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Abstract
Social inclusion frameworks to enhance ‘diversity’ inform late neoliberal municipal governance in North American metropolitan areas, especially in central cities, but suburban LGBTQ2S constituencies are neglected by researchers. This paper, therefore, uses linguistic discourse and content analysis of an LGBTQ2S-inclusion archive of municipal public-facing communication in the Canadian peripheral municipalities of Burnaby, New Westminster, and Surrey, in the Vancouver city-region to trace the micro-patterns of linguistic ambivalence shaping suburban sexual citizenship. It demonstrates municipal variance in vernacular vocabularies of LGBTQ2S social inclusion that signals equivocation within divergent local linguistic political opportunity structures for suburban sexual and gender minorities. It concludes with a typological narration that details varied gradations of linguistic obfuscation, revealing patterns of civic ambivalence towards LGBTQ2S social inclusion amidst suburban diversity. Across a shared regional geography, the paper shows that LGBTQ2S populations are infrequently referenced relative to other marginalized social groups and that their presence in social inclusion frameworks is dictated by the extent to which they align with civic priorities, particularly festivalization and marketization, but also safety, welcoming newcomers, integrating seniors, and anti-discrimination initiatives.
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Introduction

Public plans, policies, and strategies are commonly understood as a trajectory of purposive action through which political institutions – “structures exercising state authority in accordance with embedded values” – shape society (Tuohy, 1992: xvii). Like laws and rules, municipal plans, policies, and strategies are localized technologies of power central to governance that guide its priorities (Cooper and Monro, 2003). Municipal governance frameworks promoting ‘diversity’ have become increasingly commonplace (Valverde, 2012), strategically marketable “signifier[s] of everything and yet nothing” (Morrish and O’Mara, 2011: 974). As a mainstay of contemporary neoliberal municipal governance, diversity seeks to “capitalize on and gain from a context of differentiation” (Jones, 2011: 163) but often erases the most disempowered and non-commodifiable bundles of difference at the expense of intersectionality. While civic leaders may acknowledge the ‘diversity’ of their cities, as this paper shows, diversity paradigms frequently recognize “a simple plurality, a harmonious juxtapositioning” that inadequately appreciates the interrelations that mutually construct its different elements (Massey, 2007: 88). Thus, “problems of difference, among a host of axes of difference” may be elided, fostering a disconnect between diversity as an institutionalized discourse and the frictions that play out in everyday life (Ettlinger, 2010: 54).

Municipal social inclusion frameworks are a mechanism to enhance the participation of marginalized populations in governance (Fincher et al., 2014). Although much Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ+) ‘equalities’ legislation is national (Browne et al., 2019; Gorman-Murray, 2011; Hubbard, 2013), the ‘diversity turn’ that seeks to integrate LGBTQ+ constituencies into municipal social inclusion frameworks of large metropolitan areas is often limited to central-cities (Cravens, 2015; Murray, 2015). Much less is known, however, about Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Two-Spirit (LGBTQ2S) social inclusions in suburban North America, where the majority of an increasingly diverse population actually lives (Grant, 2009). Historically, suburbs have been interpreted as places where “narratives of conservatism overwhelm those of inclusion” (Niedt, 2013: 1), especially the grassroots social movement politics associated with LGBTQ+ activisms (Lichterman, 1996). Initially built to house heterosexual nuclear families, suburban local government focuses on managing development through the technoproduction of its infrastructure (Grant, 2009), often at the expense of the social planning required by its diversification. Composed of a set of independently governed locales with different political opportunity structures, the suburban periphery potentially shelters great spatial variance in the social inclusion of sexual and gender minorities (Smith, 2005). Political opportunity structures are the “consistent – but not necessarily formal, permanent, or national – dimensions” of political contexts that can afford ‘opportunities’ for political mobilization (Tarrow, 1998: 8). In a municipality, they can be created through: the bureaucratic partitioning of government responsibilities; funding by departments and advisory committees; and the establishment of plans, policies, and strategies. A municipality’s key-verb vernacular vocabulary of social inclusion as revealed through its public-facing communication channels variably structures its linguistic political opportunities for social inclusion (Statham and Tillie, 2016).

This paper focuses on the language of LGBTQ2S municipal social inclusion in the Canadian peripheral municipalities of Burnaby, New Westminster, and Surrey within the Vancouver city-region. Language has the power to shape subjects, construct knowledge, and define who is either the same or different (Foucault, 1978). In municipal governance, Statham and Tillie (2016: 182) have shown how discursive political opportunity structures
are shaped through public debate, generating more “public visibility and legitimacy to cer-
tain behaviours, opinions, and expressions while marginalising or stigmatising others”. With
specific attention to the LGBTQ2S vocabulary as it co-occurs with social inclusion key-
words in municipal records, this paper draws upon Carolyn Tuohy’s (1992) concept of
“institutional ambivalence” to demonstrate how gradations of linguistic equivocation
within diversity paradigms have different and uneven municipal manifestations. Ambivalence describes the state of having mixed feelings or contradictory ideas, while
equivocation signals the use of ambiguous language to avoid committing oneself. For
Tuohy (1992: xvii), “[w]hat appears distinctive about Canadian institutions is their extraor-
dinary capacity to embody conflicting principles within structures ambiguous enough to
allow for ad hoc accommodations over time” – what she has called “Canada’s ‘institutional
ambivalence’.” While Tuohy (1992) interprets Canadian federal policy as legitimizing com-
peting principles by valuing coexistence and accommodation, prioritizing the federal-
provincial dynamic within policy arenas like health and labour relations, this paper chooses
a different field where divergent interests are aggregated – municipal social inclusion, and,
more particularly, the inclusion of sexual and gender minorities. Despite the inclusion of
sexual and gender orientation in federal and provincial human rights legislation in Canada,
municipal governments have not consistently integrated policies, plans, and strategies for
including LGBTQ2S populations, creating scalar tensions and, ultimately, gradations of
ambivalence.

The paper argues that the public records of each municipality exhibit varied gradations of
linguistic ambivalence regarding the social inclusion of sexual and gender minority subur-
banites leading to linguistic obfuscation – rather than clarification or specificity – of
LGBTQ2S stakeholders in suburban diversity paradigms. Peripheral municipal discourses
are distinct, however, yet a general pattern of festivalization and marketization is apparent,
that fails to fully appreciate the heteronormativity of social and economic policies. The
argument is unpacked across four sections beginning with a review of the sexual citizenship,
social inclusion, and suburban municipal governance literatures. Next, it describes the
project’s mixed methods data collection strategy that combines the quantification of content
analysis with the qualitative elements of linguistic discourse analysis. The fourfold empirical
section documents civic ambivalence through the variable presence of LGBTQ2S popula-
tions and themes in municipal public-facing communication. The concluding discussion
considers the utility of linguistic ambivalence as a means to appreciate the specific location
of LGBTQ2S constituents in Canadian suburban municipal social inclusion frameworks.

**Sexual citizenship, social inclusion policies, and suburban municipal governance**

In contemporary liberal democracies, the state is understood as a complex set of institutions
that work in a dynamic, but sometimes contradictory, relationship with the economy and
civil society to condense, guide, and promote particular interests and norms (Cooper and
Monro, 2003). Under neoliberalism, state restructuring has realigned governments with the
priorities of private investors, businesses interests, and more recently the “creative class”
(Florida, 2002), over political visibility and collective responsibility for the needs, rights, and
care of marginalized social groups. Robust Marxist, feminist, and queer critiques of
Florida’s (2002, 2005) policy-resonant and divisive creative class thesis have revealed its
inherent homonormativity, whiteness, and classism (e.g., Muller Myrdahl, 2011; Oswin,
2012; Parker, 2017; Peck, 2005). By now, it is clear that the “creative turn” in urban
governance has distorted policy priorities and deepened inequalities (Parker, 2017). Furthermore, cities that privilege neoliberal ideologies of competition, consumption, and individualism often commodify and marketize ‘difference’ in place-branding, opportunistically leveraging diversity in ways that foreclose enhanced social inclusions. Promotional frameworks may deploy municipal “social landscapes” to “emphasize the entrepreneurial and cosmopolitan dimensions of the contemporary city over community needs and problems” (Paganoni, 2012: 15). When urban social inclusion policy is enveloped in, and dictated by, creative city diversity branding, it limits potential alternatives, particularly for marginalized groups.

Social inclusion, however, must be held in tension with its more critical counterpart – social exclusion – which emerged in the closing decades of the twentieth-century as state welfare and collective consumption infrastructures were reconfigured, featuring prominently in policy discourses in Europe and the United Kingdom. Defined as a multi-dimensional process through which individuals or social groups are disaffiliated to some degree from the societies in which they live (e.g., exclusion from citizenship rights, labour markets, civil society, and social arenas) (Gerometta et al., 2005), social exclusion gained global policy traction, influencing analyses of social disadvantage and focusing attention on the “problems and deficits of those labelled ‘excluded’” (Cameron, 2007: 397). Yet, in its identification of barriers to participation, social exclusion also pathologized and responsibilized ‘the excluded’ to address their own problems and “became the datum point against which social inclusion is both empirically measured and conceptually defined” (Cameron, 2007: 397). Social exclusion and social inclusion, then, exist in a complex and dynamic interrelationship. Interpreting social inclusion through the lens of Tuohy’s (1992) institutional ambivalence, sees its expression in the exclusion of individuals or social groups in one domain and their simultaneous embrace in another. The inclusion/exclusion binary is also “an exercise in normative boundary setting – a means of distinguishing between a form of social being characterized by normality, morality, responsibility, independence and competitiveness” and that “marked by difference, redundancy, pathology, immorality and obsolescence” (Cameron, 2007: 401).

Where LGBTQ+ citizens fit into municipal social inclusion policies, however, remains unclear. Historical accounts of the regulation and repression of LGBTQ+ people in urban space implicate various agencies of municipal governance, but the limited literature on more recent urban governance is varied and includes electoral processes (Bailey, 1999; Brown et al., 2005), municipal anti-discrimination ordinances (Chapman, 2011; Fejes, 2008), the regulation of gay sex premises and spaces (Brown and Knopp, 2016; Prior and Crofts, 2011) alongside interventions on queering urban planning (Doan, 2015). The incorporation of gay village districts and pride celebrations into the redevelopment and tourism strategies of neoliberal municipal regimes (Bell and Binnie, 2004; Collins, 2004; Nash and Gorman-Murray, 2015) has long been a focus, with attention to the pivotal role of municipal business improvement associations (Gorman-Murray and Nash, 2017; Nash and Gorman-Murray, 2015) in shaping a corresponding “homo-entrepreneurial” ethos (Kanai and Kenttamaa-Squires, 2015).

Some of the earliest research examining the intersections between LGBTQ+ activism and the local state, was Brown’s (1994) study of how HIV/AIDS activists reshaped politics in Vancouver, and British scholarship on how activists made use of the “New Left’s” “equal opportunity” policies to promote the interests of gays and lesbians in local councils. The interface between municipal governments and LGBTQ+ activists remains a critical area of study (Browne and Bakshi, 2013; Cooper, 2006; Cooper and Monro, 2003; Richardson, 2005). In light of these greater “equalities” some scholars consider the extent to which
national anti-discrimination legislation and civil rights recognitions, such as same-sex marriage, have unevenly filtered down to municipal governments (Cooper, 2006; Cooper and Monro, 2003). In this vein, Cooper and Monro (2003) provide an important examination of sexuality’s structural relationship to local government in their study of British municipal authorities who, between 1990 and 2001, took up the “controversial... sexuality agenda”. They determine that laws resourcefully structure local political agency by requiring the pursuit of gay and lesbian equality, but given how inconsistently embedded these laws are in governance structures and processes, individual “champions” remain important change agents. Related scholarship by Richardson (2005) draws attention to the ways that governance may produce normative sexual subjects through multiple forms of “professionalization” that see activists and community groups adjust to neoliberal agendas in order to secure funding and advance their cause.

Within city-regions, it is large central cities that are publicly heralded as hubs of policy innovation and service and resource provision for marginalized communities and it is their peripheries that are framed as playing ‘catch-up’ or ‘me-tooism’ (Grabher, 2018). Summarized in detail elsewhere (Podmore and Bain, 2020, 2021), a rich Anglo-American-Australian suburban studies tradition has inspired Canadian scholarship on suburban governance, but it prioritizes a political economy perspective to the neglect of the agency of residents and the social politics of suburban communities (e.g., Ekers et al., 2012; Filion, 2015; Filion and Kramer, 2011; Grant, 2009; Hamel and Keil, 2015). In this scholarship, heterosexuality is taken for granted – it is unnamed and unmarked – with the unstated assumption of a “straight state” (Canaday, 2009). Certainly, suburban scholars consider pressing political problems such as redistribution, sustainability, and racialized segregation (e.g., Filion, 2015), but sexuality is in abstantia. Scholarship from elsewhere, however, shows that “heterosexual norms and practices permeate local government’s internal culture, relations with citizens, and regulatory practices, as well as its policies and conduct” (Cooper and Monro, 2003: 248). If diversity governance is reflected in contemporary catchwords like ‘participation,’ ‘engagement’, and ‘outreach’, equally important is what is said about marginalized populations, where it is said, and how such language informs the vernacular vocabulary of social inclusion.

**Reading suburban social inclusion into municipal public-facing communication**

If municipalities are understood as the formal institutional “upperground” wherein procedural and interpretive authority resides (Cohendet et al., 2010), from a social constructionist perspective, urban plans, policies, and strategies are a “codebook” – a shared system of social meaning – within the administrative state to build a common knowledge base facilitating public understanding (Fischer, 2003). With their particular vocabulary, urban plans, policies, and strategies stabilize language and contribute to the embedding and reproduction of dominant group interests within the political agenda. For Fischer (2003: 56), “political language is in important ways political reality itself”; its potency comes from how it linguistically frames the world.

This paper uses linguistic discourse and content analysis of municipal public-facing records to understand where and how peripheral municipalities in Vancouver linguistically signal LGBTQ2S inclusions through vernacular keywords. In the tradition of Raymond Williams (1976), keywords are “semantically flexible” but deeply socially meaningful terms whose symbolic associations shift over time according to purpose and speaker. Within
municipal social inclusion frameworks, keywords, adapted by local actors, articulate their unique civic brand of social inclusion. As Valverde (2012) demonstrates in her critique of the power relations of the creative city, grassroots calls for a more “diverse city” have been coopted through symbolic association between “diversity” and “tolerance” that elide a distaste for discrimination. Such articulations are part of a complex set of public-facing mediations between civic leaders, municipal departments and committees, and local para-public and community activists around who, how, and upon what terms constituencies are included in municipal governance. Sexual and gender minorities are frequently under-represented in and by such governmental bureaucratic frameworks, constraining the vocabulary used to represent their interests in the ensuing local linguistic political opportunity structures they create. By attending to gradations of linguistic ambivalence within public records regarding the social inclusion of sexual and gender minority suburbanites, this paper reveals the micro ways in which linguistic obfuscation – rather than clarification or specificity – can shape suburban sexual citizenship and erase its intersectional complexity.

As part of a larger research project on the everyday lives, activisms, and governance inclusions of suburban LGBTQ2S Canadians living in municipalities on the peripheries of Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver (Bain and Podmore, 2021), this paper focuses on three Vancouver city-region suburban case studies (Burnaby, New Westminster, and Surrey) which were chosen for the density of LGBTQ2S residents, activism, and print-media representation (Figure 1). These suburbs have a relatively high proportion of suburban same-sex households in the Census Metropolitan Area (CMA), with Burnaby, New Westminster, and Surrey constituting 16.1, 13.5, and 18.2 percent respectively (Statistics Canada, 2017). They are also notably different in terms of their population size, demographic composition, and land area, but are all located on the unceded territories of the Coast Salish people – including the QayQayt (Kee-kite), Kwantlen (kwaant-luhn), Katzie (KUT-zee),

![Figure 1. Map of case study municipalities in the Vancouver City-region.](image-url)
Kwikwetlem (Kway-quit-lum), Xʷməθkəy̓əm (Musqueam), Semiahmoo, Tsleil-Waututh (Slay-wah-tuth), Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish), and Stó:lo (STOH-lo) First Nations. Burnaby is a mid-sized (232,755 residents), medium-density city with a high proportion of immigrants (50%) and non-official language speakers (58%) located at the geographic centre of the Vancouver CMA. New Westminster is the oldest settler municipality in the Vancouver CMA. It is small in area and population (70,996 residents), low in ethnic diversity (only 35% of the population are immigrants) and non-official language speakers (20%), but high in density and relative concentration of seniors. Surrey is the fastest growing and second largest city (517,887 residents) in the region with low-densities and low-incomes, and significant ethno-cultural (immigrants at 43%) and linguistic diversity (47% speak a language other than English or French at home).

An archive of civic LGBTQ2S social inclusion elements was built for each suburban municipality by collecting all civic records addressing sexual and gender minority citizenship. Municipal websites were treated as public-facing communication channels and searched using the keyword function to identify specific mentions of various iterations of the LGBTQ2S community within council and committee minutes, departmental reports, and plans, policies, and strategies. All documents were retrieved from a sampling frame of the three city websites as of May 2020 and the results from these queries formed an archive containing LGBTQ2S references. The result was a dataset of scattered instances when LGBTQ2S people and issues are explicitly named in municipal records.

The resulting LGBTQ2S municipal archive is geographically coherent, yet place-specific and temporally sequenced. This paper uses mixed methods, combining linguistic discourse analysis with content analysis to document the location, type, and quantity of the language used to describe sexual and gender minorities, and their relative positioning within social inclusion frameworks. To interpret where LGBTQ2S constituents are positioned within the vernacular vocabularies of social inclusion, documents were classified according to municipality, year, and government actor (Table 1).

Textual segments referring to LGBTQ2S populations and themes were then both qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed using a four-fold strategy. Linguistic discourse analysis identified, extracted, and interpreted the portions of text referencing LGBTQ2S populations in co-occurring relation to a document’s language of social inclusion. Keywords were then inductively identified, selected, and quantified from these segments and the wider document for the content analysis (a sample of \( n = 20,384 \) keywords). The quantification of directed content analysis permitted the tracking of the “multiplicity, variety, instability, and historical contingency” of the language of social inclusion and its document-wide co-occurrence with LGBTQ2S references (Feltham-King and Macleod, 2016: 5). A two-part condensing of keywords occurred, grouping words with similar roots and meanings together and then isolating LGBTQ2S topics, events, and identities, culminating in 20 clusters of social inclusion terms (Table 2).

To compare the frequency and relative significance of the selected keywords and prioritized social inclusion identity groups across each of the case studies, two statistical tests were conducted. First, a chi-square \( (\chi^2) \) “goodness-of-fit” test with 2 degrees of freedom (\( df = 2 \)) was run for the 20 clusters to identify the municipal variation in their observed and expected frequencies so as to create a vernacular discursive portrait of the LGBTQ2S linguistic political opportunity structure available in each suburb. The clusters were disaggregated into component parts, and the top twenty words from the keyword database were selected and illustrated using Excel treemaps in order to illustrate different city discourses. Representing each social inclusion keyword as nested proportional rectangles, the treemaps permit the visualization of their relative frequency in the database. Second, to identify who
| **Table 1.** Municipal Documents Referencing LGBTQ2S Themes and Populations (Council and Committee Minutes, Departmental Reports and City Plans, Strategies and Policies) in Burnaby, New Westminster and Surrey, 1995–2020. |
|---|---|---|
| **City Council** Minutes | **New Westminster** Minutes | **Surrey** Minutes |
| **Burnaby** | **New Westminster** | **Surrey** |
| 1) *Our City of Colours* (poster campaign) (2012: u) | 1) NW Pride Day (2010: CA, d, p) | 1) *National AIDS Awareness Week* (1995: p) |
| 2) CCMARD membership (2012: r) | 2) Gen Silent film screening (2012: u) | 2) National AIDS Awareness Week (2003: p) |
| 3) Youth Citizenship Awards (2013: d) | 3) NW Pride Festival grant (2012: RCPS, r, fr) | 3) *Social Well-Being of Surrey Residents* (2007: P) |
| 4) Int. Day of Pink (2016: p) | 4) NW Pride Festival attendance (2012: u) | 4) Surrey HIV/AIDS Awareness Week (2008: p) |
| 5) Int. Day Against Homophobia & Transphobia (2018: p) | 5) Vancouver Pride participation (2012: HFA, u) | 5) Surrey Pride Festival (2011: OSRCS, d, pr, fr) |
| 6) Burnaby Pride Day (2018: p) | 6) *Safe Harbour Implementation Plan* (2013: r) | 6) Surrey Pride Festival (2011: fr) |
| 7) Pride Festival Grant & Flag Raising (2018: BNH, LMPS, d, fr, rq) | 7) NW Pride Festival (2013: RCPS, d, u) | 7) Surrey Pride Weekend (2011: p) |
| 8) Youth Citizenship Awards (2019: BYV, d) | 8) NW Pride Festival (2013: u) | 8) Surrey Pride Weekend (2012: p) |
| 9) Int. Day Against Homophobia, Transphobia & Biphobia (2019: p) | 9) NW Pride Festival (2013: RCPS, d, pr) | 9) Spirit Day (2012: p) |
| 10) Rainbow Crosswalks (2019: r x3) | 10) NW Pride Festival (2014: RCPS, DNM-BIA, r) | 10) International Day of Pink (2013: p) |
| 11) Burnaby Pride - Funding (2019: fr) | 11) NW Pride Festival (2014: RCPS, d, u) | 11) Surrey Pride Festival (2013: p) |
| 12) Additional Rainbow Crosswalk (2019: r) | 12) NW Pride Festival (2015: RCPS, d, u) | 12) Flag Raising & Pride Festival (2014: CA, GLBTA, d, rq) |
| 13) My Artist’s Corner (2019: fr) | 13) NW Pride Festival (2015: u) | 13) Request to Present to Council (2015: CA, SPS, d, rq) |
| 14) Burnaby Pride - Road Closure (2019: r) | 14) Orlando Commemoration & Vigil (2016: u) | 14) LGBTQ History Exhibit (2015: CA, d, pr, rq) |
| 15) Burnaby Pride (2019: p) | 15) *New West Pride Accessibility Initiative* (2016: NWPS, d, r) | 15) Surrey Pride Day (2015: p) |
| 16) Burnaby Pride (2020: r) | 16) *New West Pride Accessibility Initiative* (2016: NWPS, d, r) | 16) Orlando Commemoration (2016: p) |

| Committee Minutes | **Burnaby** | **New Westminster** | **Surrey** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1) *Social Sustainability Strategy* (2011: SSSC, u) | 1) Anti-homophobia radio ad (2009: YAC) | 1) *Anti-Bullying By-Law* (2004: PC, r, u) |
| 2) *Safe Harbour Implementation* | 2) City Grants - Surrey Urban Youth Project | |
| Burnaby | New Westminster | Surrey |
|---------|----------------|--------|
| 2) School Board SOGI Policy (2011: SIC, u) | Program (2012: MAC, r) | (2006: FC, PCR, r, fr) |
| 3) Our City of Colours (poster campaign) (2012: SIC, OCC, pr) | 3) Century House Inclusion Enhancement (2013: CSIC, pr, u, x2) | 3) Diversity of Celebrations (2007: MAC, pr, u) |
| 4) Our City of Colours (poster campaign) (2012: SIC, u) | 4) Safe Harbour Implementation (2013: CSIC, pr) | 4) 2010 Calendar of Events (2010: MC, pr, u) |
| 5) CCMARD membership (2012: PRCC, r) | 5) NW Pride Festival (2014: PC, u) | 5) Safe Harbour Program (2010: MC, DCCRS, pr, d, u) |
| 6) Burnaby Social Sustainability Strategy (2013: CPC, r) | 6) LGBT art exhibit (2015: AC, u) | 6) Pride Festival - Funding Request (2011: FC, OSRCS, fr) |
| 7) Permanent Rainbow Crosswalks (2018: SCAC, rq) | 7) New Westminster's Public Engagement Plan (2016: YAC, u) | 7) Anti-Bullying Film Contest (2013: DAC, SB36, pr, u) |
| 8) Burnaby Pride (2019: EC, BFLI, fr) | 8) Gender-Free Washroom Signs - Youth Centre (2016: YAC, r) | 8) Surrey Pride (2013: FC, SPS, d, fr) |
| 9) City Involvement in Burnaby Pride (2020: EC, fr) | 9) Gender Neutral Washrooms - Community Centre (2016: PRC, u) | 9) Pride Festival Sponsorship (2014: FC, r) |
| 10) Inclusive Signage (2020: PRCC, r) | 10) Gender Neutral Washrooms in City Facilities (2016: CSIC, u) | 10) Centre Stage Activation report (2015: CDAC, u) |
| 11) Aquatic & Arena Project (2020: PRCC, r) | 11) Facilities - May Day Celebrations (2017: YAC, SD40, MDTF, d, u) | 11) Blue-Ribbon Campaign on Crime Reduction (2015: PSC, r, u) |
| 12) Festival of Learning (PRCC: r, fr) | 12) School Board SOGI policy (2018: YAC, GSDC, SD40, u) | 12) Metro Vancouver Homeless Count (2017: SPAC, pr, u) |
| 13) New Aquatic & Comm. Centre (2018: CSIC, pr, u) | 13) New Aquatic & Comm. Centre (2018: AAAC, pr, u) | 13) Late Grant Application - SV (2017: FC, PICS, SV, fr) |
| 14) New Aquatic & Comm. Centre (2018: AAAC, pr, u) | 15) Proposed Modular Housing Project (2018, CSIC, pr, d) | |
| 15) Proposed Modular Housing Project (2018, CSIC, pr, d) | 16) Seniors Care for LGBTQ2s+ Persons (2019: SAC, SGSA, r) | |
| 16) Seniors Care for LGBTQ2s+ Persons (2019: SAC, SGSA, r) | 17) Elder Abuse in the LGBTQ Comm. (2019: SAC, BCACRN, u) | |
| 17) Elder Abuse in the LGBTQ Comm. (2019: SAC, BCACRN, u) | 18) New Aquatic Centre (2019: CSIC, pr, u) | |
| 18) New Aquatic Centre (2019: CSIC, pr, u) | | |

(continued)
| Department Report | Burnaby                                                                 | New Westminster                                                                 | Surrey                                                                 |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                   | 1) CCMARD membership (2012: PBD, r)                                     | 19) Compassionate City Charter (2019: CSIC, NWHS, pr, d)                        | 1) The Social Well-Being of Surrey Residents (2005: PDD)               |
|                   | 2) Rainbow Crosswalks (2019: ED, r)                                     | 1) Century House Inclusion Enhancement (2011: PRCD, r, fr)                      | 2) The Social Well-Being of Surrey Residents (2007: PDD, r, rf)        |
|                   | 3) Burnaby Pride - Road Closure (2019: ED, r)                           | 2) Safe Harbour Implementation Plan (2013: DSD, r)                              | 3) Workplace Human Rights Policy (2006: HRD)                            |
|                   | 4) Additional Rainbow Crosswalk (2019: ED, r)                           | 3) NW Pride Festival (2014: PCRD, r, fr x2)                                    |                                                                        |
|                   | 5) City Involvement in Burnaby Pride (2020: PBD, r)                     |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
|                   |                                                                         |                                                                                 |                                                                        |
| Plans, Policies & Strategies | Burnaby | New Westminster | Surrey |
|------------------------------|---------|----------------|--------|
| 1) **Burnaby Social Sustainability Strategy** (2011: SSSC) | 1) **Homeless & At-Risk Population** (2007: C & SPARC BC) | 18) Late Grant Application - SV (2018: FD, SV, fr) |
| 2) **Your Voice, Your Home** (2019: MTFCH) | 2) **Public Engagement Plan** (2016: PETF) | 19) Cultural Grants Program (2019: PRCD, SPS, SV, EPAMA, fr, u) |
| 3) **Provisional Financial Plan, 2020-2024** (2020: FD) | 3) **New Westminster Age-Friendly Strategy** (2017) | 20) **Social Equity & Diversity Committee Policy** (2019: CSD) |
|                             | 4) **Our City 2041: Official Community Plan** (2017) | 21) Cultural Grants Program (2020: PRCD, fr) |
|                             | 5) **Respectful Workplace & Human Rights Policy** (2018) | 22) **Social Equity & Diversity Committee Policy** (2020: PDD) |
|                             | 6) **New Westminster Arts Strategy** (2018) |  |
|                             | 7) **Our City 2041: Official Community Plan (Update)** (2019) |  |
|                             | 8) **Compassionate City Charter** (2019) |  |
|                             | 9) **The Social Well-Being of Surrey Residents** (2006: PDD) |  |
|                             | 10) **Masterplan for Housing the Homeless** (2012: C) |  |
|                             | 11) **Refugee Newcomers in Surrey** (2014: SWCP, RR) |  |
|                             | 12) **Official Community Plan Update** (2014) |  |
|                             | 13) **Sustainability Charter 2.0** (2016) |  |
|                             | 14) **Surrey Aboriginal Social Innovation Project** (2016: SUILC) |  |
|                             | 15) **Public Safety Strategy** (2016) |  |
|                             | 16) **Community Engagement: 10-Year Strategic Plan** (2017: PRCD) |  |
|                             | 17) **Strategic Plan, 2018-2027** (2018: PRCD) |  |
|                             | 18) **Surrey Policing Transition Plan** (2019: CV, VPD) |  |
|                             | 19) **Night-time Safety & Service Needs of Vulnerable Women & Girls in Surrey** (2019: SWGWG) |  |

**Abbreviations**
- BFLI: Burnaby Family Life Institute
- BNH: Burnaby Neighbourhood House
- BYV: Burnaby Youth Voice
- CCMARD: Coalition of Municipalities Against Racism & Discrimination
- AAAC: Access Ability Advisory Committee
- AC: Arts Council
- CA: Community Activist
- AH: Alexandra House
- C: Consultant
- CDAC: Culture Development Advisory Committee

(continued)
| Burnaby | New Westminster | Surrey |
|---|---|---|
| CPC: Community Policing Committee | CSIC: Community & Social Issues Committee | CSD: Corporate Services Department |
| EC: Executive Committee | DNW-BIA: Downtown New Westminster BIA | CV: City of Vancouver |
| ED: Engineering Department | DSD: Development Services Department | DAC: Diversity Advisory Committee |
| FD: Finance Department | HFA: Hyack Festival Association | DCCRS: DIVERSECity Community Resources Society |
| LMPS: Lower Mainland Purpose Society | GSDC: Gender and Sexual Diversity Committee | EPAMA: Empire of the Peace Arch Monarchists’ Association |
| MTFCH: Mayor’s Task Force on Community Housing | MAC: Multicultural Advisory Committee | FC: Finance Committee |
| OCC: Our City of Colours | MDTF: May Day Task Force | FD: Finance Department |
| PRCC: Parks, Recreation & Culture Committee | NWPS: New West Pride Society | GLBTA: GLBT Alliance |
| PBD: Planning & Building Department | PC: Parking Commission | HRD: Human Resources Department |
| SB41: School Board, District 41 | PCRD: Parks, Culture & Recreation Department | MC: Multicultural Committee |
| SCAC: Sustainable City Advisory Committee | PETF: Public Engagement Task Force | OSRCS: Out in Surrey Rainbow Cultural Society |
| SIC: Social Issues Committee | PRC: Parks & Recreation Committee | PC: Police Committee |
| SSSC: Social Sustainability Steering Committee | RCPS: Royal City Pride Society | PCR: Pacific Community Resources |
| | SAC: Seniors Advisory Committee | PDD: Planning & Development Department |
| | SB40: School Board, District 40 | PICS: Progressive Intercultural Comm. Services |
| | SPARC BC: Social Planning and Research Council of British Columbia | PRCD: Parks, Recreation & Culture Department |
| | YAC: Youth Advisory Committee | PSC: Public Safety Committee |
| | | RR: Rainbow Refugees |
| | | SB36: School Board, District 36 |
| | | SPAC: Social Policy Advisory Committee |
| | | SPS: Surrey Pride Society |
| | | SUILC: Surrey Urban Indigenous Leadership Committee |
| | | SV: Sher Vancouver |
| | | SVVWG: Surrey Vulnerable Women & Girls Working Group |
| | | SWCP: Surrey Welcoming Communities Project |
| | | TCS: True Colours of Surrey |
| | | VPD: Vancouver Police Department |
| | | YP: Youth Perspective |

Acts of Governance: d = Delegation; fr = Funding Request; pr = Presentation; p = Proclamation; rq = Request; r = Report; u = Update.

LGBTQ2S-Related Governance: Municipal Policy Initiatives given in bold; Events: Comm. Service Provider & Activist Interventions are given in italics.
| Theme                      | Keywords                                                                 | Observed (Expected) Values by Municipality | Chi-Square |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------|
| 1. Children, Youth, & Families | Child/ Children; Family (-Friendly, -Oriented)/ Families; Young People; Youth (Engagement, -Friendly)  | Burnaby: 385 (406.0) | New Westminster: 179 (463.0) | Surrey: 1814 (1509.0) | 237.0^a |
| 2. Community Life          | Communities/ Community (Building, Consultation, Engagement); Lifestyle(s); Liveable/ Liveability; Outreach | Burnaby: 697 (595.7) | New Westminster: 1017 (679.3) | Surrey: 1775 (2214.0) | 272.1^a |
| 3. Disability & Access     | Access/ Accessible/ Accessibility; Barrier(s); Barrier-Free (Community); (Developmentally-, Mentally-) Disabled (Persons)/ Disability/ (Developmental, Intellectual) Disabilities; Universal Design; Universally Accessible | Burnaby: 66 (90.5) | New Westminster: 152 (103.2) | Surrey: 312 (336.2) | 31.5^a |
| 4. Discrimination          | Bias; Bullied/ Bullying; Discrimination; Harassment; Hate; Humiliation; Prejudice; Stereotype(s)/ Stereotyping; Stigma/ Stigmatization | Burnaby: 110 (49.9) | New Westminster: 43 (56.9) | Surrey: 139 (185.3) | 87.5^a |
| 5. Diversity & Difference  | Cultural (Awareness, Competency, Sensitivity)/ Culturally (-Appropriate, -Inclusive); Different/ Difference; Diverse/ Diversity; Multicultural(ism); (Cross-Cultural, Intercultural) Understanding | Burnaby: 74 (149.9) | New Westminster: 220 (171.0) | Surrey: 584 (557.1) | 53.8^a |
| 6. Events, Celebrations & Festivals | Celebrate(s)/ Celebrating/ Celebration(s); Event(s); Festival(s); (Street) Party | Burnaby: 230 (192.1) | New Westminster: 632 (219.0) | Surrey: 263 (713.9) | 1070.8^a |
| 7. Gender Diversity         | Gender(s)/ Gender (-Diverse, -Free)/ Gender (Expression, Identity/ Identities); Gender-Neutral (Bathrooms, Design, Signage); Gender Non-Binary | Burnaby: 13 (9.9) | New Westminster: 34 (11.3) | Surrey: 11 (36.8) | 64.7^a |
| 8. Housing Affordability    | Affordable/ Affordability; Homeless/ Homelessness; Home; Housing; Rent Bank | Burnaby: 579 (361.1) | New Westminster: 70 (411.8) | Surrey: 1466 (1342.1) | 426.6^a |
| 9. Immigrants, Newcomers & Refugees | Immigrant(s)/ Immigration; Newcomer(s); Refugee(s) | Burnaby: 22(245.9) | New Westminster: 68 (280.4) | Surrey: 1350 (913.8) | 573.0^a |

(continued)
| Theme | Keywords | Burnaby | New Westminster | Surrey | Chi-Square |
|-------|----------|---------|-----------------|--------|------------|
| 10. Inclusion Frameworks | Acceptance/ Accepting; Accountable/ Accountability; Advocate/ Advocacy; Awareness; Belong/ (Sense of) Belonging; Capabilities/ Capacity (Building); Care/ Caring; Collaboration; Compassionate (City); Connected/ Connectedness/ Connection(s); Empower/ Empowerment; Engage/ Engaging/ Engagement; Integrated/ Integration; Opportunities; Resilience/ Resiliency; Support; Transparent/ Transparency; Visible/ Visibility; Welcome/ Welcoming; Well-Being; Wellness | 34 (221.6) | 290 (252.7) | 974 (923.7) | 191.8a |
| 11. Indigenous Populations | Aboriginal; First Nations; Indigenous; Métis | 35 (183.9) | 10 (209.7) | 1032 (683.4) | 488.5a |
| 12. Justice & Equity | Anti-Oppression; Equality; Equitable/ (Social) Equity; (Restorative, Social) Justice; (Human) Rights | 11 (21.0) | 15 (23.9) | 97 (78.1) | 12.7b |
| 13. LGBTQ2S+ Identities, Organizations & Well-Being | Asexual; Bisexual; Gay; GLBT+ /LGBT+; HIV/ HIV-AIDS; Intersex (ed); Lesbian; New Westminster Pride; New West Pride; Queer; Queer/ Trans (Competency); Questioning; Rainbow Refugee(s); Royal City Pride Society; Sexual (Identity, Orientation); Sher Vancouver; Surrey Pride (Festival, Society); Transsexual; Transgender(ed); Two-Spirit(ed) | 103 (126.2) | 329 (143.9) | 307 (468.9) | 298.3a |
| 14. Marginalized Populations | At-Risk; Isolated/ Isolation; Marginal/ Marginalized; Neglect(ed); Social Isolation/ Socially Isolated; Vulnerable (People, Persons, Populations, Residents) | 12 (111.3) | 32 (126.9) | 608 (413.7) | 250.9a |
| 15. Pride | Flag; Pride (Celebration(s), Event(s), Festival, Week); (Pride, Rainbow, Rainbow-Pride) Crosswalk(s); Rainbow; Road Closure | 141 (90.7) | 107 (103.4) | 283 (336.9) | 36.7a |
| 16. ‘Race’, Ethnicity & Racism | (Ethnic, Ethno-Cultural, Linguistic) Communities; Ethnicity; Race; Racial Discrimination; Racialized; Racism | 83 (19.3) | 8 (22.0) | 22 (71.7) | 253.7a |
| 17. Safety | Safe (Environment, Place(s), Shelter, Space(s); Safe Harbour; Safe (r); Safety; Unsafe | 305 (198.2) | 246 (226.1) | 610 (736.7) | 81.1a |

(continued)
Table 2. Continued.

| Theme                                                                 | Keywords                                                                 | Observed (Expected) Values by Municipality |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 18. Seniors & Intergenerational Relations                           | Intergenerational; Senior(s)                                             |                                             |
|                                                                      |                                                                         | Burnaby: 280 (113.4) New Westminster: 180 (129.3) Surrey: 204 (421.3) Chi-Square: 376.9<sup>a</sup> |
| 19. Sexual & Gender Discrimination                                  | Anti-Gay; Biphobia; Heteronormativity; Heterosexism; Homophobia/ Homophobic; Transphobia |                                             |
|                                                                      |                                                                         | Burnaby: 12 (5.5) New Westminster: 8 (6.2) Surrey: 12 (20.3) Chi-Square: 11.7<sup>b</sup> |
| 20. Social Sustainability & Inclusion                               | Inclusion/ Inclusive (City, Signage) / Inclusivity; Needs; Social (Capital, Cohesion, Connection(s)/ Connectedness/ Connectivity, Networks, Infrastructure, Innovation, Interaction, Sustainability); Sustainability/ Sustainable; Stereotype(s)/ Stereotyping; Stigma/ Stigmatization |                                             |
|                                                                      |                                                                         | Burnaby: 240 (185.1) New Westminster: 201 (211.1) Surrey: 643 (687.9) Chi-Square: 19.7<sup>a</sup> |
| Total                                                                |                                                                         | Burnaby: 3192 (17.0%) New Westminster: 3640 (19.5%) Surrey: 11,863 (63.5%) |

<sup>a</sup>The critical value for $P < 0.001$ is 13.816 (df = 2).
<sup>b</sup>The critical value for $P < 0.05$ is 5.991 (df = 2).
is involved and included as part of the sexual and gender non-normative constituency, all LGBTQ2S-related identities were tallied and graphed. The relative significance of references to LGBTQ2S populations were then determined by comparing their frequencies to those of other prioritized minority groups. A chi-square “test of independence” ($df = 12$) was used to determine whether the relative importance of each identity group varied by municipality.

The linguistic discourse and content analysis of keywords permitted the further development of a social inclusion vernacular typology for each municipality. Keywords were extracted to determine the municipality-specific vocabulary of inclusion, qualitatively highlighting both predominant and unique terms. The resulting narratives weave these words together into municipal portraits of LGBTQ2S inclusion as part of the contradictory implications of their respective diversity brands. This preliminary typology (as captured in the municipal case study subheadings) comparatively showcases gradations of linguistic ambivalence within public records and the micro-politics of sexual and gender diversity governance across adjacent suburbs.

**Analysing LGBTQ2S municipal inclusion and suburban linguistic ambivalence**

This section analyzes gradations of linguistic ambivalence in the LGBTQ2S archive of suburban social inclusion. First, the occurrence of LGBTQ2S themes and populations in municipal documentation is detailed. Second, the prioritization of LGBTQ2S constituencies relative to other social groups are considered. Third, the co-occurrence of LGBTQ2S-themes within the broader language of suburban social inclusion is detailed. Finally, a typology of linguistic ambivalence is developed in order to characterize the vernacular vocabularies of LGBTQ2S social inclusion.

**Queer fragments in the LGBTQ2S archive of suburban inclusion**

Disaggregated by municipality and the type of document (council and committee minutes, departmental reports, and city plans, policies and strategies) for the period between 1995 and 2020, Table 1 illustrates where LGBTQ2S references occur in the LGBTQ2S archive of suburban inclusion for Burnaby, New Westminster, and Surrey. The table is organized horizontally by municipality and vertically by municipal source (e.g., council minutes, committee minutes, department reports, and plans, policies and strategies). Each action is numerically listed and presented in chronological order. The acts of governance are coded, noting whether they are a delegation, a funding request, a presentation, a proclamation, a report, or simply an update. The bold text font reveals municipal policy initiatives while the italics font signal events, and the underlined font indicates activist and community interventions. While the resulting list of interventions appears substantive, the types of LGBTQ2S references recorded are few and infrequent, varying from inclusion in a list of non-discrimination clauses to brief discussions of funding requests by community-based LGBTQ2S organizations, often in reference to Pride festivities. The table, therefore, illustrates municipal ambivalence through the prevalence of symbolic gestures, normalizing language, and the innocuous locations from which LGBTQ2S keywords arise.

City Council minutes are a way to showcase governance priorities – providing a record of who may speak, about what, and the extent of civic action. When an LGBTQ2S issue comes before these councils, it primarily takes three forms: proclamation; funding request; and festivalization. Proclamations account for 31 percent in Burnaby and 56 percent in Surrey of LGBTQ2S content before councils. Since 2010, New Westminster has had an annual pride
proclamation that accompanies its flag raising ceremony independent of council. LGBTQ2S topics are also a component of other proclamations such as International Day of Pink (Burnaby), International Day Against Homophobia and Transphobia (Burnaby), and HIV-AIDS Awareness Week (Surrey). While it is possible to chart shifting symbolic associations of municipal social inclusion keywords in these proclamations, in large part they are formulaic, a repetitive annual recitation of the same statements alongside issues and celebrations concerning multiple interest groups (e.g., domestic violence, homelessness, bullying, National Seniors’ Day, International Women’s Day). Although funding requests are predominantly in support of annual pride festivities, they are also opportunities for activists to frame the work of their organizations and articulate specific needs. In these seemingly mundane moments, social inclusion language shifts sharply from community needs to municipal festivalization. This is especially notable in New Westminster where 73 percent of the council records are pride-related. However, even in Surrey where the themes are more varied, pride still constitutes 52 percent of all LGBTQ2S content in council minutes.

Municipal committees and departments push councils for social change. Whether social issue-related committees raise LGBTQ2S concerns depends upon who is advising and which delegations present to them. Social issues are often siloed within the mandates of specific committees with limited intersectional crossover. For example, New Westminster’s Seniors’ and Youth Advisory Committees and Surrey’s Multicultural Committee offer a few examples where LGBTQ2S populations are recognized as intersecting with other social groups. Often it is only in passing comments, interjections, and points of information where the needs or exclusions of LGBTQ2S people are noted. Meanwhile, departments play an evidence-based role in researching requests, documenting needs, verifying suitability, and raising awareness of LGBTQ2S concerns. Across all three municipalities, departments that deal with planning, development, and engineering or culture and recreation have the highest number of references to LGBTQ2S populations. Finance, human resources, and corporate services also fund community groups and initiate LGBTQ2S-competency training. Few plans or policies reference LGBTQ2S populations and there are no policies that explicitly address sexual and gender minorities. Both New Westminster and Surrey list LGBTQ2S populations in their official community plans. In Burnaby, there are no references made; instead, generic, seemingly heterosexual nuclear ‘family’ needs are the basis of their social sustainability platform with respect to housing policy and service provision. At this macroscale of planning, LGBTQ2S subjects are found most commonly in lists of marginalized populations. New Westminster’s Age-Friendly Strategy (2017b) is the exception where a gay male couple is profiled for their move to the municipality. LGBTQ2S constituents are more likely to appear in plans and strategies developed by para-public organizations in partnership with municipal governments. In Surrey, plans and strategies regarding policing, safety, homelessness, refugees, or Indigenous populations all mentioned LGBTQ2S subjects. Overall, policy references were as infrequent as council references, reinforcing the marginality of LGBTQ2S constituencies in suburban municipalities.

Social inclusion of LGBTQ2S and other suburban constituencies

Figure 2 highlights the linguistic specificity of who is designated as ‘in need’ of social inclusion, and the priority given to homeless, children and youth, immigrants and refugees, and Aboriginal and Métis. The particularities of this list of social groups reflect regional social inclusion imperatives; shaped by, their location upon the unceded territories of multiple Indigenous populations and the international migration gateway function of Vancouver. Due to high land and housing costs, homeless populations are also a significant concern,
even in suburban areas. Thus, the most frequent subject in the archive is not LGBTQ2S, but rather people experiencing housing precarity followed closely by children and youth whose numbers are larger in peripheral municipalities. Of the 7,971 references to social groups, only 7 percent refer to LGBTQ2S identities, constituting one percent less than seniors.

However, a chi-square test of independence ($\chi^2 = 12$) showed that social group identities were independent of municipality, indicating high levels of variation between case studies. If New Westminster followed the predicted pattern of expected values, its references would be at a quarter of the observed value of 268. Such exceptional variability underscores that LGBTQ2S citizens are prioritized in New Westminster’s social inclusion initiatives. The pie charts in Figure 2 further illustrate municipal variability in LGBTQ2S coverage: Burnaby is 6 percent; New Westminster is 38 percent; and Surrey is 4 percent. Notably, in New Westminster, LGBTQ2S people are the largest social category; they amount to more than fragments of passing reference and instead are the target subjects of social inclusion. In Burnaby and Surrey, sexual and gender minorities are only referenced infrequently and, thus, are ambivalently incidental to social inclusion.

**LGBTQ2S co-occurrences with the language of suburban social inclusion**

Treemaps efficiently represent hierarchical data as nested rectangles, using relative size to accentuate the relational importance of particular themes. Figure 3 represents the frequency counts of the top twenty social inclusion words in the LGBTQ2S archive (with LGBTQ2S-specific references shown in black). Given the deliberate construction of the archive from municipal documents containing few LGBTQ2S references, it is remarkable that LGBTQ2S content occurs in the top 20 keywords. In fact, social inclusion-related themes rarely co-occurred in the same sentence with LGBTQ2S content. Such linguistic treatment conveys an ambivalence linked to the lack of substantive connections and meaningful discussion of LGBTQ2S topics in relation to broader social inclusion concerns. The treemaps also...
reveal the particular social groups prioritized within them including homeless, children and youth, and seniors. Some of the dominant keywords convey the particular brand of inclusion within each municipality, while others are so generic they convey little in the way of social group or municipal specificity (e.g., “community” including notions of “liveability” and “lifestyle” as well as “building,” “consulting,” and “engaging with community”) and signify ambivalence.

The most predominant LGBTQ2S theme is “pride”, an annual event that celebrates ‘openness’ and inclusion, but also signals the centrality of festivalization. Despite a common treatment of LGBTQ2S citizens as festivalized subjects, there were important municipal differences. In Burnaby, “pride” and variations on “rainbow crosswalk” ranked higher than iterations of the municipally-used LGBTQ+ acronym. New Westminster was the only municipality where the LGBTQ+ acronym ranked above “pride” as a keyword and it was also the municipality with the largest number of LGBTQ2S keywords in the top 20, including other subject positions such as “gay” and “transgender”. In Surrey, reference to pride is frequent, but LGBTQ2S populations are not among the top 20 keywords. Surrey’s other inclusion priorities include at-risk social groups (e.g., homeless, Indigenous, children and youth, and immigrants and refugees) while their vernacular vocabulary emphasizes vulnerability and well-being. The treemaps, therefore, visually demonstrate that for these three suburban municipalities LGBTQ2S issues just barely register on the governance radar and predominantly within a festivalization framing, and they are competing with an array of complex social issues that take inclusion priority.

Figure 3. Treemaps of the top 20 condensed keywords for Burnaby, New Westminster and Surrey, 1995–2020.
The chi-square analysis of the 20 clusters of social inclusion keywords further revealed differences between the municipalities in terms of their observed and expected frequencies with the frequency of use varying significantly (P < 0.001 for all tests) by city. Using a “goodness-of-fit” chi-square test in this way not only permits an individual comparison of each social inclusion keyword by municipality, but also allows a vernacular discursive portrait of each suburb to emerge that frames its place-specific linguistic political opportunity structure. Table 2 shows the tri-municipal patterns of linguistic variance between observed and expected values with the highest chi-square values in descending order: 1) events, celebrations, and festivals; 2) housing affordability; 3) immigrants, newcomers, and refugees; 4) Indigenous populations; and 5) seniors and intergenerational relations. Festivalizing terms had the highest value, driven by the higher observed than expected values in New Westminster and lower-than-expected values in Surrey. Housing affordability had higher-than-expected observed values in Burnaby and lower-than-expected in New Westminster. Burnaby’s geographic proximity to the City of Vancouver amplifies real estate and housing costs, particularly in redeveloping areas near the public transit Skytrain that connects to Vancouver. Immigrants, newcomers, and refugees had much higher than expected observed values in Surrey while Burnaby and New Westminster had a deficit. Surrey referred to Indigenous populations with greater frequency than expected in conjunction with lower-than-expected values for Burnaby and New Westminster. Finally, while seniors and intergenerational relations were important in all three, Burnaby and New Westminster reference this population group more than expected.

Within the social inclusion vernacular of each municipality, there were four predominant LGBTQ2S themes all with relatively low chi-square scores. LGBTQ2S+ identities, organizations, and well-being had the highest chi-square statistic which is largely shaped by the over-discussion of this topic in New Westminster and an under-discussion in Surrey, which was slightly more significant than that of Burnaby. Pride was moderately significant reflecting the high value overall for events, celebrations, and festivals. Gender diversity and sexual and gender discrimination are the most important social inclusion concepts, yet none of the municipalities over- or under-emphasized these in the documentation (sexual and gender discrimination had the lowest chi-square value of 11.7, making its critical value for p less than 0.05). In sum, while there was important linguistic variability across the case study municipalities, the prioritization of pride and festivalization predominated and came at the expense of the discussion of specific LGBTQ2S identities, gender diversity, and forms of sexual and gender discrimination, demonstrating overall a civic ambivalence to suburban LGBTQ2S needs and concerns.

**Typologies of suburban linguistic ambivalence**

In what follows, a typology of linguistic ambivalence is constructed using the vernacular vocabulary of each municipality. The objective is to narrate distinctive suburban portraits extracted from the above analysis. These portraits accentuate the LGBTQ2S inclusions of each municipality so as to characterize the politics and tensions surrounding the governance of sexual and gender minorities and to reveal the micro-ways that equivocation varies within a shared regional geography.

**Burnaby: The “socially sustainable” yet discordant city.** Burnaby characterizes itself as a “socially sustainable city,” celebrating its award-winning 2011 Burnaby Social Sustainability Strategy. Social sustainability (along with economic and environmental), “is about people – individuals and the community working together to meet their needs, realize their potential, and
prosper in a healthy environment” (City of Burnaby, 2011: 2). Burnaby’s commitment to social sustainability has been developed through the adoption of different social policies (e.g., Burnaby Multiculturalism Policy, Civic Youth Strategy, Equity Policy, Child Care Policy, Healthy Community Policy, and Adaptable Housing and Group Home Policies). Sense of belonging and social cohesion are keywords that express social sustainability with particular mention of the elimination of barriers, social bias, and discrimination. Priority social groups are “linguistic”, “ethnic,” and “ethno-cultural” communities with particular emphasis on “religious beliefs” and “faith groups”. The celebration and “respect” of the municipality’s “increasing diversity” is leveraged to “maximize the potential of all, build[ing] a stronger community, and prepar[ing] the City for the future, thereby supporting the goals of community inclusion, a liveable community and community resilience” (City of Burnaby, 2011: 38).

Burnaby adopts a critical stance on heterosexism and homophobia, employing these terms and distinctively using the adjective “homophobic”. LGBTQ2S youth are the subject of Burnaby’s recent recognition of sexual and gender diversity with the young persons’ category of “questioning” as a keyword. Following a regime change at City Hall in 2018, LGBTQ2S constituencies were talked about with greater frequency, often using more contemporary terminology. For example, Burnaby is the only municipality to employ the term “intersex” and reference “biphobia” and “transphobia”. However, Burnaby’s most distinctive signature terms for LGBTQ2S inclusions are “visibility” and “rainbow crosswalk”. Although many municipalities in the Lower Mainland have installed rainbow crosswalks, for Burnaby they are important infrastructural tools to render its LGBTQ2S-friendly status more visible in the suburban landscape. The municipality alone has installed a total of five such crosswalks (with a sixth planned). Such practices reinforce the ways that Burnaby uses infrastructure to manifest its social inclusion priorities.

Despite Burnaby’s commitment to social inclusion and its celebration of a harmonious inter-cultural diversity, it remains a discordant city that is cross-cut by frictions arising from the juxtaposition of labour politics, religious lobby groups, progressive school boards, and redevelopment pressures. These frictions delayed the social inclusion of Burnaby’s LGBTQ2S residents. Municipal elections have been shaped by an impasse between a labour-based City Hall stronghold that ignored LGBTQ2S needs while struggling for re-election over a Provincial School Board Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI 123) policy rejected by conservative faith constituencies. More recently, LGBTQ2S inclusion has been driven by para-public agencies and specific municipal services (e.g., its public libraries and recreation centres) that work in tandem with the city’s social planners to build a broader, yet still ad hoc language of social inclusion for sexual and gender minorities. Ambivalence is evident in the prolonged silence on LGBTQ2S inclusions at City Hall which stalled more systemic change and fostered a reliance upon informal mobilization within para-public organizations.

New Westminster: The “compassionate” yet festival city. New Westminster’s statement on social inclusion is contained in Our City, 2041 (City of New Westminster, 2017a: 27): “New Westminster is a healthy, inclusive and thriving community where people feel connected with each other.” The community plan is grounded in building social and physical connection to local heritage and river frontage, and fostering a “socially-minded” citizenry. However, New Westminster’s explicit positioning through a language of care as the “compassionate city” is derived from a 2019 New West Hospice Society partnership proposal. Compassionate communities “publicly encourage, facilitate, support and celebrate care for one another during life’s most testing moments and experiences” (New West Hospice Society, 2019: 1). While this framing expresses deep empathy for its populace
and validates populations rarely addressed by municipal leaders (e.g., people living with intellectual and developmental disabilities, chronic and terminal illness, in recovery, dealing with evictions, and low-income seniors), the compassionate city moniker is held in tension with the celebration of difference through festivalization.

The language of social inclusion in New Westminster revolves around an intergenerational combating of disenfranchisement and social isolation through social connection. The deployment of “social capital” and “equity” demonstrates critical municipal investment in rectifying social exclusions, while “empowerment” and “public engagement” intended to generate mutual respect across differences are also co-optable goals within the rhetoric of late neoliberalism. Although moments of equivocation can be found in the residual lingering of words like “acceptance”, “awareness”, and “tolerance”, New Westminster is the only city to mention “exclusion” in conjunction with “stigma” and the notion of being “disassociated from society”. This reckoning with socio-economic minorities is reflected in its vision for a “safe city” that can be a place of “shelter”, “liveability”, “meaning”, and “well-being” for its residents. Yet, intercultural and cross-cultural interpretations of diversity are muted in New Westminster’s inclusion documents.

New Westminster’s framing of LGBTQ2S inclusion is embedded in a concomitantly complex and contradictory vocabulary. This municipality is the only one to use specific references, some associated with a critical stance on heteronormativity, while others are linked to distinct local LGBTQ2S activities: a Seniors’ Gay-Straight Alliance; the Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity (SOGI) school board policies; the historic Stonewall uprising that launched the Gay Liberation Movement; and naming LGBTQ2S demonstrations of mourning as “vigils”. Also notable is the distinctive appearance of terms associated with increased inclusion of gender diversity (e.g., “gender expression,” “gender identit(ies),” “gender reassignment,” and “gender-free”) and associated terms (e.g., “in transition,” “trans-inclusive,” and “trans-competent”) and an emphasis on “queer competency” (fostered through the local embrace of the provincial Safe Harbour Program). New Westminster has also integrated gender diversity into its understanding of universal access to restrooms and changing rooms within its newly constructed and renovated recreational facilities.

In sum, New Westminster’s diversity paradigm is robust and substantive, but its emphasis on festivalization and its white-Anglo “Royal City” heritage undermines the complex work of inclusion. The place of LGBTQ2S populations in municipal social inclusion frameworks exemplifies its civic celebration of difference with records in council being associated with pride festivities, implicating LGBTQ2S subjects in downtown revitalization and Business Improvement Area programming for Columbia Street (the only street identified by one of the three municipalities with the LGBTQ2S population). For New Westminster and adjacent municipalities, this suburban ‘main street’ is but a backdrop for a roster of other festivals embedding LGBTQ2S social programming into the diversity paradigm of a ‘royal’ city that still finds distinction in its predominantly colonial, working-class heritage.

**Surrey: The “inclusive” yet preferential city.** Surrey is the only municipality to self-brand as “the inclusive city” in its Sustainability Charter 2.0 with the stated goal of creating “a thriving, green, inclusive city” that is “sustainable” and “resilient” (City of Surrey, 2016: 16–17). It is also the only municipality to pair this term with “welcoming” as a social ideal (i.e., “building a more welcoming and inclusive community”) (Surrey Welcoming Communities Project, 2014). Surrey strives to be inclusive and welcoming by prioritizing the needs of specific marginalized social groups (e.g., immigrants, newcomers, and refugees as well as Indigenous and youth populations). It is also the only municipality of the three to articulate the importance of “youth engagement” and “youth friendliness”. Moreover, Surrey is
particularly attentive to “at-risk” and “vulnerable” groups of residents who have the potential to be victimized and exploited with significant public commitments to reducing poverty and homelessness.

In Surrey, “social infrastructure” and “social innovation” are used to characterize its ideal landscape of inclusion, employing terms such as “social equity” and “social responsibility” and promoting community ideals of “wellness”. Its understanding of social infrastructure is multifaceted and includes a range of concepts that speak to the eradication of exclusion and the promotion of cross-cultural understanding. More than the other two municipalities, the action verbs of social inclusion are: “outreach” and “advocacy” to augment “awareness”; and “capacity”, “connectedness”, and “participation” for its marginalized residents. In so doing, Surrey deliberately seeks to foster “resilience,” “resourcefulness,” and “recognition”. “Restorative justice” and “reconciliation” for Indigenous peoples are concepts unique to Surrey’s public vocabulary, as is a generic emphasis on “support” for disadvantaged communities. Surrey’s civic language of social inclusion leverages “human rights” and “multiculturalism” to build “cultural awareness” and “cultural competency”, while being “culturally inclusive” and “culturally appropriate”. While Surrey approaches cross-cultural sensitivity and competency through a training lens, such instruction largely does not extend to its LGBTQ2S communities. Like Burnaby, Surrey makes safety a civic priority, but is distinguished by its emphasis on the creation of “safe space(s)” or “safe environment(s)”, and concomitant concern for the violence of bullying that can accompany “discrimination”, “prejudice”, and “stereotypes”. Surrey is distinctive in its occasional employment of highly critical terms regarding marginalization and exclusion (e.g., “neglect” and “segregation”) and questioning power relations (e.g., “anti-oppression” and “social justice”), but these are often siloed into bundles attributed to one particular group and not shared between or across groups.

While there is a distinctive critical employment of social inclusion terms, Surrey’s language rarely extends to include LGBTQ2S concerns. Surrey’s LGBTQ2S populations are seldom referenced, with “pride” more significant than the constituency itself. There were few distinctive Surrey keywords beside “GLBTQ” (as opposed to “LGBTQ”) and references to populations living with HIV-AIDS. From the social inclusion keywords, new concepts were introduced by LGBTQ2S activist groups (e.g., “alienation”, “loneliness”, “peer-support”, and “suicidal ideation”). Surrey documents made more references to Pink Shirt Day, which like International Day of Pink noted by Burnaby, is an event used to promote the eradication of bullying that signals LGBTQ2S youth as part of its subtext for groups who experience victimization. Other vernacular LGBTQ2S keywords in Surrey include “allies” and “anti-homophobia” and the only reference to the Rainbow Refugee Committee, a group supporting and advocating for “people seeking refugee protection because of persecution based on sexual orientation, gender identity, or HIV status” (Surrey Welcoming Communities Project, 2014: n.p.).

Surrey is a much larger municipality than either Burnaby or New Westminster making its plans, policies, and social inclusion initiatives appear more comprehensive and sophisticated in their employment of its language. Moreover, upon first reading, its vocabulary appears coherent and current, redolent with a mixture of terms derived from different socio-political stances and changing over a long time. As a larger and rapidly expanding municipality focused on the approval of land development applications (Grant, 2009), Surrey also grapples with social issues that are not as aggregated in the other municipalities (e.g., homelessness, youth disenfranchisement, addictions, and poverty) and the segmentation of particular large ethnic communities from one another. These tectonic undercurrents inform civic understandings of inclusion for Surrey’s LGBTQ2S populations; not only are they hard to reach despite the activism of a select few, but they also bring messy intersectional
“obscure needs” that render them more of an “electoral liability” than a political asset in a late neoliberal city that prioritizes festivalization (Cooper and Monro, 2003).

Conclusion

To date, Canadian suburban governance scholarship has attended to the power relations of civic decision-making, yet has seldom foregrounded sexual and gender diversity in its interrogation of the interactions between state, market, and civil society actors. Instead, it remains focused on ‘hard’ technical infrastructure to the neglect of ‘soft’ social arrangements that undergird the capacities of people in specific places. As localized technologies of power, social inclusion frameworks are no less central to suburban governance than political-economic processes – they guide civic priorities, set normative boundaries, and create political opportunity structures to address the tensions and juxtapositions emerging in rapidly diversifying peripheral landscapes.

Leveraging Tuohy’s (1992) concept of “institutional ambivalence,” this paper has contributed to the suburban governance literature by drawing attention to the political work of inclusion that language can do (or not) for sexual and gender minorities. By reading the vernacular vocabulary found in an archive of municipal public-facing communication, it has revealed the linguistic equivocations of LGBTQ2S social inclusions embedded within suburban political opportunity structures. Linguistic discourse and content analyses of the archive distilled social inclusion keywords and their co-occurrence with LGBTQ2S themes, accentuating civic ambivalence towards sexual and gender minority constituents. The municipally-variant vocabulary of LGBTQ2S social inclusion signals divergent local linguistic political opportunity structures for suburban sexual and gender minorities. Each municipality’s vernacular vocabulary has informed a typological narration that demonstrates varied gradations of linguistic obfuscation demonstrating an ambivalence towards LGBTQ2S social inclusion amidst suburban diversity.

Overall, LGBTQ2S social inclusion is formulated in the backrooms of City Hall in social issues committees and departmental reports, making fleeting appearances in policies, plans, and strategies or in proclamations and pride festival funding requests before councils. Despite an archive focused entirely on LGBTQ2S inclusion, the variable absence and uneven presence of related keywords conveys significant obfuscations through a lack of clarity, consistency, and specificity when targeting LGBTQ2S constituencies. With the exception of New Westminster, the content analysis has shown that LGBTQ2S populations are infrequently referenced relative to other marginalized social groups and that their presence in inclusion frameworks is dictated by the extent to which they align with civic priorities such as festivalization, safety, welcoming newcomers, integrating seniors, and anti-discrimination initiatives. However, municipal variation resulted in uneven political opportunity structures that did not demonstrate that any one municipality is more LGBTQ2S-inclusive than another: high levels of festivalization in New Westminster are not necessarily more inclusive than the non-discrimination lists in Surrey’s policy frameworks or Burnaby’s recent intensive use of rainbow crosswalks to visibly mark its landscape as LGBTQ2S-friendly.

While not comparative per se, this paper juxtaposes three peripheral municipalities in order to provide place-specific texture to a very understudied topic. Many LGBTQ2S North Americans live in governance landscapes similar to these suburbs. Therefore, it remains important to address ongoing specific material and financial needs for the provision of LGBTQ2S-specific safe and sustained health and social spaces with community-based programming for all ages and across ethno-cultural, Indigenous, racialized, class, and, sexual and gender differences. As the chi-square analysis revealed, each municipality has different linguistic political
opportunity structures upon which LGBTQ2S constituents can draw, but all are notably thin and fragile. Following the adoption of its 2011 Social Sustainability Plan, Burnaby has remained committed to improving the quality of life for individual citizens by providing socio-economic opportunities and a healthy environment. However, until 2018, LGBTQ2S constituencies were not incorporated into this framework. More overtly, LGBTQ2S inclusions were part of a discordant politics necessitating political trade-offs between LGBTQ2S constituencies and the morality politics of faith-based communities. While the visibility and access that New Westminster affords LGBTQ2S constituencies appears ideal, redevelopment politics and festivalization partially undermine its goal of being a compassionate city that cares about its most marginalized populations. The slippery slope of commodifying LGBTQ2S events and identities plays with well-established diversity paradigms that prefer harmonious juxtapositions to the complexities of intersectional differences. Surrey with its explicit “inclusive city” brand, long but sporadic history of LGBTQ2S inclusions, and deep integration of cross-referenced policy frameworks, appears institutionally to discursively embrace difference. However, in the face of rapid development, large youth populations, rising concentrations of Indigenous, diasporic, and at-risk populations, Surrey is a “preferential” city where LGBTQ2S inclusions are overshadowed by competing and siloed social issues that take priority.

This paper’s typology is a valuable starting point for understanding the micro-linguistic ways that ambivalence operates within suburban municipal social inclusion frameworks. Beyond language, ongoing work needs to unpack the discourses that inform municipal political opportunity structures. A crucial next step is to extend the vernacular vocabularies of LGBTQ2S inclusions through a discourse analysis of its larger “grammar of use” that frames civic actions and outcomes (Cohendet et al., 2010). Moreover, the typology is inductive and place-based, making it difficult to extrapolate or export to other contexts. Thus, a subsequent step is to develop a generic typology to assess the responsiveness of municipal governance to sexual and gender minority constituents. The application of such a typology to urban planning and policy practices could identify opportunities for enhanced suburban sexual citizenship. These preliminary findings further convey the importance of attention to, and comparative consideration of, the multi-scalar diffusion of LGBTQ2S inclusion initiatives and their varied adaptations by suburban governance actors.
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Notes
1. This paper adopts the geographically specific acronym LGBTQ2S to signal the long-standing presence of Two-Spirit communities (a term used by some Indigenous peoples to refer to the intersection of a masculine and feminine spirit in their sexual, gender, and spiritual identities) on Turtle Island (North America) and within the unceded Indigenous territories of the Vancouver city-region to combat their erasure with the widely-used generic acronyms LGBTQ or LGBTQ+. 
2. The initial governance impacts were traced through the development of a print media database \( (n = 1763) \) of newspaper articles from 1985 to 2015 that referenced metropolitan case study suburban LGBTQ2S subject matter (Bain et al., 2020). Governance impacts were also traced through semi-structured key informant interviews (2017-2019) in the Vancouver city-region \( (n = 98) \), including 23 in Burnaby, 23 in New Westminster, and 37 in Surrey) with civic leaders (municipal politicians, planners, policy makers, program administrators), Gay-Straight-Alliance (GSA) teacher sponsors, and LGBTQ2S community service providers and activists.

3. In 2018, the Canadian federal government changed the official term from ‘Aboriginal’ to ‘Indigenous’ to encourage greater recognition of territorial acknowledgments and respect for land claims. This paper uses both terms, returning to Aboriginal where the documents do so.

References

Bailey RC (1999) Gay Politics, Urban Politics: Identity and Economics in the Urban Setting. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bain AL and Podmore JA (2021) Relocating queer: Comparing suburban LGBTQ2S activisms on Vancouver’s periphery. Urban Studies 58(7): 1500–1519.

Bain AL, Podmore JA and Rosenberg R (2020) Straightening’ space and time? Peripheral moral panics in print media representations of Canadian LGBTQ2S suburbanites, 1985–2005. Social & Cultural Geography 21(6): 839–861.

Bell D and Binnie J (2004) Authenticating queer space: Citizenship, urbanism and governance. Urban Studies 41(9): 1807–1820.

Brown M (1994) The work of city politics: Citizenship through employment in the local response to AIDS. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 26(6): 873–894.

Brown M and Knopp L (2016) Sex, drink, and state anxieties: Governance through the gay bar. Social & Cultural Geography 17(3): 335–358.

Brown M, Knopp L and Morrill R (2005) The culture wars and urban electoral politics: Sexuality, race, and class in Tacoma, Washington. Political Geography 24(3): 267–291.

Browne K and Bakshi L (2013) Ordinary in Brighton?: LGBT, Activisms and the City. London: Routledge.

Browne K, Banerjea N, McGlynn N, et al. (2019) The limits of legislative change: Moving beyond inclusion/exclusion to create “a life worth living”. Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space 39(1): 30–52.

Cameron A (2007) Geographies of welfare and exclusion: Reconstituting the ‘public’. Progress in Human Geography 31(4): 519–526.

Canaday M (2009) The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chapman T (2011) Queering the political economy: Anti-discrimination law and the urban regime in Orlando, Florida. In: Doan PL (ed.) Queering Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice. Farnham: Ashgate, pp.145–155.

City of Burnaby (2011) Burnaby Social Sustainability Strategy. Available at: www.burnaby.ca/Assets/city_services/planning/Social+Sustainability+Strategy.pdf (accessed 19 July 2021).

City of New Westminster (2017a) Our City 2041: New Westminster Official Community Plan, October. Available at: https://www.newwestcity.ca/ocp (accessed 19 July 2021).

City of New Westminster (2017b) New Westminster Age-Friendly Strategy, April. Available at: https://www.newwestcity.ca/age_friendly (accessed 19 July 2021).

City of Surrey (2016) Sustainability Charter 2.0. Available at: www.surrey.ca/files/SustainabilityCharter2.0.pdf (accessed 19 July 2021).

Cohendet P, Grandadam D and Laurent S (2010) The anatomy of the creative city. Industry & Innovation 17(1): 91–111.

Collins A (2004) Sexual dissidence, enterprise and assimilation: Bedfellows in urban regeneration. Urban Studies 41(9): 1789–1806.

Cooper D (2006) Active citizenship and the governmentality of local lesbian and gay politics. Political Geography 25(8): 921–943.
Cooper D and Monro S (2003) Governing from the margins: Queering the state of local government. *Contemporary Politics* 9(3): 229–255.

Cravens RG (2015) Morality politics and municipal LGBT policy adoption: A rare-event analysis. *State and Local Government Review* 47(1): 15–25.

Doan PL (ed.) (2015) *Planning and LGBTQ Communities: The Need for Inclusive Queer Spaces*. New York: Routledge.

Ekers M, Hamel P and Keil R (2012) Governing suburbia: Modalities and mechanisms of suburban governance. *Regional Studies* 46(3): 405–422.

Ettlinger N (2010) Bringing the everyday into the culture/creativity discourse. *Human Geography* 3(1): 49–59.

Fejes F (2008) *Gay Rights and Moral Panic: The Origins of America’s Debate on Homosexuality*. Basingstoke: Palgrave McMillan.

Feltham-King T and Macleod C (2016) How content analysis might complement and extend the insights of discourse analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 15(1): 1–9.

Filion P (2015) Suburban inertia: The entrenchment of dispersed suburbanism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39(3): 633–640.

Filion P and Kramer A (2011) Metropolitan-scale planning in neoliberal times: Financial and political obstacles to urban form transition. *Space and Polity* 15(3): 197–212.

Fincher R, Iveson K, Leitner H, et al. (2014) Planning in the multicultural city: Celebrating diversity or reinforcing difference? *Progress in Planning* 92: 1–55.

Fischer F (2003) *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Florida R (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It’s Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Foucault, M (1978) The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. New York: Pantheon Books.

Gerometta J, Haussermann H and Longo G (2005) Social innovation and civil society in urban governance: Strategies for an inclusive city. *Urban Studies* 42(11): 2007–2021.

Gorman-Murray A (2011) Queering planning in Australia: The problems and possibilities of multiscalar governance for LGBT sexual minorities. In: Doan PL (ed.) *Queerying Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp.129–143.

Gorman-Murray A and Nash C (2017) Transformations in LGBT consumer landscapes and leisure spaces in the neoliberal city. *Urban Studies* 54(3): 786–805.

Grabher G (2018) Marginality as strategy: Leveraging peripherality for creativity. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 50(8): 1785–1794.

Grant J (2009) Theory and practice in planning the suburbs: Challenges to implementing new urbanism, smart growth, and sustainability principles. *Planning Theory & Practice* 10(1): 11–33.

Hamel P and Keil R (eds) (2015) *Suburban Governance: A Global View*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hubbard P (2013) Kissing is not a universal right: Sexuality, law and the scales of citizenship. *Geoforum* 49: 224–232.

Jones T (2011) A sexuality education discourses framework: Conservative, liberal, critical, and postmodern. *American Journal of Sexuality Education* 6(2): 133–175.

Kanai JM and Kenttamaa-Squires K (2015) Remaking South beach: Metropolitan gayborhood trajectories under homonormative entrepreneurialism. *Urban Geography* 36(3): 385–402.

Lichterman P (1996) *The Search for Political Community: American Activists Reinventing Commitment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Massey D (2007) *World City*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Morrish L and O’Mara K (2011) Queering the discourse of diversity. *Journal of Homosexuality* 58(6–7): 974–991.

Muller Myrdahl T (2011) Queering creative cities. In: Doan PL (ed.) *Queerying Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp.157–168.
Murray C (2015) Queering Vancouver: The work of the LGBTQ civic advisory committee, 2009-14. 
BC Studies 188: 55–80.
Nash CJ and Gorman-Murray A (2015) Recovering the gay village: A comparative historical geography of urban change and planning in Toronto and Sydney. Historical Geography 43: 84–105.
New West Hospice Society (2019) Compassionate City Charter. Available at: www.newwestcity.ca/database/files/library/CSI_2019_Nov_5_Agenda_Package.pdf (accessed 19 July 2021).
Niedt C (ed). (2013) Social Justice in Diverse Suburbs: History, Politics, and Prospects. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Oswin N (2012) The queer time of creative urbanism: Family, futurity, and global city Singapore. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space 44(7): 1624–1640.
Paganoni MC (2012) City branding and social inclusion in the glocal city. Mobilities 7(1): 13–31.
Parker B (2017) Masculinities and Markets: Raced and Gendered Urban Politics in Milwaukee. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
Peck J (2005) Struggling with the creative class. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 29(4): 740–770.
Podmore JA and Bain AL (2021) Whither queer suburbanisms? Beyond heterosuburbia and queer metronormativities. Progress in Human Geography DOI:https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520979744
Podmore JA and Bain AL (2020) “No queers out there?” Metronormativity and the queer suburban. Geography Compass 14(9): e12505.
Prior J and Crofts P (2011) Querying urban governance: The emergence of sex industry premises into the planned city. In: Doan PL (ed.) Querying Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice. New York: Ashgate, pp.185–208.
Richardson D (2005) Desiring sameness? The rise of a neoliberal politics of normalisation. Antipode 37(3): 515–535.
Smith M (2005) Resisting and reinforcing neoliberalism: Lesbian and gay organizing and the federal and local levels in Canada. Policy & Politics 33(1): 75–94.
Statham P and Tillie J (2016) Muslims in their European societies of settlement: A comparative agenda for empirical research on socio-cultural integration across countries and groups. Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies 42(2): 177–196.
Statistics Canada (2017) Census Profiles. 2016 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2016001. Ottawa. Available at: www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dppd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E (accessed 18 June 2020).
Surrey Welcoming Communities Project (2014) Refugee Newcomers in Surrey: Approaches to building a More Welcoming and Inclusive Community. Report for the City of Surrey, March.
Tarrow S (1998) Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tuohy CJ (1992) Policy and Politics in Canada: Institutionalized Ambivalence. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Valverde M (2012) Everyday Law on the Street: City Governance in an Age of Diversity. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Williams R (1976) Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society. New York: Oxford University Press.

Alison L Bain, is an Associate Professor in the Faculty of Environmental and Urban Change at York University in Canada and a North American Managing Editor for the journal Urban Studies. She has research expertise on the geographies of artists and contemporary practices of urban and suburban place-making. Through the lenses of identity politics, social justice, artistic labour, and vernacular creative practice she examines the spatial and creative affordances of cities and their peripheries for cultural workers and LGBTQþ populations. Her scholarship investigates contested neighbourhood place-embedding processes through

Alison L Bain
formal and informal arts-led urban redevelopment initiatives and social inclusion practices in mid-size and large Canadian and German cities.

**Julie A Podmore**, is a professor in the Geosciences Department at John Abbott College and an Affiliate Assistant Professor in Geography, Planning and Environment at Concordia University. Her research on Montréal’s LGBTQ communities, especially its lesbian geographies, has appeared in numerous collections and academic journals. Since 2016, she has been a coinvestigator with Alison Bain on “Queering Canadian suburbs” which seeks to map the social, cultural and policy geographies of LGBTQ+ populations in the suburbs of Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. She is also active in Montreal’s LGBTQ+ archives community, currently serving on the board of Archives lesbiennes de Québec.