Review Report

Resilient and Safe Banyule Framework

Banyule
City Council

Introduction

Banyule City Council is developing its 10-year Resilient and Safe Banyule Framework, which will act as a guiding framework to support Council's strategic planning processes and decision-making that leads to an increase in levels of community resilience in Banyule over future years.

The purpose of the Framework is to create a shared understanding of community resilience across Council, identify the community level protective factors required to maintain and increase resilience, and establish a clear investment strategy for Council over the next ten years. This will position Council to mobilise its existing and future resources to better support and uplift community resilience, with the intention of creating long term and sustainable community outcomes beyond 'emergency' situations.

The 10-year Resilient and Safe Banyule Framework will be informed by the Resilient Melbourne Plan, Emergency Management Victoria's Community Resilience Characteristics, and 100 Resilient Cities Framework, and outline the actions Council can take to address community resilience.

Policy Context

Global Context

Sendai Framework

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030[1] is the global framework and policy instrument guiding UN Member States in their approach to disaster preparedness and risk management, superseding the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters. The intended outcome of the Sendai Framework is "The substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihoods and health and in the economic, physical, social, cultural and environmental assets of persons, businesses, communities and countries".

The Sendai Framework outlines four global priorities for action to reduce disaster risk and strengthen disaster resilience. These are:

1. Understanding disaster risk
2. Strengthening disaster risk governance to manage risk
3. Investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience
4. Enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response, and to 'Build Back Better' in recovery, recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction

As a Member State, Australia is a signatory to this Framework, which commits National, State and Territory, and Local Governments to action to address its priorities and achieve its outcome.

Sustainable Development Agenda and Goals 2030

The Sustainable Development Agenda[2] is the global framework and policy instrument guiding UN Member States to take action that creates health and wellbeing, peace, equality, and a sustainable and resilient planet. The agenda includes 17 sustainable development goals and 169 targets to achieve by 2030. While all of the goals contribute to or are relevant for community resilience, there are two that explicitly reference resilience:

- Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation
- Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

The sustainable development agenda recognises the relationship between a sustainable planet, resilient and inclusive communities, and health and wellbeing in order to achieve equality and justice for all people.

National Context

National Disaster Risk Reduction Framework

The National Disaster Risk Reduction Framework(3) was developed by the National Resilience Taskforce, in collaboration with over 80 organisations across government, community and business sectors. The Framework translates the Sendai Framework priorities into action within the Australian context, to guide the national effort to reduce disaster risk reduction in natural hazards.

The National Framework adopts an 'Environments for Health' framework, recognising that action is needed across the built, natural, social and economic environment to reduce risk and strengthen resilience. It outlines for priorities for action, which are:

1. Understand disaster risk
2. Accountable decisions
3. Governance, ownership and responsibility
4. Enhance investment

National Strategy for Disaster Resilience

The National Strategy for Disaster Resilience[4] was developed by the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) in 2011, and sets out a national action-based resilience planning agenda to strengthen local capacity, capability and community engagement. The Strategy promotes a more coordinated and collaborative approach to building disaster resilience, with responsibilities shared across government, community organisations, businesses, communities and individuals. It sets out key actions and outcomes across seven priority areas:

1. Leading change and coordinating effort
2. Understanding risks
3. Communicating with and educating people about risks
4. Partnering with those who effect change
5. Empowering individuals and communities to exercise choice and take responsibility
6. Reducing risks in the built environment
7. Supporting capabilities for disaster resilience

Relevant Legislation and Regulations

- National Health Security Act 2007
- Biosecurity Act 2015
- National Health Security Regulations Act 2018
- National Emergency Declaration Act 2020
- Climate Change Act 2022

State Context

Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan

The Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan[5] is a legislative requirement under the Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008, and sets out the Victorian Government's commitment and approach to improving population health and wellbeing outcomes. The Plan outlines ten priorities for action, including two that seek to strengthen community resilience; i) Tackling climate change and its impact on health; ii) improving mental wellbeing.

The climate change priority acknowledges the health impacts of climate change due to the increasing intensity and frequency of major weather events, and the subsequent decline in air and water quality, as well as increased spread of infectious diseases. A key goal of this priority is to build safe and resilient communities that are adapting to the public health impacts of climate change.

The mental wellbeing priority recognises that people's mental health is shaped by social, economic and environmental circumstances, including social connection and participation in community life. A key goal of this priority is to increase resilience among individuals, families and communities.

Community Resilience Renewal Strategy (VICSES)

The Community Resilience Strategy Renewal[6] sets out the Victorian State Emergency Services commitment to building safer and more resilient communities. The Strategy sets out three key objectives with associated goals and outcomes: i) Build capacity: ii) Increase collaboration; and iii) Foster connections.

Other relevant plans and strategies
- Resilient Melbourne Plan
- Victorian Bushfire Recovery Framework
- Victoria's Critical Infrastructure Resilience Strategy

Relevant Legislation and Regulations
- Country Fire Authority Act 1958
- Fire Rescue Act 1958
- Ambulance Services Act 1986
- Emergency Management Act 1986
- Emergency Services Telecommunications Authority Act 2004
- Victoria State Emergency Service Act 2005
- Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008
- Emergency Management Act 2013
- Emergency Management (Critical Infrastructure Resilience) Regulations 2015
- Environment Protection Act 2017
- Climate Change Act 2017

Local Context

The Resilient and Safe Banyule Framework has a connection to a range of Council Plans and Strategies, including:
- Banyule Community Vision 2041
- Council Plan 2021-2025
- Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2021-2025
- Social Infrastructure Framework
- Inclusive Banyule 2022-2026
- Community Climate Action Plan
- Neighbourhood House Strategy
- Public Open Space Plan 2016-2031
- Community Infrastructure Plan
- Social Enterprise Action Plan 2020-2025
- Economic Development Plan 2015-2020

Banyule Community Profile

The City of Banyule is in Melbourne's north-eastern suburbs, between seven and 21 kilometres from the Melbourne CBD. Covering 18 suburbs, it is home to 127, 376 residents, with a population density of 21.11 person per hectare. Banyule is a diverse city, with people from over 140 countries. Approximately 25% of the population are aged 25 years or under and 23% are aged 60 years and over. In 2021, 862 Aboriginal people were living in Banyule, over 5,200 people had recently arrived in Australia and settled in Banyule. In 2021, nearly 7,500 people with a need for assistance to manage self-care, body movement or communication activities were living in Banyule.

Whilst most people are faring well (with a municipality SEIFA percentile of 84),[1] there are pockets of the community that are more advantaged or disadvantaged than average. Ivanhoe East is the most advantaged area in Banyule (SEIFA percentile of 99) whereas Heidelberg West/Bellfield areas have the highest level of disadvantage, and some of the highest levels of disadvantage nationally.

Table 1: Characteristics of the Banyule community

Focus	Highlights
Overall population	– The usual resident population of Banyule is 127,376 people – The population increased by approximately 4,370 people between 2016 and 2021
Gender	– There are more women (51.4%) living in Banyule than men (48.6%) – The number of trans, gender diverse and non-binary people living in Banyule is unknown, as they are not currently counted in the Census.
Age	– The largest five-year age group in Banyule is people aged 35-39 (9,226 people or 7.3% of the Banyule population). There is a significant proportion of people aged 65 years and over (18.7%), the fastest growing age group between 2016 and 2021 was people aged 70-74 years, which increased by 1,179 people. There are nearly 9,658 (7.7%) young people aged 18-24 living in Banyule, and 26,610 (21.1%) children aged under 18 years.
Sexuality	– According to the Banyule Household Survey[7], 2.8% of respondents identify as LGBTIQA+, the majority of which are adolescents or young adults. People who identify as LGBTIQA+ are more likely to live in the east and west precincts of Banyule.
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people	– There are 862 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in Banyule (0.7% of the Banyule population, which increased by 165 people between 2016 and 2021
Cultural and linguistic diversity	– A significant number of people living in Banyule were born overseas (24.5%), which increased by 8.4% between 2016 and 2021 – The largest populations born overseas are the United Kingdom (4,196), China (3,780), India (2,450) and Italy (2,014), while the fastest growing communities over that period were India, China, Iran and Malaysia. – Nearly 22% of people in Banyule speak a language other than English at home, with the largest language groups being Mandarin, Italian and Greek, while a significant number of people speak Cantonese, Arabic, Vietnamese and Somali.

---

[1] Index of Relative Socio-Economic Advantage and Disadvantage

Migration patterns	– Banyule had a relatively stable population between 2016 and 2021. Overall, more than 62% of people had not changed addressed, while 30.4% of people who moved into Banyule moved from within Australia, and 3.9% moved from overseas. In 2021, the age group with the highest net migration into Banyule was people aged 35-44 years. Net migration for all other age groups decreased, meaning there are fewer young people and fewer older people in Banyule now than in 2016. – There are a significant number of recent arrivals in Banyule, with approximately 14% of people who were born overseas arriving in Australia in the past five years, while, 27% of people born overseas have lived in Australia for 10 years or less.
Living with disability and long-term conditions	– In 2021, 7,419 (5.9%) of people living in Banyule reported needing support in their day-to-day lives due to disability, the largest proportion of which were people aged 85 years and over (1,819 people). The largest increase in need for support was in people aged 70 years and over. – In 2021, 33.4% of the Banyule population reported having a long-term health condition, with mental health conditions being the most common (11,641 people or 9.2%). – While more than 62% of respondents to the household survey reported their physical health as excellent or good, nearly 12% indicated they were in fair or poor physical health. Similarly, 61% reported their mental health as excellent or good, while over 10% indicated they had fair poor mental health. People with disability were also more likely to report their physical and mental health as being fair or poor[7].
Employment and income	– In 2021, the unemployment rate in Banyule overall was 4.3%, while the unemployment rate for people in low-income households was 26.5%. – More than 30% of people were on low incomes in 2021 (under $800 per week), and 13,144 people were living in low-income households. Women are more likely to experience this, with 55% of people living in low-income households being women.
Housing circumstances	– The majority of households in Banyule are made up of couples with children (33.5%), followed by couples without children (25.1%). There are 5,046 (10.3%) single parent families in Banyule, while a significant proportion of people live alone (24.3%), and a small proportion (3%) live in group/share households. – The majority of people in Banyule live in private accommodation in properties they either own (35.9%), are paying off (34.2%) or renting (21.5%). There are 1,768 people (3.6%) live in social housing, the large majority of which are situated in Heidelberg and Heidelberg West. – In 2016, there were 5,232 (11.3%) households that did not have an internet connection at home and 2,811 (5.7%) that did not have access to a private vehicle.

Source: Unless otherwise noted, findings based on 2016 and 2021 Census on Banyule Profile ID - https://profile.id.com.au/banyule/highlights?SeifaKey=40002

Community perceptions of life in Banyule

Health and wellbeing

Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic

The Household Survey asked a question relating to change in local living due to COVID-19, with more than 61% of respondents indicating it had changed the way they live in at least one way, some of which might be viewed as positive impacts, and some negative[7]. The two most common changes were that people have less social interaction (33.6%), and use parks and local reserves more (31.3%). A significant proportion of people also reported spending more time online (27.1%), while a quarter of residents indicated they are working from home more (24.5%).

Experiences of discrimination, abuse and social exclusion

The Household Survey asked about experiences of discrimination, abuse or social exclusion during COVID-19, including on the basis of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, religion and disability. Just over 9% of people reported they had experienced at least one form of discrimination, abuse or exclusion, including 14.8% of people with disability, 11% of multilingual people and 9.9% of women[7].

People living in Banyule were most likely to report discrimination, abuse or exclusion on the basis of ethnicity (2.6%, age (2.5%), gender (1.9%) and disability (1.5%).

Social isolation

The Household survey asked a number of questions relating to social isolation, including frequency and type of contact with family and friends. The overwhelming majority of people (94.7%) indicated they had been in contact with a family member or friend who lived outside their household in the past week[7]. The most common ways of contacting them was in person (91%), phone calls (88.6%), and text messages (85.2%), with more than half reporting they use social media to keep in contact.

The proportion of people contacting family and friends using a videoconferencing service such as zoom or skype increased by more than 25% between 2017 and 2022, reflecting a significant shift in the way people socialise and stay connected following the impact of COVID-19[7].

Food security/insecurity

The Household Survey a single question relating to levels of food security. While the majority of people (79%) indicated they always had enough food to eat and the kinds of food they wanted, 13.5% reported having enough food to eat, but not always the kind of food they wanted to be eating, and 0.7% of people reporting they sometimes do not have enough food to eat[7].

While the number of people who reported experiencing a form of food insecurity were small, the following demographics were more likely to report not being able to access the food they want:

- Two-parent families with a child under 4 years
- One-parent families with a child aged 5-12 years
- Young people living alone
- People living in group households

Financial hardship

The Household Survey assessed the extent of financial hardship by asking about the need to access services in the previous 12 months. Nearly 8% of people had accessed at least one type of service or support due to financial hardship, the most common being bill deferment (4.2%) and rate reduction (3.3%). A number of people also required emergency relief and food relief, which was significantly more common in the west precinct.

Community participation, connection and belonging

Participation in leisure, arts, and cultural activities

More than 96% of respondents to the Household Survey reported participating in at least one of the 41 predetermined leisure, arts and cultural activities, and on average people participated in eleven activities[7]. Some of the most common activities were those undertaken at home, including watching television at home (72%), and listening to music at home (57%).

The most common activities undertaken outside the home included visiting local parks (52%), dining out (20%), socialising/coffee with friends (50%). Other common activities included using computers/internet (50.7%) and shopping (48.5%).

In terms of cultural events, 42.7% reported going to the cinema, 18.3% reported going to a gallery or exhibition, 16.3% reported going to a live music event. In relation to services provided by Council, 24.2% went to the library, 26% visited playgrounds, and 4.7% visited a neighbourhood house.

Participation in sport and recreation activities

Participation in sport and recreation decreased between 2017 and 2022, with 70% of people indicating they typically participated in at least one of the 15 predetermined sport and recreational activities[7]. Children aged 5-12 years had the highest levels of participation (92.5%), followed by adolescents (85%). There was also strong participation by young adults (76.6%) adults (78.3%) and middle-aged adults (76.1%). However, participation declines quite sharply for older adults (56.9%) and senior citizens (41.9%).

Men were more likely to participate in sport and recreation activities than women (73.2% compared to 66.9%), and English-speaking residents (69.2%) were less likely to participate than multilingual residents (72.7%).

Participation in community groups

Less than half (42.4%) of respondents to the 2022 Household Survey reported being involved in at least one community group, which was a 4% decline on the 2017 survey and the lowest level of participation in nearly 15 years[7]. People aged 20-59 years were the least likely to be involved in community groups, while senior citizens (60%) and children (48.8%) were the most likely to be involved. People living in the west precinct were significantly less likely (33.2%) to be involved in community groups than the Banyule average.

The two most common community groups that people participate in are sports clubs (16%) and religious groups or places of worship (10.7%), although sports club participation declined by more than 6% between 2017 and 2022, with a notable decline in people participating in volunteer/welfare groups and arts/cultural groups over the same period[7].

Volunteering

Just over a quarter (27.7%) of respondents to the 2022 Household Survey reported that at least one person in the household had undertaking unpaid voluntary work in the past 12 months, which was a significant decline on volunteering rates in 2017 (38.7%). The most common settings in which people volunteer are sports/recreation, and schools/education. Two-parent families with a child between 5 and 18 years were more likely to volunteer than the Banyule average, while single person households and young couples were less likely than average[7].

Sense of community

The Household Survey assesses people's sense of community based on their level of agreement to eleven statements about community relationships and sense of belonging. Overall, the results of the 2022 survey indicate that most people enjoy living in the local area, believe the community is friendly and inclusive, that they feel part of the community and that they can connect with other people locally[7].

That said, there was a significant proportion of people who indicated there was a lack of sense of community or belonging in some aspects. The areas of most concern, based on the level of disagreement were:

- Often stop and chat with local people (12.8% disagreed)
- Opportunities to connect with others (12.3%)
- Could turn to the neighbours for help in times of need (12.1% disagreed)
- Interact with diverse people (11.7% disagreed)
- Feeling part of the community (9.5% disagreed)

Perceptions of neighbourhood

The Household Survey asks residents about the aspects of the neighbourhood they like or dislike, based on a predetermined set of responses. People were more likely than average to report the following as aspects of the neighbourhood they like and dislike:

Likes	Dislikes
Distance to shops (77%)	Traffic issues (32.7%)
Trees/natural vegetation (75.3%)	Car parking (25.3%)
Distance to parks/gardens (74.3%)	Distance to family or friends (17.5%)
Safety of the area/streets (65.6%)	Distance to place of work (16.1%)
Access to public transport (63.9%)	
Community 'feel' of the area (61.7%)	

Perceptions of safety improved slightly between 2017 and 2022, with the number of people who like the safety in the area increasing by 4.2% (up to 65.6%), and the number of people who dislike it decreasing by 5% (down to 8.8%).

One of the predetermined responses to the question about likes and dislikes in the local area was cultural diversity. People were far more likely to report this is an aspect of the neighbourhood they like than they were to dislike it, with 42.5% of people indicating this as a positive aspect. However, 6.3% of respondents indicated that cultural diversity was an aspect they disliked about the neighbourhood, with people living in the north precinct significantly more likely to report this than the rest of Banyule[7].

Employment

Satisfaction with work

Overall, 64.5% of respondents aged 15 years and over were satisfied with their employment status, while 10.1% were unsatisfied. People who were self-employed or employed full-time were more likely to report being satisfied with their employment, while people who were unemployed were more likely to report being dissatisfied[7]. There was also variation in satisfaction with employment based on respondent demographics, with people aged 15 to 19 years, older people, and women more likely to be dissatisfied with their work.

Impact of COVID-19

Of the respondents who were in employment, more than half (56.2%) reported that their employment or business had been impacted by COVID-19 in some way. The two most common impacts were more working from home (26.8%) and staff shortages (25.1%). Just under 10% experienced increased hours, while 6.6% experienced reduced hours and 4.5% had their wages reduced. Women were more likely than men to report an impact on their work due to COVID-19.

Basic needs and essential services

Transport

The Household Survey reported on a number of factors that discourage people to use public transport more frequently, the most common being the travel time (29.5%) and the waiting time (25.3%). Other common factors include poor connectivity (19.2%) and personal safety concerns (16.3%). For a small proportion of respondents (3.9%), COVID-19 was reported as a specific reason for not using public transport more often[7].

For a number of people, transport issues in the municipality made it difficult to access the places they needed to go, the most common being work (7.0%), social visits (5.6%) and medical appointments (5.1%).

Childcare

In 2022, 5.5% of respondents reported that they may potentially require childcare service in the next 12 months[7]. The survey also asked whether respondents had required but could not access childcare services in the last 12 months, with 2.3% of respondents indicating they could not access the services they need. Households in the North precinct were more likely than average to use at least one childcare service in Banyule.

Child and youth services

In 2022, a total of 117 of the 758 respondent households reported that they currently used at least one children's and youth service, at an average of approximately 2.5 services for each of these households[7]. The top four services were:

- Immunisations (8.7%)
- Maternal and child health service (6.5%)
- Preschool/kindergarten (4.7%)
- Playgroups (3.3%)

There was a small decline in the proportion of households using each of the services between 2017 and 2022, and the proportion of people who may potentially require these services in the next 12 months also declined from 17.1% in 2017 to 13.2% in 2022. In addition, 3.2% of respondent households across the City of Banyule reported that they required, but could not access the child and youth services they needed in the previous 12 months, with preschool dental services being the most common at 1.5%.

Aged and disability services

In 2022, 9.2% of households reported that they currently used at least one of the 13 listed aged and disability services in Banyule[7]. The aged and disability service that people were most likely to be using at the time were allied health (3.8%), home care (3.0%) and home maintenance services (3.0%). The potential future use of aged and disability services increased slightly to 11.8%

Community support services

In 2022, 30.4% of households reported that they currently used at least one of the 14 community support services in Banyule, which was a decline on use in 2017 (33.5%)[7]. The three most commonly used community services in 2022 were bulk billing doctors (27%), mental health services (3.4%), and community health centres (3.0%). Only a small proportion of residents reported using neighbourhood houses and community centres (both 1.7%) and employment support services (1.2%).

Engagement and relationship with Council

The majority of respondents to the 2022 Household Survey reported being satisfied with Banyule Council's performance overall, 35.4% of which were very satisfied[7].

Approximately 8% of respondents reported that a member of their household had been involved in a Council-led community consultation in the previous 12 months. People from the south precinct more likely than the average to be involved, while younger and middle-aged couples less likely to be involve, and group households and younger sole-person households not involved at all.

Of those people involved in a consultation, 39.3% were satisfied with the quality of the experience, and 21.3% were satisfied with the outcome of the consultation. However, a significant proportion were dissatisfied with the experience (19.7%), while 23% were dissatisfied with the outcome.

Evidence Review Findings

Introduction to community resilience

The term resilience was first applied by scientists in relation to the ability of materials to recover from external shocks, and later as a psychosocial concept relating to personal resilience following experiences of trauma[8, 9]. More recently the concept has been integrated into socio-ecological theory in relation to community action and societal transformation, particularly in relation to the way communities respond to natural disasters[10, 11].

A focus on community resilience has grown substantially in recent years, owing to the increasing impacts of urbanisation, climate change, and more frequent and intense weather events and disasters on cities and communities around the world[12]. There has also been a growing focus on resilience in public health contexts and a recognition that global health systems and services often lack the capacity and capabilities to adequately respond to epidemics and pandemics[13].

As such, the concept of community resilience has emerged as a key focus across a range of disciplines and fields, including disaster and emergency management, community development, sustainable development, humanitarian aid, and climate change policy, and is now widely reflected in global frameworks, national policies, practice tools, research and public discourse[14].

Community resilience definitions and concepts

Community resilience is a multidimensional and often contested concept and construct, which has been defined and conceptualized in various ways across settings and contexts[15]. While there is no consensus on the definition of community resilience or its core elements, it is widely viewed and framed as a positive concept that is associated with increased capacity and/or decreased risk[12, 15].

Table 2 provides an overview of the definitions used in key policy documents and frameworks most relevant to community resilience in the Australian and Victorian context.

Table 2: Definitions from key policy documents and frameworks

Definition	Source
The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management[1].	The United Nations Sendai Framework
The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management[3].	National Disaster Risk Reduction Framework
The capacity of individuals, communities, institutions, businesses and systems to survive, adapt and thrive no matter what kind of chronic stresses and acute shocks they experience[16].	EMV Community Resilience Framework
The capacity of individuals, institutions, businesses and systems within a city to adapt, survive and thrive no matter what kind of chronic stresses and acute shocks they experience[17].	100 Resilient Cities Framework
The capacity of individuals, institutions, businesses and systems within a city to adapt, survive and thrive no matter what kind of chronic stresses and acute shocks they experience[18].	Resilient Melbourne Strategy

Broadly speaking community resilience can be understood as "a process linking a set of adaptive capacities to a positive trajectory of community functioning and adaptation after a disturbance"[19], or in other words, adapting and coping with change resulting from acute shocks (i.e. disasters or critical incidents) or chronic stresses (i.e. climate change and pandemics).

A number of systematic reviews have been undertaken to identify definitions of community resilience. One review identified 75 unique definitions of community resilience applied to disaster contexts, and categorised them into three broad types: i) focus on process; ii) focus on the absence of adverse events; and iii) focus on the range of attributes[12]. A number of definitions reflected a combination of these three categories, while others emphasised community resilience as an outcome of an organisation or community's capabilities to cope with change within its environment. This review also identified nine elements and 19 sub-elements of community resilience. The nine elements were:

1. Local knowledge
2. Community networks and relationships
3. Communication
4. Health
5. Governance/leadership
6. Resources
7. Economic investment
8. Preparedness
9. Mental outlook

Another review examined community resilience definitions in relation to health systems and identified three key commonalities between them[13]:

1. A focus on absorption capacity (withstand a shock)
2. A focus on adaptive capacity (function while adapting to shock)
3. A focus on restorative capacity (return to normal functioning after a shock)

This review also identified six elements of community resilience in health system contexts, which broadly correlated with the above seven elements. The six elements were: i) local knowledge; ii) community networks and relationships; iii) communication; iv) health; v) governance; and vi) resources.

Figure 1 provides a summary of the key concepts incorporated into definition on community resilience, including the entity they relate to, the continuum on which it occurs, and the attributes or capabilities that are present.

Figure 1: Key concepts in community resilience definitions

Entity bound	Process/Continuum	Attributes/capabilities
• Individuals • Households • Communities • Businesses • Institutions • Systems • Society	• Survive • Absorb • Adapt • Recover • Restore • Preserve • Thrive • Transform	• Knowledge • Skills • Attitudes • Collective action • Cooperation • Resourcefulness • Strong relationships • Social networks • Good governance

Related concepts

While it is outside the scope of this review to report on other concepts, it is worth noting that community resilience shares some common elements with concepts such as social inclusion, social capital and social cohesion.

Social inclusion relates to the access opportunities and resources people have available to participate in all aspects of life, including social, economic and political activities[20, 21]. The term is commonly used interchangeably with social exclusion, which relates to the structural and involuntary exclusion of individuals, groups and neighbourhoods from political, economic and societal processes, and which leads to systemic deprivation and disadvantage[20, 22, 23].

Social capital is a concept that describes relationships and the benefits derived from them, and generally encompasses the networks, norms and values that facilitate cooperation and bonds between people. Trustworthiness, reciprocity, collective problem solving and resource sharing are commonly described as key characteristics of social capital[24, 25]. Social cohesion is related to the concept of social capital, but emphasises coherence between groups of people, on the basis of shared social and cultural norms and values[26].

A more comprehensive overview of these concepts is provided in the Social Inclusion Measurement Project Report[27], which is available at https://www.merrihealth.org.au/assets/Uploads/Social-Inclusion-Summary-Report-FA-2020-reprint2-3.pdf.

Community Resilience Frameworks

A significant number of conceptual and measurement frameworks have also been developed, which describe a range of community resilience dimensions and characteristics[8, 13, 15-17, 28-31]. This section presents a description of two frameworks that are likely to be the most relevant to the Resilient and Safe Banyule Framework, as well as a summary of the key dimensions of community resilience identified in other frameworks and the literature more broadly.

100 Resilient Cities Framework

One of the most well-known and widely used community resilience frameworks is the 100 Resilient Cities Framework[17], which was developed by the Rockefeller Foundation as part of the 100 Resilient Cities Initiative. The initiative aims to support cities around the world to become more resilient to the physical, social and economic challenges of the times. It is a requirement of all cities who join the 100 Resilient Cities Network to apply this framework to develop their resilient strategies, and to guide the implementation of interventions[32].

The 100 Resilient Cities Framework which includes four key dimensions.

1. Health and wellbeing
2. Economy and society
3. Infrastructure and environment
4. Leadership and strategy

Community Resilience Framework for Emergency Management

The Community Resilience Framework[16] was developed by Emergency Management Victoria and aims to support individuals and organisations to create safer and more resilient communities, by setting guiding principles and a shared vision for community resilience in Victoria. The Framework outlines seven characteristics of community resilience to guide policy and program alignment by relevant organisations, as well as actions to strengthen community resilience. The seven characteristics are:

1. Safe and Well
2. Connected, inclusive and empowered
3. Dynamic and diverse local economy
4. Sustainable built and natural environment
5. Culturally rich and vibrant
6. Democratic and engaged
7. Reflective and aware

The dimensions of community resilience vary across frameworks, and often depend on the setting and context in which it was developed, or the intended purpose and use of the framework[11-13, 33]. Some frameworks describe the environments that can influence community resilience (i.e. built, natural), while others describe the qualities or characteristics of a resilient community (i.e. culturally rich and vibrant). There are also a number of frameworks that are structured according to action areas or the intended outcome of community resilience for particular cities or other geographically bound locations. Table 3 highlights the various dimensions of the community resilience frameworks included in this review, as well as those described in community and disaster resilience literature more broadly.

Table 3: Dimensions of Community Resilience

Framework	Dimensions											
	Social	Economic	Natural	Built	Cultural	Health & Wellbeing	Community Connection	Communication	Governance & leadership	Resources	Safety	Community engagement
100 Resilient Cities[17]	x	x	x	x		x			x			
Minderoo Community Resilience Framework[30]	x	x	x	x	x	x					x	
EMV Community Resilience Framework[16]		x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x
EnRiCH Community Resilience Framework[29]							x	x		x		x
emBRACE Framework[15]									x	x		
Torrens Resilience Institute Framework[31]							x		x	x		
Bhandari & Alonge 2020[13] (Systematic Review)						x	x	x	x	x		
Loerzel & Dillard 2021[33] (Systematic Review)	x	x	x	x		x						
Patel et al. 2017[12] (Systematic Review)		x					x	x	x	x		

Note: Not all dimensions from each framework are included. This table presents the most common dimensions, and uses terms that broadly capture the focus or intent of the frameworks and reviews included

Understanding shocks and stresses

Shocks (or acute shocks) are sudden events or emergencies that pose immediate physical threats to a city, such as extreme weather events, natural disasters or critical incidents[18, 32].

Acute shocks relevant to Banyule include:[16, 18, 32]

- Droughts and bushfires
- Floods
- Heatwaves
- Infectious disease pandemics
- Infrastructure-related emergencies
- Electricity supply disruption
- Hazardous materials incidents
- Extremist acts, including domestic terror and cyber attacks

Stresses (or chronic stresses) are long-term or persistent challenges that weaken the fabric of a city on a day-to-day or cyclical basis. Stresses can include social, economic, environmental or system challenges, such as high levels of unemployment and economic stress, housing stress, inefficient public transport systems, endemic violence, and chronic food and water shortages[18, 32].

Chronic stresses relevant to Banyule include:[16, 18, 32]

- Rapid population growth across Melbourne
- An ageing population, with associated increases in age-related disease and disability
- Increasing social inequality and economic inequality/deprivation
- Housing stress, including diminishing affordability and supply issues (increasing homelessness)
- Significant pressures on public systems and infrastructure, including health and transport systems
- Economic challenges, including increasing unemployment levels, insecure work, and cost of living
- Increasing polarization and radicalization, with associated threats and violence
- Development pressures, including urban sprawl, increased population density and damage to ecosystems (including clean air and water)
- Climate change and increasing pressures on the natural environment

It is important to note that chronic stresses and acute shocks rarely happen in isolation, and indeed compound each other and the impacts on communities when they occur at the same time, or in quick succession. It is therefore important that resilience strategies or frameworks account for both shocks and stresses and set out key actions that respond to both situations[32].

Understanding vulnerability

The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction defines vulnerability as "the conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes which increase the susceptibility of an individual, a community, assets or systems to the impacts of hazards"[34]. In this context, vulnerability increases the likely impact of a disaster, and the capacity of a community to cope with it.

Disaster risks are the product of structural drivers and unequal power structures, and are shaped by political and economic systems, as well as political, economic and social ideologies, processes and practices[34, 35]. These factors also contribute to the disproportionate spread of risk and vulnerability, whereby marginalised groups and communities are more vulnerable to the impacts of disaster, and have often have reduced capacity to cope with shocks and stresses when they occur. Evidence shows that structural inequalities contribute to this increased level of vulnerability experience, including but not limited to gender inequality, racial inequality, ageism, ableism and socioeconomic status[14, 34, 35].

In order to build and strengthen community resilience, recognising, understanding and responding to systemic vulnerability is critical, which includes addressing the various forms of structural inequality that increase vulnerability for marginalised groups[35]. This is particularly important in the aftermath of major disasters and

prolonged events, given they simultaneously exacerbate vulnerability and diminish community resilience. Table 4 provides a summary of factors that contribute to increased vulnerability and decreased community resilience in Australian contexts.

Table 4: Factors that contribute to increased vulnerability and decreased community resilience

Social and economic environment	• Unemployment and lack of economic opportunities • Financial stress and poverty • Housing stress, housing insecurity and homelessness • Food insecurity • High levels of chronic health issues • Social isolation and lack of social support • Racism and discrimination • Social inequalities • Electronic gaming machines and problem gambling • Declining social cohesion and social networks • Failure to account for and respond to needs of diverse communities
Infrastructure and built environment	• Physical assets built in hazardous areas • Poor quality housing or overcrowded accommodation • Poorly built and distressed building and infrastructure • Inadequate building and planning regulations and standards
Natural environment	• Depletion of natural resources • Deteriorating ecosystems
Essential services	• Disruption to energy supply • Disruption to essential good supply chains (i.e. food)) • Disruption to communications systems • Inadequate and/or inaccessible public services and programs • Increased pressure on and decreasing capacity of public health systems and services • Lack of access to information and communication activities

Sources: (14, 16, 32, 35-37)

Community resilience strategies within local government contexts

The National Strategy for Disaster Resilience translates the Sendai Framework priorities into action within the Australian context, to guide the national effort to reduce disaster risk reduction in natural hazards[4]. The Strategy recognises that a nationwide, coordinated and cooperative effort is needed to enhance resilience to emergencies and disasters, and that all levels of government have a significant role to play in strengthening community resilience. In disaster contexts in particular, governments have a role to play in:

- Developing and implementing effective planning and land management arrangements
- Assessing and advising on risk and reducing vulnerability to hazards
- Developing and implementing effective hazard education systems
- Supporting communities to prepare for extreme events
- Ensuring a well-coordinated response from emergency services and volunteers
- Supporting communities to recover from extreme events

There is a growing number of local governments who are developing community resilience plans, strategies and frameworks to formalise their commitment to building community resilience at local levels[9]. This section presents an overview of strategies and plans developed by local governments and regional partnerships in Australia, with an emphasis on their priority action areas. A summary of these action areas is presented in Table 5.

Resilient Melbourne Strategy

The Resilient Melbourne Strategy was developed by the City of Melbourne, in collaboration with 32 local governments across the Melbourne Metropolitan area, including Banyule City Council[18]. The strategy sets out a vision, objectives and actions for creating a sustainable, liveable and resilient city. The four objectives are:

1. **Stronger Together** - Empower communities to take active responsibility for their own and each other's wellbeing, safety and health.

2. **Our Shared Places** - Create and sustain buildings, infrastructure and activities that promote social cohesion, equal opportunity and health.

3. **A Dynamic Economy** - Provide diverse local employment opportunities that support an adaptable workforce that is ready for the jobs of the future.

4. **A Healthier Environment** - Enable strong natural assets and ecosystems alongside a growing population.

These four objectives were developed in line with the four dimensions of the 100 Resilient Cities Framework, as required by all initiatives funded under the 100 Resilient Cities Initiative. The Strategy is divided into four key actions areas, and contains three flagship actions, 15 supporting local actions, and 15 aligned actions. The four action areas are:

1. **Adapt** – reduce our exposure to future shocks and stresses.
2. **Survive** – withstand disruptions and bounce back better than before.
3. **Thrive** – significantly improve people's quality of life.
4. **Embed** – build resilience thinking into our institutions and ways of working.

Victorian plans

Two Victorian-based resilience plans were identified through this review: i) Tarnagulla Community Resilience Action Plan; and ii) Goulburn Murray Resilience Strategy.

The Tarnagulla Plan[38] was developed by the Tarnagulla Alternative Energy Group (TAEG), in consultation and co-development with the local community. The plan includes five priority actions:

- Facelift for Tarnagulla (physical capital)
- Boost the local economy (economic capital)
- Establish reliable sources of energy (physical and economic capital)
- Strengthen community spirit (social capital)
- Improve access to health services, public transport and emergency evacuation plan

The Goulburn Murray Resilience Strategy[39] was developed by the Goulburn Regional Partnership, a multisectoral partnership group made up of several local governments, Victorian Government departments, industry bodies, universities and other local organisations. The Strategy outlines five areas for intervention, each containing a goal, key outcomes and priority actions: The intervention areas are: i) Futures of agriculture; ii) Learning for change; iii) Circular economy; iv) Natural and build assets; and v) Leadership and coordination.

New South Wales plans

One New South Wales-based plan was identified through this review, which was the Kyogle Council's Community Resilience Plan[37]. The plan sets out key actions at the village level for the local government area, according to four outcome areas: i) community resilience outcomes; ii) economic resilience outcomes; iii) community asset outcomes; iv) natural environment resilience outcomes.

Queensland plans

The Queensland Government recently developed The Queensland Strategy for Disaster Resilience 2022-2027[40], which promotes a systems approach to resilience involving a range of sectors across the state. The Strategy outlines five dimensions of systems resilience, with broad statements about the opportunities for strengthening resilience in Queensland. The five dimensions of systems resilience are: i) Built; ii) Human and social; iii) Economy; iv) Roads and Transport; and v) Environment.

The Queensland Government has also mandated the development of Regional Resilience Strategies to ensure every region in Queensland develops a plan that reflects locally relevant risks, vulnerabilities, needs and approaches to disaster resilience, and sets out responsibilities and accountabilities for local governments and other local organisations. There are 14 Regional Resilience Strategies, each of which is structured according to the five dimensions of systems resilience set out in the overarching state plan.

Table 5: Summary of action areas in local plans and strategies

Plan/Strategy	Action Areas							
	Social	Economic	Natural	Built	Leadership & Coordination	Education & information	Health & Wellbeing	Other
Resilient Melbourne Strategy	x	x	x	x	x		x	
Tarnagulla Plan	x	x		x				
Goulburn Murray Strategy	x	x	x	x	x			x
Kyogle Plan	x	x	x	x				
Queensland Strategies	x	x	x	x				x

Audit of potential actions and interventions for community resilience

Domain	Example Actions	Contributing Banyule Plans and Strategies
Health and wellbeing	• Provide essential resources required to meet people's basic needs (i.e. food and clothing) • Provide essential services required to meet people's needs (i.e. housing) • Provide responsive public/primary health care services to support physical and mental health needs (including community outreach) • Ensure integrated planning and response between emergency services and public health services • Provide responsive emergency health services	• Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan • Neighbourhood House Strategy • Urban Food Strategy
Strong and dynamic local economy	• Provide/support local job opportunities • Provide local training and skill development opportunities • Provide grant opportunities for local organisations and community groups • Invest in/support local businesses and economies, including small and medium-sized enterprises • Provide/support flexible and innovative loan schemes, including for financial protection and insurance	• Social Enterprise Action Plan 2020-2025 • Economic Development Plan 2015-2020 • Inclusive Local Jobs Strategy and Action Plan 2020-2025
Social capital and inclusion	• Support/facilitate community connections and social networks • Fund and support community groups and organisations as key enablers of social connect and inclusion • Provide opportunities to participate in local social activities and events • Invest in neighbourhood renewal projects in disadvantaged areas, including public housing • Facilitate community engagement in civic life, including local planning and decision-making processes • Ensure access to local schools and education opportunities, including early childhood services • Delivery and participate in cultural celebrations and enable cultural connection	• Municipal Public Health and Wellbeing Plan • Inclusive Banyule 2022-2026 • Social Infrastructure Framework • Neighbourhood House Strategy • Public Open Space Plan 2016-2031 • Community Infrastructure Plan • Creative Banyule Strategy
Sustainable natural and built environment	• Develop and implement physical and social infrastructure plans and frameworks • Build and maintain local facilities and infrastructure • Integrate risk planning into urban design plans	• Social Infrastructure Framework 2022-2032 • Capital Works Plan • Neighbourhood House Strategy • Public Open Space Plan 2016-2031

	• Ensure effective land use through planning and regulatory mechanisms • Conservation and protection of environmental assets and natural ecosystems • Provide safe, accessible and affordable public and community transport • Ensure equitable access to local facilities and built infrastructure • Ensure safe and equitable access to open spaces and the natural environment (including cycling and walking paths/tracks) • Increase the use of land for local food production, including community gardens • Advocate for more public and social housing	• Community Infrastructure Plan • Integrated Transport Plan • Walking Strategy • Cycling Strategy • Community Climate Action Plan • Climate Adaptation Framework • Biodiversity Plan 2019-2022 • Urban Food Strategy
Education and communication	• Provide training and education to communities on disaster risk reduction, preparedness and response • Implement effective communication systems and processes to ensure timely and consistent communication between organisations and communities • Implement effective public warning systems for extreme events • Provide accurate and accessible information to communities and organisations using a range of media and formats • Engage community leaders to support two-way communication between organisations and community members • Provide formal and informal education opportunities to empower communities during acute shocks and chronic stressors. • Support access to digital technologies, including devices and the internet	• Banyule Community Vision 2041 • Council Plan 2021-2025 • Municipal Emergency Management Plan
Leadership, governance and coordination	• Undertake regular disaster risk assessment • Develop effective plans and strategies to support community resilience during acute shocks and chronic stressors • Involve local communities in planning and decision-making processes (particularly marginalised groups) • Establish and convene multisector partnership groups to ensure coordinated planning and effective governance (on acute and chronic issues) • Collect and use local data and evidence to inform planning and decision-making processes (includes monitoring and understanding vulnerabilities and risks)	• Banyule Community Vision 2041 • Council Plan 2021-2025 • Municipal Emergency Management Plan

Sources: (41), (10), (42), (16), (4), (43), (18), (30), (44), (32), (45)

Consultation Summary

Consultations were undertaken between 8 and 24 May to inform the development of the Resilient and Safe Banyule Framework, including community organisations, the Emergency Management Planning Committee, and Council Staff. Community organisations and residents were invited to participate on a project working group via an expression of interest process, which was distributed widely through Council's existing networks. Five organisations took part in the working group overall, although attendance varied across the three meetings. These five organisations were:

- Banyule Community Health Service
- Greenhills Neighbourhood House
- Watsonia Neighbour House
- Bundoora Bowling Club
- University of the Third Age (U3A)

The working group meetings were also attended by two staff from the Resilient and Connected Communities team, as active participants in the consultations. The purpose and focus of the consultations with the working group and Council staff are outlined in Table 6:

Table 6: Purpose and focus of Resilient Banyule Consultations

Group	Purpose and focus	Date
Working Group Meeting 1	The purpose of this consultation was to introduce the concept of community resilience, including its origins, key definitions and concepts. Participants discussed the definitions and concepts, including their relevance and appropriateness in a Banyule context.	8 May 2023
Working Group Meeting 2	The purpose of this consultation was to identify community strengths that can be harnessed to create community resilience, and the vulnerabilities that need to be addressed to ensure equity, inclusion and social justice. Key questions included: • What makes Banyule strong, connected and healthy (assets) • What are some of the factors that threaten resilience or prevent the Banyule community from thriving (vulnerabilities) • What more is needed to enable the community to thrive? (Resources/capabilities)	15 May 2023
Working Group Meeting 3	The purpose of this consultation was to identify actions and strategies that Banyule City Council and other local organisations/groups could implement to uplift community resilience in Banyule.	22 May 2023
Emergency Management Planning Committee	The purpose of this consultation was to introduce the concept of community resilience, including its origins, key definitions and concepts. Participants discussed the definitions and concepts, including their relevance and meaning in an emergency management context, the role emergency services play to create resilient communities.	11 May 2023
Banyule Council Staff	The purpose of this consultation was to test and refine a proposed definition of resilience for Banyule, as well as the proposed framework domains and potential actions and strategies.	24 May 2023

Working Group Meeting 1

This consultation commenced with a brief presentation on community resilience, including key definitions and concepts, followed by two group discussion activities to determine an appropriate approach to community resilience for Banyule. A summary of the discussions is presented below according the key questions explored through these activities.

What resonates for you about resilience concepts and a framework for Banyule?

- A focus on a strengths-based definition, and highlighting the strengths of the community rather than deficits.
- Opportunity to understand roles & responsibilities, good communication, systems and approaches.
- A focus on community resilience provides a clear justification for funding and supporting social projects and activities that enable people to build skills (e.g. drama) & resilience.
- Connecting up work that community organisations do and mapping where it is and building on each other's work.
- Connecting and building community by tapping into existing settings, such as schools.
- A benefit of developing a framework is the ability to prioritise the activities happening in community and our specific council area, taking into consideration the unique demographics and geography of Banyule
- The framework will reinforce what we are already doing to support the community

What concerns you about the concept?

- The potential for people to think that Council is trying to remove themselves from accountability on some level, and the idea that resilience means people need to look after themselves
- There will be a need to ensure Council's role in promoting community resilience is clear within the framework

What key considerations should inform the development of a definition and framework for Banyule?

- The framework provides an opportunity for other teams and departments at Council to develop other strategies or plans that are aligned to this framework
- The need to identify and harness protective factors
- The need to ensure equity in our approach, elevating those who experience more vulnerability
- Recognise that people are at home more, which has implications for community connection and the way people are engaging in community
- Draw on the lessons from COVID-19, including examples of the way people banded together, as well as the breakdowns in community cohesion that started to occur over time
- Recognise that community resilience leads to people being more able to deal with acute shocks when they occur.

In the second group discussion activity, participants were presented with an overview of key concepts contained in existing definitions of community resilience, and asked to identify which elements should be emphasised in a definition for Banyule.

Component	Suggestions
Entity	• Placed-based focus • Community focus. Define why there is a focus on certain communities if you have an equity lens, the work is deeper and you can resource the work where it is needed.
Process/continuum	• Thriving has to be the goal, but being resilient to events etc it could be about surviving, recovering or adapting
Attributes/capabilities	• Collective action, cooperation, resourcefulness – acknowledges that people need resources, and we can do it together. • Talking about networks, holding people up • Networks need to be supported by Councils and other organisations and

	ensure connectors are well resourced.
	• Social support is important
Resources/assets	• There is no point providing information if services/resources are not there to support communities
	• Social capital is critical, but all examples are really important
Other	• The word 'enable' should be reflected in the definition, recognising that we do not want the responsibility placed on individuals, rather on how we can support them to be resilient
	• Contain it to what is relevant to us at local level and what we can influence, where we can invest time and effort, and recognise our limitations
	• We do not want to be aspirational to the point that it breaks community trust and confidence if we cannot meet it
	• The definition and framework need to be feasible
	• Need to ensure the public consultations cover off on different perspectives, and that the definition is reflective of community diversity.

Working Group Meeting 2

This consultation focused on identifying Banyule's strengths and assets, including resources and capabilities, as well as factors that increased vulnerability in the community. A summary of the discussions is presented below according the key questions explored through these activities.

What are Banyule's strengths and assets?

– Buildings and facilities that can be repurposed in times of need.
– Volunteers that can come together and mobilise in times of need
– Full commercial kitchen at bowls club
– Neighbourhood Houses are safe environments that people can come to spend time
– We have a great environment around us, great open spaces and natural environments.
– The area is not overly built up
– Diversity in the community is a strength – people from different cultural backgrounds, which we are recognising and celebrating
– New people coming into the area with new developments and they're choosing to be here. There's something that's drawn them here, and committed to making it their home
– The RSL is big on volunteer programs & having them available to everybody, and it is a useful place to go and read up on what's available.
– Food relief was provided during lockdown, we kept a lot of our older volunteers, and project-based volunteering is working pretty well.
– Community groups want to get involved in different projects (i.e. gardening), so there is a big opportunity to involve them in community activities.
– Economic centres, trading strips and precinct are quite well used and appreciated in the community and Council is doing a good job of promoting and supporting that.
– We do digital mentoring that ties in with volunteering
– Council does sustainability, arts, sport and social inclusion quite well
– Lots of different ways people can get involved in Banyule
– Good availability and access to child care and kinder
– People are willing to provide social support to their networks, for example providing transport within the local area.
– Bundoora is very well serviced with buses and trams
– Some sport and recreation clubs have done a great job of addressing inclusivity by adding change facilities for women and gender diverse people
– Great library facilities in some suburbs (i.e. Ivanhoe)

- Increase in women in leadership positions at Council

Volunteering
- Volunteering has changed with COVID. Prior to the pandemic a lot of older people were volunteering, as well as those who weren't working as much and had more time.
- Neighbourhood Houses continued their services during COVID, but changed what they did and how they did it to meet community needs at the time
- One of the challenges was that older volunteers have stopped volunteering and the volunteer base has changed.

Flexible service delivery
- During COVID services changed the way they did their work to meet the needs at the time, for example food relief programs. Food relief has grown into quite a large aspect of the service
- Neighbourhood Houses continue changing and being flexible but also returning to providing their other standard services.
- Providing activities online during COVID - connecting with people from various locations, including people overseas, and were partnering with sister houses in northern hemisphere so people could connect at all times.
- We have a much better understanding of technology than we used to, and our systems are more robust

What are the factors that may weaken resilience in Banyule? What are its vulnerabilities?
- Mental health concerns persisting so it is a lot harder for people to be resilient, more complex issues are arising and people are more tired.
- Cost of living and financial concerns making people quite insular so you're getting more abrasive behaviour and less of willingness to help others
- Pockets of strong anti-vaccination sentiment and protest
- In my service and community groups in our neighbourhood, always been fringe political views and anti-vax brought up opportunities for people to complain.
- Some buildings are not disability friendly, so community members experiencing mobility issues can't access them, including Neighbourhood Houses.
- There is tension in group programs that are weakening resilience and kindness and compassion
- There are partnership organisations that are holding everybody together as best they can but pragmatically when something gets scarce those are harder to hold
- There is residual damage as a result of covid restrictions – during that time there were some very loud people who were trying to change minds and that can really damage relationships.
- A lot of really good people are leaving community services because due to burnout, so skilled people are being lost as key community assets
- Gambling harm – there is $14 million go on gambling machines in this area.
- Seeing and hearing more about people feeling vulnerable in their housing situation. There is no housing, so nowhere for people to go
- More mental health decline across the board in COVID,
- Increased family violence and elder abuse - older people having children and grandchildren move in, which is creating unsafe homes for some people

Access to technology and capacity to use it
- Covid highlighted the digital divide. Not everyone has the technology, devices, access to wifi or the knowledge and confidence to use them.
- Older people in particular are not as tech savvy, and many do not have computers or mobile phones.
- We have to make sure we reach out actively to members to let them know of information and keep them connected, as they are not accessing social media.

Impact of urban development on the built and natural environment
- Major works occurring in Greensborough, Watsonia and MacLeod causing destruction to lots of trees, which is really distressing to see your natural environment changing like that
- From an environmental perspective, there is more dust, noise and that's going to continue for quite some time.

- Development is creating a big wedge through the area, and people who won't travel within the area because it's too hard and the traffic is a problem.
- Dealing with mental health and reactions because of major works
- There is a lot of housing coming up which is going to increase the population significantly
- We need more housing and there has to be better solutions, but socially people are against higher density.
- Need to be building appropriate dwellings and nice places to live in, but there is a real community pressure not to develop more here.

Transport and proximity to essential services
- There are some communities that are 100% reliant on their cars even if there is transport.
- Some areas are not well serviced by public transport, and there is poor connectivity between types.
- Some areas are not accessible for people with mobility issues, including some of the transport services available.
- There are currently no reliable forms of community transport in Banyule.
- Council is currently trialling a bus route, but it appears to travelling to areas that are already serviced by public transport.
- People who have mobility issues and disability are not travelling by public transport, and are instead using taxis that increase financial pressures on people.
- Many people with disability are using private transport, as they have had negative and/or unsafe experiences on public transport and do not feel safe using it
- Train stations are often not that accessible, but public safety officers and better lighting at train station car parks have increased sense of safety for some people

Marginalisation, exclusion, and accessibility issues
- Exclusion due to financial constraints and disability
- Resources are being inequitably spread across municipality, with fewer resources being allocated in the most disadvantaged areas.
- Some suburbs have the capacity to advocate strongly for themselves, which is influencing the way resources are allocated/distributed
- Inequitable investment in infrastructure and facilities across suburbs in Banyule, with Ivanhoe receiving strong investment in, while West Heidelberg receives very little (i.e. libraries, aquatic centre).

What more is needed in Banyule in order for communities to thrive?
- There is a need to ensure strong, well-funded community organisations. They are increasingly being asked to do more work, but are not resourced for it.
- Community organisations could be providing many of the services and functions that Council does, but could do some of these better or more efficiently.
- There needs to be more connection between organisation and community groups, including increased networking and partnerships.
- Having more diversity in decision-making positions in community organisations, including on boards. Council could play a role in supporting organisations to attract more diversity on their boards
- Provide more training and development opportunities to community organisations in the areas they have identified they need capability building
- More listening to communities and being connected to the right people at right time.
- Respectful relationships, being listened to, having equal relationships that are not patronising.
- Communities thrive when there is kindness and mutual respect. Acknowledging that all people are different and have strengths.
- Tolerance makes it easier for people rely on each other and build resilience
- Would like to see more dialogue in general around the idea that helping other people can make you feel better yourself (sense of belonging, social capital)
- Understanding what people need in order to be involved in inclusive, connected way, and making sure the structures are in place to support this
- There is a need for better structures, information, communication and partnerships to support community resilience in Banyule.

Working Group Meeting 2

This consultation focused on identifying the actions and strategies that Council can implement to support and uplift community resilience and safety in Banyule. A set of draft framework domains was presented to guide the discussion and categorise the actions and strategies, which are presented below.

Domain	Example Actions
Health, wellbeing and safety	• Collect data to identify basic needs for different population groups and ensure activities are targeted appropriately • Find the connectors within specific cohorts and collaborate to build relationships. • Support older people to use telehealth, including online triage for hospital services • Raise awareness about the availability of online triage for hospitals • Council to better support organisations providing health services • Connect relevant services to support the food systems work • Provide spaces that are warm and inclusive so people feel safe using them, • Monitor safety concerns of people in community spaces and venues due to the increasing presence of fringe groups • Programs to support older people to live independently for longer
Economic security and local economies	• Provide more support for older people seeking to return to the workforce • Provide more support for young people to gain employment, including skill development programs
Social inclusion, cohesion and connection	• Provide more opportunities for people to get involved in social activities to counter isolation and loneliness • Identify opportunities to strengthen volunteering, including putting structures in place to support volunteer coordination • Provide training and development for community mentors (i.e. digital literacy mentors)
Sustainable natural and built environment	• Implement a long-term plan for sharing community facilities and venues, and ensure this promotes equitable access and use • Conservation and protection of natural assets • Monitor and mitigate hazards (noise and pollution) caused by the North East Link development
Information and communication	• Identify the most useful and appropriate ways to share information with communities • Support people to develop skills with information and communication technology • Provide up-to-date information about services and referral pathways • Work with community connectors and leaders to support communication and information sharing with communities • Actively disrupt misinformation that is being spread in the community
Leadership and governance	• Strengthen coordination between local organisations and services • In emergencies, redeploy staff into frontline roles to ensure critical services can be provided to communities • Develop standardised tools and templates to support organisations to comply with policies and legislation (i.e. COVID safe plans) • Coordinated and collaborative approach to deescalate the activities of fringe groups to increase safety for everyone • Initiatives to increase diversity on Boards • Establish a multisectoral partnership group to oversee the framework

Council staff consultation

This consultation focused testing and refining a proposed definition of resilience for Banyule, as well as the proposed framework domains and potential actions and strategies. This section presents feedback from staff on the proposed definition and framework domains, as well as priority Council actions for promoting community resilience.

Feedback on the definition

The following proposed definition was presented to participants:

> *"Individuals, communities, organisation and businesses have the capacity to survive, adapt and thrive when faced with acute shocks and long-term stresses.*
>
> *Resilient communities are connected and inclusive, harness local strengths and resources and work together to ensure the health, social and economic wellbeing of everyone"*

Participants noted that a key strength of the definition was the focus on the health, social and economic wellbeing of everyone, and there was wide support for the second part of the definition. Participants also suggested that the order of the two statements should be reversed so the more academic/technical part of the definition is stated last.

Participants also provided the following comments on the definition:

- The meaning of 'acute shocks' needs to be explained
- There is an opportunity to better capture the importance of access within these statements
- There is something missing around the environment that supports people, recognising that climate change is a long-term stressor which can have immediate and acute shocks too.
- The current definition is a frozen moment in time, there is an opportunity to recognise the evolution and have a more fluid recognition of resilience over time and place. For example, 'building a culture of… building a culture where… adding in terms that indicate movement
- Need to ensure the definition speaks to our sphere of influence?

Feedback on the domains

- Suggest making information and communication the first domain, as is probably the highest priority of these domains, and is the building block for other domains
- Information and communication needs to be expanded to highlight Council's education role and responsibilities.
- Need to be clear about Council's role across each domain (i.e. enabler, facilitator, funder)
- The Resilience Framework will have value/can be used to identify key domains and for other Council plans and strategies (i.e. Creative Banyule Strategy; Climate Adaptation Framework). Staff keen to understand how they can write actions into their strategies to support community resilience.
- If safety is included in the health and wellbeing domain, there needs a better understanding of what community safety is and what perceptions are of it.

Issues to consider in developing actions

- There is a shortage of workers to provide home support services
- Older people drive less frequently and shorter distances, so need other ways of accessing services and social activities
- Not everyone has good digital literacy, note everyone has access to computers and internet, and not everyone wants to learn, so need to use multiple ways of communicating with people and keeping them informed, including providing information in multiple languages
- Health and wellbeing issues for older people – living alone, socially isolated, dealing with grief, ageism
- There are limited employment opportunities for older people

Priority actions

Domain	Example Actions
Health, wellbeing and safety	• Social prescribing and social inclusion actions groups • Facilitate expansion of mental health first aid in community, via local champions • Provide or support the provision of essential services, including home support for older people
Economic security and local economies	• Not discussed
Social inclusion, cohesion and connection	• Social prescribing and social inclusion actions groups (advocate for next round of funding as lead or partner) • Facilitate partnerships of community organisations to promote equity and inclusion • Strengthen existing networks and identify gaps • Build young people's connections and leadership • Advocacy and resources to meet community needs • Creative Banyule Strategy 2030 • Develop and harness the strong and safe networks within the community *(Sports clubs, Leisure Centres, Liberates, community facilities)* • Continue to improve infrastructure to make them accessible (identified through the Community infrastructure plan CIP) • Use community group current networks to be a leader in sharing news and being a place of refuge • Reduce loneliness through continued support of inclusive programs, initiatives and education to our sport recreation and leisure groups
Sustainable natural and built environment	• Urban food strategy • Ensure outdoor activity spaces facilitate equitable access and use • Climate proofing Council's infrastructure • Better utilise open space, streetscapes and natural areas to promote community resilience • Built and natural environments need to be accessible to older people and people with disability/limited mobility (i.e. parking, walk ways, ramp access) • Integrated Transport Plan (Safe Travel Plan, Walking Strategy, Bicycle Strategy) • Develop and provide safe, accessible, diverse and inclusive transport options across Banyule that can be used by all people. • Ensure connectivity and accessibility between transport options
Information and communication	• Provide a central information source about all local transport options on Council's website • Need better communication internally about what is happening across Banyule, including various plans that are contributing to resilience • Develop a communications plan to guide internal and external communication • Develop and use communication trees to facilitate information sharing between organisations and community members • Undertake community education (on emergency and non-emergency issues) • Engage in deep conversations and storytelling
Leadership and governance	• Establish Internal resilience partnership group to ensure we have clear communication channels and we are taking a coordinated approach • Consultation with population committees on Council's final draft policies

- Undertake more community consultation with people of all ages and demographics to inform Council's work

Recommendations

Based on a review of the current global, national and Victorian policy contexts, existing conceptual and practice frameworks, the scholarly literature on community resilience, and the findings of stakeholder consultations, we make the following recommendations for Council to consider in the development of its Community Resilience Framework:

1. Adopt the definition of community resilience contained within the Emergency Management Victoria Community Resilience Framework, 100 Resilient Cities Framework and Resilient Melbourne Strategy to ensure policy and theoretical alignment. However, include a narrative description of community resilience to ensure it reflects the local context, including specific needs, risks, strengths and preferences.

2. As a key strategic partner in the Resilient Melbourne Strategy, acknowledge and ensure alignment with the four strategic priorities outlined in the strategy.

3. Incorporate domains that best reflect the concepts used in community resilience frameworks, strategies and plans, and that align with the strategic objectives in the Resilient Melbourne Strategy, Banyule Community Vision and Council Plan. The following domains are recommended:

   - Health and wellbeing
   - Social inclusion and connection
   - Strong and dynamic local economy
   - Sustainable built and natural environment
   - Communication, information and education

4. Include a set of clear priorities for each domain that signal Council's focus and guides all areas of Council to develop plans and strategies that align with and contribute to these priorities

5. Include a set of guiding principles that reflect the perspectives of stakeholders about appropriate approaches to community resilience and safety in Banyule. These included:

   - Focus on the strengths of the community and the way these can be harnessed to build and maintain community resilience over time
   - Place-based actions and strategies that recognise assets, vulnerability and needs vary across different parts of Banyule
   - Priorities and actions should promote equity and justice
   - Ensure accountability for building community resilience, including the roles and responsibilities of Council and other stakeholders
   - Empower and enable communities to take collective action
   - Strengthen and connect work that is already happening through better partnerships and collaboration

References

1.   United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*. Geneva: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction; 2015.

2.   United Nations. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York: United Nations; 2015.

3.   Australian Government Department of Home Affairs. *National Disaster Risk Reduction Framework*. Canberra Commonwealth of Australia; 2018.

4.   Council of Australian Governments (COAG). *National Strategy for Disaster Resilience*. Canberra: COAG; 2011.

5.   Department of Health and Human Services. *Victorian Public Health and Wellbeing Plan 2019-2023*. Melbourne: Victorian Government; 2019.

6.   Victorian State Emergency Service (VICSES). *VICSES Community Resilience Strategy Renewal*. Melbourne VICSES; 2019.

7.   Metropolis Research. *Banyule City Council 2022 Household Survey*. Melbourne: Banyule City Council; 2022.

8.   Revell P, Henderson C. Operationalising a framework for understanding community resilience in Europe. *Regional Environmental Change*. 2019;19(4):967-79.

9.   Platts-Fowler D, Robinson D. Community resilience: a policy tool for local government? *Local Government Studies*. 2016;42(5):762-84.

10.   Carabine E, Wilkinson E. How Can Local Governance Systems Strengthen Community Resilience? A Social-Ecological Systems Approach. *Politics & Governance*. 2016;4(4):62-73.

11.   Baxter H. Creating the Conditions for Community Resilience: Aberdeen, Scotland—An Example of the Role of Community Planning Groups. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*. 2019;10(2):244-60.

12.   Patel SS, Rogers MB, Amlôt R, Rubin GJ. What Do We Mean by 'Community Resilience'? A Systematic Literature Review of How It Is Defined in the Literature. *PLoS currents*. 2017;9.

13.   Bhandari S, Alonge O. Measuring the resilience of health systems in low- and middle-income countries: a focus on community resilience. *Health Research Policy & Systems*. 2020;18(1):1-19.

14.   Price-Robertson R, Knight K. *Natural disasters and community resilience*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies; 2012.

15.   Kruse S, Abeling T, Deeming H, Fordham M, Forrester J, Jülich S, Karanci AN, Kuhlicke C, Pelling M, Pedoth L, Schneiderbauer S. Conceptualizing community resilience to natural hazards - the emBRACE framework. *Natural Hazards & Earth System Sciences*. 2017;17(12):2321-33.

16.   Emergency Management Victoria (EMV). *Community Resilience Framework for Emergency Management*. Melbourne: Emergency Management Victoria; 2017.

17.   The Rockefeller Foundation. *City Resilient Framework*. New York: The Rockefeller Foundation; 2015.

18.   City of Melbourne. *Resilient Melbourne Strategy*. Melbourne: City of Melbourne; 2016.

19.   First JM, Houston JB. The Mental Health Impacts of Successive Disasters: Examining the Roles of Individual and Community Resilience Following a Tornado and COVID-19. *Clinical Social Work Journal*. 2022;50(2):124-34.

20.   United Nations. *Leaving No One Behind: The Imperative of Inclusive Development - Report on the World Social Situation*. New York: United Nations; 2016.

21.   Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPC). *A Compendium of Social Inclusion Indicators*. Canberra: Australian Government; 2009.

22.   World Health Organization. Social Exclusion Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019. Available from: https://www.who.int/social_determinants/themes/socialexclusion/en/.

23.   Silver H, Miller S. Social Exclusion: The European Approach to Social Disadvantage. *Poverty and Race*. 2002;11(5).

24.   Chen X, Wang P, Wegner R, Gong J, Fang X, Kaljee L. Measusing Social Capital Investment: Scale Development and Examination of Links to Social Capital and Perceived Stress. *Social Indicators Research*. 2014;120:669-87.

25.   Magson N, Craven R, Bodkin-Andrews G. Measuring Social Capital: The Development of the Social Capital and Cohesion Scale and the Associations between Social Capital and Mental Health. *Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology*. 2014;14:202-16.

26.   Scanlon Foundation and Monash University. *Mapping Social Cohesion 2018: National Report*. Melbourne: Scanlon Foundation; 2018.

27.	Trezona A. *Social Inclusion Measurement Project: Summary Report*. Melbourne: Inner North West Primary Care Partnership; 2019.

28.	Ellis WR, Dietz WH. A New Framework for Addressing Adverse Childhood and Community Experiences: The Building Community Resilience Model. *Academic Pediatrics*. 2017;17:S86-S93.

29.	O'Sullivan TL, Kuziemsky CE, Corneil W, Lemyre L, Franco Z. The EnRiCH Community Resilience Framework for High-Risk Populations. *PLoS currents*. 2014;6.

30.	Minderoo Foundation. *Resilient Communities Framework*. Perth: Minderoo Foundation; 2022.

31.	Torrens Resilience Institute. *Developing a model and the tools to measure community resilience*. Adelaide: Torrens Resilience Institute; 2012.

32.	City of Melbourne. *Resilient Melbourne: Preliminary Resilience Assessment*. Melbourne: City of Melbourne; 2015.

33.	Loerzel J, Dillard M. An Analysis of an Inventory of Community Resilience Frameworks. *Journal of Research of the National Institute of Standards & Technology*. 2021;126:1-13.

34.	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. *Global Assessment Report on Diaster Risk Reduction: Our World at Risk - Transforming Governance for a Resilient Future*. Geneva: United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction; 2022.

35.	Department of Home Affairs. *Profiling Australia's Vulnerability: The interconnected causes and cascading effects of systemic disaster risk*. Canberra: Australian Government; 2018.

36.	Northern Metropolitan Partnership. *Building Resilience in New and Emerging Communities*. Melbourne: Northern Metropolitan Partnership; 2021.

37.	Kyogle Council. *Kyogle Community Resilience Plan 2022*. New South Wales: Kyogle Council; 2022.

38.	Tarnagulla Alternative Energy Group (TAEG). *Tarnagulla Community Resilience Action Plan*. Victoria: RMIT University; 2020.

39.	Goulburn Regional Partnership. *Goulbrun Murray Resilience Strategy*. Victoria: Goulburn Regional Partnership; 2020.

40.	Queensland Reconstruction Authority. *Queensland Strategy for Disaster Resilience 2022-2027*. Brisbane: Queensland Government; 2022.

41.	Therrien MC, Usher S, Matyas D. Enabling strategies and impeding factors to urban resilience implementation: A scoping review. *Journal of Contingencies & Crisis Management*. 2020;28(1):83-102.

42.	Pfefferbaum B, Horn R, Pfefferbaum R. A Conceptual Framework to Enhance Community Resilience Using Social Capital. *Clinical Social Work Journal*. 2017;45(2):102-10.

43.	North West Queensland Regional Organisation of Coucils. *North West Regional Resilience Strategy*. Queensland: Queensland Government; 2022.

44.	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. *Midterm Review of the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030: Good Practices in Disaster Risk Reductioon*. Geneva: UNDRR; 2023.

45.	Généreux M, Petit G, Roy M, Maltais D, O'Sullivan T. The "Lac-Mégantic tragedy" seen through the lens of the EnRiCH Community Resilience Framework for High-Risk populations. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2018;109(2):261-7.