7-1-2013

The Revitalization of Social Housing: An Analysis of Mixed-Income Housing in the City of Toronto

Zoie Browne
Western University

The Revitalization of Social Housing

An Analysis of Mixed-Income Housing in the City of Toronto

Submitted to

The Local Government Program
Department of Political Science
The University of Western Ontario

Zoie Browne
July 2013

Abstract

Mixed-income housing has been established in planning practices around the world to eliminate the socio-economic barriers that social housing projects include. This is, at best, one viable strategy for addressing social development issues associated with poverty. The overall goal of mixed-income housing is to establish better quality of life and adequate living conditions for all residents; this begins with building healthy communities for citizens of all income levels.

The St Lawrence neighbourhood (also referred to as The Esplanade by community members) is a high density, socially mixed community in the centre of downtown Toronto. The area was built to provide a mixed of uses, mix of housing types, mix of tenures, mix of income, mix of family types, and increase the number of affordable downtown units. It is seen as one of the best municipally organized inner-city redevelopments in Canada. It is also an excellent example of how the public sector, in cooperation with the private sector, can work together to develop a successful new community. The physical environment and social environment of this community has led to its success. The urban design and planning process that established this thriving neighbourhood in the 1970s is used as a model community for mixed income housing redevelopment projects; however the social planning principles are what continue to enhance the vitality of the area today. There are numerous Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) actively addressing social and community development issues within the area through resident led programs, events, and initiatives. This grassroots level of policy implementation is what continues to make the St Lawrence neighbourhood a successful story and model for replication.

The research question this study intends to discuss is: Do Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) offer a viable strategy for addressing social and community development issues within mixed-income housing in the City of Toronto? This paper will analyze how and under what conditions mixed income housing developments in Toronto produce a vibrant base of CBOs that reflect the social diversity of residents. This research will explore; the extent and manner to which mixed income developments

build a sense of community beyond the physical production of housing and infrastructure; how beneficial this type of redevelopment is to engage all residents in alleviating social development issues; and evaluating if this is being embraced or resisted from new and existing people living within the area. The objection of the report is to explore what the analysis of successful cross-class community organizations in the St Lawrence Neighbourhood can explain in terms of lessons for the planning development and future successes of current mixed income (re)development projects in the City of Toronto.

Table of Contents

Part 1: Revitalization of Social Housing

Introduction

Historically, cities have created social housing projects for affordable housing communities which have been segregated from other areas of the city and often are seen to stand alone. Most often they lack diversity, services and connectivity to other areas of the city. Although social housing was intended for temporary placements for families facing difficult times, it has become a permanent home to generations of families facing severe economic and social hardships. The notion to change this type of planning design began with federal government urban policies to eliminate poverty and exclusion which provincial and municipal governments began to address with strategic planning practices. Mixed-income housing has been established in planning practices around the world to eliminate the socio-economic barriers that social housing projects include. This is, at best, one viable strategy for addressing social development issues associated with poverty. It is believed that by enhancing diversity within a neighbourhood citizens will reap social benefits, particularly low income families.

Toronto's initiative of socially mixed public housing redevelopment is the practical implementation of an urban planning and policy-making philosophy that has become the mainstream conventional wisdom in North America and beyond. Typically, 'social mix' implies "income or socio-economic mix, sometimes with ethnic or racial mix as a subtext" (Rose 2004, 280). The planning development of mixed income housing is a mechanism used presently worldwide to reduce or eliminate social housing projects of concentrated poverty and isolated, disconnected communities from surrounding areas. This type of development includes diverse types of housing tenures with a range of income levels. The overall goal of mixed-income housing is to establish better quality of life and adequate living conditions for all residents; this begins with building healthy communities for citizens of all income levels. The revitalization of social housing in creating mixed-income communities is a planning

development to manage growth, support affordability and strengthen communities. However this issue is much more complex than simple New Urbanist planning design. The success of building strong mixed income communities involved two principles; the physical environment and the social environment. This paper will combine planning design analysis of mixed income communities with social research and policy implications at a local level to identify factors that may assist in enhancing the quality of life of low income residents through mixed-income housing developments.

Research Question

The research question this study intends to discuss is: Do Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) offer a viable strategy for addressing social and community development issues within mixed-income housing in the City of Toronto? Despite the popularity of the social mix approach to revitalizing social housing projects in both practice and in theory, there is little evidence suggesting that it is merited by socially beneficial outcomes. This paper will analyze how and under what conditions do mixed income housing developments in Toronto produce a vibrant base of CBOs that reflect the social diversity of residents. This research will explore; the extent and manner to which mixed income developments really build a sense of community beyond the physical production of housing and infrastructure; how beneficial this type of redevelopment is to engage all residents in alleviating social development issues; and evaluating if this is being embraced or resisted from new and existing people living within the area. The objection of the report is to explore what the analysis of successful cross-class community organizations in the St Lawrence Neighbourhood can explain in terms of lessons for the planning development and future success of current mixed income (re)development projects in the City of Toronto.

Research Methodology

This research will focus on two factors that influence success in building strong communities: the physical environment and the social environment. It is important to analyze these development principles in order to draw conclusions regarding the success of any given area because both are intertwined but are often given unbalanced measures of importance. This paper explores the ideas of social mixing by discussing the theoretical framework underpinning the policy and planning decisions in developing mixed income housing; and the impacts of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) on addressing social and community development issues from a bottom-up process. An extensive literature review of scholarly studies was reviewed for context of mixed income housing developments, social development, and community organizations. This investigated theoretical frameworks following neighbourhood effects, New Urbanist design principles, social mixing and the theoretical basis for addressing low income housing issues through mixed income development relating to social planning and urban planning. Empirical evidence is examined to support the literature findings. An empirical case study was conducted on the City of Toronto's St Lawrence neighbourhood as a successful model mixed income housing development in the city centre that has provided social and community developmental opportunities to its residents in a well designed area. The analysis to be presented will be based on in-depth interviews, field observations and a review of documentary data concerning mixed income developments, social and community development and CBOs.

In depth interviews were conducted with community organization members to draw conclusions relating to social and physical planning design in the St Lawrence neighbourhood. Interviews were conducted with a total of 11 individuals to uncover how and why the St Lawrence Neighbourhood has become a successful socially mixed community. This includes 3 key informants involved in some way in the vision/development of The St Lawrence Neighbourhood in the 1970s, as "Development-Team" stakeholders; 6 key informants as "Community Stakeholders" (community activist, and community based organization members); and 3 active 'Community Observers' operating at the city level in connection

with the St Lawrence neighbourhood (City of Toronto employees based in the neighbourhood). Insight was gathered on influential factors and resources needed to encourage the successful development of new revitalization projects in the City of Toronto such as: Regent Park, Alexandra Park, and Don Mount Court. The physical environment and social environment principles are used as measurements of success in community and social development. The physical environment refers to the urban design of infrastructures and public and/or open space. The social environment refers to the culture and social setting of residents in the area relating to cohesion, equity, equality, participation and access to services. Both factors relate to the interaction of community members among their spaces and/or public facilities and among other residents.

The 'Development Team' stakeholders consist of former mayor David Crombie and John Sewell as well as architect Alan Littlewood. During the 1970s, each of these actors played a significant role in the planning and implementation of design and development of the St Lawrence Neighbourhood. Alan Littlewood is the former Project Planner for this St. Lawrence Neighbourhood and was responsible for the creation of The St. Lawrence Site Plan. David Crombie and John Sewll oversaw the creation of the neighbourhood which followed Jane Jacob's vision of urban planning.

The 'Community Stakeholders' consist of various Community-Based Organization members that actively engage community members through various programs and events within the neighbourhood. CBOs are defined for the purpose of this study as not for profit organizations that are self funded and often operate on a voluntary basis. They are representative of a community or a specific segment of a community. This type of organization is interested in addressing the needs of community members through various tactics. Isorine Marc is the founding member of the not-for-profit organization *'Jamii'* (Swahili for 'community') which operates to strengthen the connection of diverse residents through community-engaged, arts-focused outdoor programming. Jessica Luke-Smith and Charlene McGeachie are founding members of the *'Empower Sustain Progress (ESP) – Change from Within'* group of racially and ethnically diverse female leaders who are dedicated to the evolution of their community through the

promotion of healthier lifestyle choices to female youth through the use of workshops, programming and education dissemination. Solomon Muyoboke is one of the founding members of the *'Esplanade Community Group'* a grassroots organization inspired by a group of youths who surveyed the community to reveal a number of issues affecting local residents which led to the development of an organizational mandate towards engaging and empowering members of the community while focusing on youth opportunities and social justice. Steve Lowden is the current president of the *'St Lawrence Neighbourhood Association (SLNA)'* which is an associated of residents in the area incorporated as a non-profit Corporation since 1982. The SLNA advocates for responsible development and promotes public and pedestrian safety, organises events and celebrations and champions neighbourhood interests with all levels of government. This organization addresses the news of the older population within the community.

The active 'Community Observers' operating at the city level in connection with the St Lawrence community are City of Toronto employees. Dulce Gomes is the Library Head at the St Lawrence Library Branch; Kyle Miller and Andre Daley are Parks and Recreation staff at the St Lawrence Recreational Centre.

Part 2: Literature Review

What is Affordable Housing?

Affordable Housing is housing with a market price or rent that is affordable to low and moderate households, which must be equal or less than 30% of their gross household income, not including government subsidies. Social housing is housing services provided to low income citizens or citizens with a particular need of government agencies or non-profit organizations. There are various types of social housing which include: municipally owned and operated housing; non-profit housing; co-operative housing; and rent supplement housing. The service of providing social housing is of extreme importance to the quality of life of low income citizens because it is a potential remedy to housing and income inequalities which can be linked to social, environmental and economic factors. Investments in housing result in savings in various systems such as: health, education, criminal justice and social service. Affordability attracts immigrants, a skilled labour force, and encourages businesses to locate and expand locally. The benefits of providing housing services are innumerable however governments have shifted the responsibility of providing social housing services along with the funds to support such initiatives leaving the conditions and management of adequate, affordable housing in a poor predicament.

A Brief History of Affordable Housing in Canada

Housing, and other types of in-place infrastructure, has the ability to indirectly support the local economy thorough the enhancement of the labour supply, the general health, safety, attractiveness and image of the overall city. It is important to review the history of affordable housing in Canada because it provides context for understanding the political and policy environments that produced successful

developments like the St Lawrence neighbourhood. This will also explain the varying political and policy environments of the past and present day.

Across Canada, the federal government supported innovative social housing programs in the 1970s, including co-operative and not-for-profit housing. In 1979, the federal government support for income mix in social housing was promoted through Section 56.1 of the National Housing Act (NHA), viewing mix as "desirable" for two reasons: "First, a mix of assisted units with tenants paying market rents would contribute to the financial viability of the projects. Second, social problems associated with projects which contained high concentrations of low-income households would be reduced" (CMHC 1983, p 162). From a policy and planning perspective, social mix would provide financial and social stability in one smart growth development plan. However, by 1983 CMHC decided that mixed-income social housing projects were too costly, and in 1986 the NHA made amendments targeting assistance towards those in 'core housing need' rather than from social mix developments (Sewll 1994, p 173); by 1992 the program was cancelled entirely.

In 1993, the federal government devolved the responsibility of funding new social housing funding and development onto the provinces. Hackworth and Moriah note that Ontario's housing sector has been thoroughly "neoliberalized". In 1995, support for 17,000 planned social housing units was eliminated by the Harris government, housing responsibility was devolved to 47 (mostly) municipal service providers, and attempts were made to privatise as much as possible (Hackworth & Moriah, 2006, p 515). The Social Housing Reform Act (SHRA) came into effect in December of 2000 which transferred the responsibility of social housing from the Province to municipal level and tax base. The Act defines the role of the municipality as a 'Service Manager' and provides a legislative framework that ensures the efficient and effective administration of social housing programs. As a result of this restructuring, there was hardly any new non-profit housing built in Ontario from 1996 to 2000 (Mah, 2009).

Affordable Housing in the City of Toronto – Toronto Community Housing Revitalization Projects

Most of the [present] housing market within the central City [of Toronto] is inaccessible to low-income households and the promise of inclusionary programs to create equal housing opportunities for all income groups in every neighbourhood carries a powerful appeal. Affordability and healthy communities have been known to "promote family stability, assist health and wellbeing of household members, educate attainment of children, encourage workforce participation, reduce travel time and costs, alleviate patterns of spatial disconnect and address exclusion affecting lower income and disadvantaged households," (Tiley & Hil, 2010). Toronto Community Housing (TCH) is a public housing agency that is committed to investing in buildings that provide affordable housing for low and moderate income households through revitalization projects throughout the city. The revitalization of social housing projects goes beyond the repair of decaying infrastructures in existing areas. TCH is actively engaging residents throughout the planning process to transform the culture and sense of community among all residents. Current revitalization projects include: Regent Park, Lawrence Heights, Alexandra Park, Don Mount Court, Allenbury Gardens and Leslie Nymark. There are 254 community-based non-profit and co-op housing organizations providing social housing in Toronto (City of Toronto, 2011). This is especially critical in new developing mixed income communities as these organizations protect and support issues relating to affordability in urban developments.

Mixed-Income Housing Developments

There is ample research conducted on the efforts, rationale and importance of mixed-income housing developments (e.g., Briggs 1997; Brophy and Smith 1997; Epp 1996; Khadduri 2001; Kleit 2005; Popkin, Buron, et al. 2000b; Rosenbaum, Stroh, and Flynn 1998; Smith, and Stovall 2008); However the theoretical framework, conceptual clarity and empirical justification is under examined. Nevertheless, local investments and policy implementation have proceeded in redevelopment strategies worldwide

despite the lack of expected and actual benefits of social mix (re)developments. The most general assumption for social strategy is that mixed income development will counteract the negative effects of social isolation and concentration of inner-city poverty and promote increased mobility among low-income residents. With regards to a financial or economic strategy, it is believed that this type of redevelopment will renew public expectations for urban living and increase vacancy rates while better utilizing urban land use. The financial strategy is less about poverty alleviation and social development but rather the economic and political approaches of policy makers. Joseph, Chaskin, & Webber (2007) discuss maintaining a focus on identifying if the mixing of income groups is a fundamental part of the financial and operating plan of the development. This is important in determining the financial or social strategy behind policy implications of new mixed-income developments. This research determined 4 stated goals as articulated by policy makers. "The first is a *social networks* argument, which assumes that, through social interaction among neighbors of different incomes and backgrounds, mixed-income development can connect low-income people to networks that provide access to resources, information, and employment. The second is a *social control* argument, which posits that the presence of higher-income residents will lead to higher levels of accountability to norms and rules through increased informal social control and thus increased order and safety for all residents. The third is a *behavioral argument*, which assumes that the presence of higher-income residents will lead to the influence of role modeling and the observation of alternate lifestyles and norms, which will in turn promote individual behavioral change and an increased sense of self-efficacy among lower-income residents. The fourth is a *political economy of place argument,* which suggests that the influence of higher-income residents will generate new market demand and political pressure to which external political and economic actors are more likely to respond, leading to higher quality goods and services available to all residents" (2007, p 373).

Roberts (2007) discusses the sharing of spaces with urban design and social mixing in relation to the United Kingdom and identifies the concept of mixed-income housing as "creating housing

developments and neighbourhoods that accommodate a variety of types of households, income levels and tenure arrangements", (2007, p 183) which is a strategy that has moved from a specialist component of planning policy to conventional growth management. It is argued that the concentration of deprivation suffer is that of social stigma and isolation not only associated with low income public housing developments but with high income gated developments also. "Permeability through a neighbourhood is decreased and overall safety levels are diminished as the development turns its back on the street, lowering the possibilities of "natural surveillance" (Ellin, 2001; Flusty, 1997). These critiques suggest that mixed income neighbourhoods can offer social and community benefits to disadvantaged and those of average or above average means residents. The authors concluded that tenure mix does not in itself lead to a successful neighbourhood and identified other development and management features as being critical.

Chaskin and Joseph (2010) refers to 4 broad promises and potential effects of mixed-income developments for individuals, communities, and social dynamics overall. These broad factors include: the expectation for promoting social interaction and connection among residents; expectations for neighbourhood change; expectations for promoting changes and improvement for individuals (relocating public housing with a specific focus on low income residents); and expectations for addressing broader issues of racism and prejudice.

The financial realities brought on by neoliberal style housing management reform in Ontario have contributed to the City of Toronto's vision and development of socially and financially mixed housing projects as an entrepreneurial strategy. Specifically, Toronto Community Housing (TCH) identifies "mixed-income housing as an antidote to the conditions of social and economic isolation brought about by traditional public housing development" (Regent Park Collaborative Team, 2003, p 64) and believe that by developing social mix in public housing redevelopments "behavioural patterns of lower-income tenants will be altered by interaction with higher income neighbours. For example, social norms about

workforce participation will be passed on to lower income residents", (ibid., p 77). It would appear that the priorities driving the TCHC's approach are rooted more in a desire to be entrepreneurial and to capitalise on its valuable landholdings than in concerns for tenant outcomes. Given that gentrification rends to negatively affect low-income citizens in gentrifying communities (Martin & Atkinson, 2003)

In 1992, the U.S department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) unveiled HOPE VI (Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere) program, with the intention of dealing with 'problem public housing sites'. The program funded redevelopment through the demolition of projects and their reconstruction as socially-mixed communities. Tenants would be re-housed on-site or given vouchers to rent in the private market. Part of the theoretical justification for HOPE VI drew from sociological literature on poverty, which argued that urban problems could be ameliorated through the dispersion of concentrated poverty (Wilson, 1987). Social mix policies, then, are seen as one way of achieving poverty de-concentration. Critics of the HOPE VI approach to public housing redevelopment have pointed out its neoliberal trappings and accuse the program of promoting gentrification by removing public housing concentrations in hot real estate markets (Bennett and Reed 1999).

Physical Design Principles:

New Urbanism (NU) began in the mid 1980s with various urban design and planning founders and promoters with an anti-sprawl message and the promotion of housing diversity in walkable, traditionally designed developments. This type of design encompasses traditional neighbourhood design (TND) and transit-oriented development (TOD). However, NU is focused primarily on planning design and has minimal concern with social mix. New Urbanist developers suggest that particular aspects of the physical environment can enhance and promote social interaction, interpersonal networks and community cohesion. The design principles assume that a diverse population, land use, building and unit size and type; access to common 'civic' space; and pedestrian-friendly roads and pathways will positively impact

social and community development (Bohl 2000; Day 2003; Jacobs 1961; Katz 1994; Leccese and McCormick 1999; Talen 2002).

Gurran (2008) looks at a range of approaches for affordable housing in metropolitan areas. The article focuses on Adelaide, Brisbane, Melbourne, Perth and Sydney in Australia and notes "the key objective underlying metropolitan plans in Australia and in many international contexts, is inconsistent with affordable housing objectives...these impacts reflect the relative value of high accessibility, efficient service provision, economic vitality and the investment certainty associated with clear planning requirements, including containment or compact city goals" (2008, p 109). The role of local government and policies is highlighted for "good" and "bad" planning. "'Good' planning can create the conditions that underpin demand for housing, just as 'bad' planning-for instance, dispersed development that is poorly serviced and has little regard for landscape or environmental values-can lead to the conditions that undermine housing demand. In this scenario housing is cheaper but the social and environmental costs are greater, (2008, p 104).

The arguments for 'good planning design' were that they raised residents' satisfaction and eliminate stigma between tenures. 'Tenure blind' is concept that Tunstall and Fenton (2006) point out has two components. "The first is that housing from different tenures should be indistinguishable from each other with regards to their external architectural treatment and the second is that units from different tenures should be 'pepper-potted' throughout the development, rather than being configured in clumps, i.e arranged in 'segmented' or 'segregated' layouts'" (Tunstall & Fenton, 2006, p. 35; Rowlands et al., 2006). 'Pepper potting' is a term adopted in practices by the UK government development agencies which essentially means mixed-income housing development. Although this solely refers to the physical planning design principles of having owned and rented properties in close proximity, the social benefits of such design are disputed. Martin & Atkinson's (2003) survey of local authorities and registered social landlords (RSLs) found that social mixed developments had an influence on the 'sense of community'. Beekman et al. (2001) study of 10 case study areas in Scotland found the same influence however, the

outcome was not always positive. "While tenants and owners did not mind living near to each other, more resistance was apparent as proximity between tenures increased", (Beekman et al. 2001, p 53). Friction was specifically reported on developments where social housing tenants with children are located adjacent to childless higher income owner residents.

Social Planning Principles:

William Julius Wilson (1987) proposed an influential description and analysis of urban poverty in the book '*The Truly Disadvantaged'*. This characterized high rates of joblessness; welfare dependency; female-headed households; out of wedlock/teenage pregnancy; social disorganization; violence; and crime by geographic concentration of low income neighbourhoods. Wilson and other scholars with complementary analysis on concentrated poverty developed a theoretical basis for a new view of urban poverty which aims to begin to explain the growth in poverty neighbourhoods from 1970 to 1990. Families in these social development hardships not only had to contend with individual challenges but their surrounding environments encompassed families with similar challenges. This led to an increased level of social isolation that disconnected residents from opportunities for upward mobility and increased quality of life. Joseph, Chaskin & Webber (2007) refer to several studies that documented the "importance of neighbourhood effects on outcomes such as school achievement and teenage pregnancy, although direct effects are relatively small compared with the influence of family-level characteristics (e.g., Briggs 1997; Brooks-Gunn et al. 1997; Crane 1991; Datcher 1982; Ellen and Turner 1997; Galster and Killen 1995; Jencks and Mayer 1990b)". Following the lead of such studies and publications like *'The Truly Disadvantaged'*, Researchers have continued to clarify the nature of urban poverty and potential remedies (see Gephardt [1997]; and Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley [2002] for reviews). Joseph and Chaskin point out that the findings are complex and heavily debated however "investigations into "neighborhood effects" suggest that both compositional factors (e.g., concentrated

poverty, housing quality, crime, residential stability) and aspects of social organization (e.g., collective efficacy, social networks, and organizational participation) have an impact on the well-being and developmental trajectories of neighborhood residents, especially children and youth, (2010, p 301).

"Community is invoked as a unit of belonging and action that can be mobilized to effect change, in which the resources, skills, priorities, and participation of community members can be drawn on to inform, shape, and contribute to solutions to social problems and efforts to improve neighborhood life as it is affected by both material circumstances and social dynamics", (Chaskin & Joseph, 2010). Building a sense of community or positive neighbourhood effect is a complex issue in socially mixed developments. Sarkissian (1976) suggests that there are two sets of goals that motivate early 'social mix strategies' in housing redevelopments. "The first includes abstract and utopian aspirations of promoting social harmony, reducing social tensions, and raising the standards of the lower classes by nurturing a spirit of emulation", (Sarkissian 1976, p 232-233). The second set were utilitarian or "hard objectives for social mix: to provide community leaders in all urban areas, to provide a diversified employment base and economic stability, and to maintain essential services at a minimum expense through mix in housing", (ibid, p 233). Mix of housing and income is the foundational element in creating a social mix community. The False Creek South neighbourhood in the City of Vancouver attempted to achieve a successful development by replicating the region's demographic profile as the social mix 'target'. "An attempt to replicate the age, income, household size and type, distribution in the city or region, with some emphasis on special needs group, is as good as any formula,"(Hulchanski, 1990, p 13).

Gehl (1996) and Sennett (1990, 1994) suggested that a well-defined and high functioning public realm will promote intimate contact and personal friendships. The facilitation of 'bumping into your neighbour' would enhance social cohesion through mutual exchange in mutual public safe environments. These findings support Gehl and Sennett's claim about the importance of the public realm of streets and urban spaces as an arena for social encounters. Talen (1999) supported the promotion of multiple venues

for social contact. The importance of community facilities in promoting social mix are assessed in various studies but it is unclear if the social benefits outweigh the financial difficulties that may arise with developing such infrastructures. Strategies, like public infrastructures, that pursue 'social mixing' as a way of improving the lives of residents through service delivery and social interaction are approached critically given the emerging interest in mixed developments from a political and ideological climate. This is to say that residents and scholars are often unclear about the motive of public administrations and planners in choosing to develop socially mixed housing developments. It seems the progressive era of similar developments is not approached today with the same respect and care for social and community development but rather economic and land use development.

Silverman (2008) reviews the role and partnership of Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and governance in addressing affordable housing and social development issues. "Since the late 1960s, CBOs have been increasingly responsible for implementing affordable housing policy, " (2008, p 27). A policy is only as good as its implementation and having CBOs advocate in their respected communities can assist governance and individuals simultaneously. "One of the most cited articles' dealing with this area of research is Norman Glickman and Lisa Servon's identification of five components of CBO capacity: resource, organizational, programmatic, networking, and political, " (ibid, p 28). It is noted that public administrators are unsure about the performances of CBOs and there is a disconnected affiliation between the relationships of both the community organizations and local administrations.

Hypotheses

If mixed income housing and social developments policies are formed and implemented by Community-Based Organizations then social development issues will be more efficiently addressed and communities will be strengthened. With that being said, this study would use a working statement like: Resident led organizations will encourage, support, form and implement social and community development initiatives in mixed income neighbourhoods. The hypothesis here is that the City of Toronto

can revert the stigma of social housing and support affordability and social development in mixed income communities with Community-Based Organizations (CBO) working with local governments (and eventually other levels of government) to form and implement policies to address social development issues relating to community cohesion, equity, equality, and access in social mix housing developments. This will also empower residents and enhance the overall quality of life of citizens.

Part 3: Empirical Case Study – Toronto's St Lawrence Neighbourhood

Introduction

The St Lawrence neighbourhood (also referred to as The Esplanade by community members) is a high density, socially mixed community in the centre of downtown Toronto. The area was built to provide a mixed of uses, mix of housing types, mix of tenures, mix of income, mix of family types, and increase the number of affordable downtown units for approximately 10,000 people. This area is seen as one of the best municipally organized inner-city redevelopments in Canada. It is also an excellent example of how the public sector, in cooperation with the private sector, can work together to develop a successful new community. The physical environment and social environment of this community had led to its success. The urban design and planning process that established this thriving neighbourhood in the 1970s is used as a model community for mixed income housing redevelopment projects; however the social planning principles are what continue to enhance the vitality of the area today. There are numerous Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) actively addressing social and community development issues within the area through resident led programs, events, and initiatives. This grassroots level of policy implementation is what continues to make the St Lawrence neighbourhood a successful story and model for replication.

History & Development

The town of York was founded (1793-1834), on a site of ten blocks north of Front Street between George Street and Berkeley Street. The area of today's St. Lawrence Neighbourhood, in the City of Toronto was then below the waterline; the shoreline being just south of Front Street. St. Lawrence was the first industrial area of the Town of York. The area was in-filled to provide more land for port and industrial uses. It was used for parking, warehousing, scrap yards, and truck deports. By the 1960s, the industrial uses of the area declined which left numerous empty sites and decaying buildings.

The federal, provincial, and municipal governments made amendments to their housing policies around the 1970s. There was a movement towards socially mixed housing developments in the city centre initiated by a wave of social and political change. In the City of Toronto, this change was led during the civic election in 1972 where urban reformers won control of City Council. The 'reform council', directed by Mayor David Crombie, had social mixing at the top of the planning agenda (Crombie, 2013). The reformers were adamantly opposed to public or private urban renewal schemes because they tended to be exclusionary developments to either the high or low income residents of the city, rather than both (Gordon, 1996, p 2).

Toronto's City Council created a Housing Work Group to study the problem of housing in the city centre. They developed home and land banking programs which would allow the municipality to take advantage of the housing policy changes made by the federal and provincial governments. The Federal Government also played a significant role in new housing developments at this time by creating land-banking and non-profit housing programs which provided the financing and legislative mandate to make the neighbourhood vision a reality. The Province of Ontario played a minor role by providing no-interest loans and subsidies. "The Working Group recommended to city council that they get back into the housing business through the creation of new housing department and that they assume the role of provider, facilitator, and coordinator of new housing activity in the central city" (Gordon, 1996, p 2).

In 1973, a report was produced by the housing Work Group called *'Living Room'* and recommended that a site for new housing development be found in order to qualify for loans under the Federal Government's Land Banking Program. St Lawrence was identified as the location for the city's first land banking project. The site was selected for this type of development for its immediately adjacent downtown location, and the conversion of industrial land for residential purposes caused only minimal disruption to the City's employment base. Most significantly, the cost of the land was reasonable and half of the land in the hands of the public sector made it easy to assemble the entire site. However, it was in close proximity to transportation corridors (the railroad embankment) and the presence of airborne

pollutants from nearby industrial activity needed to be addressed. The conversion of industrial lands for residential purposes was common and the soil analysis was relatively simple by the standards of the 1990s for polluted industrial lands. In contrast, the physical planning and urban design were quite sophisticated and details. The report outlined specific development strategies used by the City to initiate the St Lawrence Neighbourhood development. "First, the cost of assembling the land was not based on subsidies from the City but on the money recovered through the sale and leasing of land to private developers In order to secure funds under the federal and provincial non-profit housing programs, the City chose to provide non-profit housing. This relieved the City of having to manage much of the housing after it was completed...The report also stated that citizens be involved from the beginning stages of planning and developing the SL neighbourhood", (Gordon, 1996, p 2).

In the first planning study for the St Lawrence site, the City of Toronto Housing Department planners felt that if the "social and physical considerations are handled with sensitivity and with imagination," St Lawrence would "become a vital, dynamic and attractive new community on the edge of downtown Toronto." (ibid, p 2).The goals of the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood were:

- To provide housing for all income groups, in particular families with moderate to low household incomes.
- To increase the supply of housing in the central city.
- To develop the new community according to sound planning principles.
- To restore the character of the Old Town of York by integrating the existing neighbourhood and historical buildings with the St. Lawrence neighbourhood.
- To prevent the building of a typical public housing project. (Gordon, 1996, p 2-3)

Approximately 28 acres were held by the public sector, another 16 acres were purchased at market value from private land owners, and the remaining 12 acres were acquired by expropriation. The site was then cleaned of the high levels of toxicity derived from the site's previous uses. This

neighbourhood development was initiated, planned, and implemented by the City of Toronto Housing Department, in cooperation with the Federal and Provincial governments, the private sector, and the community. The area is a product of the urban reform movement which was built as a mixed-use, mixed-income community with the vision and fight of reform to historic segregated isolated social housing projects. “The project was feasible because the City had access to federal and provincial government subsidies and loans to finance the development of St Lawrence. As the public sector developer, the City of Toronto’s Housing Department was given 25 year mortgage by the Federal Government’s Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation to finance the acquisition, and assemble the land; in addition to the grants received under the Community Services Contribution Program and Federal Housing Action Program the Provincial Government provided interest-free loans... More importantly, the City retained the title of the land so the building of St Lawrence became self-financing as land was sold and leased to the private sector. The revenues were used to underwrite the cost of producing the community infrastructure and the non-profit and co-op buildings,” (Gordon, 1996, p 5). The investment exceeded $50 million in the 1980s for land assembly. In addition, the new social housing created in the area involved capital expenditures in excess of $100 million, although the public expenditure for this is spread over long-term subsidies.

Physical Design Principles

The St. Lawrence Neighbourhood was based on Toronto's 19th century grid street plan and featured brick row houses and townhouses, along with higher density eight-to-10 storey apartments, that resembled the streetscape of the old town of York. A total of 16 different developers and 25 different architects provided diversity in the building form of the community as a result of different interpretations of the design guidelines. Allowing many developers to build on small portions of the site prevented the uniformity of developments most often seen in the suburbs. The Toronto Community Housing

Corporation and the Metro Toronto Housing Authority, in addition to private developers, also participated. The design retains the character and scale of the surrounding neighbourhoods. The housing tenures reflect the variation in income, social class, age, and household sizes throughout the City of Toronto. “Three storey family townhouses are found on north-south tree lined interior roads providing families with an address on local streets. They are surrounded by medium rise second to ten storey apartments that serve as a buffer to reduce noise from the main traffic south of the neighbourhood... Community facilities such as schools, health clinics, grocery stores, hairdressers, cleaners, a recreation centre, and restaurants are located in the apartments at grade level facing main streets,” (Gordon, 1996, p 4). At its centre is the six-block long David Crombie Park with its pedestrian pathways, fountains, playgrounds, and basketball court. The park is lined with a canopy of trees that accommodates many uses and serves as the community’s focal point.

Gordon (1996) points out that the working committee and planning team went beyond urban design issues to prepare a plan for neighbourhood social services. “The first phase included two elementary schools, a health clinic, shops, a restaurant, and a health club. To ensure that the services were available, they were all incorporated into one mixed use complex developed by the City Housing Department itself,” (1996, p 5). The historic St Lawrence Market, St Lawrence Hall and St Lawrence Centre for the Performing Arts are located within the area. The area is also within walking distance of downtown shopping employment, and entertainment, waterfront recreation, cultural facilities, schools, hospitals and public transit.

Social Planning Design Principles

The participation in planning movement began in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The St Lawrence is one of the earliest products of the cohesive democratic interaction of community organizations, elected municipal officials, and professional planners. Sewell (1993) refers to downtown

residents as being "infected with the idealism of the 1960s [who] fought to protect the old City Hall from demolition, opposed plans for a downtown expressway, and challenged urban renewal proposals for downtown neighbourhoods" (1993, p 178-180). Therefore, the references to 'planners' of the neighbourhood development include more than professional hired staff. The St Lawrence Neighbourhood had three groups of planners which included the professional planners; the decision makers/municipal staff; and the citizens and community based organizations. "The group of professional planners included the usual team of urban planners, architects, and engineers – the professional paid to do the actual work in planning and designing the new neighbourhood. The decision makers included member of City Council as well as the senior municipal staff who gave the team of professional planners their orders. Rather than passively reviewing final development proposals, this group was actively involved in all important decisions relating to the nature of the new neighbourhood. City Council decided, even before selecting the site, to create a municipal Housing Department to implement its housing policy in order for Council and municipal staff to maintain full control over decisions. Citizens and community-based organizations included the active and articulate individuals and groups who influenced the politicians and senior staff," (Hulchanski, 1990, p 2-3).

The planning principle of social mixing addresses issues of democracy: "equal access to a basic necessity (housing) in a good quality living environment (neighbourhood)," (Hulchanski, 1990, p 13). The St Lawrence Neighbourhood incorporated many socio-economic elements: age; income; tenure; household size; household type; and families with children. This development was unlike housing developments of the past that tended to have one housing type and tenure with one predominant socio-economic class of resident. The goal is to be inclusive of not only the physical urban design but social planning principles. This principle addresses fundamental justice and equity considerations. Hulchanski (1990) points out that the reason for the popularity of 'social mix' is that "the real estate market is not 'democratic', it is not accessible and does not even try to be accessible to all. The unregulated market produces "exclusive" districts based on the ability to pay. The early public housing projects did the same

in the opposite direction: based on the inability to pay. Separate segregated worlds were being created," (Hulchanski, 1990, p 14). An attempt to revert this type of planning design was achieved in the St Lawrence Neighbourhood by carefully planning the range of housing tenures and types. 57% of the units in the community are various forms of non-market, non-profit housing to ensure long term affordability for low to moderate income households. "In spite of the high land values, a significant proportion of family units with grade access was achieved: 16% approx 575 units. There is a thorough mix of tenure types: 39% condo apartments; 30 non profit coop and private non profit rental; 27 mun non profit non market rental; 4 ownership townhouses," (Hulchanski, 1990, p 15). This aimed to ensure there wasn't a huge gap between low income residents and high income residents. The physical integration of housing types and groups of socially diverse residents created the potential for actual social integration.

Interviews

The physical environment is being examined to evaluate the creation of a mixed income community life within the area. The social environment is being examined through the use of community organizations to evaluate the culture among socially mixed residents in the area. The interview data provides empirical evidence regarding both the physical and social principles relating to social and community development in the St Lawrence neighbourhood. The evaluation of effort and support to alleviate income polarization among diverse residents is also addressed.

Development Team Stakeholders

The 'Development Team Stakeholders' were selected for this study based on their active role in the vision and implementation of development in the St Lawrence Neighbourhood in the 1970s. Although there were numerous professional planners, developers and city officials involved three were selected for in-depth interviews to gain insight of past and present assumptions, beliefs and realities of the area; then and now.

David Crombie is a teacher, politician, consultant and a name quite familiar to residents of the St Lawrence community because of the 6 block linear park in his name. He is the former Mayor of Toronto and Member of Parliament. He was the first mayor who represented the reform movement of Toronto politics in the 1970s. His role, as mayor and advocate of strong communities, was to oversee the creation of the St Lawrence neighbourhood which followed the vision of urban planning development set out by Jane Jacobs.

Alan Littlewood is an architect who has provided the City of Toronto with creative and innovative services in urban and interior design. He is the former Project Planner for the St Lawrence Neighbourhood and was responsible for the creation of the St Lawrence Site Plan. More recently, he assisted in developing housing design standards for the redevelopment of Regent Park and worked with residents to develop a new plan for their community.

John Sewell is a teacher, politician, writer and affordable housing advocate. He served Toronto City Council in 1969 and championed the causes of protecting neighbourhoods, resident participation, and adequate affordable housing for all. He also served as City of Toronto mayor where he was the chair of the City's non-profit housing company, Cityhome. He has written numerous publications including Houses and Homes: Housing for Canadians (1994) and The Shape of the City: Toronto Struggles With Modern Planning (1993) which discuss issues of social housing planning design and characteristics of mixed income developments.

Interviews: Community Stakeholders

The 'Community Stakeholders' were selected for their community-based organization involvement or resident-led community engagement presently in the St Lawrence Neighbourhood. The organizations selected are all quite distinctive however each attempts to enhance the social development of the neighbourhood through cohesive and engaging planning. Although some specifically target youth

and others senior; all would like to bridge the generational gaps that exist among residents in the area. Each organization offers programs and events that are open to all residents to participate or observe regardless of socio-economical status. The members selected to participate in the in-depth interviews are founding members, presidents or key actors.

The Esplanade Community Group is a grassroots organization comprised of residents in The St Lawrence Neighbourhood. Their work was inspired by a group of youths who surveyed the community to reveal a number of social development issues affecting local residents. They use public participation practices towards engaging and empowering members of the community while focusing on youth opportunities and social justice. Community programming includes an annual basketball tournament, cultural shows, movie nights and youth public forums. Solomon Muyoboke, Jessica-Luke Smith and Charlene McGeachie, founding members, were interviewed for this study.

The ESP Girls Group has a mandate to 'Empower. Sustain. Progress (ESP) – Change from Within'. This is a community organization of racially and ethnically diverse female leaders from The St Lawrence Neighbourhood who are dedicated to the evolution of their community through female youth. They have a mission to promote healthier lifestyle choices through the use of workshops, programming, and education dissemination. With a quest to empower women, encourage positive community involvement, and provide a program that is for-the-community-by-the-community. A needs assessment was conducted with female youth participants by female facilitators to build a relationship and establish improvement areas both personal and communal. This program differentiates from other community 'girls groups' because it focuses on bridging generational gaps and combating the barriers that female youth face specific to the community. Jessica Luke-Smith & Charlene McGeachie, founding members were interviewed for this study.

Jamii (Swahili for 'community') is a not-for-profit organization founded in 2011. This organization has a mandate to enhance The St Lawrence neighbourhood vitality with community-

engaged, arts-based outdoor programming and contribute to creating community leaders of all ages. The programming is a mix of various creative workshops and events that foster a sense of pride and belonging to 'The Esplanade'. Programming includes movie nights, dance/theatre performances, concerts, bicycle clinics, photography projects and more. Events are free, open to all, and are taking place in or near David Crombie Park. This offers opportunities for social interaction and encourages people to (re)claim ownership of the public space within the area. Isorine Marc, the founding member was interviewed for this study

Friends of Berczy Park (FOBP) is a volunteer community group with the goal of inspiring and driving park improvements that balance the priorities of residents, visitors and businesses in the St Lawrence Neighbourhood. Berczy Park is located within the St Lawrence Neighbourhood just behind the famous flatiron building on Front Street. The group aims to enhance the public space of the park to meet the diverse needs of all park users – including families, pet owners and seniors – and encourage inclusive, community-based stewardship of this heavily-used downtown park in a rapidly-evolving neighbourhood. Dwight Peters, social advocate and key actor, was interviewed for this study.

The St Lawrence Neighbourhood Association (SLNA) is incorporated as a not-for-profit Corporation comprised of residents in the St Lawrence Neighbourhood since 1982. The organization advocates for responsible development within the area and promotes public and pedestrian safety. The group also organizes events and celebrations such as the annual Canada Day Celebration. They support the needs and interest of residents with all three levels of government. Steve Lowden, President, was interviewed for this study.

Interviews: Community Observers

The St Lawrence Recreational Centre and St Lawrence Library are two public facilities with a range of services for all residents. The recreation centre offers a pool, gymnasium, squash courts, weight room, meeting room, dance studio, arts & craft room, youth lounge, park and is joined to the neighbourhood daycare and elementary school. The library offers books, magazines, movies, kids programming, and internet access. Both facilities offer services to learn new skills and get information for any resident. Dulce Gomes was interviewed as the Head Librarian at the St Lawrence Library. Kyle Miller & Andre Daley were interviewed as St Lawrence Recreational Centre staff members. Both also serve as Jamii board members, and frequently provide volunteer assistance during events and programs produced by various community organizations.

Part 4: Analysis – Mixed-Income Housing in the City of Toronto

Findings and Discussion

Presently, housing services are administered by municipalities and a revitalization of social housing in certain areas is under development. Social housing and affordability issues are long standing concerns in urban municipalities, particularly in the City of Toronto. The partnerships of the public and private sectors have inspired revitalization projects that support the alleviation of income polarization and stigma of typical social housing projects by developing mixed-income communities.

The City of Toronto's Strategic Plan states that social development "encompasses principles of social equity, social well-being and citizen engagement, and is an important determinant of healthy communities and quality of life," (City of Toronto, 2010). The City of Toronto's Strategic plan and Social Development Strategy outlines specific protocol the municipality aims to achieve in order to enhance the overall quality of life of citizens. Particularly the report outlines five principles of social development according to the 1995 UN World Summit for Social Development which include: equality, equity, cohesion, participation and access, (City of Toronto, 2001). The promotion of democracy, human dignity, social justice, and solidarity are just a few of the directions public administrations wish to accomplish in order to strengthen communities across all 44 Wards in Toronto.

The City of Toronto is comprised of numerous communities who all retain a different culture with regards to: social, economic and political behaviour. The one main unison factor among all is their community ties and relations within their own areas as a single portion of the larger Greater Toronto Area. A sense of community is important to establish harmony, growth and development in society. The division of work, sense of belonging and cooperation all foster a higher social development and quality of life. Although administrations aim to foster this type of growth through various policy formations a bottom up approach is better equipped for influence and impact at a local community base level.

Sewell explained that "the rationale for creating a social mix was to replicate the city as it [already] existed. Most neighbourhoods in Toronto in the 1970s consisted of a mix of different kinds of people and income just as they consisted of a mix of different housing types and different uses," (Sewell, 2013). The intention of the St Lawrence planners, as explained by the 'Development Team' was to produce more than just a large housing project; they wanted to produce a "neighbourhood" (Crombie, 2013; Littlewood, 2013; Sewell, 2013). The definition of a 'neighbourhood' is broad however it is partly created in the urban design of the area with relation to infrastructure, connectivity and public space; and the social development factors with regards to cohesion, equity, equality, participation, and access to services. The pairing of the social and physical principles creates a neighbourhood and the sense of community is subjective to residents and societal perception.

Interviews: Creation of Community Organizations

When discussing the reasoning behind ones involvement in a community organization responses involved personal and societal factors. Luke-Smith explained that she is "an involved community member who likes to see productive and positive workings within her community [she is] also a Social Work graduate who understands the complexities associated with a mixed-income communities. In a nutshell, [she is] committed to making the lives of others better and enjoys bringing new opportunities to those within [the] community" (Luke-Smith, 2013). McGeachie believes that CBOs "provide supports and services that may not be offered to communities otherwise. Members of a CBO strive to achieve the best possible outcomes for its community because there is (typically) a deeper and more meaningful connection... members of 'The Esplanade' are considered a family extension; therefore, it is important to work towards strengthening the community by expanding its features and services, ensuring constant growth and positive change" (McGeachie, 2013). Peters & Muyoboke believe that community organizations are an opportunity to strengthen neighbourhoods from the most local level, using residents.

Muyoboke discussed the initial development of the *'Esplanade Community Group'* because he "saw some social development issues within the community that [he] wasn't happy with and decided the best way to evoke change would be at a grassroots level with mass participation" (Muyoboke, 2013). Peters explained that it "seems to be the best way to address specific opportunities in the community while bringing communal interest together" (Peters, 2013). Founding members of community organizations noted most predominantly that their organizations began as personal thoughts of change and progress in various aspects of the community but that growth was established with participation from not only members alike but also a mix of diverse residents. All community organization members indicated that their programming, event planning and community initiatives were widely accepted and embraced within the neighbourhood. However, the capacity of self-funding resident led initiatives was detrimental to the growth process of community organizations within the area. A few organizations are supported by the City of Toronto and receive conditional grant funding. For example, the Community Partnership Investment Program (CPIP) supports community capacity-building and service delivery of Council approved services that enhance the quality of life of residents and align with the City of Toronto Strategic Plan, (City of Toronto, 2011).

The development of each organization used a deliberative democracy approach. This theory arose in the 1980s from a growing citizen participation movement and the momentum is continuously pushed through active, engaged citizens. Community organizations in the St Lawrence neighbourhood use public participation and community engagement factors as foundational elements. Organizations incorporated the collective judgment of members of the organizations and citizens in their decision-making process. This not only attempts to reduce social development issues relating to equity, equality, cohesion and access to services within the community but also enhances the governing process of the community organizations themselves while fostering engagement throughout the process and the community. This reinforced the notion that decisions should be deliberated through healthy discussions rather than a majority ruling process. This allows a more reflective decision making approach in a socially mixed

community. Participation and engagement is encouraged throughout every phase of the planning process of events, programming and evaluation. Resident's voices are equated regardless of race, ethnicity, income, or social status.

Interviews: Perspectives on Issues to Sustain a Mixed-Income Community life

When discussing the social development issues that exist within the community, 'Community Stakeholders' identified a lack of cohesion, equity, equality and access to all services. Many long standing community organizations have been residents for decades and have noted that large community events began to dwindle around the Mike Harris government era which separated much of the community. Luke-Smith described "the needs of those whom live in public/government owned housing and privately owned dwellings are very different. A stronger effort to address a comprehensive community needs assessment has to be made". McGeachie and Marc agree that the promotion of cohesion and engagement is highlighted in the area through physical developments such a public open spaces and the social mix design but "low-income families and individuals do not receive the same supports and services that can be found in low-income or 'at risk' neighbourhoods," (McGeachie, 2013). Although the neighbourhood consist of a mixed of incomes, the majority of housing is social and cooperative housing, which is generally geared to lower and middle-income individuals – therefore, community members should still have access to free or subsidized services. This speaks to a major issue that more than 85% of 'Community Stakeholders' and 'Community Observers' addressed. The lack of services for lower income households is a major issue in mixed-income communities because equal opportunity is often impeded by the ability-to-pay.

Every Community-Based organization in the St Lawrence neighbourhood attempts to address perceived social development and community issues within the area in various ways. The *'Esplanade*

Community Group' addresses social issues from a political platform. Luke-Smith explains that "the work of the [Esplanade Community Group] directly addresses the social and political factors associated with mixed –income housing communities. It holds events to raise public awareness of the various issues as well as builds alliances to echo the voices of the community. ESP CG within its 6 point program addresses issues related to poverty, stability, housing- gentrification, employment, education, and social political issues" (Luke-Smith, 2013). *'Jamii'* has no political affiliation but organizes free public events that are accessible to all in public open spaces with the intent to encourage creativity, leadership, cohesion of diverse neighbours and vitality throughout the community. This type of holistic participation and engagement is seen throughout all community organizations. For example, *'The ESP Girls Group'* was created to address the specific needs of female youth. A needs assessment of the specific target group was conducted with the inclusion of participants and facilitators. This was further developed during weekly workshops and established through relationship building of participants and facilitators. However, the entire group would extend their knowledge and growth to the entire community through assisting at community events and helping to bridge some of the generational gaps that exist in the area through specific programs at the Recreational Centre. Miller explained that "the Recreational Centre provides programs such as camps and after school programs however it does not address social development issues directly and community organizations are a viable strategy to achieve such goals," (Miller, 2013). Although each group has specific target groups to initially engage, the projects and events extend to all residents. These targets are well rounded and do not exclude anyone based on socio economic status. The *'Esplanade Community Group'* has a specific target of youth in the area; *'The Friends of Berczy'* target neighbourhood park users; *'The ESP Girls Group'* target female youth; *'Jamii'* targets art lovers/observers; *SLNA* target the older generations and those interested in physical community development issues. The targets vary from physical features, environmental features and people. This speaks to the diverse nature of a community and the many elements that it encompasses. However, all organizations are progressively and actively working towards building better relationships within the neighbourhood to create a "family effect" (Daley, 2013; McGeachie, 2013; Marc, 2013).

Interviews: Attitudes towards Social Mixing in Community Life

'Community Stakeholder' participants have been residents of the St Lawrence neighbourhood between 7-26 years. 75% of respondents have lived in the area for more than 20 years. The physical features most important are its location, design and distinctive infrastructure such as the historic St Lawrence Market. Participants enjoy the social advantages of community activities, facilities and public/open space. This promotes social interaction and encourages developing new relationships that stretch across ethnic, economical and equitable barriers. Participants believed the environmental features of the community were most defined by the rooftop solar panels and gardens in addition to the canopy of greenery that surrounds the linear David Crombie Park. The 'Development Team' Stakeholders identified not only the mix of housing but the design of public spaces as strong factors contributing to the social mix in community life. Crombie noted that "the park in a sense is one of the greatest characteristics of the plan. It was criticized by the Ontario Association of Architects because it did not give sufficient open space but our argument is that large open space was not connected to what people were actually doing. It's not the amount of open space but the way in which it is designed and the way in which it is used. It should fit people's actual habits", (Crombie, 2013). Littlewood agreed with this statement and explained that "the linear 6 block park made sense because every part of the community was guaranteed a piece of the park. It was also a visual linkage device that ran through the neighbourhood with a double row of trees," (Littlewood, 2013). 'Community Stakeholder' participants expressed positive attitudes towards social mixing in community life. McGeachie explained that "diverse communities can create new ideas and problem-solve through different points of views," (McGeachie, 2013). Crombie supports this claim and argues that "people should not be afraid of conflict because it produces energy which produces solutions" (Crombie, 2013). The production of diverse interest and arguments developed the St Lawrence neighbourhood and that same attitude toward social mixing in community life is led by community organizations through residents.

Although the 'Community Stakeholders' and the "Development Team' have very positive attitudes towards social mixing in theory and in practice, the 'Community Observers' witness varying opinions among new residents within the area. Gomes witnessed tension arise at the St Lawrence Library among new residents coming into the neighbourhood and the established residents. "The new condominium owners are less tolerant of the homeless or disenfranchised people who visit the library. I believe the new residents must be brought into the existing organizations or they will resort to NIMBYism to try and squeeze out those they do not like," (Gomes, 2013). Gomes has received request from parental groups in newer private condominiums that surround the area to do private story telling session in their building rather than attend story telling events at the library or in the public parks because many new condo members do not feel like they are part of the community or are able to be integrated. She has also been told that new residents do not feel incorporated in the already existing neighbourhood. Daley and Miller expressed similar concern for tension at the St Lawrence Recreational Centre regarding programming by existing social housing residents. Daley explained that the mix of incomes results in a polarization of funding assessment for recreational programming. "The lower income families in mixed income neighbourhoods are not considered to be 'at risk' which results in less funding support and the pricing of programs to increase considerably and/or programs being completely cut due to low attendance rates," (Daley, 2013).

Gomes strongly believes that the kind of diversity developed in socially mixed areas in the City of Toronto like the St Lawrence neighbourhood "helps everyone because shared resources create equal opportunities for the next generations" (Gomes, 2013). Unfortunately the capacity of public facilities alone cannot strengthen the social and community development of a socially mixed area. All 'Community Observer' stakeholders believe that CBOs are imperative to enhance the social and community development of the area beyond the local public facilities.

Limitations

There are noted limitations between the development of the St Lawrence neighbourhood and the revitalization of social housing projects currently underway in the City of Toronto. The most evident factor is the development of a new neighbourhood such as St Lawrence which was not housed previous to initial developments in 1970s. Comparatively, current TCH revitalization projects such as Regent Park are redeveloping a community and culture that has existed for numerous years. This should be highlighted because of the obvious differences in the perceptions and attitude between new residents and established residents in any area; However, specifically examined in the St Lawrence neighbourhood. The stigma associated with social housing projects cannot be reverted overnight and therefore results of change in revitalization projects may take substantially longer to develop positive results in comparison to new mixed income developments.

As highlight throughout this research, the political context is also factually different between the St Lawrence development in the 1970s and presently. This will influence the need for affordable housing and the support that social housing services and social development services will receive among all levels of government. The available land for (re)development in the City of Toronto downtown is scarce. Therefore, administrations must proceed with good planning designs in order to create and maintain vibrant strong communities.

Recommendations and Further Research

Intergovernmental Funding Support

We are witnessing increasing local investment in the strategy of mixed income developments at a time of shrinking public sector budgets and increased demand for affordable urban housing within the city centre. The current administrative priority of reducing government spending for not only affordable

housing development but social programs or 'discretionary services' is a detrimental factor to social and community development. Some plans may work without additional governmental funding, but the bottom line is that cuts in federal and provincial funding decrease the chances for the success of mixed-income housing developments, like the St Lawrence Neighbourhood, to be replicated. Without the commitment of all levels of government the change of mixed income housing won't come easy. John Sewell explained that "plans to replace modernist housing projects with mixed-use, mixed-income neighbourhoods were drawn up (but never implemented) in 1987 for Edgely Village in Toronto's Jane and Finch area, and also for the Finch / Birchmount project in northeast Toronto, the downtown Moss Park community, and in 1996, for the northeast corner of Regent Park (1993, p. 229-232). Funding and support were largely to do with these uncompleted outcomes and all areas indicated have seen a decrease in social and community development with issues relating to violence, isolation, segregation and lack of service support for low income residents. This has only reinforced the negative stigma associated with social housing projects in the City of Toronto.

Crombie expressed that "city hall does not exist by itself and depends heavily on the federal government, the provincial government and citizens," (Crombie, 2013). Littlewood explained that "none of the funding programs that were available to St Lawrence are around today. The Federal and Provincial governments got out of the business of affordable housing" (Littlewood, 2013). The creation of successful mixed income housing developments begins with the support of all levels of government in the investment of building strong, vibrant, communities that enhance the quality of life of all residents and reduce income polarization and social development issues.

The funding and support requires stretches beyond the investment in the areas built form. No matter how well designed the physical environment of current revitalization projects appears, it risks failure in creating a mixed-income community life unless governments implement stronger policies that support resident led community agencies that pursue mandates of social and community development.

Inclusionary Zoning

Mallach (2011) explains the use of inclusionary zoning and other policy reforms to get more equitable and productive future housing results by using money that is already set to be spent on affordable housing. "For that to happen we must make fundamental changes to national housing policy. Instead of building new low-income housing projects, we should make the market and the existing housing stock work better for low-income households, while using inclusionary zoning to create new low-income units that are integrated into mixed-income communities, (Mallach, 2011). Inclusionary zoning will provide contributions towards affordable housing for new developments (residential or commercial). "The possibility of mandatory affordable housing requirements for major residential developments is foreshadowed in [various strategic regional plans]; as well as promises to provide guidance to local governments interested in density bonus schemes and planning agreements for affordable housing; and to enable inclusionary zoning mechanisms," (Gurran, 2008).

The St Lawrence neighbourhood did not have legislative zoning that deemed the areas mix at a minimum standard. However, John Sewell explained that the new revitalization projects in the City of Toronto such as Regent Park are explained as 'mix' but are not in fact so. The integration of housing and tenure types is none existent in the way many of the co-ops in the St Lawrence neighbourhood are designed. "St Lawrence attempted to replicate the city as it existed, unlike Regent Park and other public housing projects which tried new ideas such as a single income slice and no mixed uses," (Sewell, 2013). Crombie agrees and believes that "the success then and now [of the St Lawrence neighbourhood] is because of organized co-ops. There was extreme value in using private and public co-ops" (Crombie, 2013). The concept of inclusionary zoning would create a policy standard for developing a percentile of affordable housing units in new private developments in mixed income developments. This type of zoning should be explored in the City of Toronto, specifically for mixed income housing (re)developments.

Conclusion

The planning and development process pushed the plan for the St Lawrence neighbourhood forward in an efficient way in the 1970s. The social mix of residents engaged in the same environments developed a sense of community over the years. Then, community organizations persist in addressing the needs of the community through social and community development beyond the capacity of public facilities and housing. All in all, the success of a model neighbourhood is established in the development of the St Lawrence through the physical and social environment and design. Three main 'planning lessons' that the community has to offer to other social housing (re)developments are: the physical site plan/building form; the social planning decisions of social mixing; and the planning process itself in continuously engaging citizens. However, the empirical case study and interview data provides evidence that while mixed-income community life is indeed established in the neighbourhood it is under threat since it was supported not only by physical design principles, but by ongoing multilevel policy support from multiple levels of governments. This is to say that the development or revitalization of mixed income housing needs two broad phases of intergovernmental support: initial funding for planning design and ongoing support for social planning factors.

References

1. Beekman, T., Lyons, F. & Scott, J. (2001). Improving the Understanding of the Influence of Owner Occupiers in Mixed Tenure Neighbourhoods. Report 89 (Edinburgh, ODS Ltd. for Scottish Homes).
2. Bennett L, Reed A. (1999). The New Face of Urban Renewal: the Near North Redevelopment Initiative and the Cabrini-Green neighborhood. In: Reed A, ed. Without Justice for All: the New Liberalism and Our Retreat from Racial Equality. Boulder, CO: Westview Press; 176–192.
3. Bohl, C. C. (2000). New Urbanism and the City: Potential Applications and Implications for Distressed Inner-City Neighborhoods. Housing Policy Debate 11 (4): 761-801.
4. Briggs, X. (1997). Moving Up Versus Moving Out: Neighbourhood Effects in Housing Mobility Programs. Housing Policy Debute 8(1): 195-234.
5. Brooks-Gunn, Jeanne, Greg J. Duncan, Tama Leventhal, and J. Lawrence Aber. (1997). Lessons Learned and Future Directions for Research on the Neighborhoods in which Children Live. In Neighborhood Poverty, vol. 1, Context and consequences for children, ed. Jeanne Brooks- Gunn, Greg J. Duncan, and J. Lawrence Aber, 279-97. Newark, NJ: Russell Sage Foundation.
6. Brophy, P.C., and R. N. Smith. (1997). Mixed-Income Housing: Factors for Success. Cityscape: A Journal of Policy and Development Research 3 (2): 3-31
7. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. (1983). Sect. 56.*1 Non-profit and co-operative housing program evaluation*. Ottawa: CMHC.
8. Chaskin, Robert J. and Mark L. Joseph. (2010). Building "Community" in Mixed-Income Developments: Assumptions, Approaches, and Early Experiences. Urban Affairs Review. 45, 299-335
9. City of Toronto (2011, May). Toronto Social Housing by the Numbers. Retrieved December 20, 2012, from City of Toronto: http://www.toronto.ca/housing/social_housing/pdf/shbynumbers.pdf

10. City of Toronto. (2010). Shelter, Support & Housing – Social Housing Home. Retrieved from: http://www.toronto.ca/housing/social_housing/index.htm#social
11. City of Toronto. (2001). *A Social Development Strategy for the City of Toronto*. Retrieved from: http://www.toronto.ca/sds/pdf/sds_finalpolicy.pdf
12. Crane, Jonathan. (1991). The Epidemic Theory of Ghettos and Neighborhood Effects on Dropping Out and Teenage Childbearing. American Journal of Sociology 96 (5): 1226-59.
13. Crombie, D. (2013). Personal interview conducted on May 27th, 2013.
14. Daley, A. (2013). Personal interview conducted on June 26th, 2013.
15. Datcher, Linda. (1982). Effects of Community and Family Backgrounds on Achievement. Review of Economics and Statistics 64 (1): 32-41.
16. Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Margery Austin Turner. (1997). Does Neighborhood Matter? Assessing Recent Evidence. Housing Policy Debate 8 (4): 833-66.
17. Ellin, N. (2001) Thresholds of Fear: Embracing the Urban Shadow, Urban Studies , 38(5 – 6), 869 – 883.
18. Epp, G. 1996. Emerging Strategies for Revitalizing Public Housing Communities. Housing Policy Debate 7 (3): 563-588.
19. Flusty, S. (1997) Building Paranoia, in: N. Ellin (Ed.) Architecture of Fear , pp. 47 – 59 (New York: Princeton Architectural Press)
20. Galster, George C., and Sean P. Killen. (1995). The Geography of Metropolitan Opportunity: A Reconnaissance and Conceptual Framework. Housing Policy Debate 6 (1): 7-43.
21. Gehl, J. (1996) Life Between Buildings: Using Public Space, 3rd ed (first published 1971) (Skive, Arkitektens Forlag).
22. Gephart, Martha A. (1997). Neighborhoods and Communities as Contexts for Development. In Neighborhood Poverty, vol. I, Contexts and consequences for children, ed. Jeanne Brooks- Gunn, Greg J. Duncan, and J. Lawrence Aber, 1-43. Newark, NJ: Russell Sage Foundation.
23. Gomes, D. (2013). Personal interview conducted on June 15th, 2013.

24. Gordon, David L.A. (1996). Directions for New Urban Neighbourhoods; Learning from St. Lawrence, City of Toronto. CIP/ACUPP Case Study.
25. Gurran, N. (2008). Affordable Housing: A Dilemma for Metropolitan Planning? Urban Policy & Research, 26(1), 101-110.
26. Hackworth, J., and A. Moriah. (2006). Neoliberalism, Contingency and Urban Policy: the Case of Social Housing in Ontario. *International Journdal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 (3): 510-527
27. Jacobs, J. (1961). The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Vintage Books.
28. Jencks, Christopher, and Susan E. Mayer. (1990a). Residential segregation, job proximity, and black job opportunities. In Inner city poverty in the United States, ed. Laurence E. Lynn and Michael G. H. McGeary, 187-222. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
29. Joseph, M., R. J. Chaskin, and H. S. Webber. (2007). The Theoretical Basis for Addressing Poverty Through Mixed-Income Development. Urban Affairs Review 42 (3): 369-409.
30. Katz, P. (1994). The New Urbanism: Toward an Architecture of Community. New York: McGraw Hill.
31. Khadduri, Jill (2001). Deconcentration: What Do We Mean? What Do We Want ? Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research 5 (2): 69-84
32. Kleit, R. G. (2001). The Role of Neighbourhood Social Networks in Scattered-Site Public Housing Residents search for jobs. Housing Policy Debate 12 (3): 541-573.
33. Leccese, M., and K. McCormick, eds. (1999). Charter of the New Urbanism. New York: McGraw-Hill.
34. Littlewood, A. (2013). Personal interview conducted on May 30th, 2013.
35. Luke-Smith, J. (2013). Perssonal interview conducted on June 21st, 2013.
36. Lowden, S. (2013). Personal interview conducted on July 3rd, 2013.

37. Mah, J. (2009). Can inclusionary zoning help address the shortage of affordable housing in Canada. CPRN Research Report, December 2009. Retrieved from http://www.cprn.org/documents/51952_EN.pdf

38. Mallach, A. (2011). Rethinking Affordable Housing Policy. United States, Chicago: - American Bar Association.

39. Marc, I. (2013). Personal interview conducted on June 17th, 2013.

40. Martin, G. & Atkinson, J. (2003) Rebalancing Communities: Introducing Mixed Incomes into Existed Rented Housing Estates (York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation).

41. McGeachie, C. (2013). Personal interview conducted on June 19th, 2013.

42. Miller, Kyle (2013). Personal interview conducted on June 26th, 2013.

43. Muyoboke, S. (2013). Personal interview conducted on June 18th, 2013.

44. Peters, D. (2013). Personal interview conducted on July 4th, 2013.

45. Popkin, S. J., B. Katz, M. Cunningham, K D. Brown, J. Gustafson, and M. Turner. (2004). A Decade of Hope VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute and The Brookings Institution.

46. Regent Park Collaborative Team (RPCT), (2003). Lessons from St. Lawrence for the Regent Park Redevelopment Process (Toronto: TCHC).

47. Roberts, M. (2007). Sharing Space: Urban Design and Social Mixing in Mixed Income New Communities. Planning Theory and Practice 8 (2): 183-204.

48. Rose, D. (2004). Discourses and Experiences of Social Mix in Gentrifying Neighbourhoods: A Montreal case study. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 13(2): 278-316.

49. Rosenbaum, J. E., L. K. Stroh, and C. Flynn. (1998). Lake Parc Place: A Study of Mixed-Income Housing. Housing Policy Debate 9 (4):703-40.

50. Rowlands, R., Murie, A. & Tice, A. (2006) More than Tenure Mix: Developer and Purchaser Attitudes to New Housing Estates (York, Chartered Institute of Housing and Joseph Rowntree Foundation).
51. Sampson, R. J., J. Morenoff, and T. Gannon-Rowley. (2002). Assessing Neighborhood Effects: Social Processes and New Directions in Research. Annual Review of Sociology 28:443-78.
52. Sarkissian, Wendy. (1976). The Idea of Social Mix in Town Planning: An Historical Review. Urban Studies 13 (October): 231-246.
53. Sennett, R. (1994) Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization (London, Faber and Faber).
54. Sennett, R. (1990) The Conscience of the Eye: The Design and Social Life of Cities (London, Faber and Faber).
55. Sewell, John (2013). Personal interview conducted on May 28th, 2013.
56. Sewell, J. (1994). Houses and Homes: Housing for Canadians. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, Publishers.
57. Silverman, R. M. (2008). CBOs and Affordable Housing. *National Civic Review, 97*(3), 26-31.Smith, J. L., and D. Stovall. 2008. "Coming home" to new homes and new schools: Critical race theory and the new politics of containment. Journal of Education Policy 23 (2): 135-52.
58. Talen, Emily. (2002). The Social Goals of New Urbanism. Housing Policy Debate 13 (1): 165-88.
59. Talen, Emily. (1999). Sense of Community and Neighbourhood Form: An Assessment of the Social Doctrine of New Urbanism. Urban Studies 36 (8): 1361-79.
60. Tiley, Ian, and Richard Hil. (2010). Affordable housing: What role for local government? Australasian Journal of Regional Studies 16, (2): 267-277, https://www.lib.uwo.ca/cgi-bin/ezpauthn.cgi/docview/817301577?accountid=15115 (accessed December 10th , 2012).
61. Toronto Community Housing Corporation. (2013). Investing in Buildings. Toronto, ON. Retrieved June 18th, 2013 from http://www.torontohousing.ca/revitalization.

62. Tunstall, R. & Fenton, A. (2006) In the Mix: A Review of Mixed Income, Mixed Tenure and Mixed Communities (York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, English Partnerships, and the Housing Corporation).

63. Wilson, W. J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

___ 2005. HOPE VI new communities: Neighbourhood relationships in mixed-income housing. Environment and Planning A