Research Update and Review of Phase 1 Research Projects

The researchers presented brief overviews of the proposed projects, and participants offered comments. Project #1 was left to the end, since it is the farthest advanced.

PROJECT #2: NEIGHBOURHOOD ISSUES

Rick Eagan explained that this project is not only part of the CURA project, but also necessary for SCH’s strategic planning. Is SCH still needed in a gentrifying area? Researchers will talk to residents about their perceptions of and reactions to
neighbourhood change. This work began with *Taking the Pulse*, now published as a research paper by CUCS.

**PROJECT #3: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

This project will begin in September 2005. CUCS has launched a collaborative master’s program in community development, and students in the program will have an opportunity to do field work in the catchment area as part of their degree requirements. Details are still being worked out.

**PROJECT #4: NETWORK DATABASE ON POLICY AND COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO GENTRIFICATION AND DISPLACEMENT**

This project is intended to find out who is working in this area in other cities, and where the CURA might find good examples to consider in its work. Although the project title mentions “gentrification,” participants felt it should include all kinds of neighbourhood change. However, certain non-traditional neighbourhoods (for example, temporary encampments like Tent City) would be excluded, as they represent a different set of issues. Tom Slater offered to make available e-mails from people in gentrifying areas who responded to his website on gentrification. Janet Smith will contribute information from webloggers in Chicago who write on the topic.

**PROJECT #5: HOUSING AND HOMELESSNESS IN THE CURA STUDY AREA**

At present, researchers are compiling an inventory of housing in the area, including types, forms, social housing, rooming houses, and areas where homeless people sleep rough. Rick Eagan noted that much of the affordable housing is privately owned, in many cases by numbered companies, and information on ownership is hard to come by. The researchers hope to partner with the Toronto Real Estate Board to get information on house prices and sales, and with the City of Toronto on information relating to supportive housing, group homes, and social housing. This project will also draw on census data going back to 1951.

**PROJECT #6: LOCAL ECONOMY IN THE CURA STUDY AREA**

Artscape, one of the project partners, is mapping commercial changes in the area. The researchers will also draw on data from the Centre for Commercial Activity at Ryerson University. Information about where residents themselves work will come from Project #8. Information on the informal economy will be gathered after the formal economy has been covered. Information on ethnic-based businesses will also be collected.
PROJECT #7: COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE CURA STUDY AREA

Researchers will start with the Toronto Blue Book, which lists social services of all kinds. Then they will investigate informal organizations and ad hoc groups, such as groups of unemployed immigrants who come together to share information and support each other.

PROJECT #8: COMPARISON OF TRAVEL BEHAVIOUR IN THE CURA STUDY AREA WITH OTHER AREAS

Prachi Mehta, working with Professor Eric Miller, will be using the Transportation Tomorrow Survey to collect information on travel patterns. This database uses surveys conducted every five years throughout the Greater Toronto Area on travel patterns. However, the data does not include tenure or income levels.

GENERAL COMMENTS ON DATA

Larry Bourne recommended the use of data sources not directly linked to the census. Another census will be conducted in 2006, but results won’t be available until 2008 or so. Harvey Low mentioned that the City of Toronto could use help in analysing available municipal data. David Hulchanski said that anyone in the CURA project is welcome to attend meetings of the data committee, which are held regularly at CUCS.

PROJECT #1: NEIGHBOURHOOD PROFILE AND TRENDS

To date, the research team led by Alan Walks has focused on census data. Later, other types of data, such as retail classifications, house sales, and travel behaviour, will be added. The Project 1 research team is available to help other research teams with data analysis and mapping.

The group reviewed the maps and graphs that had been produced so far. Participants suggested avoiding the term “yuppie” and removing non-populated areas from the maps before releasing information to the media. Also, it is important to control for the massive changes that are occurring south of King Street (up to 20 new highrises are proposed for the former Molson Brewery site), which may skew the results.

Alan Walks noted that the data does not yet show the presence of non-visible minorities, such as the Portuguese; however, the team plans to look at changes in ethnic composition over time.

Shawn Conway suggested investigating consumption patterns, which marketing organizations usually track by postal code.

Janet Smith recommended including information on schools and school attendance. Although Larry Bourne said that this information is not in the census and the Toronto
District School Board uses different spatial units, Alan Walks knows of a thesis on school closures in Toronto that may contain useful information.

Rob Howarth suggested looking into health and hospital data. Harvey Low said some information is available from Toronto Public Health, although problems such as STDs and teenage births tend to be underreported. James Dunn and a city research group are looking into inner-city health data, including such things as the distribution of fast food outlets and community gardens.

David Ley asked about crime data for the area, which may be available from the police department. Harvey Low said that the new Toronto police chief may be more open to partnership with the research team. Janet Smith noted that some groups who oppose gentrification have used crime data to “scare away” potential gentrifiers. She added that it is important to consider the types of crime – in gentrifying areas, violent crime may decline while property crime increases.

Bob Murdie mentioned the Metropolis database, which includes information on immigration patterns. Janet Smith asked about tracking the origins of recent immigrants: their port of entry and subsequent moves. Alan Walks said that the downtown area is losing its status as the first place that immigrants live – now many people go straight to the suburbs.

Income data shows that people in every part of the study area are poorer than they were in 1971, although Damaris Rose noted the importance of controlling for household size in interpreting the data. There may be more, smaller households with more disposable income. Rick Eagan pointed out that in 1995, when the provincial government cut social assistance by more than 20%, $50 million disappeared from the area overnight. This indicates the importance of including social policy changes that have effects at the local scale. However, the census data does not distinguish social assistance payments from other forms of government transfers, which hinders analysis.

**Current Research on Neighbourhood Change**

**RAY FORREST, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL**

In the U.K., the public policy goal is generally to *encourage* gentrification, as a way to reduce inner-city crime and improve the economy. The government would like to see more homeowners settling in areas that are now predominantly rental. Ethnic segregation is a current urban problem, associated with race riots, right-wing extremism, and conflicts over faith-based schools. The government is promoting a “respect agenda” to counter these problems.
Levels of homeownership are rising in the U.K., following the privatization of much of the council housing stock. Researchers are looking at household change from the perspective of consumption profiles, using marketing data, as well as education data (affluent households gravitate to areas with better state schools), and household mobility (using information from utilities).

One question is: how long do people maintain a “gentrification aesthetic” – that is, once couples begin to have children and move into a different phase of their careers, do they abandon urban gentrified neighbourhoods in favour of safer suburbs or even gated communities?

The research focuses largely on poor and gentrified/gentrifying neighbourhoods, and neglects neighbourhood change in suburban or middle-class areas. Discussion is dominated by people’s place of residence – where they sleep, not where they work, shop, and spend time – which overlooks citywide patterns and interactions. Old ideas of community solidarity persist; Ray Forrest finds the term “social capital” problematic, and feels it may be misleading.

There is also a need for updated research on how people choose where to live. The Internet now affects how some people hunt for housing. There is also a need for social and anthropological research into older industrial cities with large Muslim populations, which have unusual dynamics.

**TOM SLATER, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL**

The term “gentrification” was coined by Ruth Glass in 1964. Early studies focused very much on displacement, but in the 1990s, displacement itself was “evicted” from the research. Researchers studying gentrification disagree over the roles and importance of cultural and economic factors in neighbourhood change.

Displacement occurs in several ways – directly, or by exclusion, or in response to various pressures. It is hard to track where displaced people end up.

A study done in New York in 2004 by Freeman and Braconi focused on people who stay put despite neighbourhood change. The media presented these findings as “good gentrification,” but it is possible that the people who stay are simply trapped, unable to go elsewhere. There is plenty of quantitative research on neighbourhood change and displacement, but a shortage of qualitative work.

The only proposed “solution” to displacement seems to be the “decommodification of housing.” There is a “Displacement-Free Zone” in Brooklyn where community leaders try to prevent evictions. Members of the clergy approach landlords who are trying to evict tenants; if that approach doesn’t work, they may address the problem through legal
means, or by picketing and demonstrations. There has been a 40% drop in evictions in the area since 1999.

**JANET SMITH, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO**

Housing costs in Chicago are rising faster than incomes. Researchers have worked with settlement houses in neighbourhoods undergoing rapid change. One of the important trends is the demolition of public housing units – about 18,000 in Chicago have been or will be demolished, and the city is promoting mixed-income neighbourhoods. However, there may not be enough affordable housing to replace the stock that is lost and it is not clear whether mixed-income neighbourhoods are stable or simply transitional.

Smith’s research team has created maps that categorize inner-city neighbourhoods in various ways – “booming, bursting, filling, converting, tightening, thinning.” These terms were deliberately chosen to be provocative and to catch the attention of the media. The team tracks information on demolitions and redevelopment, but research is needed on the real cost to communities of market-driven speculative development, especially the impact on community services. She noted that two settlement houses have moved out, and the buildings have been converted to loft apartments.

The paper by Nancy Hudspeth and Janet Smith that was provided to participants describes a community index consisting of 13 indicators that was developed to measure gentrification, decline, and transition in Chicago neighbourhoods. For example, gentrifying areas are often characterized by smaller numbers of children and seniors; poorer areas tend to have more seniors and non-white families.

As Tom Slater mentioned, some researchers and the media have promoted the idea of “good gentrification,” which confuses the issue. Potential interventions involve influencing market forces through written agreements or land trusts to help stabilize people in neighbourhoods and protect community services.

**DAMARIS ROSE, INSTITUT NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE, MONTREAL**

Gentrification has been a slow process in Montreal, given the recessions of 1977-84 and 1989-97. The unemployment rate began to fall in 1997, and since then, real estate prices have been climbing, leading to a shortage of affordable housing. Montreal has traditionally been a city of rental tenants, but the city is promoting homeownership. Gentrification has accelerated, and there is a boom in condominium construction.

The influence of Ruth Glass’s definition of gentrification has obscured some of the issues associated with gentrification. The trend may not be completely linear, and direct displacement may be less significant than indirect forms of displacement, such as the
effects of NIMBYism, the loss of commercial services, reduced access to social services, or rising property taxes.

In Canada, gentrification must be studied in the context of public policy, which is complex, and in the context of attitudes to social mixing, which differ from attitudes in the U.S. Despite “inclusive city” rhetoric, it is still difficult to establish social housing in middle-income neighbourhoods. However, the Hochelaga-Maisonneuve redevelopment in Montreal does attempt to balance condos and social housing.

In gentrifying neighbourhoods, it is important to distinguish between incoming gentrifiers and in-place upgraders. There are also important equity issues, including property tax holidays for developments, and benefits for first-time buyers, who may receive windfall gains.

**DAVID LEY, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA**

In the 1970s, gentrification was mainly achieved through sweat equity, as people bought older inner-city houses and fixed them up. Many of the small-scale builders were European immigrants. It was an experimental process, and banks would not lend money for middle-class housing in formerly industrial areas. Nevertheless, it was possible to predict where gentrification would occur: usually, older, rundown residential areas.

Today, it can occur anywhere and there is no shortage of capital. Submarkets have expanded – empty nesters, childless couples, families with children. It is not a one-generation phenomenon. Recent research has focused on the role of artists and immigrants in neighbourhood change.

Academics assume that gentrification is bad for neighbourhoods, but politicians usually like it. What is needed is a cost-benefit analysis that recognizes which groups bear which costs and which groups benefit. For example, the city benefits from increased property taxes and some homeowners benefit when they sell to incoming gentrifiers. However, affordable housing is lost in the process. Also, neighbourhood change is more than just housing change, and research should look at all the aspects of change.

Public policy can certainly accelerate gentrification, but can it slow the process down? This question needs to be addressed. Public policy also has unintended consequences. Attempts to stop highrises by downzoning parts of the city in the 1970s may have spurred gentrification in some areas.

There is also an assumption that residential segregation is a bad thing, although it is not viewed as such in places like Rosedale. Segregation can provide social support and improve information transmission among community members.
Not everything can be explained at the neighbourhood scale. Some issues, such as immigration policy, are national; others are provincial or citywide. Although the effects are felt at the neighbourhood level, neighbourhood-level interventions will not affect the causes.

**DISCUSSION**

Janet Smith noted that communities can help each other by forming coalitions to ensure balanced development, or support set-asides for affordable housing. Alan Walks pointed out that gentrification tends to concentrate high-income households, while dispersing low-income households; it is harder to provide services to a scattered population.

Rick Eagan said that segregation leads to the passing on of life experiences – good experiences in affluent neighbourhoods, cycles of poverty in poor neighbourhoods. Ray Forrest made a distinction between segregation of new immigrants vs. that of established immigrants, because the effects are different. He also noted that currently China is looking for ways to resist or control market forces in housing.

Janet Smith said that divisions may appear along class lines more than ethnic lines. For example, a largely Latino neighbourhood in Chicago is opposing a Latino developer whose development plans would disrupt the neighbourhood.

Rob Howarth mentioned the new *City of Toronto Act*; it may offer opportunities to reshape neighbourhood change. David Hulchanski added that the CURA researchers need to look at recent city initiatives such as the rezoning of the “Kings” (King-Spadina and King-Parliament areas). At the same time, it is hard for city councils to innovate, since they are largely elected by homeowners, who tend to oppose most kinds of change. Toronto’s attempts to stem the loss of rental housing have been opposed and have been referred to the Ontario Municipal Board for review. He also noted that federal politicians are slow to recognize the immigration policy is really urban policy.

**Issues and Needs**

**SOCIAL HOUSING**

Hugh Lawson suggested identifying city-owned land that could become social housing. David Hulchanski suggested creating a “YIMBY” (Yes In My Back Yard) committee to promote social housing, and Maureen Fair said that there is already the beginnings of such a committee forming in the area in response to some unpleasant meetings about social housing. Janet Smith mentioned that in Chicago, Housing Illinois is a coalition of interests that promotes social housing through high-profile advertising campaigns,
although this approach is controversial, since the money could be spent elsewhere.
Damaris Rose noted that there is some YIMBYist activity in Montreal.

**Neighbourhood Change and Displacement**

The group considered the question of whether gentrification is necessarily good or bad. Rob Howarth noted that the dispersal of poor people from one neighbourhood affects other neighbourhoods. Maureen Fair said that although the introduction of new blood into an area is often positive, too much turnover is destabilizing. Janet Smith spoke about the “tipping point” in gentrification, and suggested that Toronto could learn from other places that had already passed that point.

The group considered ways to identify who was moving out and where they were going. Alan Walks suggested that any investigation into where people go when they are displaced should start as soon as possible, before more people are displaced. Bob Murdie suggested using assessment rolls, although this would not capture rental tenants. For tenants, it may be a matter of getting in touch with individual households, and trying to stay in touch after they leave the neighbourhood. Carlos Teixeira added that it would be useful to look at the role of urban gatekeepers, such as developers, speculators, and real estate agents.

Larry Bourne said that retail is an important barometer, and the annual data from the Ryerson database would be useful in tracking retail turnover, vacancies, and bankruptcies. James Dunn mentioned the need to study schools as indicators, and the turnover of school populations. He added that the province’s standardized testing program could be used to track children through the schools. Miia Suokonautio asked if displaced children could be tracked through requests to transfer school records. Larry Bourne noted that people have to register change of address information for their health records, driver’s licences, and school records, and this information might be used to track displaced residents.

**Urban Ethnography**

The group agreed that an urban ethnographer or anthropologist could contribute to the research. Suggestions included oral histories of residents, storytelling, and photography to document people’s lives and experiences, which would supplement the quantitative data being collected.

**Community Involvement**

Maureen Fair said that the community does not perceive itself to be in a crisis at the moment, even though the area may be close to (or past) the “tipping point.” Janet Smith
said that West Town in Chicago changed very quickly, and her team is trying to do community education in a nearby neighbourhood before it is too late. The key is to make people more aware of the indicators, such a conversions of buildings to condominiums. Harvey Low suggested collecting photographs that depict the changes.

Rick Eagan cautioned that there is no point getting people fired up until there is somewhere to channel that energy; it is too soon to say what action is required or warranted. Hugh Lawson mentioned the participatory budget process – people are willing to participate when they have some meaningful control over how public money is spent.

Tom Slater mentioned that in New York, there is an area where block captains have been designated – these people are volunteers who track change in the block and help mobilize other residents. Rick Eagan suggested talking to crossing guards – they know everyone and are very familiar with their neighbourhoods.

Maureen Fair noted that the summer is for conducting research, and community participation could start in the fall, once the group has some research results to present to the community.

2006 Conference

The group agreed to a May 2006 date, probably early May, to take advantage of Blair Badcock’s visit to North America.

The conference should be tightly focused (no irrelevant papers), and doesn’t have to be all that big. The topic will be neighbourhood change, not gentrification. Researchers will be invited to participate, although there needs to be some way to identify new or less-well-known researchers and students working in the area (Project #4 should help in this area). The conference should also include non-academics, people who are actually helping to control change in their neighbourhoods, who might not otherwise have an opportunity to capture and reflect on what they have achieved.

Research Priorities

MONITORING AND ORAL HISTORY

David Hulchanski suggested choosing areas of several blocks each that are not yet gentrified, monitoring turnover in those blocks, and carrying out interviews to determine why people do or do not move out. Janet Smith suggested interviewing recently displaced people to learn about their experiences (this would contribute to the oral history of the area).
**Evictions**

Sylvia Novac mentioned a project conducted with Linda Lapointe on evictions, using information from rental tribunals. The information is issued weekly, but the researchers had to act quickly to contact the people being evicted before they went elsewhere. Most evictions were for rent arrears.

**Middle-class associations**

Shawn Conway said that a Parkdale Residents Association has recently been formed to deal with concerns about safety and crime. This represents a middle-class initiative to “clean up” the neighbourhood. It is necessary to connect with these groups, too. He also mentioned talking to landlords about their perspective and concerns.

**Marginalized populations**

Izumi Sakamoto noted the importance of connecting with marginalized groups, through shelters, hostels, women’s groups, and agencies that serve Aboriginal people. Rick Eagan added that it is important to contact people in the area who are not represented by organizations or groups, or served by agencies.

**Tracking displacement**

Damaris Rose pointed out the difficulty of measuring displacement, and the importance of distinguishing different types of displacement and the different pathways by which people are displaced. David Ley mentioned a project in Vancouver that identified people at particular risk of displacement – immigrants, artists, those with mental illness, students. The researchers contacted members of these groups and interviewed them about their housing history. Many of those at risk of displacement were people who had been displaced before.

Damaris Rose recommended monitoring neighbourhood retail, but noted that some trends, such as the loss of mom-and-pop stores, are not restricted to gentrifying neighbourhoods. Carlos Teixeira suggested studying ethnic business directories and ethnic newspapers to get a sense of trends in these areas, and holding focus groups with business leaders representing different ethnic groups, to ask for their input.

Miia Suokonautio made the point that some people don’t want to stay in a particular neighbourhood, and displacement may be less of a problem for some people than others. They view their housing as an interim arrangement and aspire to live elsewhere. Damaris Rose added that we should distinguish between poor neighbourhoods and poor households. People in transition need short-term accommodation, and it is important to
have affordable rental housing available for these people. When these people move on, it is not really displacement.

Larry Bourne spoke about the Michelson principle of housing: 80% of those surveyed claim to be satisfied with their housing, but 50% don’t expect to stay in that housing. For some people, modest housing is a transition to something better.

Janet Smith recommended talking to real estate agents, and Larry Bourne emphasized the role of institutions, including banks, in shaping the housing market. He also mentioned a student paper on mortgage financing, which found that in the inner city, many mortgages are privately arranged, especially within ethnic communities, often at lower rates than those offered by banks.

David Hulchanski observed that politicians are reluctant to modify market dynamics. The regressive Tenant Protection Act is still in effect, despite a change in government. High vacancy rates mean that landlords need tenants, so the situation has eased somewhat. At the same time, low interest rates encourage house buying and deconversions. Larry Bourne noted that the demand structure for housing is changing. Harvey Low asked what will happen when interest rates rise again; will gentrification slow down?

**Next meeting**

The Research Advisory Committee will meet on Tuesday, September 13, 9 a.m. to noon.
**June 7 meeting**

**PRESENT ON JUNE 7**

David Hulchanski, UofT  
Maureen Fair, SCH  
Larry Bourne, UofT  
Philippa Campsie, UofT  
Sirine El Kalache, UofT  
Limin Fang, UofT  
Ray Forrest, University of Bristol  
David Ley, Univ. of British Columbia  
Abigail Moriah, UofT  
Bob Murdie, YorkU  
Sylvia Novac, UofT  
Luz Rodriguez, UofT  
Damaris Rose, INRS, Montreal  
Tom Slater, University of Bristol  
Janet Smith, Univ. of Illinois at Chicago  
Melissa Tapper, UofT  
Alan Walks, UofT

**Research Title**

Following yesterday’s discussion of the term “gentrification,” the group decided to substitute the term “neighbourhood change” in the project title, which will now be:

**Neighbourhood Change: Building Inclusive Communities from Within**

**Community Forum**

The group discussed the community forum held the previous evening. Bob Murdie mentioned the problem of raising community expectations before the research team has any solid results or a plan of action. Maureen Fair said that the turnout was good, but not really representative of the area. Future community meetings need to be held in different places to attract different types of people.

Limin Fang noted that there were few Chinese people at the meeting, even though many Chinese live in the area. She noted that the word “gentrification” does not exist in Mandarin, and that people from China are not accustomed to having much say in planning matters.

Maureen Fair said that community members are weary of “visioning exercises” and “problem statements” and want to move on to real action. They appreciated the presence of experts from outside Toronto. Unfortunately, through some miscommunication, some of the outside visitors had not been fully prepared for the meeting and were unsure of their role in the proceedings. The group members also suggested more publicity for any subsequent event, such as more colourful posters, distributed more widely.
Tom Slater felt that community members were very much aware of gentrification, but noted that it would be difficult to meet all their expectations. David Ley felt that a priority would be to gather information on successful examples elsewhere of managing gentrification (since it probably can’t be halted). Janet Smith pointed out that just as one cannot be “a little bit pregnant,” neighbourhoods cannot be “a little bit gentrified.” The process tends to continue. The question is whether the process can be controlled and directed for the benefit of the area residents.

Maureen Fair noted that there is no point trying to make middle-class residents feel like the enemy, and polarizing the neighbourhood. Community action must bring all residents together, not push them farther apart.

2006 Conference

The purpose would be to identify successful initiatives elsewhere, and hear from academics and community practitioners who are trying to manage neighbourhood change on what works and what doesn’t. The information must be relevant to the Canadian context, however, and must appeal to working practitioners, not just researchers. Ideally, the proceedings can be gathered into a book, similar to Finding Room – not too academic, accessible to a wide audience, with fairly short chapters on key topics.

Note: Most people in the group were leery of the term “best practices.” The point is to translate experiences, not simply transfer them.

Potential Themes

1. Lessons learned in managing or controlling gentrification elsewhere that could be translated to the Canadian context
2. Revisiting successful inclusive communities in Toronto and elsewhere
3. Successful community initiatives in affordable housing, including building new housing and preserving existing housing
4. Methods for investigating and measuring neighbourhood change
5. Measuring and responding to displacement, and identifying at-risk populations
6. The politics of neighbourhood transition: planning, governance, neighbourhood organizations, and community participation – who represents the community?