

## NCRP October 2013 Team Meeting Summary of Discussions

David Hulchanski & Emily Paradis  
February 2014

Members of the Neighbourhood Change Research Partnership met October 17-19, 2013 in Toronto to share updates from the six CMAs and to plan cross-CMA comparative research. Below is a report on the meeting along with updates about progress since the meeting.

### Attendance

#### *Board Members*

David **Hulchanski** (PI, Toronto), Jill **Grant** (Dalhousie), Paul **Shakotko** (United Way Halifax), Damaris **Rose** (INRS), Alan **Walks** (Toronto), Michelynn **Lafleche** (United Way Toronto), Bob **Murdie** (York), Valerie **Preston** (York), Kathleen **Gallagher** (OISE/UT), Ivan **Townshend** (Lethbridge), Leslie **Evans** (Federation of Calgary Communities), David **Ley** (UBC), Mamie **Hutt-Temoana** (Association of Neighbourhood Houses of BC).

#### *Partners*

Rob **Howarth** (Canadian Association of Neighbourhood Centres), John **Campey** (Social Planning Toronto), Adriana **Beemans** (Metcalf Foundation), Matt **Krepicz** (City of Toronto), Mihaela **Dinca-Panaiteescu** & Laura **MacDonough** (United Way Toronto), Sean **Meagher** (Public Interest Research), Diane **Dyson** (Woodgreen Community Services).

#### *Co-Investigators*

Larry **Bourne** (Toronto), Shauna **Brail** (Toronto), Caroline **Fusco** (Toronto), Lance **McCready** (Toronto), Sheila **Neysmith** (Toronto), Shalini **Sharma** (Toronto), Daniyal **Zuberi** (Toronto), Sean **Lauer** (UBC), Richard **Harris** (McMaster), Howard **Ramos** (Dalhousie).

#### *Research Advisory Board Members*

Caroline **Andrew** (Ottawa), Tom **Carter** (Winnipeg).

#### *Staff, Students, Guests*

Emily **Paradis** (project manager), Richard **Maaranen** (data analyst), Jessica **Carriere** (PhD Candidate, Toronto), Tori **Prouse** (MA Candidate, Dalhousie), Andrew **Kaufman** (Research Associate, Institute for Urban Studies, U Winnipeg), Lauren **Nolan** (Research Associate, Nathalie Voorhees Centre, University of Illinois Chicago). International Guests: Tuna **Tasan-Kok** (EU Divercities Project, University of Delft, Netherlands), Donya **Ahmadi** (EU Divercities Project, University of Delft, Netherlands).

<b>Summary of Decisions, Action Items and Next Steps</b>
--

***Thematic and comparative research***

Local teams need to recruit co-investigators and partners with interest in thematic areas including age-friendly neighbourhoods, urban Aboriginal issues, immigrant settlement, housing, income and access to jobs, and youth. Not all themes will be relevant to all six CMAs and there is no expectation that every CMA will do research in all six areas. Local teams will decide which areas to focus on. CMA-specific thematic research can be funded out of each CMA's \$100,000 for locally-defined projects. Comparative cross-CMA thematic research will draw upon the funds set aside for comparative projects. Not all comparative projects will involve all CMAs.

***Cross-CMA comparative study on deteriorating rental neighbourhoods***

The group agreed to frame a cross-CMA comparative study on the theme of Deteriorating Rental Neighbourhoods. Each CMA will prepare a brief on the current context in their own locale, and proposed research questions and methodologies. The central project will take the lead in synthesizing these into a project proposal.

***Next meeting***

The next in-person meeting will be held in Toronto in about six months. Topics will include partnerships, knowledge mobilization, policy implications, and planning cross-CMA comparative studies. The group requested that the central project provide a framework and practices document on partnerships.

---

## Summary of the Discussions at the October 2013 Team Meeting

### **Agenda Item 1. Neighbourhood change, neighbourhood trends: What do we know, what do we need to know?**

---

#### ***The National Household Survey, David Hulchanski***

Comparisons between data from Census 2006, CRA (tax filer) 2010, and NHS 2011 show important discrepancies, especially at the neighbourhood level. NHS income data underrepresent the highest and lowest income brackets, making neighbourhoods appear more middle-income than they really are. The NCRP will not use NHS income data and will evaluate the reliability of other NHS data before using it. Some members of the NCRP data committee published an op-ed about the NHS in the Globe and Mail.

Workshop participants discussed problems with the NHS, and the ramifications of not having access to reliable data. Some alternate data sources include city administrative data, school board data, and CIC data, however these may not be available at the CT level, may not be comparable across jurisdictions, and generally require extensive cleaning in order to be usable.

#### ***A Neighbourhood Typology for Canadian Cities, Bob Murdie***

A typology of Canadian urban neighbourhoods was developed using joint analysis of selected 2006 Census variables for all CTs in eight CMAs: Halifax, Montréal, Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver. The typology includes 15 neighbourhood clusters which can be further categorized into six groups: Older Working Class; Urban/Suburban Homeowner; Old City Establishment; Young, Single and Mobile Renters; Disadvantaged Groups; and Family Ethnoburbs. Not all clusters and groups can be found in all CMAs. A typology of neighbourhood change is currently in development, using Census variables from 1981 and 2006.

Participants discussed whether it is feasible to “translate” the typology for broader use. The clusters and groups appear different on the ground in different cities – the typology therefore must be interpreted with reference to the local context. Other NCRP team members are encouraged to make use of these datasets to develop their own CMA-specific clusters.

### **Agenda Item 2. Our 6 CMAs: Progress and prospects**

---

#### ***Halifax, Victoria Prouse and Jill Grant***

The Halifax team recently completed its preliminary report and is identifying questions and trajectories for future research. A new Halifax website will house local publications, maps, and updates <http://theoryandpractice.planning.dal.ca/neighbourhood/acknowledgements.html>.

Halifax is the smallest NCRP CMA by population, but the second-largest by land area. Amalgamation with adjacent regions in the mid-90s formed a large CMA with a diverse set of neighbourhood trajectories and conditions in each former region. Overall, CMA-level income trends do not reveal strong indications of polarization, though some trends of gentrification, concentrated poverty, and declining incomes are visible in the central-city peninsula. The CT scale tends to obscure

---

neighbourhood trends that are occurring at a smaller geographic scale; DA-level analysis may yield stronger indications of neighbourhood change. The 1981-2010 period is also one of rapid population growth, which makes it more challenging to distinguish neighbourhood creation from neighbourhood change. A better understanding is needed of the factors driving some trends; for example, are declining incomes in post-war suburbs explained by a population aging in place, or the arrival of new low-income groups?

### ***Winnipeg, Andrew Kaufman (for Jino Distasio)***

The Winnipeg team is developing multiple papers on topics such as Indigenous urbanization (Evelyn Peters), “greying ghettos” (Gina Sylvester), and slow growth development (Christopher Leo). The report will also include case studies of the North Main, Transcona, and West Broadway neighbourhoods, as well as a photographic history of neighbourhood change using photos from the archives of the *Free Press*. Release of about 12 papers is anticipated beginning in January 2014.

Two or three of Canada’s poorest postal codes are in Winnipeg’s inner city. This CMA has the largest urban Aboriginal population in Canada, accounting for 11% of its total population and as much as 30% of the population of high-poverty neighbourhoods. Municipal amalgamation in the early 1970s preceded significant decline in the north end, with a hollowing-out of the inner city similar to that of Detroit. A coordinated intervention by all three levels of government in 1979 led to the largest urban intervention initiative in Canada. Community-based organizations have also been very important neighbourhood actors. Winnipeg shows evidence of three distinct “cities” with spatial sorting based on income, though the trajectories are not as pronounced as those in Toronto. Downtown shows little evidence of gentrification. As with Halifax, the CT scale tends to conflate very different neighbourhoods. The City of Winnipeg defines neighbourhood areas outside of CT boundaries. Comparable cities in Canada might include Edmonton, Saskatoon, Regina, Hamilton and Montréal.

### ***Calgary, Ivan Townshend***

The Calgary team has met to discuss preliminary findings. The spatial patterns shown in the maps do not reflect the team’s knowledge of city development patterns. For example, there has been a shift of high-income neighbourhoods away from traditional elite areas into western areas of the city. The Calgary team plans to focus on case studies illustrative of different neighbourhood trajectories and transitions.

Changes in the social structure of neighbourhoods across time can be identified using principal components analysis with a time-space data set, using a different method than the one presented by Bob Murdie. This method shows transformation across all NCRP CMAs, in which neighbourhoods of a specific type in 1981 tend to transform into a limited number of other neighbourhood types by 2006. For example, neighbourhoods belonging to the category “socially diverse middle class” in 1981 have tended to morph into one of two categories by 2006: “non-family communities” or “immigrant impoverishment and service sector workers.” This method shows a change in type between 1981-2006 for 92% of Calgary neighbourhoods.

### ***Montréal, Damaris Rose***

The Montréal team has published a full report and summary version on neighbourhood change trends <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/publications/research-papers/montreal-neighbourhoods/> as well as a literature review on the spatial patterning of wealth and poverty in Montréal <http://bit.ly/1fx9gBN>.

---

The lead Montréal partner, Centraide (United Way) is developing a research plan, and local projects will be jointly conducted. Current efforts are devoted to developing two proposals: a statistical portrait of the working poor in Greater Montréal (using special tabulations and methodology based on that used by John Stapleton for a Metcalf Foundation report on the working poor in Toronto <http://bit.ly/1exBb2p>); and a project examining the dynamics of socioeconomic and inter-ethnic “cohabitation” in a diverse neighbourhood. The team has also identified two promising case study neighbourhoods: Longueuil, a suburb with an influx of low- and modest-income immigrants; and Parc Extension, a low-income recent immigrant neighbourhood, the south part of which is undergoing gentrification.

### ***Vancouver, David Ley***

Vancouver’s report on income trends is available on the Neighbourhood Change website <http://neighbourhoodchange.ca/cities/vancouver/>, along with an 8-page summary for public dissemination. The team is now focusing on a project examining the development of growing low-income zones along the Skytrain corridor. Key informant interviews suggest that the change has no direct relationship to the rapid transit line, and instead coincides with a specific housing type: the multi-unit residential buildings (MURBS) constructed in the 1970s, which have now filtered down. The project will pay close attention to potential state-induced gentrification of these MURB sites, in connection with proposals for redevelopment.

A second proposal under development in partnership with the Social Planning and Research Council will build on Alan Walks’ work on household debt. It will track the location of household debt loads, and changes in types of debt, over the 2007-2011 period.

### ***Toronto, Alan Walks***

Toronto’s team has established thematic working groups on a number of topics: age-friendly neighbourhoods; the “905” outer suburban regions; collective efficacy in neighbourhoods; tower neighbourhoods and immigrant settlement; and urban youth, schooling and crime. These groups bring together NCRP co-investigators, students, and community partners to define and carry out projects. Co-investigators affiliated with some of the groups have proposals in development. The Toronto NCRP team also maintains the Toronto Neighbourhoods Research Network, which meets a few times per year. A number of reports and policy briefs published this year by members of the Toronto team can be found on the project website.

The “three cities” maps for Toronto have been updated to 2010 using tax filer data. The maps and graphs for this analysis were shared with the Toronto Star for a series on declining incomes in the outer suburbs. Shalini Sharma and Alan Walks have been examining trends in the outer suburbs in terms of income, immigration, transit, and places of employment. Another topic of interest is apartment ownership in the inner city. These factors are related and working together to drive processes of neighbourhood change. Alan Walks has published a report on household debt, using data from Environics Analytics; this data can’t be shared but Alan is permitted to co-publish with other CMAs. Emily Paradis is leading a project on housing conditions and risk of homelessness among families in Toronto’s aging high-rise rental buildings. This study is co-funded by the Homelessness Partnership Strategy of HRSDC, and uses survey data collected by United Way Toronto from 2800 tenant households in 2010.

---

### **Agenda Item 3. Comparative research**

---

#### ***Six theme areas and comparative CMA analyses***

The NCRP proposal lists six theme areas: adequate housing and high-rise neighbourhoods; age-friendly neighbourhoods; immigrant settlement and integration / marginalization; income and access to jobs; urban Aboriginal issues; and youth, criminal justice and urban schooling. These themes were chosen based on the expertise of team members and our hunches about the causes and consequences of social-spatial inequality and polarization. Other theme areas may be added. The theme areas influenced the selection of variables for the neighbourhood typology.

#### ***Age-friendly neighbourhoods***

Toronto has established a working group to define projects in this area, led by Sheila Neysmith. This group is planning a publication based on tax filer data on age and income, with a focus on neighbourhoods with high concentrations of Chinese and South Asian older adults. A partner organization, Woodgreen Community Services, is conducting qualitative research on older adults' housing in their catchment area; there may be an opportunity to work with this data. This theme is also being examined in Winnipeg by Jean Sylvestre, and is of interest to the Montréal team as well.

#### ***Immigrant settlement***

Research in this area can build on the legacy of the Metropolis project, which had centres in a number of NCRP CMAs. Metropolis research can offer opportunities for cross-CMA comparisons, and many NCRP team members were involved with Metropolis in their cities.

#### ***Labour market trends***

Several team members and advisors have highlighted the labour market as a key area for research. We need to build NCRP capacity on this topic. Toronto's "905" working group on outer suburban regions is examining labour market trends. Another potential connection in Toronto is a CURA called *Poverty and Employment Precarity in Southern Ontario*. United Way Toronto is a partner on that study. Some Halifax organizations are studying shifting labour market patterns by location.

#### ***Adequate housing and high-rise neighbourhoods***

A Toronto project examining rental housing draws upon survey data collected in 2009-2010 by United Way Toronto and the Neighbourhood Change CURA with 3200 high-rise tenant households in low-income neighbourhoods.

#### ***Urban youth, schooling and criminal justice***

In Toronto, a working group on this theme has identified relevant datasets including a student census conducted by the public school board, and police data on calls for violent crime and police contacts with youths. Kathleen Gallagher is partnering with a theatre company working with youth in an inner-suburban shelter which has a sister shelter in Edmonton. Some cross-CMA comparative potential may emerge from this pilot study.

#### ***International comparative research***

NCRP international comparative work will mainly take the form of partnerships with funded projects in other jurisdictions. Four participants provided updates on international projects: Tuna Tasan-Kok and Donya Ahmadi (EU DIVERCITIES project, Technical University of Delft); Lauren

---

Nolan (working with Janet Smith, University of Illinois, Chicago); and Mamie Hutt-Temoana (International Federation of Settlements).

### *EU DIVERCITIES*

This is a four-year, \$6.5 million Euro project led by NCRP co-investigator Ronald Van Kempen; David Hulchanski is on the advisory board. Tuna Tasan-Kok and Donya Ahmadi lead the Toronto component, the only non-EU case study. The project examines governance of hyper-diversity, including immigrant and ethno-racial diversity, but also diversity in gender, sexual orientation, age and other factors. EU policies generally treat diversity as a problem; this project seeks to highlight the positive aspects of diversity for urban centres. Black Creek, a cluster of neighbourhoods in the inner suburbs, is the case study area for Toronto.

### *Chicago*

A team led by Janet Smith is currently conducting an analysis of income trends since 1973 by census tract, using the NCRP “three-cities” method. Preliminary analysis shows trends of segregation and polarization by income as well as race, and impacts on the inner suburbs, similar to those found in Toronto. A proposal to the National Science Foundation (posted on the NCRP team documents webpage) aims to fund further elaboration on this analysis.

### *International Federation of Settlements*

International Federation of Settlements will hold its convention in Vancouver, May 5-9 2014. NCRP research is very relevant to this federation of neighbourhood-based settlement organizations. Several NCRP team members, including Mamie Hutt-Temoana, Sean Lauer, Rob Howarth and Maureen Fair are directly involved with IFS; other co-investigators plan to attend the convention.

## **Agenda Item 4. Break-out discussions and report-back**

---

Meeting participants broke into three groups to discuss specific areas of interest: CMA trend analysis, partnership development, and thematic research.

### ***CMA trend analysis***

More detailed trend analysis will require data on intermediate time periods between 1981 and 2006, as well as information about new suburban CTs not included in the original analysis - especially those where issues of poverty are evident. A cross-CMA comparative analysis could be done using Alan Walks’ data on household debt.

### ***Partnership development***

Not all local teams are effectively leveraging the contributions of community partners. The purpose of the partnership grant is to build these partnerships; it is the responsibility of academic and community partners to ensure that this takes place. Local community partners can act as leads in assembling local networks to influence and disseminate research. Community partners also can contribute to framing policy-relevant research, and translating findings for non-academic audiences. Local teams may require information about effective partnership techniques, and principles and practices of community-engaged research.

---

### ***Thematic research***

This group identified a number of cross-cutting themes. Racialization and racial exclusion are often inaccurately subsumed under immigration in research, policy and practice; these should be examined directly. These dovetail with urban Aboriginal issues, including neighbourhood colonization / gentrification, and city planning policies that move reserves out of the urban context. Deteriorating rental neighbourhoods are a key socio-spatial formation apparent across all CMAs, in different housing forms. The ubiquity of this type suggests the need for comparative analysis of overarching structural factors contributing to this trend; at the same time, there are different questions associated with this neighbourhood type in different cities, including gentrification, policing, racialization. In the neighbourhood typology, “downsizing households” are also prominent in six CMAs, but less so in Toronto and Vancouver. What are the factors that exclude Toronto and Vancouver from this pattern? Finally, analyses of local policies must consider not only the causes of polarization, but also examples of policies and local interventions that are working, and the factors that contribute to their success.

### **Agenda Item 5. Work plan: Comparative neighbourhood case studies**

---

The group agreed to frame a cross-CMA comparative study on the theme of Deteriorating Rental Neighbourhoods. Each CMA will prepare a brief on the current context in their own locale, and proposed research questions and methodologies. The central project will take the lead in synthesizing these into a project proposal. CMA briefs will focus on the following questions: What is the extent of this neighbourhood type in each city? What form does it take, and where is it located? What types of households live there and what are the demographic profiles? What is known in each city from prior research by academics and community partners?

The group is also interested in examining the trend of Downsizing Neighbourhoods identified in Bob Murdie’s change typology, but more information is needed in order to frame a question.

Dynamics associated with aging populations at the neighbourhood level are also of interest.

---