect is to “exclude, perpetuate inequality, and place limits on the freedoms of others” (Gent, 2022, p. 141). While NIMBYs claim to defend democracy, they uphold only the will of people who are privileged and often protect their own self-interests (Gent, 2022). Marble and Nall (2021) found that attitudes toward housing developments were structured more by home ownership interests, such as property values, than by political ideology. This means that though some people identified largely with political groups or movements that support public housing or community resources, they too opposed their development in their own backyards.

NIMBYISM AND INEQUALITY

NIMBY attitudes are often reinforced by underlying notions of inequality related to race, class, gender, and (dis)ability. Although NIMBYism is focused on opposing land use, it can also be considered an exercise of power that marginalizes and exacerbates unequal power dynamics across social locations. As aforementioned, NIMBY advocates tend to be primarily white- and upper-middle class residents, while the targets of their opposition are often from minority communities (Gipson, 2020; McNee & Pojani, 2022). As such, NIMBY advocates have more authority to oppose housing developments on the basis of spatial gatekeeping, but also to preserve and secure a neighbourhood's existing racial, class, and family structure (Gent, 2022). According to Tighe (2012), NIMBY reactions are due, in part, to anti-poverty sentiments and racial prejudice. NIMBYism thus excludes certain people because they are homeless, poor, disabled, or because of their race and ethnicity, demonstrating that this opposition may be shaped by negative attitudes towards minorities (Tighe, 2012; see also Einstein et al., 2020; Tretter & Heyman, 2022). Further, Vallone (2020) calls NIMBYism a "form of institutional racism" (p. 2), drawing attention to exclusionary zoning policies that discriminate against low-income and racialized groups who are "priced out" (p. 3) of the community, keeping affordable housing out of their backyards.

THE EFFECTS OF NIMBY ON PUBLIC POLICY

NIMBYs have succeeded in blocking, delaying, and shutting down housing developments at zoning and city council meetings, especially when carrying and approval costs become too burdensome (Anthony, 2022; Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2020; Garland et al., 2017; Glovin, 2021). Upzoning, the process of relaxing zoning restrictions related to building height and density, is often opposed by local residents, with the idea that doing so will negatively impact the neighbourhood character (Haapaniemi, 2020). NIMBY attitudes also influence the housing supply, as NIMBYs can effectively block new housing proposed for their neighbourhoods. Homeowners are often troubled by new housing developments because new housing has a negative effect on prices. NIMBYs claim that affordable housing developments will result in higher taxes and lower home values for current residents (Hankinson, 2018). Further, the presence of NIMBY attitudes allows city councils, businesses, and neighbourhood organizations to justify policies and practices aimed at "keeping neighbourhoods safe" without addressing the core issues surrounding homelessness, such as relying on the police to manage homelessness (Franklin, 2018, p. 62).

Focusing on the safety of neighbourhoods allows for exclusionary policies to flourish. Amaral (2021) examined the "political forces behind exclusionary laws" (p. 1525) that banish people experiencing homelessness from public spaces, such as laws that prohibit sitting or resting in public, and those that prohibit tents or other temporary structures. Louthen (2020) also discussed anti-integrationist impulses that are associated with public housing policies, where community members can use a "local veto" (p. 569) to oppose housing developments. As such, attacks on affordable housing are common, with people at government meetings opposing developments and pressure local legislators to oppose and reject such projects.

Further, although legal scholars have identified homeless encampments to be a viable option to negotiate some of the health harms associated with homelessness, sanctioned encampments are strongly opposed

by NIMBYs (Allen & Nolan, 2022). Changes in policies that reduce the amount of public space without increasing homeless services result in the displacement of people experiencing (Allen & Nolan, 2022). Similarly, although tiny homes are often feasible options to support people experiencing homelessness, substantial barriers to their implementation include policies surrounding land-use and zoning regulations, as well as strong NIMBY sentiments that take the form of local meetings and calls for opposition (Evans, 2022; Jackson et al., 2020).

In Massachusetts, for example, there are three laws related to public participation to combat NIMBYism. They are the *Open Meeting Law*, which requires transparency in decision-making; the *Zoning Law*, which gives planning commissions land-use power; and the *Anti-Snob Zoning Law*, which allows affordable housing developers to bypass public meetings and opposition (Glovin, 2021). These laws were created to combat the housing crisis in Massachusetts, which is fueled by public opposition to public housing. Similarly, in England, the *Localism Act* gives local residents influence over developments, while also enabling building corporations to gain approval more easily. As such, the goal is to stop NIMBY attitudes in public meetings from stopping housing developments (Glovin, 2021). However, local residents still maintain anti-development sentiments, and the system is under-representative, as only people from certain social locations participate in local meetings.

Public resistance is a powerful force influencing the initiation and sustainability of public policies (Garland et al., 2017). Ruming (2014) finds that opposition to specific developments may occur when planning authority is removed from local residents or governments, and instead, given to higher tiers of government. If multi-government interventions are to succeed in improving housing supply and conditions, each level of government must work with local residents to ensure that they feel invested in and part of democratic processes (Ruming, 2014)

Successful policy solutions need to recognize the participatory politics of housing and the ways that citizens and bureaucrats shape the development process (Einstein et al., 2020). While public debate should not be shut down, instead, public engagement needs to be modified in a way that encourages broader thinking about community interest and attitudes towards housing developments (Doberstein, 2020). Public engagement should also include people experiencing homelessness, who are often excluded from political representation and processes related to housing developments. According to Martin (2013), emphasis should be placed on the fact that social needs must take priority over “protectionist place identity claims” (p. 536) when developing policies related to social housing. Policies also need to focus on mitigating the divide between NIMBYs and YIMBYs at the local level (Ford & Schuetz, 2019).

YIMBYISM

The increasing visibility of homelessness, particularly amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, and the subsequent pressure for communities to act quickly has come up against their ability to adapt to the changing needs of the community and to respond in a way that leads to long-term stability and equity for everyone. Such contentions can negatively impact *community resilience* - that is community harmony, sense of belonging, and ability to get along. Community resilience is a multi-dimensional, dynamic, and iterative process that involves collective awareness, action, reflection, adaptation and social inclusion. Central to developing community resilience is the ability to address sustainable, affordable housing,

poverty reduction, and access to a continuum of healthcare and mental health resources (Sayers et al., 2017; Wulff et al., 2015).

DEFINING YIMBYISM

The ‘Yes in my Backyard’ (YIMBY) movement positions itself as quite literally the opposite of NIMBYism. While YIMBY groups and campaigns take on varying forms, at its core, the movement binds itself as the antithesis of policies, practices, and discourses that seek to exclude, deny, and restrict community diversity and growth (McNee & Pojani, 2022). In its most idealized state, YIMBY movements are about meeting the needs of all community members (Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness, 2021) and “accepting our community’s collective responsibility to make our shared space welcoming to everyone” (PIVOT, 2015, p. 8). YIMBY campaigns are premised on designing intentional communities that promote housing affordability and localized capacity building.

The literature on YIMBYism situates the movement as inherently political and intimately connected with other social movements, such as climate change advocacy, environmentalism, human rights, and political progressiveness (Tapp, 2021; Tretter & Heyman, 2022; WRYIMBY (Waterloo Region Yes In My Backyard), 2022). Scholars on the issue of YIMBYism articulate a deep connection between YIMBY campaigning and the concerns of the millennial generation specifically who, as they have grown into adulthood and middle-age, are struggling to make ends meet, find affordable housing, and ultimately delve into home ownership (Beyer, 2017; Tapp, 2021). Bogusz suggests that both NIMBY and YIMBYism are tied to localism—that is, “the notion that individuals share not only a geographical or spatial connection but that, within a defined area, they share socio-economic and legal relationships which bind them together” (2018, p. 56). Localism thereby contributes to NIMBYism but also provides the solution to the problematics of ‘space attachment’ (Bogusz, 2018, p. 57) by empowering local communities to have a voice in shaping their respective neighbourhoods.

To date, YIMBY campaigns are largely situated within individual municipalities, offering a space for political and social mobilizing. Indeed, local YIMBY campaigns have grown exponentially over the last five years (Meronek, 2018). The groundswell of the YIMBY movement rests in San Francisco and from there people in urban centres across the United States, Canada, and throughout the global North have developed YIMBY campaigns (Beyer, 2017). More recently, however, leaders in local YIMBY movements have collectivized to build off one another, with the YIMBY Action collective acting as an example of large-scale organizing around the issues of building more affordable housing, increasing housing stability, and streamlining development and zoning regulations to do so quickly and efficiently (YIMBY Action, 2021). Still, Beyer (2017) contends that YIMBY movements remain highly decentralized and thereby limited in the kinds of transformative work they achieve.

There is tension in the literature about the fundamental nature of YIMBY campaigns, their politics, and the breadth of issues they cover. Tapp (2021) for example, distinguishes the YIMBY movement from other forms of justice-led community and housing affordability activism because YIMBYists focus exclusively on market-based solutions to the housing supply and affordability issue. Tretter and Heyman (2022) agree, arguing that the key tenet of the YIMBY movement is “the belief that the housing crisis can be solved by increasing housing supply, density, and diversity” (p. 288). The argument here is that YIMBY

campaigns consistently focus on housing development and housing affordability (see Bronstein, 2018; Coy, 2018; Tapp, 2021) to the detriment of other issues related to housing. Conversely, others contend that YIMBYism is an important strategy to homelessness prevention. Homelessness prevention refers to “policies, practices, and interventions that reduce the likelihood that someone will experience homelessness” (Dej et al., 2020, p. 402) and includes a continuum of strategies ranging from upstream structural policies to housing stabilization efforts for people who have previously experienced homelessness. Abdel-Samad et al. (2021) see YIMBY campaigns as promoting distinct techniques to respond to pre-homelessness, whereby people are supported to find and maintain housing prior to becoming homeless, with the aim of preventing homelessness altogether. For Abdel-Samad et al. (2021) YIMBYism can advocate for strategies around city planning, housing affordability, as well as broader systems level change in health, criminal justice, and child protection, all of which have the objective of ensuring that people have a safe, affordable, and permanent place to live (Dej et al., 2020).

YIMBYISM AND HOUSING

The YIMBY movement’s roots lie in its focus on rapidly building and maintaining a strong housing supply and increased housing density, predominantly in large urban centres. Related with that aim is an effort to make housing and communities work for everyone and not only people who hold social and economic privilege (Coy, 2018). Efforts to reach these goals take on different shapes and many YIMBY campaigns pursue multiple tactics to effect policy and practice change. Examples of these strategies include:

- Establish municipal density requirements that promote maximizing housing growth on available land (Bronstein, 2018)
- Devising innovative models to increase the housing supply, including multiple-unit builds and secondary suites (Merriam, 2020; Tolfo & Doucet, 2021)
- Prioritize affordable housing development in areas with close proximity to public transportation (Bronstein, 2018; McNee & Pojani, 2022)
- Design mixed-income housing that promotes social inclusion across the socio-economic continuum (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2020)

The overarching drive of most YIMBY campaigns is, as Bronstein (2018) describes it, “build baby, build.” The YIMBY movement is at times and in some communities singularly fixated on building new housing within the current housing market, which in some instances is to the detriment of the best fit for people most in need of affordable housing, as we describe below. This emphasis on market housing has led some community mobilizers to develop a new acronym, PHIMBYism – Public Housing in my Backyard. This advocacy model focuses not simply on building more housing but is dedicated to prioritizing public and truly affordable housing. Included in the PHIMBYism model is ensuring that housing is available for everyone from a range of social locations and using empty lots as opportunities for increased housing development and density (McNee & Pojani, 2022). These strategies, both within market housing and public and affordable models, works to make neighbourhoods more liveable for everyone in need of housing and that will lead to increased diversity and inclusion as people are able to build roots in their communities. As Merriam (2020) describes, “The YIMBY movement is not the end all for the problems that we must surmount, but it may serve us well” (p. 8).

PARTICIPATORY URBAN GOVERNANCE

Building more inclusive and diverse neighbourhoods requires active support from community members. The ability to take YIMBYism from an ideological or political concept into a social movement requires active civic participation in local government and advocacy. Since the 1960s, the U.S. federal government has taken active steps to incentivize local participation in the planning and development processes by requiring active citizen participation in order to receive federal funding (Hankinson, 2018). Klement et al. (2022) found that one of the most prominent reasons for opposing development was a lack of transparency and an overwhelming distrust towards developers. These can be remedied not only through an active consultation process and dialogue between developers, city planners, and residents, but through other ways of building trust such as giving back to the community through mechanisms such as profit sharing (Klement et al., 2022).

Though garnering civic participation among individuals may be challenging, Jun and Musso (2013) note that the use of secondary associations (such as NGOs, neighbourhood councils, and service providing organizations) can make up for the relative lack of enthusiasm around city planning and service provisioning at local levels. These organizations, they argue, have the potential to influence and advocate for spatial preferences and “provide a forum for community networks to mobilize around spatially differentiated preferences and to exert political pressure on city officials” (Jun & Musso, 2013, p. 75.)

Tapp (2021) found that neighbourhood councils had a significant impact in advocating for an increased housing supply by placing political pressures on local governments to de-regulate land use restrictions. Local organizing can be extremely effective because local governments will often defer to neighborhood councils on zoning proposals, which serve to empower local residents over the make-up of their respective neighbourhoods. One thing to consider, however, is that neighbourhood councils have a tremendously low barrier to entry, allowing for almost anyone to participate. Councils can recruit pro-development citizens who will actively campaign and advocate for increased housing supply, multi-dwelling residences, or other local planning strategies they feel will benefit their communities. At the same time, the lack of experience or consultation with planning or housing experts may pose a significant challenge to achieving sustainable and equitable housing solutions (Lerch, 2017).

Gaining support for non-market housing can be a challenge. The BC Housing Research Centre (2019) recognizes that while community input is important, setting limits and timelines on how feedback is collected can prevent unnecessary delays in the development process. Limiting the scope of opposition to a set of core issues — as opposed to entertaining a full-scale opposition to certain developments — may ultimately allow for community residents to feel that their concerns are directly addressed while allowing for important affordable housing or shelter projects to continue (see also Legacy et al., 2016).

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL YIMBY CAMPAIGNS

There are examples of successful YIMBY campaigns across North America that make clear the range of tools available to communities to build inclusive and social neighbourhoods. Among those examples are:

- Los Angeles County’s piloted new Accessory Dwelling Units. These sponsored units allow a homeowner to create a ‘granny flat’ that provides a unit for someone who is unstably housed (Dinh et al., 2018; Han, 2018)
- Guelph, Ontario developed a YIMBY campaign during the COVID-19 pandemic that met two objectives – it built two supportive housing buildings, and it engaged community in the planning process to get people involved in YIMBY efforts (Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness, 2021)
- A study from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (2020) provided a series of strategies to develop social and affordable housing projects from a YIMBY perspective, including techniques on building rapport and sharing information with current neighbourhood residents, address concerns neighbours might have, and integrate affordable housing projects into municipal plans to increase the housing stock
- In their efforts to build supportive housing in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver, the Union Gospel Mission created a Good Neighbour Agreement that provides tools to people to speak up for social inclusion and diversity, including how to connect with their local government and how to break down stereotypes about supportive housing (Larkin, 2015)
- Communities can develop strategies that promote dialogue, but discourage discrimination and exclusionary rhetoric, including building YIMBY principles into municipal housing plans, challenging discriminatory narratives, and meaningfully addressing opposition to housing projects (Hanson et al., 2015; HomeComing, 2005).

PROMOTING YIMBYISM THROUGH MEDIA

YIMBYism should also be understood as a discursive concept that can be mobilized to publicly advocate for increased housing, shelters, and other social services.

The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (2006) notes that lack of awareness about community development projects can pose a significant barrier to community acceptance and support for housing projects. To counter this, local councillors, city officials, and YIMBY advocates should make “regular contact with the media through news releases, articles and interviews to ensure the project is ‘front and centre’ in the mind of the community” (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2006, p. 3).

Moorhead (2022) encouraging journalists to take a more active role in their communities—acting as stakeholders and not just fact-finders—could motivate those in news media to hold those in power accountable on their housing promises and mandates. Moorhead goes on to write, “In addition to issuing press releases and reports that influence journalists’ coverage, nonprofits, advocates, and government officials can partner with journalists in more creative ways (e.g., directories, fundraisers, and training events) that might combine tangible steps forward (e.g., policy change that mandates more affordable housing) with community backing and engagement” (2022, p. 1913). Dinh (2018) also finds that the media can be an effective tool for educating and building community support for different housing proposals such as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). This can be mobilized in a proactive or reactive sense. Organizations can seek the media to advocate for proposed developments or can use the media to respond to concerns over certain projects (Canadian Home Builders’ Association, 2013).

Mass media can also be an influential tool for educating the public on issues related to homelessness. Abdel-Samad et al. (2021) write,

Mass media and communications scholars can contribute to solutions-based approaches to homelessness in several ways, including correcting false narratives about who is experiencing homelessness. Becoming more conscious of the impact of textual and visual messaging has the power to more fully engage community and policymaking stakeholders with the diverse lived experiences of people experiencing homelessness... Centering research on insider perspectives (the storytellers) values and respects their positionality, elevates the narratives that the storytellers generate into community and policy dialogue, and recognizes those voices as the authority on their situation. (p. 12)

There is tremendous value for scholars to share their research with news media in order to create a counter-narrative to NIMBYism, using and offering finding from research to mobilize knowledge to a broader audience. This can also be useful for community organizations who produce a regular flow of information or maintain their own research agendas. As the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Association (2020) suggests, “The purpose is to: Demonstrate the value of the project. Create a transparent process. Educate and inform the community. Maintain a regular flow of information and ensure as many people as possible are aware of the project. Build support through community connections – bring like-minded agencies together to support the project. Allay community concerns about the project. Focus on the facts, not the arguments” (p. 3). The prioritization of facts over other forms of housing rhetoric can ultimately serve to ground people in evidence-based solutions. This, coupled with highlighting the personal narratives of those who experience homelessness or housing precarity, serve to provide the public with a fact-based intervention that also includes experiential knowledge of those who are lived experts.

CRITIQUES OF YIMBYISM

A major critique launched against YIMBYism is centred on its over-reliance on “YIMBYs logic as being grounded in the “free-market logic of supply and demand” in which building more housing is thought to reduce housing costs (Meronek, 2018, p. 30). Since there is no universally agreed upon strategy for increasing affordable housing, YIMBYs tend to be divided in their approach. Some YIMBY advocates in California, for example, advocate for increased luxury developments as a way to entice middle class residents to newer, upscale properties in an effort to create vacant older buildings for lower-income residents (Ford & Schuetz, 2019). Other YIMBY advocates have critiqued this market-rate approach, arguing that it concentrates poverty and reinforces ideas around class and racial spatial divisions (Ford & Schuetz, 2019; Pill, 2020).

This focus on countering NIMBYism by removing housing restrictions and increasing housing supply tends to come at the cost of invisibilizing advocacy groups that have long been working to fight the “displacement of working-class communities of color for decades” (Meronek, 2018, p. 31). In fact, “YIMBYs, who advocate for luxury and market-rate housing but not public housing, conflate housing

activists' affordability campaigns with NIMBY preservationist battles. These false connotations and binaries, we argue, are best understood within a framework of racial capitalism" (McElroy & Szeto, 2018, p. 31).

Importantly, Rodríguez-Pose & Storper (2020) note that academia has become dominated by a "housing as opportunity" school of thought whereby scholars have "captured the public imagination with its claims about the benefits of housing deregulation to prosperous and less prosperous areas alike and to the national economy as a whole" (p. 226). They critique this view, arguing that there is little evidence support that more housing in already prosperous areas will lead to greater housing equality. They argue that "upzoning generally involves replacing older and lower quality housing stock in areas highly favoured by the market, effectively decreasing housing supply for lower-income households in desirable areas. This is gentrification" (p.240). In some cases, upzoning and de-regulating had the direct consequence of raising housing prices without creating the demand for new (and more affordable) construction homes (Freemark, 2020). Finally, Rodríguez-Pose & Storper (2020) suggest that each regional context is unique and an aggregated or blanket approach to de-regulation misses important socio-cultural, geographic, and historical factors related to each proposed development area. They argue that more regulation—not less—may be the key to equitable building practices:

Most importantly, undifferentiated aggregate supply policies do essentially nothing to abate the underlying structural causes of the housing crisis in prosperous metro areas that we have identified: high demand from highly-skilled, high income people; increasing income inequality; and a rise in construction and land costs due to the growth and maturation of metropolitan regions and demands for a higher quality urban environment. The targeted policies that would be needed to reduce spatial economic segregation may involve increased regulation and other forms of public intervention into the housing market, exactly the opposite of the deregulation approach. The evidence from cities with active public/social housing programmes (such as New York, Paris and London) is that this requires high public subsidies for construction of affordable housing. (Rodríguez-Pose & Storper, 2020, pp. 241–242)

Imbroscio (2021) contributes to this critique by arguing that though NIMBYS are the ones pushing for greater land-use restrictions to ensure a greater preservation over the spatial and racial dynamics of their neighbourhoods, YIMBYS can often times be developers looking to de-regulating zoning in order "to realize profits by capturing rents" (p. 232).

One way YIMBYS have advocated for increased de-regulation is by de-politicizing housing and focusing on development specific concerns (Legacy et al., 2016). By isolating oppositional concerns to key issues related to the proposed development or building projects, YIMBYS and NIMBYS can work towards negotiating or compromising on specific issues rather than larger ideological debates (such as those related to the rights to housing). While useful in a pragmatic sense, such de-politicization may oversimplify and obfuscate the racist, classist, and ableist histories of certain kinds of exclusionary community-building practices. According to McNee and Pojani (2022), critics have deemed this depoliticized and market-oriented approaches as "supporting unrestrained capitalism, anti-regulation,

whitewashing, neoliberal multi-culturalism, and racialized gentrification” (p. 559). These kinds of narratives are also largely reproduced by news media which tend to support and amplify the voices of those who support de-regulation and capitalist expansion. As Meronek (2018) writes, “YIMBY seem to offer a straightforward prescription that doesn't upend the free market, and national media outlets love it” (p. 31).

COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

The increasing visibility of homelessness, particularly amidst the Covid-19 pandemic, and the subsequent pressure for communities to act quickly has come up against their ability to adapt to the changing needs of the community and to respond in a way that leads to long-term stability and equity for everyone. Thus, making communities less resilient and able to quickly adapt and change in the face of challenges, emergencies, and disasters. As discussed above, NIMBY discourses, practices and policies reinforce social exclusion and erode a sense of community belonging. Such contentions negatively impact *community resilience* - that is community harmony, sense of belonging, and ability to get along (Brodsky & Cattaneo, 2013). However, YIMBY informed discourses, practices and policies can help to overcome such contentions and work to facilitate and foster community resilience. Further, resilient communities, those that move beyond an ‘individual community’ and take a ‘holistic view’ toward the ‘global community’ make it ‘impossible for any individual to believe that they are not worthy of every consideration and support to be fully functioning, empowered community members’ (Flaherty et al., 2019, p. 27). In this way, resilient communities and the import of social inclusion inform, foster and support YIMBY driven initiatives.

To date, the bulk of research available on community resilience has been conducted in ‘silos’ and in the context of natural disasters (e.g., responses to floods, hurricanes, tsunami), public health (e.g., pandemics) and public safety concerns (e.g., terrorist attacks), with little attention and research on community resilience in the face of homelessness (see, for example, Adger, 2000; Chandra et al., 2013; Cutter et al., 2008; Herrmann-Lunecke & Villagra, 2020; Imperiale & Vanclay, 2016; Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Masten, 2001; Pfefferbaum et al., 2015; Rapaport et al., 2018). Yet, as many researchers have convincingly shown, homelessness should be treated and responded to as a disaster (Doll et al., 2022; Karabanow et al., 2022). Further, much of the research available on community resilience has been reactionary in nature, focusing on the use of resilient frameworks, policies and practices for responding to, or recovering from, incidents thereby focusing on returning communities back to the status quo (Carpenter et al., 2021; Genik & Chouinard, 2015). Yet, a focus on disaster and/or emergency response does not build long term stability and ‘resilience’ but instead focuses on temporary and short-term stability. As such, much of the research available on community resilience has provided little evidence-based research to inform community responses to homelessness.

In what follows, we provide an overview of the available research on community resilience to identify ways in which this research could be used to inform long-term stability and foster YIMBY discourses, practices, and policies that work to entrench a sense of community belonging and social inclusion. We begin by reviewing the diverse ways in which ‘community resilience’ has been used as a construct and theory. Specifically, we identify three different, yet overlapping, ways in which community resilience is presented in the literature: a systems construct/framework, an individual construct/framework, and a

meso-level construct/framework. Based on this review, we identify the importance of multi-sector cooperation, and the inclusion of marginalized and vulnerable populations for developing policies and practices that foster and support long-term community resilience in a way that promotes a sense of community belonging and social inclusion writ large.

DEFINING COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

Community resilience, as a construct, was first established in South America by Elbio Nestor Suarez Ojeda after conducting observational research on community responses following natural disasters (Juliano & Yunes, 2014). From these observations, the research found “that at the same time as pain and loss of lives and resources are processed, these factors often generate a mobilizing effect on the supportive capabilities that allow the damage to be repaired and make recovery possible” (Juliano & Yunes, 2014, p. 141). To date, the literature on resilience offers multiple perspectives that interrogate the capacity of communities to overcome difficult or stressful life situations (see Henderson & Milstein, 2003). As a construct, community resilience has been used in a variety of diverse contexts and disciplines, leading to what some argue to be ‘imprecise use’ (Wulff et al., 2015, p. 363). In fact, there is no consensus in definition and the use of the term in theory and practice has been found to lack precision - ‘[t]hat is, resilience has been defined in numerous ways, including as an outcome, as a coping strategy, and as a trait’ (Liu et al., 2017, p. 113).

The inability to clearly define and operationalize ‘community resilience’ has impeded scientific testing and, subsequently, the ability to inform evidence-based policies and practices (Liu et al., 2017). Based on a review of the literature, we found community resilience to be discussed at a structural/systems level, a psychological/individual trait, as well as a community (meso) level construct. As illustrated through our review of the literature, the wide adoption and imprecise application of ‘community resilience’ has made it difficult to identify ‘concrete actions people, organizations, and institutions can take to promote the sustainable and long-term well-being of communities in the face of adversity and disaster’ (Wulff et al., 2015, p. 363). Below we provide a brief review of each of these frameworks and conclude our review by advocating for a meso-level framework for defining community resilience.

STRUCTURAL LEVEL CONSTRUCT AND FRAMEWORK

The largest body of research available on community resilience has explored, operationalized, and studied the concept through disaster emergency management (Imperiale & Vanclay, 2016; Pfefferbaum et al., 2015; Rapaport et al., 2018). As much of this research was outside the purview of our interest in community resilience in the face of homelessness, we provide a brief overview of the existing research, recognizing that much more has been written about community resilience from a structural response framework. Within this framework, community resilience is defined as a positive outcome in the face of adversity or serious threat to personal or collective safety (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Masten, 2001). Adger (2000), for example, defines resiliency as “the ability of groups or communities to cope with external stresses and disturbances as a result of social, political and environmental change” (p. 347). Whereas Wulff et al. (2015) define it as ‘an approach to preparedness that connects our ability to withstand a disaster with efforts to strengthen day-to-day systems to improve the public’s health and vitality’ (p. 368). In this framework, community resilience is recognized as helping communities to *mitigate* the damage

caused by disasters in order to heal, because “actions taken before, during, and after events, be it a natural disaster or an act of terror, can clearly mitigate damage and help communities and individuals to heal and even thrive” (Wulff et al., 2015, p. 361).

Community resilience in the wake of disasters has frequently focused on a systems and infrastructure level approach. A systems approach recognizes that components of complex systems interact and change together, often in unpredictable ways, when faced with external pressures and forces (Lerch, 2017). Resilience within this context is “the capacity of a system to undergo disturbance and maintain its function and controls” (Jabareen, 2015, p. 2). According to a resilient city framework, a resilient city:

is defined by the overall abilities of its governance, physical, economic and social systems and entities that are exposed to hazards to learn, be ready in advance, plan for uncertainties, resist, absorb, accommodate to and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions. (Jabareen, 2015, p. 19)

As illustrated by the definition above, a structural and systems approach to community resilience focuses on returning a community back to its original state in the wake of disaster. Such research shows that when communities have healthy partnerships with local government agencies, are educated on threats to health and safety, and are able to access resources effectively they fare more positively when faced with a natural disaster or public health threat as compared to communities where bonds are weaker (Chandra et al., 2013; Cutter et al., 2008; Herrmann-Lunecke & Villagra, 2020). Such an approach prioritizes structural, economic and political factors to resilience with significantly less attention on the individual and community level factors. For example, when discussing resilient community frameworks, Lerch (2017) argues:

The built environment is really the physical manifestation of decisions about how we occupy land, played out over decades and centuries. Governments decide who can own and what it can be used for. Landowners decide what they want to do with the land. Financial institutions decide what kinds of land uses they are willing to lend money for (and who they are willing to lend money to). Architects and planners decide how a structure will be designed and situated; engineers decide how a structure will be constructed. Owners and managers decide how a structure will be operated, maintained, repaired, and retrofitted....Multiply this pattern by hundreds or thousands of buildings – and many more individual pieces of infrastructure and you have the build environment of a community. (Lerch, 2017, p. 294)

Problematic within the above perspective is the way a systems approach prioritizes the voices and agency of those with power. The ‘community’, as represented above, constitutes and prioritizes the agency of those with social, political and economic power. If a resilient communities framework prioritizes the voices and experiences of those with power when developing structural policies and practices, it inevitably excludes and invisibilizes the needs, experiences, and voices of those who are marginalized, vulnerable and underserved. Further, community resilience frameworks that focus on returning communities back to ‘normalcy’ will do little to address underlying structural issues of vulnerability (Sledge & Thomas, 2019).

Finally, in the context of homelessness, a structural framework may negate the important role individual and community level factors play in fostering and sustaining community resilience. When homelessness is conceived as solely a lack of housing issue it may lead communities to building houses as the solution. However, research available on homelessness and housing has identified that it takes more than just a house to help those experiencing homelessness “thrive” (Marshall et al., 2021, 2022). When simply placed in a home without social integration and supports, many people ‘languish’, have psychosocial needs that remain unmet, and, as a result, live in a continued state of survival (Marshall et al., 2021, 2022). In this way, a structural framework toward community resilience pays inadequate attention to the import of social and psychological supports.

INDIVIDUAL/COMMUNITY LEVEL CONSTRUCT AND FRAMEWORK

Another line of inquiry has focused on individual and community group levels of ‘resilience’ to understand what makes some people, and groups of people, more resilient than others in the face of adversity. In this framework, it is recognized that individual resilience is an important component of community resilience. This framework is particularly salient in the research looking at community responses to mental health, addictions, and to a lesser extent, homelessness. Here it is argued that building long-term resilience offers promise for addressing mental illness in communities outside of a disaster-relief context (Flaherty et al., 2019). For Bowling et al. (2020), community resilience is made up of both the context (e.g., psychosocial boundaries) and networks of relationships. For example, in their study on community resilience among gender diverse individuals, they found community resilience to be significantly affected and shaped by individual-level experiences, such as one’s ability to share experiences with other group members and engage in self-reflection, and community level factors, such as the leadership approach of the group, group norms and climate (Bowling et al., 2020). Of significant import within this framework is the role social inclusion and community belonging hold for building resilient communities. Community resilience, therefore, must include strategies that not only address the basic physical needs of community members (such as safety and security), but also “the creation of safe places where good mental health and full social inclusion are part of the fabric of peaceful, strong communities” (Flaherty et al., 2019, p. 27).

Thus, social integration is a key element of community resilience because

[o]pportunities for social integration can contribute to proximity bridging and bonding with other people outside the mental health system (Ornelas, Duarte et al., 2014; Ware et al., 2007). The recent community science literature suggests the relevance of objective indicators for the integration of people with mental illness related to employment, housing, and the size and interactions of social support. (Ornelas et al., 2019, p. 45)

While much of the research within this framework has focused on community resilience in the response to mental health and addictions, there is a smaller body of work that looks at the importance of individual and community factors for fostering community resilience among those precariously housed or homeless.

For example, Bell and Walsh (2015) conducted qualitative field research to understand how residents of homeless shelters perceive and, subsequently, overcome social exclusion and marginalization within their

community. Within their study, they identify the difference between “rooflessness” and “rootlessness” to describe homelessness as “more than the absence of shelter, but rather ... the absence of support and inclusion in one’s community” (p. 1977). Drawing on the work of McMillan and Chavis (1986), Bell and Walsh (2015) identify four elements of community that shape one’s social inclusion and belonging: membership, influence, reinforcement, and shared emotional connection. This research underscores the importance of shared experiences for creating a sense of community. Bell and Walsh’s study found homeless shelters to provide all four elements to residents and uncovered how one’s transition from a shelter into housing was described as ‘leaving your home for a house’ (p. 1987). Their findings led them to advocate for a reimagining of housing that moves away from a heteronormative and nuclear conception of the “home” toward community housing options that foster “a less radical transition” (p. 1987) for housing residents learning to live on their own while still providing social contact and relations that instill a sense of community. These findings are in line with more recent Canadian scholarship that shows that individuals who secure housing after being homeless often do not thrive, but instead live in a constant state of survival (Marshall et al., 2021). This research identifies that while housing is critically important, it is not the solution on its own. Rather, ‘other aspects of a person’s life including being integrated in their community, having enough money to pay for basic needs, attaining mental well-being, and having opportunities to engage in meaningful activities are similarly important’ (Marshall et al., 2021, p. 5).

In this framework, attention is placed on micro level factors that facilitate or impede resilience within individuals, and by extension the community. While such work has provided important insights into the role psychosocial factors play in the development and sustainability of resilience, it has given less attention to the role structural factors play within resilience. As Liu et al., argue, while ‘the emphasis placed on the individual is important in dictating resilient outcomes, it is also an important limitation as these measures assume resilience to be nested within an individual, with little consideration for other variables that may influence the outcome’ (2017, p. 112). Thus, when looking at community resilience from an individual framework, we risk placing ‘blame’ and ‘responsibility’ on individual actors or groups for failing to be resilient, without being attentive to the structural elements that shape and inform those very experiences. Further, when studying community resilience among specific ‘populations’ of people it risks making the applicability of the findings difficult to generalize across communities in ways that can inform evidence-based policy and practice developments (Liu et al., 2017).

MESO-LEVEL CONSTRUCT AND FRAMEWORK

While important insights have been gained about the structural and individual factors that inform and foster community resilience, such frameworks prioritize one factor (i.e., structural vs. individual) over another and give little attention to the interplay among structural and individual factors. There is a smaller body of scholarship that has taken a meso-level framework to empirically examine the interplay among structural, individual and community level factors in order identify what communities need to in order to develop resilience. This line of scholarship has focused on the interactions between ‘political economic conditions and social networks within communities to demonstrate how the strength of these interactions enhance or negate a community’s capacity for resilience (Currie, 2018). For example, the Australian government established a Housing and Accommodation Support Initiative (HASI) to improve the mental and physical health of its consumers by facilitating access to mental health services, secure

housing and social supports. Sayers et al. write, “HASI programmes recognize that people with a mental illness require support not only with access to mental health services and housing, but also more basic support associated with daily living, such as managing their money, health, and participating in community life” (2017, p. 143). This research highlights the need for *integrated and collaborative responses* – specifically among essential services (health supports), infrastructure (stable housing) and community supports for fostering community resilience among Indigenous mental health clients.

In a study on mid-size community responses to homelessness in British Columbia, Canada, Dej et al. (2021) define community resilience as

a multi-dimensional, dynamic and iterative process that involves collective awareness, action, reflection, adaptation and social inclusion. Community resilience is influenced by social, cultural and structural resources, constraints and opportunities. Central to developing community resilience is the ability to address sustainable, affordable housing, poverty reduction, and access to a continuum of healthcare and mental health resources (p. 51).

Their definition identifies the social, cultural, political, and structural factors needed to develop community resilience. Drawing on the work of Brodsky and Cattaneo (2013), Dej et al. (2021) argue that community resilience requires communities to:

1. Develop *conscious collective awareness* of the root causes of problems.
2. Develop an *intention* to set and maintain goals that aim at addressing problems in a long-term sustainable way.
3. Develop *thoughtful actions* that locate and utilize appropriate and accessible resources.
4. Continually acquire *collective feedback and reflection* on the initiative to allow for adjustments and refinement...it is essential to build feedback loops to solicit reflection from all community members (Dej et al., 2021, p. 52).

Within this framework, community resilience is something that is *built* through the inclusion of all community members – including those who are vulnerable, marginalized and underserved. Such an approach identifies the importance of investing in participatory action research to identify what supports are needed and what impact policies and practices are having on experiential outcomes. For example, in a study on the development of social capital and community resilience in affordable housing communities, Currie (2018) found “a lack of pre-existing resources in neighbourhoods hindered the development of social capital and community resilience” and that building such resources into the environment produces better outcomes (p. 100). Some of the benefits of community participation – including the voices and experiences of vulnerable, marginalized and underserved groups – include better understanding of community needs, identifying where differential access to resources and help reside within your community, improve accountability and problem solving and develop trust and cooperation (Mayers et al., 2021).

PROGRAMMING FOR PROMOTING COMMUNITY RESILIENCE

Balancing the individual and structural need of people and communities is central for developing resilient communities. Research has shown that programming focused on multi-tiered intervention can systematically enhance how people interact not only with their built environments, but with other community members. Community sports and music programming, for example, can have beneficial

effects on bringing together mixed-income residents and contribute to a vibrant community. In Edmonton, recreational floor hockey programming created a “network of mutuality and solidarity among a group of young men experiencing homelessness” (Koch et al., 2020, p. 2) The sport program was developed by a local community member who was also actively involved in harm reduction services. The program served to not only bring community members together, but it contributed to the identification of root problems. Koch et al. (2018) also notes the important of sport programs in bringing together community members and carving out a space for friendship and belonging. They write:

Creating spaces where men can show affection and kinship is also important for countering negative stereotypes related to masculinity in the context of homelessness. These sporting programs can also provide an opportunity for engagement by the wider community and social service providers to identify the needs of their clients in a setting that is not clinical or bureaucratic. (Koch et al., 2018, p. 19)

There is also a body of literature that addresses the importance of recreation and community bonding in the context of musical interventions an vulnerable populations (e.g., Kriegel et al., 2022; Lenette et al., 2016). Like sports, music programming can be an effective way to carve out spaces where marginalized or vulnerable groups can develop a sense of attachment and “place” while bringing together a wide range of community members. As Lenette et al. (2016) note, “musical activities contributed to creating a sense of solidarity among participants, who, due to diverse backgrounds, were unlikely to have come together outside the detention context” (p. 131). Similarly, Kriegel et al. (2022) also found that

While creativity was a significant draw, so was social diversity. Participants often referred to the opportunities to engage with people they would not meet otherwise, including those with different health problems (e.g., substance use or mental illnesses), different socioeconomic statuses (e.g. homeless and housed; class-based; criminal justice involvement) and a range of demographics (e.g., age, race, gender, sexuality, and religion). (p. 12).

As noted above in the discussion on the systemic and built environment aspects of resilience, it is important to consider how spatial design contributes to (or works against) community belonging. Jones (2015) notes that the simple act of removing one’s fence in favour of a shared neighbourhood garden or outdoor space can work toward challenging the deeply engrained spatial design that homeownership has to be closed off and completely privatized. In fact, Lanionu and Byerly (2021) found that residents’ support for housing and shelter programming is positively linked to their interactions with people experiencing homelessness. Those that interact with or come into contact with precariously housed people are more likely to vote public housing programs. Thus, fighting against the displacement of people experiencing homelessness can in turn create greater support for social programming and increased public funding for vulnerable groups.

Evidence suggests that the upkeep of urban green spaces has significantly positive effects on people experiencing homelessness. Green space provides places to sleep for those living rough and offers opportunity for some to build shelters in more secluded areas (Koprowska et al., 2020). People experiencing homelessness also use riverbeds and waterways as places to shelter. They offer access to running water, and as Flanigan and Welsh (2020) suggest, offer a place for those sleeping rough to avoid contact with law enforcement or other agencies. Though these natural landscapes can offer temporary

reprieve for people experiencing homelessness, it is important to consider and invest in how spatial design can work towards bringing people together, creating a sense of place, and ultimately strengthen the structural and individual aspects of resilience.

KEY MESSAGES FOR POLICY, PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH

The following section highlights practical and research-based approaches noted in this report. It offers a succinct summary of key findings from this knowledge synthesis that will help policymakers, practitioners, and researchers continue to develop ways for challenging NIMBYism, developing inclusive and equitable YIMBY strategies, and promoting community resilience and belonging.

All orders of government should empower community organizations to play a more influential role in shaping YIMBY policies by providing funding and resources to do this work. Having community organizations, rather than government entities, take the lead on needed community developments and services could expedite processes by reducing delays related to political influence (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, 2006). Empowering non-governmental organizations in the planning and development stages could reduce delays related to multi-jurisdictionality. Organizations can be effective players in placing pressure on multiple levels of government to enact zoning provisions and also acquire funding from several sources simultaneously (see, for example, Oakley, 2002).

All orders of government must develop housing policies that meet the needs of people from varying ages, races/ethnicities, genders, and abilities and that these factors are given meaningful consideration early on. YIMBY policies that promote social inclusions, offer harm reduction services (including mental health, substance use treatment, etc.), and provide adequate and affordable housing solutions can be seen as proactive commitments to address things “happening in my backyard” (Bergen, 2019). Factors such as age, race, gender, and ability, must be given meaningful consideration from the earliest stages of community development projects.

All orders of government must recognize homelessness and housing unaffordability as a crisis to expedite multi-tiered responses and combat NIMBYism. A “disaster and emergency management” approach to policies and practices that are “forward-looking,” consider multiple response scenarios, and complement efforts between government and non-governmental agencies can ultimately create and strengthen resilient communities.

Lived experts of housing precarity/homelessness should be consulted at every stage of urban planning/design process to inform best practices related to housing, service provision, and infrastructure supports. Lived experts hold the experiential knowledge needed to inform best practices related to housing, service provisioning, and infrastructure supports needed within their respective communities. Collaboratively developed and driven policies and programs are necessary for fostering a sense of community belonging and social inclusion (Marshall et al., 2021, 2022; Sayers et al., 2017). Any approach to building and sustaining community resilience requires a focus on, and inclusion of, peer support specialists and lived experience.

Funding agencies must provide reliable funding streams for programs that foster and promote community resilience, especially in urban design. This includes programs that promote and incentivize community-based participatory policy and evaluation. By recognizing the expertise of community members and the unique and specific needs they identify, governments can work to support those at the grassroots to meaningfully carry out their work on a long-term basis (Wulff et al., 2015).

Governments and policymakers must develop creative ways for educating the public on housing and homelessness, which can have a strong influence over public opinion on housing policy. Evidence suggests that members of the public are seldom influenced by economists and other professional experts when it comes to fact-based approaches to housing policy. This is why governments and policymakers should collaborate with grassroots community members to create more effective tools (Marble & Nall, 2021).

Promoting YIMBYism requires a multi-sector coalition, and as such all orders of government should actively consult organizations dedicated to YIMBY principles on the best ways to address community needs. Governments at all levels should actively consult with other governmental sectors and organizations that are dedicated to building resilient communities on ways to address the specific and unique needs of those communities.

Policy makers and service managers must develop holistic responses to address housing needs that prioritizes not only building units, but also strategies to foster community belonging and social inclusion. While exclusionary zoning practices can limit housing supply and exacerbate class and racial divisions, public policy related to zoning is not enough to build and strengthen communities (Imbroscio, 2021; Rodríguez-Pose & Storper, 2020). Fostering community belonging requires a strong investment with community leaders, stakeholders, and lived experts. Investing in creative ways to foster emotional connections among housed and unhoused residents can strengthen community member bonds and promote resilience (Koch et al., 2018, 2020; Koprowska et al., 2020; Lenette et al., 2016).

CONCLUSION

The YIMBY (“Yes in My Backyard”) movement focuses on policies and discourses that promote affordable, social, and equitable housing for all. To counter NIMBY narratives of homelessness, YIMBY attitudes have become prevalent among grassroots and community organizations to advocate for compassionate and sustainable approaches to address the intersecting and systemic factors that contribute to homelessness (Fraser et al., 2019; Gibson, 2005; Scally, 2013). However, no studies have conducted a systematic literature review of the research on NIMBYism and YIMBYism, as well as the promotion of community resilience when considering social and physical exclusion. This report addresses this gap, first offering a synthesis of literature on NIMBYism and YIMBYism, allowing us to identify the methods communities use to combat social exclusion and isolation, while also synthesizing grey literature to complement and contribute to academic and policy research on homelessness and community resilience. Second, it identifies literature gaps and offers a comprehensive summary of evidence-based strategies that address social exclusion and promote community resilience. Our literature review synthesizes peer-reviewed academic and grey literature in the following three areas related to

homelessness: (1) NIMBY discourses, narratives, and policies, (2) YIMBY and social inclusion discourses, narratives, and policies, and (3) current uses, iterations, and conceptual and theoretical contributions around community resilience.

CORE FINDINGS

A scoping literature review strategy was employed to collect, analyze, and synthesize research (Ambramovich, 2017) related to NIMBYism, YIMBYism, and community resilience in the context of homelessness. Both academic and grey literature were drawn upon to analyze research and practices that contribute to, and counter, narratives related to NIMBYism and YIMBYism, as well as the development of community resilience in terms of social exclusion and inclusion. After conducting a systematic academic and grey literature search, the research team used a set of inclusion criteria to ensure only relevant articles were included in the synthesis. Following exclusions, a total of 191 records were read for synthesis in the final report, including literature focusing on NIMBY, YIMBY, and community resilience in the context of housing or homelessness.

The literature on NIMBYism demonstrated how NIMBY attitudes can have detrimental effects on policies and practices designed to address homelessness. NIMBYism is described as local opposition towards controversial land uses, that contribute to the public good but are considered to have a negative influence on the quality of life of local residents (Christiansen et al., 2019; Costanza et al., 2013; Davidson & Howe, 2014). NIMBYs, or community residents in opposition to development, are usually homeowners or businesses that want to protect or increase home values through housing supply restriction and land development prevention (S. Miller & Kiernan, 2021; Tretter & Heyman, 2022). These active, vocal, and connected residents base their NIMBY opposition around concerns such as declining property values, preserving neighbourhood characteristics, increasing crime, personal safety, and infrastructure strain (Gipson, 2020; Hanson et al., 2015; Kolla et al., 2017). However, these NIMBY assumptions are easily dispelled by research that focuses on social and housing developments and the impact these developments have on neighbourhood communities. Research suggests that NIMBY discourse is instead framed around stereotypes about people experiencing homelessness, fueling opposition to social housing and services. NIMBY attitudes are thereby reinforced by notions of inequality related to race, class, gender, and ability, due to anti-poor sentiments and racial prejudice (Gipson, 2020; McNee & Pojani, 2022; Tighe, 2012). Regardless, NIMBY attitudes effect public policy decisions, and NIMBYs have successfully blocked, delayed, and shut down housing developments by participating in zoning and city council meetings (Anthony, 2022; Garland et al., 2017; Glovin, 2021). The influence of these attitudes demonstrates that successful policy solutions should recognize the participatory politics of housing and the ways citizens shape the development process (Einstein et al., 2020).

The “Yes in My Backyard” (YIMBY) movement is the opposite of NIMBYism, focusing on meeting the needs of all community members and promoting affordable housing (Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness, 2021). YIMBY campaigns are usually situated in municipalities, providing a space for political and social mobilization. While some argue that YIMBY’s main focus is housing development and affordability (Coy, 2018; Tapp, 2021), others contend that YIMBYism is an important strategy to prevent homelessness (Dej et al., 2020). A new acronym, PHIMBYism—Public Housing in my Backyard—focuses specifically on public and affordable housing, demonstrating the importance that housing is available to

everyone, regardless of social location (McNee & Pojani, 2022). For YIMBY campaigns to be successful, active support from community members is needed. Housing developments are usually supported or opposed through local participation in council meetings, offering residents an opportunity to engage (Tapp, 2021). Research suggests that a lack of awareness about development projects can pose barriers to housing developments, and as such, the media should be mobilized to educate and build support for housing (Dinh, 2018).

YIMBY-informed discourses, practices, and policies can help facilitate and foster community resilience. Promoting community resilience should focus on multi-tier interventions, to enhance how people interact with each other and their built environments. Some successful programs include community sports and music programming to facilitate recreation and community bonding (Koch et al., 2020; Lennette et al., 2016).

FUTURE RESEARCH AREAS

While this scoping literature review synthesized research related to NIMBY, YIMBY, and community resilience in the context of housing and homelessness, future research is needed in the following areas. More research needs to focus on community resilience and homelessness. To date, much of the research available on community resilience has been conducted with a focus on natural disasters, public health, and public safety concerns, with minimal attention on social exclusion and homelessness. Further, the current research on community resilience is primarily reactionary, focusing on policies and practices for responding to incidents in order to return to the status quo. However, these types of responses emphasize temporary and short-term stability, providing minimal evidence-based research to inform community responses to homelessness, which requires long-term solutions.

Further, much of the research on NIMBYism focused on different issues, ranging from wind energy to supportive housing development. Research related to NIMBYism and homelessness are often produced in silos (Oudshoorn, 2020), which prohibits information sharing and disrupts the development of practices and policies to address NIMBYism and social exclusion. This form of siloing needs to be addressed in future research to ensure that NIMBYism is properly understood, further enabling evidence-based solutions to NIMBYism and homelessness.

While the literature addresses how exclusionary practices tend to be drawn along class and racial lines, little research has been conducted as to the impacts of NIMBYism in or near Indigenous communities. Current and historical colonial practices of land dispossession are inextricably tied to homelessness and social exclusion and more research into how these legacies inform and shape exclusionary practices is needed.

KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION ACTIVITIES

Our knowledge mobilization efforts will contribute to our existing research networks and expand multi-sector approaches to combatting NIMBYism and promoting social inclusion. As a result of our research, we will:

1. Publish our knowledge synthesis findings on the [Homeless Hub](#) website. The Homeless Hub is an invaluable resource for those in the homeless sector and contributes to important policy research.
2. Develop and share infographics and research briefs focused on: (1) approaches to combating community level NIMBY discourses and practices; (2) discourses, policies and practices to promote YIMBYism; and (3) policies and practices to foster community resilience.
3. Develop and create a podcast episode for the series *CRSP Talk*—a podcast series designed to share and promote research at the Centre for Research on Security Practices (CRSP) at Wilfrid Laurier University. The podcast episode and full Knowledge Synthesis report will be sent to all members of CRSP.
4. The report will also be sent within our [“From NIMBY to Neighbour Network.”](#) Our ongoing project, funded by a SSHRC Partnership Development Grant, explores perceptions of homelessness in three mid-size Ontario cities. Through this project, we have developed connections with city partners, community organizations, and local residents and businesses. We will distribute our report to these stakeholders.

REFERENCES

- Abdel-Samad, M., Calzo, J. P., Felner, J. K., Urada, L., Verbyla, M. E., Madanat, H., Adams, B. E., Alves, T., Appleyard, B., Chanin, J., Flanigan, S., Foad, H., Ginsberg, M., Higgins, M., Ko, E., Maher, K., Mladenov, N., Peattie, P., Welsh, M., & Sleet, D. (2021). Conceptualizing an interdisciplinary collective impact approach to examine and intervene in the chronic cycle of homelessness. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18042020>
- Abramovich, A. (2017). Understanding how policy and culture create oppressive conditions for LGBTQ2S youth in the shelter system. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 64(11), 1484–1501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2016.1244449>
- Adger, W. N. (2000). Social and ecological resilience: Are they related? *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(3), 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1191/030913200701540465>
- Allen, B., & Nolan, M. L. (2022). Impact of a homeless encampment closure on crime complaints in the Bronx, New York City, 2017: Implications for municipal policy. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 19(3), 356–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26408066.2022.2043797>
- Amaral, D. J. (2021). Who banishes? City power and anti-homeless policy in San Francisco. *Urban Affairs Review*, 57(6), 1524–1557. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087420925909>
- Anthony, J. (2022). Housing affordability and economic growth. *Housing Policy Debate*, 0(0), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2022.2065328>
- Aubry T, Goering P, Veldhuizen S, Adair Ce, Bourque J, J, D., E, L., V, S., J, S., Dl, S., & S, T. (2016). A multiple-city RT of housing first with assertive community treatment for homeless Canadians with serious mental illness. *Psychiatric Services (Washington, D.C.)*, 67(3), 275–281. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201400587>
- Bates, L. K. (2019). Growth without displacement: A test for equity planning in Portland. In N. Krumholz & K. W. Hexter (Eds.), *Advancing Equity Planning Now* (pp. 21–43). Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501730399-004>
- BC Housing Research Centre. (2019). *Community acceptance of non-market housing toolkit*. <https://www.bchousing.org/publications/Community-Acceptance-Toolkit-Guide-Three-Gaining-Maintaining.pdf>
- Belanger, Y. D., Dekruyf, K. A., Moncrieff, A., & Kazakoff, T. (2019). *The urban indigenous housing experience of NIMBY-ism in calgary, alberta* [Final report prepared for the Aboriginal Standing Committee on Housing and Homelessness (ASCHH)]. <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/documents/2019/11/belanger-urban-indigenous-housing-experience-of-nimby-calgary.pdf>

- Bell, M., & Walsh, C. (2015). Finding a place to belong: The role of social inclusion in the lives of homeless men. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(12), 1974–1994. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2015.2414>
- Bergen, R. (2019, May 27). Walking alongside people with addictions. *Canadian Mennonite*, 23(11), 5–6.
- Bertrand, A. (2019). Proxy war: The role of recent CEQA exemptions in fixing California’s housing crisis. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*, 53, 413. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/collsp53&id=431&div=&collection=>
- Beyer, S. (2017, February 13). *Build, baby, build: A new housing movement’s unofficial motto.* Governing. <https://www.governing.com/archive/gov-housing-yimby.html>
- Bogusz, B. (2018). Neighbourhood planning: National strategy for ‘bottom up’ governance. *Journal of Property, Planning and Environmental Law*, 10(1), 56–68. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPEL-01-2018-0001>
- Bowling, J., Vercruyse, C., Bello-Ogunu, F., Krinner, L. M., Greene, T., Webster, C., & Dahl, A. A. (2020). “It’s the nature of the beast”: Community resilience among gender diverse individuals. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 48(7), 2191–2207. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22371>
- Brodsky, A. E., & Cattaneo, L. B. (2013). A transconceptual model of empowerment and resilience: Divergence, convergence and interactions in kindred community concepts. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 52, 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9599-x>
- Bronstein, Z. (2018). California’s “Yimby’s.” *Dollars & Sense*, September/October. <https://www.dollarsandsense.org/archives/2018/0918bronstein.html>
- Brown, D. (2021, January 4). Civil rights group urges Toronto to reallocate more than \$250M spent on police. *CBC News*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/canadian-civil-liberties-association-report-over-policing-1.5860483>
- Brunes, F., Hermansson, C., Song, H.-S., & Wilhelmsson, M. (2020). NIMBYs for the rich and YIMBYs for the poor: Analyzing the property price effects of infill development. *Journal of European Real Estate Research*, 13(1), 55–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JERER-11-2019-0042>
- Buikstra, E., Ross, H., King, C. A., Baker, P. G., Hegney, D., McLachlan, K., & Rogers-Clark, C. (2010). The components of resilience—Perceptions of an Australian rural community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(8), 975–991. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20409>
- Calder, M. J., Hansard, A., Richter, S., Burns, K. K., & Mao, Y. (2011). Framing homelessness for the Canadian public: The news media and homelessness. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 20(2), 1–19. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26193866>
- Cameron, A., Abrahams, H., Morgan, K., Williamson, E., & Henry, L. (2016). From pillar to post: Homeless women’s experiences of social care. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 24(3), 345–352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12211>

- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. (2006). *Gaining community acceptance of affordable housing projects and homeless shelters* (Government Report No. 06–016; Socio-Economic Series). <https://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/NH18-23-106-016E.pdf>
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. (2020). *Research insight: Understanding social inclusion and NIMBYism in providing affordable housing* (p. 5). <https://assets.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/sites/cmhc/data-research/publications-reports/research-insight/2020/research-insight-social-inclusion-nimby-affordable-housing-69697-en.pdf?rev=e7e1f381-e328-438e-b578-95b854f0658f>
- Canadian Alliance to End Homelessness. (2021). *Yes! In my backyard campaign rises up against NIMBYism*. <https://caeh.ca/bright-spot-yimby/>
- Canadian Home Builders' Association. (2013). *Building "yes": A not-in-my-backyard (NIMBY) toolkit*. <https://chbanl.ca/wp-content/uploads/CHBA-NIMBY-2013.pdf>
- Carpenter, A., Council, D., & Burnett, J. (2021). Understanding how community resilience can inform community development in the era of COVID. In I. Linkov, J. M. Keenan, & B. D. Trump (Eds.), *COVID-19: Systemic Risk and Resilience* (pp. 345–357). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71587-8_19
- Chandra, A., Williams, M., Plough, A., Stayton, A., Wells, K. B., Horta, M., & Tang, J. (2013). Getting actionable about community resilience: The Los Angeles County community disaster resilience project. *American Journal of Public Health, 103*(7), 1181. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301270>
- Christiansen, W., Heinrich, T., & Peterson, T. M. (2019). Foreign policy begins at home: The local origin of support for US democracy promotion. *International Interactions, 45*(4), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2019.1610748>
- Clifford, S., & Piston, S. (2017). Explaining public support for counterproductive homelessness policy: The role of disgust. *Political Behavior, 39*(2), 503–525. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-016-9366-4>
- Costanza, S. E., Kilburn, J. C., & Vendetti-Koski, S. (2013). Are minority areas disproportionately targeted for halfway house placement? *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 11*(4), 256–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15377938.2012.762754>
- Coy, P. (2018, September 3). Yes in my backyard. *Cities, 52*–53.
- Currie, M. A. (2018). The formation of social capital in newly constructed neighborhoods. *Housing and Society, 45*(2), 81–103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08882746.2018.1488213>
- Cutter, S. L., Barnes, L., Berry, M., Burton, C., Evans, E., Tate, E., & Webb, J. (2008). A place-based model for understanding community resilience to natural disasters. *Global Environmental Change, 18*(4), 598–606. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.07.013>

- Davidson, P. J., & Howe, M. (2014). Beyond NIMBYism: Understanding community antipathy toward needle distribution services. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 25(3), 624–632. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2013.10.012>
- Davison, G., Han, H., & Liu, E. (2017). The impacts of affordable housing development on host neighbourhoods: Two Australian case studies. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 32(4), 733–753. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-016-9538-x>
- Dej, E. (2020). *A complex exile: Homelessness and social exclusion in Canada*. UBC Press.
- Dej, E., Gaetz, S., & Schwan, K. (2020). Turning off the tap: A typology for homelessness prevention. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 41(5), 397–412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-020-00607-y>
- Dej, E., Sanders, C., & Braimoh, J. (2021). *Rewriting the narrative on homelessness mid-sized Canadian cities*. Centre for research on security practices.
- DeVerteuil, G. (2013). Where has NIMBY gone in urban social geography? *Social & Cultural Geography*, 14(6), 599–603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2013.800224>
- Dinh, T., Brewster, D., Fullerton, A., Huckaby, G., Parks, M., Rankin, S., Ruan, N., & Zwiebel, E. (2018). *Yes, in my backyard: Building ADUs to address homelessness* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 3173258). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3173258>
- Doberstein, C. (2020). Role-playing in public engagement for housing for vulnerable populations: An experiment exploring its possibilities and limitations. *Land Use Policy*, 99, 105032. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105032>
- Doll, K., Karabanow, J., Huges, J., Leviten-Reid, C., & Wu, H. (2022). Homelessness within the COVID-19 pandemic in two Nova Scotian communities. *International Journal on Homelessness*, 2(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.5206/ijoh.2022.1.14227>
- Dum, C. P., Socia, K. M., & Rydberg, J. (2017). Public support for emergency shelter housing interventions concerning stigmatized populations: Results from a factorial survey. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 16(3), 835–877. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12311>
- Einstein, K. L., Glick, D. M., & Palmer, M. (2020). Neighborhood defenders: Participatory politics and america's housing crisis. *Political Science Quarterly*, 135(2), 281–312. <https://doi.org/10.1002/polq.13035>
- Evans, K. (2022). An examination of perceptions and preferences for tiny house villages for the homeless in Missouri. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 0(0), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19491247.2022.2072661>
- Flaherty, M., Sikorski, E., Klos, L., & Vus, V. (2019). Peacebuilding and mental health: Moving beyond individual pathology to community responsibility: moving beyond individual pathology to

- community responsibility. *Mental Health: Global Challenges Journal*, 1(1), 27–28. <https://doi.org/10.32437/mhgcj.v1i1.13>
- Flanigan, & Welsh, M. (2020). Unmet needs of individuals experiencing homelessness near San Diego waterways: The roles of displacement and overburdened service systems. *Journal of Health and Human Services*, 43(2), 105–130.
- Ford, T., & Schuetz, J. (2019, July 17). Tackling zoning to help the middle class: 5 policy approaches. *Up Front*. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2019/07/17/tackling-zoning-to-help-the-middle-class-5-policy-approaches/>
- Franklin, J. (2018). Not in my backyard. *Fourth Genre: Explorations in Nonfiction*, 20(1), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.14321/fourthgenre.20.1.0061>
- Fraser, B., Pierse, N., Chisholm, E., & Cook, H. (2019). LGBTIQ+ homelessness: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(15), E2677. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16152677>
- Freemark, Y. (2020). Upzoning Chicago: Impacts of a zoning reform on property values and housing construction. *Urban Affairs Review*, 56(3), 758–789. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087418824672>
- Gaetz, S. (2013). The criminalization of homelessness: A Canadian perspective. *European Journal of Homelessness _ Volume*, 7(2).
- Garland, B., Wodahl, E., & Cota, L. (2016). Measuring public support for prisoner reentry options. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(12), 1406–1424. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X15578438>
- Garland, B., Wodahl, E., & Saxon, C. (2017). What influences public support of transitional housing facilities for offenders during reentry? *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(1), 18–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403414564866>
- Genik, L., & Chouinard, P. (2015). *An overview of pilot projects in support of critical infrastructure resilience* (p. 4). Defence Research and Development Canada.
- Gent, W. (2018). *The rhetorical circulation of the housing first model in the United States* [Ph.D., The University of Wisconsin - Madison]. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2033053106/abstract/3ED5F36BA9E54162PO/1>
- Gent, W. (2022). “Not in my back yard”: Democratic rhetorics in spatial gatekeeping. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 19(2), 140–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2022.2061026>
- Gibson, T. A. (2005). Nimby and the civic good. *City & Community*, 4(4), 381–401. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2005.00144.x>

- Gidley, J., Hampson, G., Wheeler, L., & Bereded-Samuel, E. (2010). Social inclusion: Context, theory and practice. *The Australasian Journal of University Community Engagement*, 5(1), 6–36.
- Gipson, N. M. (2020). *Making the third ghetto: Race and family homelessness in Washington, D.C., 1977-1999* [Ph.D., The University of Manchester (United Kingdom)]. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2514727904/abstract/9A0BC00947534E5FPQ/1>
- Glovin, G. (2021). Power and democracy in local public participation law. *Urban Lawyer*, 51, 43. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/urban51&id=49&div=&collection=>
- Goering, P. N., & Streiner, D. L. (2015). Putting housing first: The evidence and impact. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry. Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie*, 60(11), 465. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674371506001101>
- Grainger, G. L. (2021). Punishment, support, or discipline? Taking stock of recent debates about homeless governance in neoliberal cities. *Sociology Compass*, 15(8), e12909. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12909>
- Grommon, E. (2017). Public perceptions and housing assistance for reentrants: Examination of the enduring power of stigmatizing labels. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 16(3), 827–833. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12324>
- Haapaniemi, P. (2020). In the ZONE: Many cities see upzoning as an effective way to increase density and affordable housing, but how does it affect property values and land use? *Valuation*, Q2, 7.
- Halimi, M. (2019). Siting homeless shelters in New York city: Fair share versus borough-based. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 47, 1519. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/frdurb47&id=1551&div=&collection=>
- Han, M. (2018, May 21). Yes, in my backyard. *The Nation*.
- Hankinson, M. (2018). When do renters behave like homeowners? High rent, price anxiety, and nimbyism. *American Political Science Review*, 112(3), 473–493. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000035>
- Hanson, T., Vandenberghe, C., & McLean, B. (2015). *Community inclusion frameworks for vulnerable populations & strategies for combating not in my back yard attitudes to social housing projects*. Alberta Centre for Child, Family and Community Research.
- Henderson, N., & Milstein, M. M. (2003). *Resiliency in schools: Making it happen for students and educators* (Updated ed). Corwin Press.
- Herring, C. (2021). Complaint-oriented “services”: Shelters as tools for criminalizing homelessness. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 693(1), 264–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716221996703>

- Herrmann-Lunecke, M. G., & Villagra, P. (2020). Community resilience and urban planning in tsunami-prone settlements in Chile. *Disasters*, 44(1), 103–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/disa.12369>
- HomeComing. (2005). *Yes, in my back yard*. HomeComing Community Choice Coalition. <https://yesinmybackyard.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/YIMBY-2.pdf>
- Imbroscio, D. (2021). Rethinking exclusionary zoning or: How i stopped worrying and learned to love it. *Urban Affairs Review*, 57(1), 214–251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087419879762>
- Imperiale, A. J., & Vanclay, F. (2016). Experiencing local community resilience in action: Learning from post-disaster communities. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 47, 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.08.002>
- Jabareen, Y. (2015). The risk city resilience trajectory. In Y. Jabareen (Ed.), *The Risk City: Cities Countering Climate Change: Emerging Planning Theories and Practices around the World* (pp. 137–159). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9768-9_7
- Jackson, A., Callea, B., Stampar, N., Sanders, A., De Los Rios, A., & Pierce, J. (2020). Exploring tiny homes as an affordable housing strategy to ameliorate homelessness: A case study of the dwellings in Tallahassee, FL. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17020661>
- Jones, T. (2015, October). The end of alone. *The New Statesmen*, 35–39. <https://www.newstatesman.com/long-reads/2015/10/end-alone-0>
- Juliano, M. C. C., & Yunes, M. A. M. (2014). Reflections on the social support network as a mechanism for the protection and promotion of resilience. *Ambiente & Sociedade*, 17(3), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-753X2014000300009>
- Jun, K.-N., & Musso, J. (2013). Participatory governance and the spatial representation of neighborhood issues. *Urban Affairs Review*, 49(1), 71–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087412453704>
- Karabanow, J., Bozcam, E. S., Hughes, J., & Wu, H. (2022). Lessons learned: COVID 19 and individuals experiencing homelessness in the global context. *International Journal on Homelessness*, 2(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.5206/ijoh.2022.1.13798>
- Keating, W. D. (2019). The right to housing: The goal versus the reality. In K. B. Anacker, M. T. Nguyen, & D. P. Varady (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Housing Policy and Planning* (pp. 11–22). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315642338>
- Kidd, S. A., Frederick, T., Karabanow, J., Hughes, J., Naylor, T., & Barbic, S. (2016). A mixed methods study of recently homeless youth efforts to sustain housing and stability. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 33, 207–218. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-015-0424-2>

- Klement, J., Kozák, J., Ševčík, M., & Pekárek, Š. (2022). Causes of opposition to residential development: A survey-framing experiment from the Czech Republic. *European Planning Studies*, 0(0), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2022.2049709>
- Koch, J., Scherer, J., & Holt, N. (2018). Slap shot! Sport, masculinities, and homelessness in the downtown core of a divided western canadian inner city. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 42(4), 270–294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723518773280>
- Koch, J., Scherer, J., & Kafara, R. (2020). Structural inequality, homelessness, and moral worth: Salvaging the self through sport? *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 49(6), 806–831. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241620931908>
- Kolla, G., Strike, C., Watson, T. M., Jairam, J., Fischer, B., & Bayoumi, A. M. (2017). Risk creating and risk reducing: Community perceptions of supervised consumption facilities for illicit drug use. *Health, Risk & Society*, 19(1–2), 91–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698575.2017.1291918>
- Koprowska, K., Kronenberg, J., Kuźma, I. B., & Łaszkiwicz, E. (2020). Condemned to green? Accessibility and attractiveness of urban green spaces to people experiencing homelessness. *Geoforum*, 113, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.04.017>
- Kriegel, L. S., Bernard, P., Fraser, E. R., Maclean, K., Noonan, C., Crespo, M., Schmidt, R., Bruce, L., Cole, R., Rowe, M., & Bellamy, C. D. (2022). Public spaces as transformative creative wellness spaces: An evaluation of Musical Intervention. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 20(1), 6–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2021.1964675>
- Kulig, J. C., Edge, D. S., Townshend, I., Lightfoot, N., & Reimer, W. (2013). Community resiliency: Emerging theoretical insights. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(6), 758–775. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21569>
- Laniyonu, A., & Byerly, S. (2021). More than spare change: A case study of contact and voter support for the homeless in Los Angeles County, California. *Urban Affairs Review*, 57(4), 1149–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087420905337>
- Larkin, D. J. (2015). Yes in my backyard! A guide to inclusive communities. *Visions: BC's Mental Health and Substance Use Journal*, 10(3). <https://www.heretohelp.bc.ca/yes-my-backyard>
- Legacy, C., Davison, G., & Liu, E. (2016). Delivering social housing: Examining the nexus between social housing and democratic planning. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 33(3), 324–341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2016.1145133>
- Lenette, C., Weston, D., Wise, P., Sunderland, N., & Bristed, H. (2016). Where words fail, music speaks: The impact of participatory music on the mental health and wellbeing of asylum seekers. *Arts & Health*, 8(2), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17533015.2015.1037317>
- Lerch, D. (2017). *The community resilience reader: Essential resources for an era of upheaval*. Island Press.

- Liu, J. J. W., Reed, M., & Girard, T. A. (2017). Advancing resilience: An integrative, multi-system model of resilience. *Personality and Individual Differences, 111*, 111–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.02.007>
- Lofaro, R. J., & Miller, H. T. (2021). Narrative politics in policy discourse: The debate over safe injection sites in philadelphia, pennsylvania. *Contemporary Drug Problems, 48*(1), 75–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091450921993821>
- Louthen, E. (2020). Prerogative and legislator vetoes. *Northwestern University Law Review, 115*, 549. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/illlr115&id=561&div=&collection=>
- Luthar, S. S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and Psychopathology, 12*(4), 857–885. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1903337/>
- Lyon-Callo, V. (2001). Making Sense of NIMBY poverty, power and community opposition to homeless shelters. *City & Society, 13*(2), 183–209. <https://doi.org/10.1525/city.2001.13.2.183>
- Marble, W., & Nall, C. (2021). Where self-interest trumps ideology: Liberal homeowners and local opposition to housing development. *The Journal of Politics, 83*(4), 1747–1763. <https://doi.org/10.1086/711717>
- Marshall, C. A., Oudshoorn, A., Holmes, J., Easton, C., Phillips, B., Todd, E., Cameron, J., Collins, S., Suliman Aryobi, Shanoff, C., Goldszmidt, R., Rolfe, S., Yosieph, L., Ford, J., Cornish, L., Mechele Te Brake, Chhokar, P., Woodburn, M., Turner, K., ... Rudman, D. L. (2021). “We need to genuinely listen to what people tell us they need”: Identifying how to support individuals living with mental illness and/or substance use difficulties to thrive following homelessness in London, Ontario, Canada. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28235.72485>
- Marshall, C. A., Phillips, B., Holmes, J., Todd, E., Hill, R., Panter, G., Easton, C., Landry, T., Collins, S., Greening, T., O'Brien, A., Jastak, M., Ridge, R., Goldszmidt, R., Shanoff, C., Laliberte Rudman, D., Carlsson, A., Aryobi, S., Perez, S., & Oudshoorn, A. (2022). ‘We stick people in a house and say okay, you’re housed. The problem is solved’: A qualitative study of service provider and organisational leader perspectives on thriving following homelessness. *Health & Social Care in the Community, hsc.14035*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.14035>
- Martin, D. G. (2013). Up against the law: Legal structuring of political opportunities in neighborhood opposition to group home siting in Massachusetts. *Urban Geography, 34*(4), 523–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2013.790640>
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*, 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227>

- Mayers, R., Bodin, K., & Teare, G. (2021). Love my hood: An examination of community engagement techniques in the city of Kitchener, Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research*, 30, Article. <https://cjur.uwinnipeg.ca/index.php/cjur/article/view/352>
- McElroy, E., & Szeto, A. (2018). The racial contours of YIMBY/NIMBY bay area gentrification. *Berkeley Planning Journal*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/BP329138432>
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14, 6–23. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629\(198601\)14:1<6::AID-JCOP2290140103>3.0.CO;2-I](https://doi.org/10.1002/1520-6629(198601)14:1<6::AID-JCOP2290140103>3.0.CO;2-I)
- McNee, G., & Pojani, D. (2022). NIMBYism as a barrier to housing and social mix in San Francisco. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 37(1), 553–573. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-021-09857-6>
- Meanwell, E. (2012). Experiencing Homelessness: A Review of Recent Literature: Experiencing Homelessness. *Sociology Compass*, 6(1), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00432.x>
- Meronek, T. (2018, June). Experiencing homelessness: A review of recent literature: Experiencing homelessness. In *These Times*, 30–37.
- Merriam, D. (2020). The great “yes in my back yard” (YIMBY) movement: Driven by the gig economy. *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law*, 29(1), 57–74.
- Miller, B., & Nicholls, W. (2013). Social movements in urban society: The city as a space of politicization. *Urban Geography*, 34(4), 452–473. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2013.786904>
- Miller, S., & Kiernan, K. T. (2021). Proceedings from the conference on the impact of housing affordability on economic development and regional labor markets. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 35(4), 262–268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08912424211044404>
- Monkkonen, P., & Manville, M. (2019). Opposition to development or opposition to developers? Experimental evidence on attitudes toward new housing. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 41(8), 1123–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2019.1623684>
- Moorhead, L. (2022). What to do about homelessness? Journalists collaborating as claims-makers in the San Francisco Homeless Project. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 50(4), 1893–1917. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22687>
- Neale, J., & Brown, C. (2016). ‘We are always in some form of contact’: Friendships among homeless drug and alcohol users living in hostels. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 24(5), 557–566. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12215>
- Nesbitt, C. (2018). *Affordable housing and NIMBYISM: urban, suburban and rural strategies* [PLAN 530: Affordable Housing Policy and Planning]. British Columbia Non-Profit Housing

Association. <https://buildhomesnotbarriers.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/2018-BCNPHA-SCARP-NIMBY-Strategies-July-2018.pdf>

- Nguyen, M. T., Basolo, V., & Tiwari, A. (2013). Opposition to affordable housing in the USA: Debate framing and the responses of local actors. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 30(2), 107–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2012.667833>
- Nguyen, M. T., & Payton Scally, C. (2019). Affordable housing and its residents are not pollutants. *Housing Policy Debate*, 29(2), 363–368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511482.2019.1574377>
- Nichols, N. (2019). *Youth, school, and community: Participatory institutional ethnographies*. University of Toronto Press.
- Oakley, D. (2002). Housing homeless people: Local mobilization of federal resources to fight NIMBYISM. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 24(1), 97–116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9906.00116>
- Ontario Human Rights Commission. (2012). *In the zone: Housing, human rights and municipal planning*. <https://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/zone-housing-human-rights-and-municipal-planning>
- Ornelas, J., Vargas Moniz, M., Duarte, T., & Jorge-Monteiro, M. F. (2019). The role of community integration and empowerment for the transformative change in community mental health. *Community Psychology in Global Perspective*, 5(1), 38–55. <https://doi.org/10.1285/i24212113v5i1p38>
- Oudshoorn, A. (2020). Homelessness as a fusion policy problem. In K. M. Lersch & J. Chakraborty (Eds.), *Geographies of Behavioural Health, Crime, and Disorder* (Vol. 126, pp. 165–186). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33467-3_8
- Oudshoorn, A., & Kirkwood, K. (2017). The geographic scope of opiate substitution therapy in an urban area in Canada. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 24(5), 369–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687637.2016.1216947>
- Perron, J. L. (2014). Addressing service access barriers for homeless youth: A call for collaboration. *Journal of Urban and Regional Analysis*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.37043/JURA.2014.6.1.6>
- Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C. M., Khalil, H., McInerney, P., Parker, D., & Soares, C. B. (2015). Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*, 13(3), 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050>
- Pfefferbaum, B., Jacobs, A. K., Griffin, N., & Houston, J. B. (2015). Children’s disaster reactions: The influence of exposure and personal characteristics. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, 17(7), 56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-015-0598-5>

- Pill, M. (2020). The austerity governance of Baltimore's neighborhoods: "The conversation may have changed but the systems aren't changing." *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 42(1), 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2018.1478226>
- PIVOT. (2015). *Yes, in my backyard: Welcoming inclusion, upholding human rights*.
- Rapaport, C., Hornik-Lurie, T., Cohen, O., Lahad, M., Leykin, D., & Aharonson-Daniel, L. (2018). The relationship between community type and community resilience. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 31, 470–477. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2018.05.020>
- Rodríguez-Pose, A., & Storper, M. (2020). Housing, urban growth and inequalities: The limits to deregulation and upzoning in reducing economic and spatial inequality. *Urban Studies*, 57(2), 223–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019859458>
- Roy, L., & Coulombe, S. (2021). Les pratiques intersectorielles auprès des personnes en situation ou à risque d'itinérance. *Nouvelles pratiques sociales*, 32(2), 280–299. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1085525ar>
- Ruming, K. (2014). "It wasn't about public housing, it was about the way it was done": Challenging planning not people in resisting the Nation Building Economic Stimulus Plan, Australia. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 29(1), 39–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-013-9339-4>
- Sayers, J. M., Cleary, M., Hunt, G. E., & Burmeister, O. K. (2017). Service and infrastructure needs to support recovery programmes for Indigenous community mental health consumers. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 26(2), 142–150. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12287>
- Scally, C. (2013). The nuances of nimby: Context and perceptions of affordable rental housing development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 49(5), 718–747. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087412469341>
- Skaburskis, A. (2008). The origin of "wicked problems." *Planning Theory & Practice*, 9(2), 277–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649350802041654>
- Sledge, D., & Thomas, H. F. (2019). From disaster response to community recovery: Nongovernmental entities, government, and public health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 109(3), 437–444. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2018.304895>
- Smith, A. (2022). *Multiple barriers: The multilevel governance of homelessness in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, J. (2017). Responding to globalization and urban conflict: Human rights city initiatives. *Studies in Social Justice*, 11(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v11i2.1394>
- Stahl, K. A. (2018). "Yes in my backyard": Can a new pro-housing movement overcome the power of NIMBYS? *41(3)*, 16.

- Sylvestre, M.-E. (2010). Policing the homeless in Montreal: Is this really what the population wants? *Policing and Society*, 20(4), 432–458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2010.523114>
- Tapp, R. (2021). Introducing the YIMBYs: Renters, housing, and supply-side politics in Los Angeles. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 39(7), 1511–1528. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544211044516>
- Thulien, N. (2017). *Precarious lives: A critical examination of homeless youth transitions to independent housing* [Thesis]. <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/78804>
- Tighe, J. R. (2012). How race and class stereotyping shapes attitudes toward affordable housing. *Housing Studies*, 27(7), 962–983. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2012.725831>
- Tolfo, G., & Doucet, B. (2021). Gentrification in the media: The eviction of critical class perspective. *Urban Geography*, 42(10), 1418–1439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2020.1785247>
- Tretter, E., & Heyman, R. (2022). YIMBYism and the housing crisis in Canada and the United States: A critical reflection. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 46(2), 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13062>
- Vallone, G. T. C. R. E. (2020). Affordable housing: The same problems, only worse. *Real Estate Issues*, 1–6. <https://pesquisa.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/resource/pt/covidwho-924949>
- Voronka, J., Wise Harris, D., Grant, J., Komaroff, J., Boyle, D., & Kennedy, A. (2014). Un/helpful help and its discontents: Peer researchers paying attention to street life narratives to inform social work policy and practice. *Social Work in Mental Health*, 12(3), 249–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332985.2013.875504>
- WRYIMBY (Waterloo Region Yes In My Backyard). (2022). *Housing platform*. <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5f6b539cb1a7393f2ec88584/t/633b0133c1ae32064b7b8627/1664811340347/WRYIMBY+Housing+Platform-2.pdf>
- Wulff, K., Donato, D., & Lurie, N. (2015). What is health resilience and how can we build it? *Annual Review of Public Health*, 36(1), 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031914-122829>
- YIMBY Action. (2021). *YIMBY action*. YIMBY Action. <https://yimbyaction.org/2021/>