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Toronto: Justice Denied?

*Mark Kingwell: A just city ...*

“Though a city in pursuit of glory may neglect justice, the opposite does not hold: a truly just city is always a glorious one, because it allows greatness even as it looks to the conditions of strangeness posed by the other.”
Toronto: Justice Denied?

Mark Kingwell: A just city ...

“does not oppose development, including grandiose development, ... but it does demand, over and over, that all development be, at some level, in the service of every one.”


A Divided City

“The plain truth is that our inner city is now a virtual ghetto dominated by a single ethnic group - one that is increasingly cut off and isolated from the rainbow-hued paradise we all hoped to build in the new century.”
Poverty: High & low concentrations

Change in Average Individual Income, City of Toronto, 1970 to 2005
Average Individual Income from all sources, 15 Years and Over, Census Tracts

Change in the Census Tract Average Individual Income as a percentage of the Toronto CMA Average, 1970-2006
- Increase of 20% or more (100 Census Tracts, 19% of the City)
- Increase or Decrease is Less than 20% (206 Census Tracts, 40% of the City)
- Decrease of 20% or More (206 Census Tracts, 40% of the City)
Three City Destroying Trends

Income INEQUALITY

- the size of the gap between rich and poor in the distribution of income and wealth

Income POLARIZATION

- the decline of the middle; the movement towards the poles (a bimodal distribution) in income and wealth distribution

Spatial SEGREGATION

- the relative residential separation of population categories from each other; the formation of ‘outcast ghettos’ & ‘elite ghettos’

Average Individual Income in the Three Cities of Toronto, 1970 to 2005

Income of Persons 15 and Over from all Sources

City #1: $88,000

City #2: $36,000

City #3: $27,000

The “Growing Gap” from 30% to 250%
Toronto Neighbourhoods with a Persistent Change in Income, 1980 to 2005
Average Individual Income from all sources, 15 Years and Over, Census Tracts

25 years: 128 neighbourhoods, 25% of the City, PERSISTENT INCOME DECREASE relative to the average

Neighbourhood Gentrification in Toronto, 1961 to 2001
Census Tracts

Gentrification: one form of neighbourhood change – SES of residents
Income Polarization: the decline of the middle income group

Change in Neighbourhood Income Distribution in City of Toronto
1970 to 2005 and Forecast to 2025

Census Tract Average Individual Income (Persons 15 and Over) compared to Toronto CMA Average

Change in Neighbourhood Income Distribution in City of Toronto 1970 to 2005

1970 to 2005 decline
City = -37%
905 = -25%
City #3 Income Distribution Change, 1970 to 2005

City #3 is defined as those census tracts in the City of Toronto that decreased 20% or more in average individual income relative to the Toronto CMA average 1970-2005.

Cities 1, 2, 3 Income Distribution, 1970 to 2005

City #1

City #3

City #2
Canada’s Urban Policy: Urban Growth Nodes

Top 10 Census Metropolitan Areas in Canada by Recent Immigrant Arrivals, 2001 to 2006

- Toronto: 40% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 9% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Montreal: 15% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 5% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Vancouver: 14% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 7% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Ottawa – Gatineau: 6% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 6% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Calgary: 5% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 3% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Edmonton: 3% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 3% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Winnipeg: 2% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 4% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Hamilton: 4% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 3% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Kitchener: 2% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 4% of the CMA Population, 2006
- Windsor: 1% of Canada’s Recent Immigrants, 4% of the CMA Population, 2006

Diversity: but only in some parts of the country

Ten CMAs: 54% of Canada’s population, received 56% of 2001-06 new immigrants.

Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver: 34% of Canada’s population, received 69% of 2001-06 new immigrants.

Toronto’s Segregated Ethno-Cultural Population, 2006

City #1
- White: 82%
- South Asian: 2%
- Chinese: 7%
- Black: 2%
- Other: 7%

City #2
- White: 65%
- South Asian: 6%
- Chinese: 9%
- Black: 0%
- Other: 14%

City #3
- White: 34%
- South Asian: 20%
- Chinese: 15%
- Black: 12%
- Other: 19%
Recent Immigrants, 1971 & 2006

Percentage of the Total Recent Immigrant Population in the Inner City, Inner Suburbs and Outer Suburbs and Percentage of the Population Recent Immigrant by Census Tract, Toronto CMA, 1971 and 2006

1971
- 285,000 Immigrants Arrived 1965-1971
- Inner City (former City of Toronto)
- Inner Suburbs (former cities of Scarborough, North York, Etobicoke, York, East York)
- Outer Suburbs (the "905 Region" adjacent to the City of Toronto and within the Toronto Census Metropolitan Area)

2006
- 450,000 Immigrants Arrived 2003-2006
- Inner City 11%
- Inner Suburbs 40%
- Outer Suburbs 49%

City #3 Black Population, 2006

64% of the City of Toronto's Black Population Lives in City #3
City #3 Black Population = 130,775, (12% of the City #3 population)

Segregation? Black population – Neighbourhood concentrations
Neighbourhoods with an Increase in White Population Percentage
Census Tracts, City of Toronto, 1996-2006

White Population Percentage, 1996-2006
- Increase of 5% or More: 14 CTs, 3% of the City
- Increase of 1% to 5%: 31 CTs, 6% of the City

Segregation? White population, greater concentration in 9% of city, 1996-2006

Recent Immigrants (2001 to 2006) in the Toronto CMA, 2006

Recent Immigrants (2001 to 2006) as a Percentage of the Population by Census Tracts, 2006
- 15% to 48%
- 10% to 15%
- 5% to 10%
- 0% to 5%
- No Data

RECENT IMMIGRANTS
- City #1 = 4%
- City #2 = 8%
- City #3 = 15%
- City avg. = 11%

450,000 newcomers between 2001 and 2006. In which neighbourhoods do they live?
What to do? Policy options?

**Income INEQUALITY**

- the size of the gap between rich and poor in the distribution of income and wealth

**Social POLARIZATION**

- the decline of the middle; the movement towards the poles (a bimodal distribution) in income and wealth distribution

**Spatial SEGREGATION**

- the relative residential separation of population categories from each other; the formation of ‘outcast ghettos’ & ‘elite ghettos’

What can be done?

**Federal & Provincial Policy Action**

- National Housing Strategy
- Income Support Strategy
- Labour Market Strategy
- ESSENTIAL Federal & Provincial Policy Actions
THE CONTEXT

TOTAL Gov. Expenditure % GDP, 1970 TO 2007

Fed. program expenditures, 1961 TO 2008

Canada has returned to early 1970 levels
Policy Options for the Divided City

- INCOME STRATEGY
- HOUSING STRATEGY
- LABOUR MARKET STRATEGY

1. Inclusionary Zoning
2. Rental Housing Rehabilitation
3. Eliminate vacancy decontrol
4. Maintain existing rental buildings with 6 or fewer units
5. “Tower Renewal” initiative

Policy Options continued

6. Second suite incentive program
7. Encourage rooming houses, SROs, supportive housing
8. Reduce parking requirements & related reg. reforms
9. Prov. share of land transfer tax to municipalities
10. Energy program for low-income households
11. Support small independent neighbourhood businesses
12. Active social / community development planning
13. ________________________________
14. ________________________________
Mayor’s Tower Renewal

Transit City

“There is ... no justification for the level or condition of poverty that coexists with this wealth.”

“Poverty does not directly cause violence ... If not ameliorated it can nonetheless play a central role in generating

- alienation,
- a lack of hope or opportunity,
- low self-esteem,
- a sense of having no future and
- other immediate risk factors”

1. The level of poverty
2. The concentration of poverty
3. The circumstances of poverty
“no one should be seriously disadvantaged by where they live”

In addition to mandatory zoning, the Community University Research Alliance has also suggested a number of other mechanisms, which could be deployed to advance the goal of economically integrated neighbourhoods. These mechanisms support a number of specific objectives, including decreasing the potential to displace existing residents, maintaining the affordability of existing rental housing, adding new rental housing and maintaining a mix of local shops and services. They include:

- Increase federal funding for the federal rental housing rehabilitation program.
- Eliminate vacancy de-control — a provision that phases out rent control when a tenant moves out of an apartment and thereby reduces the supply of affordable housing, especially in improving neighbourhoods.
- Provide incentives to maintain existing rental buildings with six or fewer units.
- Increase federal funding and make less restrictive the requirements for the federal government’s secondary suite incentive program to generate more rental accommodation in private homes.
- Encourage more roommate housing by permitting them in more neighbourhoods and streamlining their regulation.
- Reduce parking requirements for affordable housing and make related regulatory reforms to encourage its creation.

We are not in a position to assess the merits of each of these proposals. We list them here simply to illustrate that there is an established body of thinking about how to work towards economically integrated neighbourhoods. What Ontario needs to do is to

Priorities

City’s hopes rest with PanAm bid

Published On Wed Nov 04 2009

A favourable outcome is by no means certain, regarding the odds of hosting PanAm Games. But Peterson has done everything right — connect with key decision-makers, including not just Toronto but municipalities throughout the province.

“There’s nothing left to change,” he said before leaving for Guatemala City on Sunday for a meeting that could determine PanAm Games host.

Peterson is being joined by Ontario Premier Dalton McGuinty, Mayor David Miller and a host of other local PanAm boosters. They have a convincing story to tell.

The municipalities, province and country are ready to invest $1.43 billion to build facilities and stage the Games for 10,000 athletes and officials from more than 40 countries in the western hemisphere.

An entire athletes’ village is to be constructed in the West Don Lands area of Toronto’s waterfront. A new stadium is to be built in Hamilton. And a host of other brand new sports facilities are to be built, including Olympic-sized swimming pools and a velodrome.
For further information

www.gtuo.ca

www.NeighbourhoodChange.ca