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Abstract
This research uses the Canadian Censuses of 1996 and 2006 in order to explore the pace of gentrification to date in the neighbourhoods surrounding the proposed MUHC, Saint-Henri and Lower NDG. These two case study neighbourhoods are compared to the Plateau-Mont-Royal as well as to the Island of Montréal and the Montréal Census Metropolitan Area (CMA). The two case study neighbourhoods exhibit different trajectories of neighbourhood change and gentrification over the 1996 – 2006 period. The Saint-Henri neighbourhood experienced continued ’standard’ gentrification (i.e. the upgrading of the existing housing stock), as well as significant proliferation of ’new-build’ gentrification (i.e. the adaptive reuse of former industrial buildings to housing or infill housing development which is targeted to higher-income groups than those in the surrounding neighbourhood). The majority of indicators assessed suggest there is considerable gentrification under way in the neighbourhood. In Lower NDG, the story is more complex. The areas north of the railway tracks and closest to Westmount have been gentrifying for a number of years and continue to do so until 2006. However, there is no evidence that the Saint-Raymond neighbourhood, south of the train tracks and adjacent to the MUHC site, has experienced any gentrification. The key findings of this study are: (1) that the trajectories of neighbourhood change in the neighbourhoods surrounding the proposed MUHC are not uniform; and (2) the census tracts that are exhibiting trends other than gentrification are both enclave neighbourhoods with impermeable physical barriers surrounding them.
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Executive Summary

Gentrification is simultaneously a physical, economic, social and cultural phenomenon, which involves the ‘invasion’ of previously working-class neighbourhoods by middle or upper-income groups, and the subsequent displacement of many of the original residents (Hamnett, 2000). There is widespread concern among community groups that the proposed McGill University Health Centre (MUHC) mega-project will lead to gentrification or accelerate gentrification already underway in the surrounding neighbourhoods, with competing land-uses leading to increasing property values and speculation in adjacent areas and the potential displacement of existing residents.

This report uses the Canadian Censuses of 1996 and 2006 in order to explore the pace of gentrification to date in the neighbourhoods surrounding the proposed MUHC, Saint-Henri and Lower NDG. These two case study neighbourhoods are compared to the Plateau-Mont-Royal (reputedly Montréal’s most gentrified neighbourhood), as well as to the Island of Montréal and the Montréal Census Metropolitan Area (CMA).

In fact, the two case study neighbourhoods exhibit different trajectories of neighbourhood change and gentrification over the 1996 – 2006 period. The Saint-Henri neighbourhood experienced continued ‘standard’ gentrification (i.e. the upgrading of the existing housing stock), as well as significant proliferation of ‘new-build’ gentrification (i.e. the adaptive reuse of former industrial buildings to housing or infill housing development which is targeted to higher-income groups than those in the surrounding neighbourhood), which is primarily concentrated in the census tracts that border the Lachine Canal (CT 79 and 83). Indeed, the majority of indicators assessed suggest there is considerable gentrification under way in the neighbourhood, with the notable exception of CT 84.

In Lower NDG, by contrast, the story is more complex, as there is considerable variation among census tracts. The areas north of the railway tracks and closest to Westmount (CTs 95 and 96) have been gentrifying for a number of years and continue to do so until 2006. Census tract 97.01, which is also north of the railway, but farther west, is characterized as exhibiting ‘potential for future re-capture’ (refers to instances of neighbourhood upgrading in which a census tract regains its prior above-average income status after spending a minimum of two consecutive decades below the metropolitan average (Walks and Maaranen, 2008: 27). However, up until 2006 there is no evidence that the Saint-Raymond neighbourhood (CT 94.01), which is wedged between the railway track and
the Saint-Jacques Escarpment, as well as directly adjacent to the MUHC site, had experienced any
gentrification.

The key findings of this study are:

1. that the trajectories of neighbourhood change in the neighbourhoods surrounding the
   proposed MUHC are not uniform. Indeed, looking at neighbourhood change at the scale of
   census tracts reveals that within each neighbourhood there is a fair amount of heterogeneity.
   This is true in terms of the degree of gentrification (complete gentrification vs. incomplete
   gentrification vs. potential for future recapture) as well as the type of gentrification under-
   way (i.e. standard vs. new-build);

2. the CTs that are exhibiting trends other than gentrification (CT 84 in Saint-Henri and CT
   94.01 in Lower NDG) are both enclave neighbourhoods with impermeable physical barriers
   surrounding them. Interestingly, it is also these census tracts which house a high proportion
   of immigrants compared to elsewhere in their respective neighbourhoods, as well as very
   high proportions of residents who speak non-official languages as a mother tongue.

Future research should explore:

1. physical changes that have taken place since the 2006 census was taken, such as new-build
   development; and

2. changes in the commercial services available in the surrounding neighbourhoods.
**Synthèse**

L’embourgeoisement est, de façon simultanée, un processus physique, social, économique et culturel. Il implique l’« invasion » de quartiers autrefois essentiellement habités par des individus de la classe ouvrière par des groupes à revenus moyens ou élevés, entraînant, du même fait, le déplacement des populations initiales (Hamnet, 2000). Plusieurs groupes communautaires sont préoccupés par le fait que le projet du Centre Universitaire de Santé McGill (CUSM) risque de provoquer ou d’accélérer l’embourgeoisement des quartiers avoisinants, entraînant une compétition pour les terrains disponibles, une augmentation de la valeur des propriétés, de la spéculation sur les régions adjacentes et le déplacement des résidants actuels.

Ce travail se base sur les recensements canadiens de 1996 et 2006 afin d’évaluer le rythme d’embourgeoisement s’étant produit jusqu’à maintenant dans les quartiers entourant le projet proposé du CUSM, soit Saint-Henri et le bas Notre-Dame de Grâce. Ces deux étude de cas ont par la suite été comparées au Plateau Mont-Royal (considéré le quartier le plus embourgeoisé de Montréal), ainsi qu’à l’île de Montréal et la Communauté Métropolitaine de Montréal (CMM).

Les deux études de cas présentent une évolution bien différente pour la période 1996-2006. Le quartier Saint-Henri a connu un embourgeoisement « standard » (c’est-à-dire une amélioration des habitations existantes), de même qu’une augmentation significative d’un embourgeoisement « nouvellement bâti » (soit l’adaptation d’anciens bâtiments industriels en logement ou la densification des quartiers par la construction d’habitations dédiées aux résidants à revenus élevés). Ce dernier type d’embourgeoisement est localisé principalement dans les secteurs de recensement longeant le Canal Lachine (SR 79 et 83). La majorité des indicateurs analysés suggère ainsi un niveau d’embourgeoisement considérable dans le quartier, à l’exception du secteur de recensement 84.

En comparaison, le secteur du bas Notre-Dame de Grâce présente une évolution beaucoup plus complexe. Il existe une variation importante entre les différents secteurs de recensement. La région au nord du chemin de fer et celle située le plus près de Westmount (SR 95 et 96) se sont embourgeoisées au cours des années, et ce, jusqu’en 2006. Le SR 97.01, qui est également au nord du chemin de fer, mais un peu plus à l’ouest, semble présenter un « potentiel pour une reprise future » (faisant référence à des régions qui, suite à un processus de revalorisation, pourraient regagner leur statut de zone à revenus au-dessus de la moyenne après une période d’au minimum deux décennies.
consécutives en dessous de la moyenne métropolitaine) (Walks et Maaranen, 2008, 27). Cependant, jusqu’en 2006, il n’existe aucun signe d’embourgeoisement dans le quartier Saint-Raymond (SR 94.01), calé entre le chemin de fer et la Falaise Saint-Jacques et directement adjacent au site du futur CUSM.

Les principales conclusions de cette étude sont :

1. Les changements s’étant produits dans les quartiers entourant le site proposé pour le CUSM ne sont pas uniformes. En effet, l’analyse des changements enregistrés à l’échelle des secteurs de recensement dénote une hétérogénéité importante à l’intérieur même des quartiers. Cette affirmation s’applique autant pour le degré d’embourgeoisement (embourgeoisement complet vs. embourgeoisement incomplet vs. potentiel pour une reprise future) que pour le type d’embourgeoisement en cours (standard vs. nouvellement bâti).

2. Les secteurs de recensement présentant des tendances autres que l’embourgeoisement (SR 84 dans Saint-Henri et SR 94.01 au sud de Notre-Dame de Grâce) sont tous deux des quartiers enclavés par des barrières physiques imperméables. Ces régions sont également celles détenant la plus grande proportion d’immigrants par rapport à leur arrondissement respectif, de même qu’une proportion importante de résidents dont la langue maternelle n’est pas l’une des deux langues officielles.

Des recherches futures devraient explorer : (1) les changements physiques ayant eu lieu depuis le recensement de 2006, notamment les nouveaux développements résidentiels, et (2) les changements par rapport aux services commerciaux offerts dans les quartiers avoisinants.
Introduction

Context

The proposed McGill University Health Centre (MUHC) mega-hospital is to be built by 2013 on the former Glen Yards (adjacent to Saint-Henri and Lower NDG). In addition to the 280,000m² hospital complex, at least 1.6 million m² of office space will be needed offsite for medical offices, laboratories and spin-off research companies (Arbour, 2005; MUHC, 2007). The mega-hospital will create substantial employment in the area for both professional and non-professional tertiary workers. There is widespread concern among community groups that the development will lead to gentrification or accelerate gentrification already underway, with competing land-uses leading to increasing property values and speculation in adjacent neighbourhoods and the subsequent displacement of existing residents. Additionally, there is concern that there will be increased demand for housing in the surrounding neighbourhoods as professional employees of the new mega-hospital seek to live closer to their new place of employment. Equally, the consumption practices of professional tertiary workers (both as workers and residents) will likely lead to a change in local consumption patterns, which may subsequently leave its mark on the neighbourhood landscape through the process of commercial gentrification.

Objectives of study

The research was undertaken as part of a Community University Research Alliance (CURA), Making Mega-Projects Work for Communities. Members of the CURA Housing Sub-Committee expressed the need for an analysis similar to that conducted by David Ley (1988, 1992, 1996) undertaken in the case of the neighbourhoods surrounding the MUHC development. Ley analyses Canadian census variables, at the geographical scale of the census tract, to gauge the degree of gentrification underway in Canadian inner cities over various five- and ten-year periods. For the vicinity of the hospital, studies of gentrification are limited. Gentrification-related changes in the Saint-Henri district have not been examined since the work of the Regroupement économique et social du Sud-Ouest (RESO) (2002), at which time the most recent census data available were those of 1996. A more recent study (RESO, 2007) offers only a brief update of the situation in the Sud-Ouest and uses 2001 census
data. And to our knowledge, no study exists concerning gentrification in Lower Notre-Dame-de-
Grace (Lower NDG) directly adjacent to the hospital site.

While the census does not cover all relevant indicators, it provides valuable data. A full “tool-
kit” of gentrification indicators would also include longitudinal information on rent levels in particu-
lar units (the data are unobtainable) and housing price data drawn from real estate transactions, as
included in the RESO (2002) study – a costly and time-consuming undertaking.

The objectives of this study are to examine the nature of:
• socio-economic change;
• demographic change;
• housing tenure change;
• and changes in housing affordability.

Where?
• In the neighbourhoods adjacent to the MUHC.

Why?
• In order to assess the pace of gentrification to date, before construction of the mega-hospital
begins.

How?
This research project adapts established indicators of gentrification to census variables freely
available to university researchers through the Data Liberation Initiative. Changes in Saint-Henri
and Lower NDG from 1996 to 2006 are documented. Where population numbers are large enough
to permit it, we also pay especial attention to those census tracts that are closest to the MUHC site.
Documented changes are compared with those taking place at the scale of the Montréal Census
Metropolitan Area (CMA), the Island of Montréal as a whole, and also with the Plateau Mont-Royal,
reputedly the most “gentrified” district of Montréal and thus a useful barometer for measuring gen-
trification and neighbourhood change. (We have opted for a 10-year time frame to avoid cluttering
the “big picture” with the effects of short-term cyclical macroeconomic trends).

This introductory section begins by defining gentrification and new-build gentrification.
Second, it briefly introduces the case study neighbourhoods for this report, Saint-Henri and Lower
NDG, as well as presenting brief descriptions of the census tracts within them. Next, it reviews the existing literature on the degree of gentrification underway in these neighbourhoods. It then outlines some of the principal indicators used by researchers in previous Canadian assessments of gentrification that rely upon data from the Canadian census.

Gentrification is a physical, economic, social and cultural phenomenon that involves the ‘invasion’ of previously working-class neighbourhoods by middle or upper-income groups – typically, university-educated professionals employed in the central-city – and the subsequent displacement of many of the original residents as the existing housing stock changes hands (Hamnett, 2000). Most scholars now also see new housing construction on vacant sites and adaptive re-use of former industrial buildings as a part of the gentrification process when this housing is targeted at households with higher incomes than residents of the surrounding neighbourhoods. This phenomenon is referred to in the literature as ‘new-build gentrification’ (see Davidson and Lees, 2004). Both types of changes in the housing stock will lead to an increasing share of owner-occupied units (with or without an absolute decline in rented units), as well as to changes in the socio-economic composition of the area, the commercial and public and/or community services available, and also, often, to changes in household demography (i.e. an influx of younger, non-family households). Additionally, while new-build gentrification does not imply ‘direct displacement’ of the original neighbourhood residents (as more units are added rather than conversion of existing units), some scholars raise the concern of ‘indirect displacement’. For example, ‘exclusionary displacement’ whereby overtime an area becomes inaccessible to low and modest-income people due to the gentrification of the surrounding neighbourhood (Davidson and Lees, 2004). Some of these changes can be captured and measured to a considerable extent by census data, and many of the pertinent variables are available at the census tract (CT) level.

The case study neighbourhoods: Saint-Henri and Saint-Raymond

Saint-Henri

Saint-Henri is one of Canada’s oldest working-class neighbourhoods, located in the south-west of Montréal. Favreau (1989) categorizes Saint-Henri as a traditional ‘quartier populaire’, which historically had the following characteristics: a situation of relative social homogeneity; a sense of neighbourhood belonging developed more on a cultural than socio-professional basis; the creation of a
certain type of social and cultural life; and a frame of reference of belonging to a very well-defined
neighbourhood, where the neighbourhood unit dominates (Favreau, 1989: 53). The opening of the
Lachine Canal in 1826 and Montréal’s first railway, the Montréal Lachine Railroad soon after, were
key to its development (Blais et al., 1981: 8). Initially, tanneries were the main industry, however,
after 1882, a more diverse industrial base began to develop: from refining to textiles (Benoit, 1983:
6). The industrial boom beginning in the 1890’s gave way to rapid housing construction, with the
majority of housing units in the neighbourhood constructed between 1890 and 1925 (Blais et al.,
1981: 22). As a result of deindustrialization, Saint-Henri has been losing population since the 1960’s.
In 1966, the population peaked with 26,699 inhabitants and from then on declined continuously
until 2001, bottoming out at 13,563 inhabitants. During the 1960’s a significant portion of the Vil-
lage des Tanneries neighbourhood (the north-western sector of Saint-Henri) was razed and hundreds
of households were evicted to make way for the construction of the Autoroute 720 (Lavigne and
Carlos, 1974: 38).

Today, Saint-Henri is still a largely working-class and francophone neighbourhood, with a high
percentage of single-parent families, low-income households, elderly persons and renters (Statistics
Canada, 2001 Census). It has been changing substantially in recent years, with new condominium
development along the Lachine Canal (designated a recreational corridor by Parks Canada in 1997)
and widespread conversion of the former industrial landscape into housing. Between 2001 and
2006 there has been a 9.1% increase in population, a 10.8% increase in the number of dwellings in
the neighbourhood, accompanied by a 5 percentage point decrease in renters (from 86% to 81%,
although there was still an increase in the absolute number of rental units in the neighbourhood) and
a 4.3 percentage point increase in owner-occupants (Statistics Canada, Censuses of 2001 and 2006).
A large portion (46%) of neighbourhood housing was built before 1946 and 13.2% of housing
required major repairs. However, an additional 9% of the total housing units in the neighbourhood
have been built between 2001 and 2006, suggesting the possibility of substantial new-build gentri-
fication, when considered with the 4.3 percentage point increase in homeowners over the same period,
with the addition of 490 new owner-occupied households. Nonetheless, social and community hous-
ing1 represents a significant portion of the housing within the neighbourhood, at 33.6 % of rented

---

1 The specific breakdown by type of social and community housing in the Saint-Henri neighbourhood is: 2019 total units, of which
664 are HLM; 507 are OBNL; 457 are cooperatives; and 391 are public non-HLM (abordables) (Ville de Montréal, 2009: 21).
units, or 27.4% of the total occupied units in the neighbourhood (Ville de Montréal, 2009: 21). For a breakdown of community and social housing by census tract in Saint-Henri, refer to Table 2.

However, there are still opportunities for more new-build development in Saint-Henri on brownfield sites. Possible consequences of new-build gentrification include ‘indirect displacement,’ which may take a variety of forms. ‘Exclusionary displacement,’ mentioned above refers to when an area becomes inaccessible to low-income households due to the gentrification of the surrounding area, pushing rents beyond their capacity to pay. Another possible consequence is ‘political displacement’ whereby new-build gentrification may lead to the shifts in power within existing neighbourhood organizations (as new-comers infiltrate existing organizations) or create parallel organizations to mobilize around their vision of neighbourhood futures (see Martin, 2007).

Census Tract Portraits

The following section will provide a brief descriptive capsule of each of the census tracts in Saint-Henri considered for analysis in this report according to data available from the 2006 Census of Canada.

CT 79

The borders of this census tract are rue Saint-Jacques south to the Lachine Canal and from rue Atwater west to rue Saint-Marguerite. This census tract contains the Atwater Market. The railway track runs diagonally through this census tract between rues Saint-Ferdinand and Maria (see Figure 1).

The residential environment in this census tract contains the following housing types: 80.6% apartment with fewer than five storeys; 6.8% row houses; 6.6% apartment that has five or more storeys; and 1.3% duplexes. The age of the dwellings in the area is: 36.5% of housing was built before 1946; 18.2% between 1946 and 1960; 8.3% between 1961 and 1970; 7.2% from 1971 to 1980; 11.4% from 1981 to 1990; 5.5% from 1991 to 2000; and 13.3% between 2001 and 2006. As of 2006, 10.7% of dwellings in the neighbourhood required major repairs and 79.3% of the housing in the area is rented. In terms of social and community housing, 33.5% of the housing stock in the neighbourhood is social or community housing (see Table 2 for absolute numbers and a breakdown by type).
The population density is 7289 persons per square kilometre (for a comparative glance at population density see Table 1). This census tract has quite abundant green space: it borders Lachine Canal in the south, has two community gardens, the Jardin communautaires de Bon Voisins and the Jardin communautaires de Rosa-de-Lima; as well as numerous parks such as Parc Louis-Cyr, Parc Jacques-Viger and Parc des Cordonniers. The area also has a significant immigrant population, with 21.6% of neighbourhood residents claiming immigrant status in 2006. In terms of mother tongue, 60.7% of residents have French as their first language, 18.0% English and 21.3% non-official languages.

**CT 80**

This census tract is located in the north-east corner of neighbourhood from rue Saint-Antoine to Saint-Jacques in the south, and from rue Atwater to rue Rose-de-Lima. It is considerably smaller than other census tracts in neighbourhood and its location is closest to downtown among CTs in Saint-Henri (see Figure 1).

In terms of residential environment the predominant housing type in this census tract is apartments in buildings with fewer than five storeys constituting 93.9% of the housing in the neighbourhood, with an additional 4.9% in semi-detached houses and 1.2% in other single-attached houses. Buildings are of a higher quality than elsewhere in the neighbourhood, mostly triplexes, many of which are built of grey stone. In terms of the age of the housing stock, 72% of housing units in the neighbourhood were built before 1946, 8.5% from 1946 to 1960, 9.8% from 1961 to 1980, 9.8% from 1981 to 1990. No new housing has been built in this census tract between 1991 and 2006. Due in part to the age of the housing stock, a significant proportion (23.2%) requires major repairs. Of the housing in the neighbourhood, 86.6% is rented. This census tract does not have any social or community housing.

It is a densely populated census tract compared to others in the neighbourhood, with 8611 persons per square kilometre, due no doubt to the fact that triplexes are the predominant housing form. There are no parks or green spaces within this census tract. Immigrants constitute 19.4% of the population. With regards to mother tongue, 52.6% of residents have English as their first language,
33.6% French and 14.5% non-official languages. This CT has the highest proportion of English-speakers in Saint-Henri.

CT 81
The borders of this census tract are rue De Richelieu (below the Ville Marie Autoroute (720)) to rue Saint-Jacques, from rue Rosa-de-Lima to rue Sainte-Marguerite (see Figure 1).

As in census tract 80 mentioned above, the predominant housing type in CT 81 is apartments with fewer than five storeys (98.4%), with an additional 0.4% duplexes, 0.4% row houses, 0.4% other single attached houses. In terms of the age of the housing stock: 57.5% of dwellings in this census track were built before 1946; 11% from 1946 to 1960; 16.9% from 1960-1980; 6.7% from 1981 to 1990; 3.1% between 1991 and 2000; and 4.3% from 2001 to 2006. Of the housing in the area, 12.6% requires major repairs. Of the households in the census tract, 87.4% are renters. With regards to social and community housing, 22.3% of the housing stock is social or community housing (see Table 2).

It is the most densely populated census tract in the neighbourhood, with 9458 people per square kilometre, due no doubt to the fact that triplexes are the predominant housing form. There are a number of green spaces within the area, including Parc Saint-Henri, Parc de la Ferme Brodie, Parc Polyvalente Saint-Henri and Parc des Couterières. Immigrants make up 16.6% of the population. In terms of mother tongue, 63.8% of residents spoke French as a first language, 20% spoke English and 16.2% spoke non-official languages.

CT 82
The borders of this census tract are rue De Richelieu (below the 720) south to the railway tracks, rue Saint-Marguerite to the Turcot Interchange. This is an enclave neighbourhood (often referred to as the Villages des Tanneries), surrounded by significant physical barriers including the 720 to the north, the Turcot Interchange to the west and the rail bed to the south (see Figure 1).

The predominant housing type in the area is apartments in buildings with fewer than five storeys (87.2%), followed by 11.8% apartments with more than five storeys, 1% duplexes. In terms of the age of the housing stock, 35% of housing in the area was constructed before 1946, 9.4% between 1946 and 1960, 31.2% between 1961 and 1980, 15.3% between 1981 and 1990, 5% between
1991 and 2000, 3% between 2001 and 2006. As such, much of the housing in the neighbourhood has been constructed more recently than in other census tracts in the area, such as CT 80, mentioned above. Nonetheless, 17.3% of the housing in the area requires major repairs as of 2006. This census tract has the highest overall proportion of renters in Saint-Henri, at 94.1% of the population. Social and community housing represents 49% of the housing stock in the census tract (see Table 2).

In terms of population density, there are 7826 persons per square kilometre. This census tract contains numerous green spaces including: Parc Lacasse, Parc des Hommes-Forts, Square Sainte-Elizabeth, Parc des Tanneries-des-Rolland, Jardin des Motards and Parc Emilie-Berliner. Immigrants represent 19.6% of the population. With regards to mother tongue, 65.6% of residents spoke French as a first language, 16.1% spoke English and 18.6% spoke non-official languages.

**CT 83**

The boundaries of this census tract are the railway tracks in the north to the Lachine Canal in the south, rue Sainte-Marguerite to rue St-Remi in the west (see Figure 1).

In terms of the residential environment in CT 83, 89.6% of the housing stock is in apartment buildings with less than five storeys, while 6.2% is comprised of units in duplexes and 2.9% is row housing. The age of the housing stock in the area is more varied than elsewhere in the neighbourhood with 58.8% of housing built before 1946, 13.7% between 1946-1960, 7.8% between 1961 and 1980, 5.6% between 1981 and 1990, 4.2% between 1991 and 2000, 9.8% between 2001 and 2006. As such there has been a construction boom in this census tract with approximately 14% of housing in the area built between 1991 and 2006. However, despite the relatively new housing stock in some parts of the area, 11.8% of the housing stock in CT 83 requires major repairs. The proportion of rented housing in the area is 71%, which is the lowest proportion among census tracts in Saint-Henri. With in this census tract 15.8% of the housing stock is social and community housing (see Table 2).

In terms of population density, there are 7256 persons per square kilometre. The area contains a number of green spaces including Parc Sir-Georges-Etienne-Cartier, the Lachine Canal, and the community compost station. Further, the Centre récréatif, culturel et sportif Saint-Zotique is located across from Parc Georges Etienne Cartier. Immigrants constitute 13.3% of the population. In
terms of mother tongue, 77% of residents spoke French as a first language, 11.6% spoke English and 11.6% spoke other non-official languages.

*CT 84*

This census tract is the western most part of the Saint-Henri neighbourhood. In the north, its border is the railway track to the Lachine Canal in the south, rue Saint-Remi in the east to the Turcot Interchange in the west (see Figure 1).

In *CT 84* 79% of the housing stock is apartments with fewer than five storeys, 11.9% is in buildings with five or more storeys, 4.2% in duplexes, 2.4% in semi-detached units and 1.2% in single-detached houses. In terms of the age of buildings: 35.1% of the housing in this census tract was built before 1946; 12.5% between 1946 and 1960; 19.6% between 1961 and 1980; 16.1% between 1981 and 1990; 1.2% between 1991 and 2000; 14.9% between 2001 and 2006. As such, this area has experienced the most marked construction boom in the last few years, with 14.9% of housing in the area built between 2001 and 2006. Of the housing in the area 14.2% requires major repairs and 81% of occupied dwellings are rented. This census tract contains the highest proportion of social and community housing in Saint-Henri, representing 68.8% of the total housing stock (see Table 2).

This is by far the least densely populated census tract in the neighbourhood with 5105 persons per square kilometre. There are a few green spaces in the area including the Lachine Canal and open spaces under the Turcot Interchange. Centre Recreatif Gadbois is located in this census tract. This area has the most significant proportion of immigrants in Saint-Henri, with 21.9% of the population claiming immigrant status in 2006. In terms of mother tongue, 65.9% of residents spoke French as a first language, 21% non-official languages and 13.1% spoke English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land area in square km</th>
<th>MONTRÉAL (CMA)</th>
<th>CITY OF MONTRÉAL</th>
<th>CT 79</th>
<th>CT 80</th>
<th>CT 81</th>
<th>CT 82</th>
<th>CT 83</th>
<th>CT 84</th>
<th>CT 94.01</th>
<th>CT 95</th>
<th>CT 96</th>
<th>CT 97.01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,258.97</td>
<td>365.13</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Population density    | 853.60         | 4,438.70        | 7,289 | 8,611 | 9,458 | 7,826 | 7,256 | 5,105 | 3,349  | 9,465 | 11,289 | 17,957 |

*Table 1: Population density in a comparative context*
Lower NDG (including Saint-Raymond)

The population of Lower NDG, including Saint-Raymond (census tracts 94.01, 97.01, 95, 96 – see Figure 2) increased from 19,309 to 20,213 between 2001 and 2006, an increase of 4.7% (Statistics Canada, Censuses of 2001 and 2006). While NDG is considered a middle-class neighbourhood, Lower NDG has a significantly lower average personal income than elsewhere in the neighbourhood. Further, Lower NDG is comprised primarily of renters. Like in Saint-Henri, in recent years there has been an increase in the number of owner-occupants from 14.8% to 18.4% and a decrease in renters from 85.1% to 81.5% (Statistics Canada, Censuses of 2001 & 2006). A significant difference between Lower NDG and Saint-Henri is the period of dwelling construction; in Lower NDG only 35% of dwellings were built before 1946, while 56.5% were built between 1946 and 1980. However, similar to Saint-Henri, 13.1% of housing requires major repairs (Statistics Canada, Census 2006). There has not, however, been a significant construction boom between 2001 and 2006, with a modest 1.5% increase in the total number of dwellings (Statistics Canada, Census 2006). Compared to Saint-Henri, the proportion of social and community housing within the neighbourhood is much more modest in Lower NDG. In a recent assessment by the Ville de Montréal which examined the Upper Lachine Quartier de référence – (which includes CTs 94.01, 97.01, 97.02, 95, 96), community and social housing represented 6% of rented housing units and 5% of the total occupied housing units in the neighbourhood (Ville de Montréal, 2009b: 22). For a breakdown of social and community housing in Lower NDG by census tract (also referred to as Upper Lachine), see Table 2.

Saint-Raymond (a neighbourhood at the southern edge of Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (NDG)) is isolated from the rest of NDG by physical barriers, to the east by the Décarie Expressway, to the north by the commuter rail track, to the south by the Saint-Jacques escarpment (refer to Figure 2). In contrast to Saint-Henri, the area developed between 1920 and 1960 and established itself as a lower-middle class Italian neighbourhood (Boissevain, 1970). However, since the 1970’s, unemployment has risen steadily from 3% in 1961 to 17% in 1991, accompanied by a steady increase in

---

2 For example, in NDG Est (the area north of Sherbrooke to boulevard Côte-Saint-Luc, west to Grand Ave), had an average personal income of $36,198 according to the 2006 census (CSSS Cavendish, 2009: 7). Lower NDG (as defined above) had an average personal income of $24,898 in 2006. However, in Saint-Raymond (CT 94.01), the average personal income in 2006 was $20,002.

3 N.B. This census tract (97.02) was not included in our analysis of Lower NDG, although it is included in the Ville de Montréal QR – Upper Lachine.

4 The specific breakdown of types of social and community housing in the Upper Lachine QR are: 511 total units: 137 HLM; 0 OBNL; 70 cooperative; 304 Public non-HLM (abordables) (Ville de Montréal, 2009b: 22).
low-income people living in the neighbourhood (Akins et al., 2005: 12). Since 1991, the immigrant population has continued to grow and diversify.

Census Tract Portraits

The following section will provide a brief descriptive capsule of each of the census tracts included as part of Lower NDG for analysis in this report, according to census tract data from the 2006 Census of Canada.

CT 94.01

The borders of this census tract are boulevard De Maisonneuve to rue Pullman in the south, avenue Claremont in the east to avenue Brock in the west. It is an enclave neighbourhood, surrounded by physical barriers including the commuter rail track to the north, the Saint-Jacques Escarpment to the south and the Décarie Expressway to the east (see Figure 2).

In terms of residential environment, this census tract (often referred to as Saint-Raymond) contains the following housing types: 66.5% apartment buildings with fewer than five storeys; 28.5% duplexes; and 3% buildings with 5 storeys of more. With regards to the age of the housing stock: 27.4% of housing was built before 1946; 32.9% between 1946 and 1960; 33.6% between 1961 and 1980; 5.2% between 1981 and 1990; 3% between 1991 and 2000; and 0.4% between 2001 and 2006. Of the housing in the area, 11.2% of occupied dwellings required major repairs in 2006 and 82.2% of occupied dwellings were rented. Social and community housing represent 9.4% of the housing stock in this census tract (refer to Table 2 for a specific breakdown by type).

The population density is lowest in this census tract among those considered as part of Lower NDG, at 3349 persons per square km. This census tract contains numerous green spaces including the Jardin communautaire Saint-Raymond, the Parc de la Falaise Saint-Jacques and the Parc Georges Saint-Pierre. The area also has a significant immigrant population, with 43.6% of the population claiming immigrant status in 2006. In terms of mother tongue, 44.7% of residents spoke non-official languages, 38.8% spoke English and 16.4% spoke French.
CT 95

The borders of this census tract are from Claremont west to the Décarie expressway, and rue Sherbrooke south to boulevard De Maisonneuve (see Figure 2).

The residential environment contains the following housing types: 78.6% in apartment buildings with fewer than five storeys; 9.8% in apartment buildings with 5 storeys or more; 8.5% in duplexes; and 3.1% semi-detached houses. The age of the housing stock contained in the area is: 55.4% was built before 1946; 20.5% was built between 1946 and 1960; 20.1% between 1961 and 1980; 2.7% between 1981 and 1990; and 0% between 1991 and 2006. Of the occupied dwellings in the area 14.7% required major repairs in 2006 and 85.7% of occupied dwellings were rented. There is no social or community housing located in this census tract.

The population density in the area is 9465 persons per square kilometre. There are no parks or green spaces within the census tract. In 2006, 29.8% of residents claimed immigrant status. In terms of mother tongue, 50.3% of residents spoke English as a first language, 27.8% spoke non-official languages and 22.3% spoke French.

CT 96

The borders of this census tract are from the Décarie expressway west to avenue Melrose, and from rue Sherbrooke south to boulevard De Maisonneuve (see Figure 2).

Census tract 96 contains the following housing types: 33.3% apartment buildings with fewer than five storeys; 58% duplexes; and 6.8% apartment buildings that have 5 or more storeys. In terms of the age of the housing stock: 69.4% of dwellings were built before 1946; 19.4% between 1946 and 1960; 10.7% between 1961 and 1980; and 0% between 1981 and 2006. Of the housing in the area 17.4% of occupied dwellings required major repairs in 2006. This census tract contains a much lower proportion of rented dwellings (66.2%) than elsewhere in Lower NDG. There is no social or community housing in this census tract.

However, in terms of population density, this is a more densely populated census tract (compared to 94.01 and 95), with 11 289 persons per square kilometre. In terms of greens spaces, the northern border of the census tract (rue Sherbrooke) is adjacent to Parc Notre-Dame-de-Grace. This census tract contains the lowest proportion of residents claiming immigrant status (21.9%) among
the census tracts considered here as Lower NDG. With regards to mother tongue, 41.9% spoke
English as a first language, 34.8% spoke French and 23.2% spoke non-official languages.

**CT 97.01**
The borders of this census tract are avenue Melrose to boulevard Cavendish in the west, and from rue
Sherbrooke to boulevard De Maisonneuve in the south (see Figure 2).

Census tract 97.01 contains the following housing types: 39.1% of dwellings are in apartment
buildings with five or more storeys; 37.1% are in apartment buildings with fewer than five storeys;
20.9% in duplexes; and 2.3% are row houses. As to the age of the housing stock, 26.5% of dwellings
were built before 1946, 23.7% between 1946 and 1960, 38.1% between 1961 and 1980, 5.3% be-
tween 1981 and 1990, 3% between 1991 and 2000 and 3.3% between 2001 and 2006. As of 2006,
12.9% of occupied dwellings required major repairs and this census tract has the highest proportion
of rented dwellings (84.5%) in Lower NDG. Of the housing stock in this neighbourhood, 8.7 % is
social and community housing (see Table 2).

CT 97.01 is also the most densely populated in Lower NDG with 17 957 persons per square
kilometre. This is due in part to the fact that buildings with more than five storeys are the predom-
inant housing form within this census tract. There are no green spaces within the area. This census
tract is also home to the highest proportion of residents claiming immigrant status (43.9%) in 2006,
among the CTs considered part of Lower NDG. In terms of mother tongue, 47.8% spoke non-
official languages, 34.7% spoke English and 17.4% spoke French.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFERENCE AREA (RA)</th>
<th>CT (REC. 2006)</th>
<th>LOW-RENT HOUSING (HLM)</th>
<th>NON-PROFIT (OBNL)</th>
<th>COOPERATIVES</th>
<th>PUBLIC NON-LOW-RENT (AFFORDABLE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0094.01</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0097.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RA 44 -Upper-Lachine</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0079.00</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0081.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0082.00</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0083.00</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0084.00</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total RA 50 –Saint-Henri</td>
<td></td>
<td>664</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Number of social and community housing units by tenure type and census tract**
Source and compilation: Ville de Montréal, Service de la mise en valeur du territoire et du patrimoine, Direction de l’habitation, November 2009.
Figure 1: Base map of Saint-Henri with census tract boundaries
Map by Sarah Hrdlicka
Figure 2: Base Map of Lower NDG with Census Tract Boundaries

Map by Sarah Hrdlicka
Indicators of gentrification in the neighbourhoods to 2001: what does existing research tell us?

Having briefly introduced the concept of gentrification and the case study neighbourhoods, the following section explores existing research on gentrification in these areas. There are four major studies that address the case study neighbourhoods of Saint-Henri and Lower NDG: RESO, 2002; RESO, 2007; Ley, 1996; and Walks and Maaranen, 2008.

The recent work of the RESO Comité Habitation Sud-Ouest (2002; 2007) documents that in the Southwest Borough in Montréal, of which the Saint-Henri neighbourhood is a part, there were sharp increases in housing prices between 2001 and 2005: single-family homes in the South-West increased by 87%; triplex prices increased by 108%; condo prices increased by 89% (RESO, 2007: 1). Similarly, there has been an increase in rents in the South-West, for example between 2001 and 2006 the price of both 2 and 3 bedroom apartments increased by about 30% (RESO, 2007: 1). In terms of housing affordability, measured by the proportion of household income spent on housing, in 2001, one in two households (10 795 households) in the South-West spent more than 25% of their income on housing; 8105 households (36.5%) spent more than 30% of their income on housing; and finally, 4190 households (18.4%) paid more than 50% of their income on housing (RESO, 2007: 2).

David Ley (1996) relies on a different methodology than the work of RESO mentioned above. Ley’s analysis compared gentrification of six Canadian inner cities, including Montréal, from 1971 through 1991 using special tabulations of census data. He pioneered the development of indicators of gentrification based on Canadian census data. In his analysis, an inner-city area is defined using the same criteria used by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) and includes the combination of housing age and proximity to the central business district (CBD) (Ley, 1996: 83); housing age is a useful proxy because housing built before 1946 defines – in many cities – the outer edges of the inner city. This classification presents difficulties for our purposes, however, since substantial portions of Lower NDG were built after 1946 (especially in census tract 94.01 and 97.01 – see Figure 2), and they are therefore excluded from his analysis.

Ley was primarily concerned with the social-class dimensions of neighbourhood transition, arguing that “For charting the entry of the middle-class into the inner city, the accumulated wisdom in the literature is that measures of occupation (professional-managerial status) and education (at the
university level) are the most sensitive indicators” (Ley, 1996: 88). Thus, Ley created a social status index from 2 variables: the percentage of the population employed in the quaternary occupations (professional, managerial, technical and administrative jobs) and the percentage of the population with university education. These percentage values were added and then divided by two to give a simple social status index for each census tract (Ley, 1996: 88). In terms of changes in social status, Ley mapped changes in social status in quintiles, with census tracts in the top quintile showing evidence of gentrification (Ley, 1996: 89). His findings in the case study areas will be briefly discussed below.

In Saint-Henri, for the 1971-81 period, census tract (CT) 84 (see Figure 1) was the only census tract in Saint-Henri that appeared in the top quintile, and thus exhibited evidence of gentrification. CT 82 and 83 were classified as in the second highest quintile of social status change, while CT 79, 80 and 81 were in the fifth quintile. Thus, according to his analysis, for this period the only census tract that could be characterized as definitively gentrifying during the 1971-1981 period was CT 84 (Ley, 1996: 90). Ley notes that while municipal policy encouraged gentrification through Operation 10 000 logements\(^5\) during this period, there is a conspicuous lack of social status change in the industrial districts of the Southwest, of which the Saint-Henri neighbourhood is a part.

For the 1981-86 period, CT 80 is the only census tract within Saint-Henri that appears in the highest quintile, thus exhibiting evidence of gentrification\(^6\). CTs 79, 81 and 83 are in the third quintile, while CTs 82 and 84 are in the fourth quintile (Ley, 1996: 98). Ley remarks that aside from the settlement of the Plateau Mont-Royal (which had two dozen census tracts in the highest quintile during this period), a remarkable transition took place into the declining industrial districts of the Southwest.

The third and final time period considered for analysis by Ley was that of 1986-1991. This period saw the further expansion of middle-class settlement into the neighbourhoods of the southwest of Montréal. In Saint-Henri during this period, CTs 80, 81, 84 are in the highest quintile, thus exhibiting evidence of gentrification in terms of changing social status. CTs 82 and 83 are in the

---

\(^5\) Operation 10 000 logements was later extended to become Operation 20 000 logements in 1982. The goal of the program was to create 20 000 new dwellings by the City selling off its vacant land-holdings to developers on advantageous terms (Germain & Rose, 2000: 166).

\(^6\) Anecdotal evidence suggests that this is probably due to the nature of the housing stock in this census track which differs from elsewhere in the neighbourhood. For instance, this area is comprised primarily of triplexes (as opposed to duplexes elsewhere) and quality (much of it is constructed in greystone).
second highest quintile, and CT 79 in the third highest quintile. During this period, redevelopment also moved south across the Lachine Canal. Ley (1996: 101) states:

This is in many respects the most remarkable development of all, for old industrial neighbourhoods like Saint-Henri and Pointe-Sainte-Charles have never been anything but working-class quarters, set in a matrix of heavy industry. Indeed, as the city below the hill, for a century they have been amongst Canada’s most disadvantaged slums. As such, their gentrification would provide the Canadian counterpart to the imputed gentrification of Harlem.

As such, it is during this final period in Ley’s analysis (1986-1991) that we see the consolidation of gentrification in certain census tracts within Saint-Henri.

As mentioned above, the classification Ley used of the inner city excludes two of the census tracts included in Lower NDG (94.01 and 97.01). However, his analysis explores the changing social status of CT 95 and 96, so we will briefly review the dynamics he observed. In the 1971-1981 period, both CT 95 and 96 were in the highest quintile, thus exhibiting evidence of gentrification in terms of changing social status. During the 1981-86 period, CT 95 and 96 were in the second highest quintile. In the 1986-91 period, CT 95 and 96 were in the third and fourth quintile, and had by now stabilized after gentrifying considerably during the earlier period (Ley, 1996: 91-100).

Walks and Maaranen (2008) present an assessment of neighbourhood gentrification and upgrading in Toronto, Montréal and Vancouver, divided into stages over the 1961-2001 period using indicators from the Canadian census. To detect the presence of gentrification and upgrading, 6 indicators were used (Walks and Maaranen, 2008: 10):

- Changes in neighbourhood income were measured by analyzing average personal income as a ratio to average personal income in the CMA where the census tract is located;
- Changes in social class/social status;
- Changes in the Location Quotient (LQ) of artists (artistic, recreational and literary occupations) in order to analyze artists role as potential pioneers of gentrification;
- Changes in housing tenure, analyzed through the conversion from rental to owner-occupation;
- Average monthly rents; and
- Average dwelling values.

Walks and Maraanen created an index representing the composite of the Location Quotient (LQ) for those 20 years and older with a university degree and the LQ of the population working in professional and managerial occupations (including health, education, engineering and applied science, law, religion and social work). This index is similar to Ley’s (1986, 1996) social status index with the important exception that artists are not included in this index, but are analyzed separately.
The map (Figure 3) shows their results, depicting the onset (or not) of gentrification by census tract for the Montréal Urban Community (MUC) from 1961-2001. They characterize CT 79 and 83 in Saint-Henri, which border the Lachine Canal, as in a stage of ‘incomplete gentrification – with the potential of gentrification in the future’. CT 80, 81 and 82 are in a stage of ‘incomplete gentrification’, with the onset of gentrification in these census tracts beginning in the 1981-1991 period, consistent with Ley’s (1996) analysis cited above. Last, CT 84 was characterized as ‘not gentrification and other trends’ (Walks and Maaranen, 2008).

In Lower NDG, CT 94.01 (Saint-Raymond) was identified as ‘not gentrification and other trends.’ Both CT 95 and CT 96 were in a stage of ‘incomplete gentrification’ that began in the

---

8 “Complete gentrification” refers to forms of gentrification whereby (in which neighbourhoods that began the period with below metropolitan average incomes attain average incomes above the metropolitan average by the end of the period). “Incomplete” forms of gentrification refer to instances in which the average income of the neighbourhood remains below the metropolitan average (Walks & Maaranen 2008, 9). “Recapture” and “potential future recapture” refer to instances of neighbourhood upgrading in which a census tract regains its prior above-average income status after spending a minimum of two consecutive decades below the metropolitan average (Walks and Maaranen, 2008: 27).
1971-1981 period. Last, CT 97.01 was characterized as exhibiting ‘potential for future recapture.’
Recapture and potential future recapture refer to instances of neighbourhood upgrading in which a census tract regains its prior above-average income status after spending a minimum of two consecutive decades below the metropolitan average (Walks and Maaranen, 2008: 27).

Walks and Maaranen (2008: 30) further explain:

“Neighbourhoods experiencing incomplete gentrification tend to be contiguous to previous waves, often clustering together and forming a “gentrification frontier” which makes further investments in previous waves safer and helps to solidify their status. The concept of a gentrification frontier belongs to Smith (1996), and denotes the line beyond which gentrification is encroaching through the effects of land speculators, real estate agents, developers and investors.”

The gentrification frontier in Montréal includes the area southwest of downtown and Westmount: the NDG district, the eastern portion of Verdun, the industrial areas to the west of the port area and along the eastern portion of the Lachine Canal (Walks and Maaranen, 2008: 32).

In terms of the forms and pathways to gentrification until 2001, for Saint-Henri, CT 79, 83 and 84 are characterized as ‘not gentrification’. CT 80, 81 and 82 however, are characterized as ‘standard gentrification’ (i.e. transformation of the older building stock). In Lower NDG, CT 94.01 and 97.01 are characterized as ‘not gentrification.’ Census tract 95 and 96 are identified as ‘standard gentrification,’ as defined above (Walks and Maaranen, 2008: 50).

Further analysis of the Walks and Maaranen data set
With regards to the aforementioned indicators of gentrification (changes in neighbourhood income, changes in social status, changes in proportion of renters), Walks and Maaranen kindly provided us with the data sets at the CT level, so I have been able to create graphs which provide a longitudinal view of these indicators for each of the neighbourhoods at the CT level.

Changes in neighbourhood incomes were tracked for the period from 1961 to 2001 by analyzing average personal income from all sources of persons 15 and over as a ratio of the average personal
income of the Montréal CMA. However, due to the information available from the 1961 census the variable chosen was the average wage ratio, while for the later periods it was an average income ratio.\footnote{The average personal income ratio compares the average income from all sources of those aged 15 and over in each census tract to that in the Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) where it is found. Note, however, that only average employment income (ratio) is available in 1961.}

![Average Income Ratio - Saint-Henri 1961-2001](image)

**Figure 4: Average Income Ratio, Saint-Henri 1961-2001**
(Source: author’s calculations from unpublished data supplied by Walks and Maaanen)

In Saint-Henri, throughout the 1961-2001 period, all the census tracts in the neighbourhood have average income ratios of less than 1.0, indicating incomes for the neighbourhood below those of the CMA as a whole. Overall, every CT experienced steady declines in average income ratios from 1961-1981, as one would expect with the steady deindustrialization taking place over this period. However, after this period, the trajectories differ among CTs within the neighbourhood (see Figure 4 above). In CTs 79 and 83, average income ratios continued to decline between 1981 and 1991. This is likely due to the fact that at this point in time deindustrialization continued along the Lachine Canal (which borders CTs 79 & 83), leaving residents in these areas with fewer work opportunities. During the same time period, in CTs 80, 81, 82 and 84, average income ratios began to rise. In CTs 80 and 81, this increase in average income ratios was accompanied by stark increases in social status (see Figure 6) during the same period, suggesting that gentrification was well underway in these CTs during the 1981-1991 period. Between 1991 and 2001, in contrast, CTs 79, 80 and 83 were characterized by increasing average income ratios. This could be due to the continuation of ‘standard’ gentrification in CT 80, and the onset on new-build gentrification in CT 79 and 83, as during the
1991-2000 time period, both CT 79 and CT 83 experienced new construction with an increase in housing units in each census tract of approximately 5%.

However, in CTs 81, 82 and 84, average income ratios decreased in the 1991-2001 period. This is perhaps due to the fact that these areas were less affected by the onset of gentrification than elsewhere in the neighbourhood. Take note for instance of the less marked increases in social status for the 1991-2001 period in these CTs compared to CTs 79, 80 and 83 during the same period (see Figure 6).
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**Figure 5: Average Income Ratio, Lower NDG, 1961-2001**
(Source: author’s calculations from unpublished data supplied by Walks and Maaranen)

In Lower NDG, there is considerable variation among census tracts in the average income ratios over the 1961-2001 period. Census tracts 94.01 and 97.01 have experienced a constant decrease in their average income ratios. Both CTs 95 and 96, however, experienced decreasing average income ratios in the 1961-1981 period, and increases in 1981-1991 and 1991-2001.

The following discussion will address change in social status in the case study neighbourhoods over the 1961-2001 period. As previously mentioned, a key difference between Walks and Maaranen’s social status index and that of Ley’s (1996) work is that the former do not include artists in their index.
In Saint-Henri, there is considerable variation between census tracts. CT 80 exhibits a vastly higher social status compared to the other CTs in the neighbourhood from the 1991 census onward. CT 81 has experienced an increase in social status from the 1991 census onward, though less drastic than in the case of CT 80. CTs 79 and 83 have shown marked increases in social status between 1991-2001. It is possible that this marked increase in social status could be due to the new construction (or adaptive reuse of former industrial buildings to condominiums), as these are the CTs that border the Lachine Canal (designated a recreational corridor in 1997). The increases in social status in CT 82 and CT 84, while still present, have been considerably more modest than in the other census tracts in the neighbourhood.

In Lower NDG, there is significant variation in social status between census tracts. For example, CT 94.01 (Saint-Raymond) has a much lower social status than the other 3 census tracts considered for analysis as part of Lower NDG. Nonetheless, CT 94.01 does reveal a pattern of gradually increasing social status from 1961-1991, before a slight decline in the 2001 census. In general, CTs 95, 96 and 97.01 all experienced a marked increase in social status in the 1981 census, although the increase in social status was most marked in the case of CT 96.
More recently (1991-2001), CTs 94.01, 95 and 97.01 have experienced slight decreases in social status. CT 96, however, shows an increase in social status between 1991 and 2001.

![Social Status - Lower NDG - 1961-2001](chart)

**Figure 7: Social Status, Lower NDG, 1961-2001**
(Source: author’s calculations from unpublished data supplied by Walks and Maaranen)

We now turn to housing tenure\(^\text{10}\). In Saint-Henri, there is variation among census tracts in terms of the proportion of rented dwellings over the 1961-2001 period (see Figure 8).

---

\(^{10}\) A dwelling is classified as “owned” even if it is not fully paid for, such as one which has a mortgage or some other claim on it. The dwelling may be situated on rented or leased land or be part of a condominium (whether registered or unregistered). A dwelling is classified as “rented” even if it is provided without cash rent or at a reduced rent or if the dwelling is part of a cooperative. For census purposes, in a cooperative all members jointly own the cooperative and occupy their dwelling units under a lease agreement (Canadian Census Dictionary, 1996).
In Lower NDG (see Figure 9), CTs 94.01, 95 and 97.01 have had a relatively constant proportion of rented dwellings in the 1961-2001 period. CT 96 has shown a steady decline in the proportion of rented dwellings over the entire 1961-2001 period, from approximately 80% of dwellings in 1961 to just under 70% rented dwellings in 2001.
In sum, in the period covered by Walks and Maaranen’s analysis (up until 2001), both Saint-Henri and Lower NDG were experiencing ‘incomplete gentrification.’ However, there was considerable variation among census tracts. In some census tracts, ‘incomplete gentrification’ was well underway, while in others ‘incomplete gentrification – with the potential for gentrification in the future’ was a more apt characterization, as in the areas that border the Lachine Canal in Saint-Henri (CT 79 and CT 83). Additionally, CT 84, which borders the Turcot Interchange was characterized as 'not gentrification – other trends.’ In the case of Lower NDG, certain CTs exhibited ‘potential for recapture’ (CT 97.01) and Saint-Raymond (CT 94.01) was characterized as ‘not gentrification – other trends.’

The additional analysis of Walks and Maaranen’s data set reveals the following trends: the average income ratio in Saint-Henri was below that of the CMA in all periods considered for analysis, but CTs 79, 80 and 83 experienced increases in the 1991-2001 period. In Lower NDG, there was considerable variation among census tracts, but both CT 94.01 and 97.01 experienced constantly decreasing average income ratios in the 1961-2001 period.

With regards to changing social status in Saint-Henri, all census tracts have experienced increasing social status over the 1961-2001 period. In the 1991-2001 period, this was most marked in the cases of CTs 79, 80 and 83. In Lower NDG, there was significant variation among census tracts over the 1961-2001 period. In the 1991-2001 period, CTs 94.01, 95 and 97.01 all experienced slight decreases in social status.

Last, in terms of changes in housing tenure, in Saint-Henri all census tracts had between 80-90% rental tenure between 1961-2001. This is a far higher proportion of rental tenure than in the Montréal CMA, for all census years considered. The Montréal CMA has experienced a constantly declining proportion of rented dwellings over the 1961-2001 period, from 67.4% in 1961, to 49.8% in 2001 – see Table 3. In the most recent period (1991-2001), CTs 79 and 80 experienced a decrease in the proportion of rented dwellings, while CTs 81, 82, 83 and 84 all experienced slight increases.

MONTRÉAL CMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% rented 1961</th>
<th>67.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% rented 1971</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% rented 1981</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% rented 1991</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% rented 2001</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Proportion of rented dwellings, 1961-2001, Montréal CMA

In Lower NDG, all census tracts except CT 96 have experienced a relatively constant proportion of rented dwellings over the forty-year period. Like in the case of Saint-Henri cited above, the proportion of rental tenure in Lower NDG is considerably higher than in the CMA, over the entire 1961-2001 period. Having reviewed the existing literature on gentrification in the case study neighbourhoods, we will now turn to the methodology for our investigation of gentrification in the case study neighbourhoods from 1996 to 2006.
Methodology

Our analysis of gentrification is made using published Canadian census data (Statistics Canada 1996 & 2006) available through the Data Liberation Initiative. This analysis uses only census-based data and thus provides a complementary analysis to the recent work of RESO (2002; 2007), which documented changes in housing prices in the Southwest Borough.

The following indicators have been selected and used in order to assess the degree of gentrification underway in the case study neighbourhoods. All the indicators selected rely upon census data freely available to university researchers:

- Population trends – for example changes in population over time, in our case from 1991-2006. The population of gentrifying neighbourhoods often decreases because smaller, non-family households take over the existing housing stock. However, with the onset of new-build gentrification (which adds additional units at the neighbourhood level) an increase in population accompanied by an increase in the number of housing units may be observed. Thus, population trends are not a good stand-alone indicator of gentrification and must be supplemented with other indicators whether from the census (as done here) or through neighbourhood housing assessment.

- Changes in the age structure of residents – gentrifying neighbourhoods typically experience an increase in the proportion of residents in the 25-44 age group, as this group often drives gentrification.

- Housing tenure composition (% tenants and % owner-occupiers) as well as tenure composition in absolute numbers. This is an important indicator of gentrification, as in a neighbourhood experiencing traditional gentrification there will tend to be a decrease in both the % tenants (as rental units are converted to owner-occupation) and the absolute number of rental units. In a neighbourhood experiencing new-build gentrification, there will tend to be a decrease in the % of renters, although there may be an increase in rented units in terms of absolute numbers.

- Housing affordability, based on average dwelling values and average gross rents – in a gentrifying neighbourhood, one would expect to find a rapid increase in the average value of dwellings as well as in average gross rent.

- Housing affordability, based on proportion of household income spent on shelter – polarization between a “gentrifier” population and renters can also be captured, to some extent, by means of the variable “those spending 30% of more of their income on housing”.

- A rapid increase in the proportion of renters paying more than 30% of their income on gross rent is an indicator of housing difficulty for low-income renters. A marked decrease in the proportion of renters paying 30% or more of their income on gross rent can suggest that (a) low-income renters, as a group, are doing much better financially; or (b) low-income renters have already been displaced by gentrification processes, and for the more affluent
residents that have replaced them, their monthly rent represents a smaller proportion of their income; or (c) low-income renters have since moved into cooperative housing within the neighbourhood, which have subsidized rents.

- Changes in the number of owner-occupiers spending more than 30% of this household income on shelter costs is also a useful indicator. A marked increase in the proportion of owner-occupiers paying more than 30% of household income on shelter costs can indicate that gentrification is underway. It is not unusual for first time property owners, including those comprised of middle-class households, to pay more than 30% of income on shelter costs. However, over time, as their incomes increase and their housing costs remain relatively stable, the proportion of income spent on shelter decreases.

- Percentage change in mean and median household (inflation-adjusted) incomes – this is an interesting indicator (Ley 1996; RESO 2002) because household incomes are related to what a household can pay for housing costs. However, a methodological limitation when working with published data is that it is not possible to aggregate geographical areas (i.e., census tracts) in order to get the median for a larger area (i.e., a neighbourhood).

- % change in real (inflation-adjusted) average personal income – this is a pertinent indicator (Rose 1996) because it helps to gauge individuals’ actual purchasing power.

- Changes in the income distribution among households – provides an indication of the degree of polarization among different households. However, a serious methodological limitation is that we are not able to adjust this variable for inflation when using published census data. Nonetheless, local residents and housing providers find such indicators of interest in assessing change.

- Changes in the occupational structure of the population – the prevalence of university-educated residents and in workers employed in “advanced services” employment (most of whom are in managerial, professional or specialized technical positions (Ley 1988, 1992, 1996; Ponce-Alvarez 2003), or more specifically, the changing share of professionals in the workforce (Rose 1996) highlights the changing occupational structure (towards tertiary employment) that is one of the driving forces behind gentrification processes. Historically, in the academic literature on gentrification, there have been two main types of explanations for the causes of gentrification, highlighting either the supply of gentrifiable housing (supply-side arguments focused on structural causes) or the demand for inner city housing by middle and upper-income groups (demand-side arguments focused on individual agency). More recently however, gentrification scholars have attempted to forge supply and demand-side explanations for gentrification. Hamnett (2000) argues that the shift from manufacturing based society to post-industrial society has resulted in changes in class-structure such as the growth of an expanded middle-class and their social relations, cultural tastes, and consumption practices. According to such a perspective, changes in demand are central to explaining gentrification, as while gentrification does indeed involve changes in the structure of the land and property markets, it is better understood as a product of the shift from industrial to post-industrial society.
Descriptive analysis of change in selected indicators for study area in a comparative context

Population trends 1996-2006

Population 1991-2006 for Montréal CMA and the Island of Montréal compared to selected neighbourhoods

The following table provides a general overview of the population change that has taken place between 1991 and 2006 in the Montréal Census Metropolitan area, compared to the Island of Montréal, and the case study neighbourhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Montréal CMA</th>
<th>Island of Montréal</th>
<th>Saint-Henri</th>
<th>Lower NDG</th>
<th>Plateau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3,208,970</td>
<td>1,775,871</td>
<td>14,401</td>
<td>15,468</td>
<td>100,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,326,510</td>
<td>1,775,846</td>
<td>13,988</td>
<td>15,296</td>
<td>99,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,451,027</td>
<td>1,812,723</td>
<td>13,563</td>
<td>15,822</td>
<td>101,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,635,571</td>
<td>1,854,442</td>
<td>14,802</td>
<td>16,569</td>
<td>101,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Population 1991-2006

Population Percentage Change 1996-2006 for the Montréal CMA and the Island of Montréal compared to selected neighbourhoods

Table 5 provides an overview of percentage change in population from 1996-2006. Population growth rates for Saint-Henri and Lower NDG are higher than for the Island of Montréal but lower than for the Montréal CMA as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Montréal CMA</th>
<th>Island of Montréal</th>
<th>Saint-Henri</th>
<th>Lower NDG</th>
<th>Plateau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-2006</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Population Percentage Change 1996-2006

Saint-Henri has experienced a population decrease every census year from 1991-2001, before experiencing population increase of approximately 1200 additional residents between 2001 and 2006. This increase is likely due to significant new construction (and adaptive re-use of former industrial buildings) in the neighbourhood, most of which, with some exceptions, has been condominiums.
Lower NDG, however, shows a different trajectory. The area experienced a decrease in population between 1991-1996, however, since 1996 it has increased steadily every census. Between 2001 and 2006, the population of the area increased by approximately 800 residents. Similar to Saint-Henri, there has been some new construction in the area.
Population and Housing, 1996-2006

Both the case study neighbourhoods have experienced an increase in population from 1996-2006. An increase in population, when accompanied by an increase in the number of dwellings and a rise in the proportion of owner-occupiers in an area, is an indicator of new-build gentrification. In Saint-Henri, this particular combination is present, suggesting new-build gentrification is underway. In Lower NDG, the increase in the proportion of owner-occupiers has been less significant. It is not clear whether the new construction during this period is condos or not.\textsuperscript{12}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MONTRéAL (CMA)</th>
<th>ISLAND OF MONTRéAL</th>
<th>SAINT-HENRI</th>
<th>LOWER NDG</th>
<th>PLATEAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2006)</td>
<td>3 635 571</td>
<td>1 854 442</td>
<td>14 802</td>
<td>16 569</td>
<td>101 054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop change (1996-2006)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in no. of dwellings</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied (2006)</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied (1996)</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 6: Population and Housing, 1996-2006}

\textsuperscript{12} It was also suggested by Leslie Bagg (NDG Community Council) that while much new construction was initially condominium development, much of this new stock is currently being rented. (Presentation of preliminary findings to CURA Housing Sub-Committee, May 4th, 2009).
Age Structure

*Age structure, 1996-2006, percent for the selected neighbourhoods compared to Montréal (CMA) and the Island of Montréal*

In a gentrifying neighbourhood, we usually see an influx in residents in the 25-44 age group. People in this age group (i.e., younger non-family households) typically drive gentrification. While in both the Montréal CMA and the Island of Montréal there has been a decrease in the proportion of residents in this age group, there has been a relative increase in this group in Saint-Henri and the Plateau (see Figure 12).

In the case of Lower NDG there has been a relative decrease in the proportion of residents in the 25-44 age group. However, in both Saint-Henri and Lower NDG, there has been an increase in the proportion of residents in the 45-64 age group, which may be due to new-build gentrification within the neighbourhoods, (as much of the new housing stock, especially in Saint-Henri, is luxury\(^\text{13}\) condominiums) that may be beyond the capacity to pay of households in the 25-44 age group. This is not surprising, as empty nesters (i.e. couples with grown-up children) are a target market for some of the higher end new construction.

\(^\text{13}\) The City of Montréal defines ‘affordability’ and ‘affordable’ housing as a housing unit in which: ‘rent’ or ‘monthly mortgage’ (including municipal taxes and heating), does not surpass 30% of the gross monthly income of the household that inhabits it (Ville de Montréal, 2007: 9). In the City of Montréal’s ‘Strategy de inclusion des logements abordables dans les nouveaux projets résidentiels,’ the threshold by which a housing unit was deemed affordable was established according to the capacity to pay of households hoping to become 1st time homeowners (120% of the regional median income) and the evolution of the housing market. In 2006, the threshold was established at $170 000 or $200 000 for families with children (Ville de Montréal, 2007: 41). However, one must recognize that there was controversy in terms of the appropriateness of the method used to define ‘affordability.’
In Saint-Henri, 0-14 age group has decreased in numbers, but there have been sizable increases in the number of residents in the 25-44 age group (non-family households in this group typically drive
gentrification) and the 45-64 age group. Further, there has been a decrease in the number of elderly living in the neighbourhood.

*Age structure, absolute numbers, Lower NDG, 1996-2006*

In Lower NDG, there has been a slight increase in both the 0-14 and 15-24 age groups. Further, the increase in the number of residents in both the 25-44 age group and the 45-64 age group is present. There has also been a decrease in the number of elderly residents in the neighbourhood, though less marked then in Saint-Henri.
Housing Tenure\(^{14}\)

*Number of renter households, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Saint-Henri*

![Number of renter households, by census tract, 1996-2006, Saint-Henri](chart.png)

**Figure 15: Number of renter households, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Saint-Henri**

Overall, in Saint-Henri there has been an increase in the number of renter households between 1996-2006, with the addition of approximately 450 renter households during this period. Census tract 83 however, lost 100 renter households during this period.\(^{15}\)

---

\(^{14}\) A dwelling is classified as "owned" even if it is not fully paid for, such as one which has a mortgage or some other claim on it. The dwelling may be situated on rented or leased land or be part of a condominium (whether registered or unregistered). A dwelling is classified as "rented" even if it is provided without cash rent or at a reduced rent or if the dwelling is part of a cooperative. For census purposes, in a cooperative all members jointly own the cooperative and occupy their dwelling units under a lease agreement (Canadian Census Dictionary, 1996).

\(^{15}\) One possible explanation for this is that alongside the 'new-build' gentrification taking place in this census tract, there may have been the continuation of 'standard gentrification,' i.e. the upgrading of old housing stock and the conversion from rental to owner-occupation. This explanation seems plausible, in so far as, this census tract has the Parc Sir-Georges-Etienne-Cartier within its boundaries, and contains some of the higher quality housing stock in the neighbourhood.
Number of renter households, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG

Similar to Saint-Henri, in Lower NDG there has been an increase in the number of renter households between 1996-2006, with the addition of approximately 400 renter households during this period.
However, in Saint-Henri the increase in the number of owner-occupier households has been much more marked than the increase in renter households, with the addition of 500 owner-occupier households in the 1996-2006 period. There have been particularly large increases in CT 79 and CT 83, which border the Lachine Canal.
Number of owner-occupied households, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG

In Lower NDG, there has also been an increase in the number of owner-occupier households with the addition of approximately 200 owner-occupier households. This is less marked than in the case of Saint-Henri.
Housing Tenure, %, 1996 and 2006

In terms of the percentage of owner-occupied households, both Saint-Henri and Lower NDG experienced an increase, although this was much more marked in Saint-Henri with an approximate 5% point increase in owner-occupied households between 1996-2006 compared to a 1.3% point increase in owner-occupied households in Lower NDG. However, both neighbourhoods still have a much lower percentage of owner-occupied households, when compared to the Plateau, the Island of Montréal and the Montréal CMA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MONTRÉAL (CMA)</th>
<th>ISLAND OF MONTRÉAL</th>
<th>SAINT-HENRI</th>
<th>LOWER NDG</th>
<th>PLATEAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Owners (1996)</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renters</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owners (2006)</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renters</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Housing Tenure, percentage, 1996 and 2006
Saint-Henri experienced a relative increase in the percentage of owner-occupied households (5% point increase) between 1996 and 2006. The neighbourhood experienced a relative decrease in the percentage of renter households. However, even though there has been a decrease in the proportion of renter households, in terms of absolute numbers there has been an increase in the number of renter households (see previous section – Figure 15). Again, the census tracts where these changes were most marked were in CT 79 and CT 83, which border the Lachine Canal (and are also the location of a significant amount of new-build and adaptive reuse). Interestingly, CT 82 actually experienced a decrease in the proportion of owner-occupiers from 8.9% in 1996 to 5.9% in 2006.

### Table 8: Percentage population by tenure type, 1996 and 2006, Saint-Henri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>CENSUS TRACT</th>
<th>SAINT-HENRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Owners (1996)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renters</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owners (2006)</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renters</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Housing Tenure, %, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG**

Similarly, Lower NDG experienced an increase in the proportion of owner-occupied households, which was most marked in CT 95 and CT 96. However, Saint Raymond (CT 94.01) experienced a decrease in the proportion of owner-occupiers over this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TENURE</th>
<th>CENSUS TRACT</th>
<th>LOWER NDG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Owners (1996)</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renters</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owners (2006)</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Renters</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9: Percentage population by tenure type, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG**

However, a caveat with regards increasing owner-occupation in both Saint-Henri and Lower NDG is that one cannot make a direct link between increasing proportions of homeowners and gentrification, because one must allow for the possibility of upward social mobility among long-term residents (i.e. they become homeowners).
Housing Affordability

Average Dwelling Values, 1996 and 2006

Following Walks and Maaranen (2008), change in the average value of dwellings is a basic indicator of housing affordability.\(^{16}\) As shown in Figure 19, overall there has been a rapid increase in the average value of dwellings in Montréal at all geographical scales, from the CMA level to the case study neighbourhoods. In both Saint-Henri and Lower NDG this change in the average value of dwellings has been particularly extreme. In Saint-Henri the average dwelling value rose $171,127 in the 1996-2006 period. In Lower NDG, the average dwelling value rose even more, by $199,942 over the same period. These increases in average dwelling values are larger than that observed in the Plateau (an average increase of $162,224).

\(^{16}\) Refers to the dollar amount expected by the owner if the dwelling were to be sold. “Value of dwelling” refers to the value of the entire dwelling, including the value of the land it is on and of any other structure such as a garage which is on the property (1996 Census Dictionary).
Table 10: Percentage change in average value of dwellings, 1996 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MONTRÉAL (CMA)</th>
<th>MONTRÉAL ISLAND</th>
<th>SAINT HENRI</th>
<th>LOWER NDG</th>
<th>PLATEAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% change in average dwelling values 1996-2006</td>
<td>85.39%</td>
<td>92.29%</td>
<td>177.47%</td>
<td>142.85%</td>
<td>127.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Gross Rents, 1996 and 2006

Figure 20: Average Gross rents, 1996 & 2006

A second measure of housing affordability is average gross rent. Throughout the Montréal CMA, the Island of Montréal and the case study neighbourhoods, there has been a marked increase in the average gross rents. This increase was most extreme in the case of the Plateau, which experienced a $178 increase in average rents over the 1996-2006 period. Saint-Henri experienced a $137 increase and Lower NDG a $103 increase in average gross rents over the same time period. We might ex-

---

17 Refers to the total average monthly payments paid by tenant households to secure shelter. Gross rent includes payments for electricity, oil, gas, coal, wood or other fuels, water and other municipal services and monthly cash rent (1996 Census Dictionary).

18 When 1996 average gross rents were adjusted for inflation to 2006 levels: Saint-Henri (1996) average gross rents inflation adjusted = $562; Plateau (1996) average gross rents inflation adjusted = $645; and Lower NDG = $644. So in the case of Saint-Henri and Plateau, the increase in average gross rents was greater than inflation over ten years. But in the case of Lower NDG, the increase in gross rents was less than inflation. However, the real impact of these changes in average gross rents would have to take into account whether the wages of actual individuals have kept pace with inflation over the same time period.
pect that the case of the Plateau would be the most extreme among our case study neighbourhoods, as it is notorious for being Montréal’s most gentrified neighbourhood. Indeed the increase in average gross rent observed there is greater than in the CMA and the Island as a whole, as well as the other case study neighbourhoods. Nonetheless, the increase in average gross rents observed in Saint-Henri is also quite remarkable considering it was well below the CMA and Island average gross rent in 1996 and is now relatively closer to both the CMA and Island average gross rent in 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MONTRÉAL (CMA)</th>
<th>MONTRÉAL ISLAND</th>
<th>SAINT-HENRI</th>
<th>LOWER NDG</th>
<th>PLATEAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% change in average gross rent 1996 &amp; 2006</td>
<td>21.22%</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
<td>19.46%</td>
<td>33.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Percentage change in average gross rents, 1996 and 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENSUS TRACT</th>
<th>SAINT-HENRI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average gross rent $  (1996)</td>
<td>$447</td>
<td>$631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average gross rent $  (2006)</td>
<td>$574</td>
<td>$769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change 1996-2006</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12: Average gross rents, 1996 and 2006, by census tract, Saint-Henri**

The census tract in Saint-Henri with the greatest increase in average gross rents in between 1996-2006 is CT 82 (Villages des Tanneries), with a 29.3% increase. CT 81 also experienced a very marked increase in average gross rents (29%). The increase in average gross rents was less marked in the case of CT 80, but average gross rents were already more than $100 more expensive than elsewhere in Saint-Henri. CT 79 (which had the lowest average gross rents in 1996) also experienced a sizable increase (28.4%) between 1996 and 2006, as did CT 83 (27.3%). Last, CT 84 (the western tip of the neighbourhood) experienced the least significant percentage change in average gross rents and remains the CT in the neighbourhood with the lowest average gross rent in 2006.
Table 13: Average Gross Rents, 1996 and 2006, by Census Tract, Lower NDG

In Lower NDG, CT 97.01 experienced the most marked increase in average gross rents, with a 23.2% increase between 1996 and 2006. Both CTs 95 & 96 experienced increases of over 20%. In the case of CT 96 however, average gross rents were approximately $75 more expensive than in CT 95 and considerably more expensive than in the other CTs considered part of Lower NDG. In CT 94.01 (Saint-Raymond), the percentage change in average gross rents between 1996 and 2006 was the least marked (13.9%), as well as having the lowest average gross rents in Lower NDG.
Another indicator of housing affordability is the proportion of renters spending 30% or more of their income on rent. All the case study neighbourhoods, as well as the Island of Montréal and the Montréal CMA, show a decrease in the proportion of renter households spending 30% or more of their income on gross rent. In Saint-Henri, the decrease is particularly marked, with an approximately 15% drop in the proportion of renter households spending 30% or more of their income on gross rent.
In Saint-Henri, at the census tract level, all census tracts in the neighbourhood showed decreases in the proportion of households spending 30% or more of their income on gross rent. In many census tracts this was quite extreme, for example, for CT 80 there was a decrease of almost 20% in the proportion of renter households spending 30% or more of their income on gross rent (from 44.9% in 1996 to 27.1% in 2006). Likewise, CT 83 (which borders the Lachine Canal) showed a marked decrease, from 48.7% in 1996 to 29.8% in 2006. However, in CT 79 (which also borders the Canal) and particularly CT 84 (at the Western edge of the neighbourhood), the decrease in the proportion of renter households spending 30% or more of their income on rent was much less marked. In CT 84, the decrease was negligible in comparison, from 46.2% in 1996 to 43.7% in 2006. Nonetheless, in a gentrifying neighbourhood, one might expect to find a decreasing proportion of renters spending more than 30% of their income on gross rent, because as rental units change hands and more affluent renters move into the neighbourhood, the rent is likely to represent a smaller proportion of their income when compared to the lower-income households they have replaced. Alternatively, the
decrease in the proportion of households spending more than 30% of their income on gross rent could also be the result of the fact that many long-term renter households have since moved into coop or OBSL housing with subsidized rents. These differing explanations highlight the difficulties inherent in interpreting this variable.

Percentage of renter households spending 30% or more of income on gross rent, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG

Figure 23: Percentage of renter households spending 30% or more of income on gross rent, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG

In Lower NDG, there was not a uniform decrease in the proportion of renter households spending 30% or more of their income on gross rent. In CT 94.01 and CT 97.01, there has been a decrease, though less marked than in the case of Saint-Henri. This may suggest that in these census tracts, much of the low-income population has been pushed out of the neighbourhood and for the more affluent households that have replaced them, the rent represents a smaller proportion of their overall income, than was the case with the low-income residents that lived there beforehand. Alternatively, it could suggest that households are earning more than before, so the rent represents a smaller proportion of their income, or, that household composition has changed. However, in both CT 95 and CT 96 there has been an increase in the proportion of renter households spending 30% or more of
their income on gross rent. This is particularly marked in the case of CT 96, where the proportion increased from 35.7% in 1996 to 46.3% in 2006. Recall that CT 96 also had the highest average gross rents in Lower NDG in 2006. This might suggest that the remaining low-income renters in this census tract are under significant pressure caused by gentrification. This variable presents difficulties in terms of making conclusive interpretations, however.

*Percentage of homeowner households spending 30% or more of income on housing costs (1996 and 2006)*

![Housing Affordability - Owner households paying 30% or more of income on shelter costs](image)

**Figure 24: Percentage of homeowner households spending 30% or more of income on housing costs, 1996 and 2006**

The proportion of owner-occupied households spending 30% or more of their income on housing costs decreased from 1996 to 2006 in the Montréal CMA, the Island of Montréal, Lower NDG and the Plateau. In Saint-Henri, however, there was a marked increase in the number of owner-occupied households spending 30% or more of their income on housing costs, rising from 26.3% in 1996 to 31.9% in 2006.
In Saint-Henri, at the census tract level, there is considerable difference among census tracts in the percentage of owners spending 30% or more on shelter. In CT 80, 81 and 84, there has been a dramatic increase in the proportion of owner-occupiers spending 30% or more of household income on housing costs, while in CT 83 the increase has been very slight. This is most extreme in the case of CT 81, which experienced an increase from 13.8% in 1996 to 40.6% in 2006. However, in CT 79 and 82 there has been a decrease in the proportion of such households. Possible explanations for the decreasing proportion of owner-occupier households experiencing housing affordability problems in CT 79 and 82 could be a) that for the more affluent condo residents, housing costs represent a smaller portion of their income; or b) residents are ageing in place and so a drop in their income (i.e. with retirement) is combined with having already paid off their mortgage.

That there has been an increase overall in the percentage of owners paying 30% or more of household income on shelter costs in Saint-Henri is not unexpected in so far as at the beginning of their housing careers many middle-class people pay more than 30% of their income on housing.
Over time however, their incomes increase but their housing costs remain stable. Another possible interpretation is that modest income residents already living in the neighbourhood have become homeowners, so their housing costs represent a significant proportion of their income. These differing explanations highlight the difficulties inherent in interpreting this variable in a conclusive fashion.

*Percentage of homeowner households spending 30% or more of income on housing costs, by census tract, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG*

In Lower NDG, at the census tract level, CTs 95, 96 and 97.01 all experienced a decrease in the proportion of owner-occupiers paying 30% or more of household income on housing costs. This was most marked in the case of CT 95, which decreased from 42.9% in 1996 to 29.0% in 2006. In CT 94.01 however, there was an increase in the proportion of owner-occupied households paying 30% or more of household income to rent, from 28.7% in 1996 to 34.7% in 2006. Saint-Raymond (94.01) seems to be following a different trajectory that the other census tracts considered part of Lower NDG, as it is the only census tract where we observed an increase in the proportion of owner-occupiers paying 30% or more of income on housing costs. That overall Lower NDG has experi-
enced a decrease in the proportion of homeowners spending 30% or more of their income on major payments could suggest that there has been an influx of wealthier homeowners over this period, and shelter costs represent a lower proportion of their total household income. Alternatively, it could suggest that long-term homeowners have aged in place and over time their incomes have increased, such that shelter costs now consume a smaller portion of their household income.
Income

*Percentage increase in real incomes 1995-2005*

Two income variables have been selected for analysis. Household income\(^19\) influences what a household can pay for housing. However, this variable cannot be used in a conclusive fashion without knowing household size. Total personal income\(^20\) on the other hand, is a better indicator for gauging the actual purchasing power of individuals.

In terms of household income (which is related to what households can pay for housing), Saint-Henri experienced a sizable increase in average household income (25.5% increase between 1996-2006), which is just slightly below the % change in average household income in the Plateau, and much above that for the Island and the CMA as a whole. In Lower NDG however, the increase in average household income (13.8%) was less than the other inner city neighbourhoods, the Island and the CMA as a whole.

With regards to personal income, Saint-Henri experienced a 23.7% increase in average personal income between 1996-2006, which is less than what happened in the Plateau (Montréal’s most famous gentrified neighbourhood), but far larger than the percentage changes that took place on the Montréal Island or the Montréal CMA. However, in terms of actual real incomes, Saint-Henri is still far below the average personal income on the Island of Montréal and the Montréal CMA. Lower NDG experienced a lower percentage change in personal incomes than the other neighbourhoods, the Island or the CMA. However, the average personal income for Lower NDG is still higher than in Saint-Henri (see Table 14).

---

19  Average household income refers to the weighted mean total income of households in 1995 (1996 Census Dictionary).
20  Average income of individuals refers to the weighted mean total income of individuals 15 years of age and over who reported income for 1995. Average income is calculated from unrounded data by dividing the aggregate income of a specified group of individuals (e.g., males 45 to 54 years of age) by the number of individuals with income in that group (1996 census dictionary).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>MONTRÉAL CMA</th>
<th>MONTRÉAL ISLAND</th>
<th>SAINT-HENRI</th>
<th>LOWER NDG</th>
<th>PLATEAU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average household income $ - 1995 (inflation adjusted to 2005 $)</td>
<td>54 131</td>
<td>49 583</td>
<td>31 338</td>
<td>34 637</td>
<td>38 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household income $ - 2005</td>
<td>63 038</td>
<td>57 738</td>
<td>39 340</td>
<td>39 413</td>
<td>49 295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change, 1996-2006</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average personal income $ 1995 (inflation adjusted to 2005 $)</td>
<td>29 892</td>
<td>28 607</td>
<td>19 509</td>
<td>22 526</td>
<td>25 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average personal income $ 2005</td>
<td>34 196</td>
<td>32 946</td>
<td>24 127</td>
<td>24 898</td>
<td>32 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change, 1996-2006</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 14: Percentage increase in real incomes, 1995-2005**
Average Household Income, 1995 and 2005, by census tract, Saint-Henri

In Saint-Henri, the CTs where the increase in household income was most marked was in the case of CT 79 and CT 83, both of which border the Lachine Canal. In CT 84 however, there has been a slight decrease in household income.
In Lower NDG, the census tracts that experienced the greatest increase in average household income were CT 96 and CT 95. Indeed, in CT 96, average household incomes are much higher (at least $10 000 more) than in other census tracts in the neighbourhood. The average household incomes in this census tract are above the Island average, though still slightly below the average household income of the CMA. In Saint-Raymond (94.01), while there has been an increase in average household incomes between 1995 and 2005, average household income is lowest in this census tract, and it is only slightly above the census tracts with the lowest 2005 average household incomes in Saint-Henri (CTs 82 and 84).
Household Income Distribution, 1995 and 2005, selected neighbourhoods compared to the Island of Montréal

The income distribution comparison between years does not take account of inflation.

Household Incomes (current dollars), Saint-Henri

In terms of household income distribution in Saint-Henri, there has been a drastic decrease in the number of households in the lowest household income range, less than $20,000. This could suggest that many of the lowest income residents have been pushed out of this neighbourhood in between 1995 and 2005 and the households that have replaced them are better off.21 Alternatively, it could suggest that some households formerly in these income ranges could be doing better finally and thus are now in the now in the $20,000 - $49,999 range. There have been increases in the number of households in all the income ranges above this. Again, this is not unexpected, as much of the new housing in the neighbourhood has been luxury condominium development.

21 In the Saint-Henri neighbourhood, in 2006, 17.9% of the population received 'Transferts governmentaux des particuliers.' However, this was a variation of -15.5% in the proportion of the population receiving government transfers between 2001-2006 (see Centre de santé et des services sociaux du Sud-Ouest-Verdun (2009) Annex 1.)
Likewise in Lower NDG, there has been a decrease in the number of households in the lowest income range. There has also been a marked increase in the number of households in the $20,000 - $49,999 income range. Again, this could suggest one the one hand, that the lowest income residents of the neighbourhood have been pushed out and those who have replaced them are in a modestly better financial position. Alternatively, it could suggest that in general the lower income residents of the neighbourhood are in a better financial position in 2005 compared to 1995. There have been increases in the number of households in all the higher income ranges.
Household Incomes in current dollars, distribution by percentage

In terms of the distribution of household income by percentage, in Saint-Henri the most drastic decrease is in the proportion of households in the less than $20,000 range, with a decrease of over 20%. The largest increase was in the $80,000 and more range, with an almost 7% increase in the proportion of households in this range. In Lower NDG, the most dramatic decrease was in the proportion of households in the less than $20,000 range, with a decrease of approximately 15%. There was also a decrease in the proportion of households in the $20,000 – $39,999 range. The largest increase was in the proportion of households in the $80,000 + range, with a 4.8% increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN CURRENT DOLLARS</th>
<th>LESS THAN $20,000</th>
<th>$20,000 TO $39,999</th>
<th>$40,000 TO $59,999</th>
<th>$60,000 TO $79,999</th>
<th>$80,000 AND MORE</th>
<th>N(=100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Henri</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower NDG</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>7,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island of Montréal</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>773,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>831,540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Household Incomes in current dollars, distribution by percentage
Average personal income is a good indicator of individuals’ actual purchasing power. The largest increases in average personal income were again in CT 79 and CT 83. This is not unexpected as there has been significant condominium development in these census tracts, attracting residents with higher incomes. There has also however, been a decrease in personal income in CT 84.
Figure 32: Average Personal Income, 1995 and 2005, by census tract, Lower NDG

In terms of average personal income in Lower NDG, the greatest increases were in CT 96 and CT 95. Again, CT 96 stands out as having an average personal income approximately $10,000 greater than any other census tracts in the neighbourhood. Further, Saint-Raymond (94.01) in 2005 has the lowest average income in the neighbourhood, again close to the 2005 average personal incomes in the census tracts in Saint-Henri with the lowest average personal incomes (CTs 82 and 84).
Socio-economic status: education and occupation

*Education, University Degree or Certificate, 2006 – selected neighbourhoods compared to Montréal (CMA) and the Island of Montréal, absolute numbers*

An “over-representation” of university degree-holders in a particular area is an important indicator of its social status. If, over time, the proportion of highly educated people climbs from below to close to the city average, this is one of the classic indicators of gentrification. However, due to a major change in the way that Statistics Canada collects these data, comparisons between 2006 and previous years are limited. In 2006, the variable is the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate. In previous censuses, the variable was population aged 15 and over with a university degree or certificate, which therefore included those still in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAINT-HENRI (TOTAL)</th>
<th>LOWER NDG (TOTAL)</th>
<th>ISLAND OF MONTRÉAL</th>
<th>MONTRÉAL (CMA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population aged 25 - 64 years</td>
<td>8 830</td>
<td>10 085</td>
<td>1 037 325</td>
<td>2 044 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With university degree or certificate</td>
<td>2 630</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>340 060</td>
<td>541 905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With university degree or certificate, %</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 16: Education, University Degree or Certificate, 2006*
In 2006, Saint-Henri is still a little below the Island average in terms of the percentage of the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate. Lower NDG is above the Island average, but considerably below the Plateau Mont-Royal.
However at the census tract level, in Saint-Henri there is a large amount of heterogeneity in terms of the proportion of the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate. CT 80 stands out with approximately 15% more of the population 25-64 years old with a university degree or certificate compared to the other census tracts in the neighbourhood. At the other extreme, CT 82 and 84 (which had the lowest average household incomes and lowest average personal income within the neighbourhood in 2005) were far below the other census tracts in the neighbourhood in terms of percentage of the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate, as well as below the Island and CMA averages.
As mentioned above, overall, Lower NDG is above the Island average in terms of the proportion of the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate. However, there is heterogeneity among census tracts, and Saint-Raymond (CT 94.01) is an exception, falling below the Island average, as well as having a considerably lower percentage of the population with a university degree or certificate compared to elsewhere in Lower NDG. Recall that Saint-Raymond (94.01) was the CT with the lowest average household income and lowest average personal income in Lower NDG.
University degree or certificate (15+ age group), 1996 and 2006, selected neighbourhoods compared to the Montréal (CMA) and the Island of Montréal

The comparison that can be made 1996-2006 is the percentage of the population aged 15+ with a university degree or certificate, but an important caveat is that the denominator includes people who are still in school. Nonetheless, a change in the proportion of highly educated residents from below to close to the city average is a classic indicator of gentrification when it is paralleled by a major rise in occupational status or income levels.

In Saint-Henri, there has been a major increase in the proportion of the population aged 15+ with a university degree or certificate, from well below the Island average in 1996, to just below the Island average in 2006. In Lower NDG, in both 1996 and 2006, the area had a proportion of the population with a university degree or certificate that was well above the Island average.
Proportion of Professionals and Senior Managers in the working population, 1996 and 2006

It is not possible to compare all occupational categories between censuses, because of incompatibilities in terms of how the various occupational categories have been defined. However, the professional and senior manager occupational category remained constant between the 1996 and 2006 censuses, and this is the category that is typically associated with gentrification. In Saint-Henri the increase in the proportion of professionals and senior managers has been larger (5.4% point increase between 1996 and 2006). However, it still has a smaller proportion of professionals and senior managers than the Island of Montréal. It is however not as large an increase as is seen in the Plateau Mont-Royal, Montréal’s most notorious gentrified neighbourhood which experienced a 8.5% point increase in the proportion of senior managers and professionals in the neighbourhood between 1996 and 2006. In Lower NDG, while the percentage point increase in professionals and senior managers was less, there was nonetheless a 3.3% point increase between 1996 and 2006. However, the proportion of professionals and senior managers in the neighbourhood was above the Island average both in 1996 and 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Montréal (CMA)</th>
<th>Island of Montréal</th>
<th>Saint-Henri</th>
<th>Lower NDG</th>
<th>Plateau Mont-Royal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Proportion of Professionals and Senior Managers in the working population, 1996 and 2006
Presence of senior managers and professionals in Saint-Henri, compared to other occupational groups (absolute numbers), both sexes, 1996 and 2006

At the census tract level in Saint-Henri, the increase in the number of residents working as senior managers and professionals is most marked in CT 79 and CT 83, the two census tracts which border the Lachine Canal and have also experienced significant new-build construction in the last 10 years. In CT 82 and 84, while there has been a slight increase in the number of residents employed as senior managers and professionals, the number of residents in these types of occupations is very low. CT 80, on the other hand, experienced a slight decrease in the number of residents working in professional and managerial occupations.
Presence of senior managers and professionals in Lower NDG, compared to other occupational groups (absolute numbers), both sexes, 1996 and 2006

In Lower NDG, at the census tract level, the most marked increase in the presence of senior managers and professionals took place in CT 95 and CT 97.01. CT 94.01 (Saint-Raymond) had virtually no increase in the number of residents employed in the professional and managerial occupations in the 1996-2006 period. Likewise in CT 96, the increase was very slight over the same time period.
So while Saint-Henri has experienced a significant increase in the proportion of senior managers and professionals, this occupational grouping is still less proportionally present than in the Island of Montréal or the Montréal CMA. Equally, it is far less significant than in the case of the Plateau Mont-Royal, where this occupational category now represents over 45% of the active working population living in the neighbourhood. In Lower NDG, the proportion of professionals and senior managers in the neighbourhood was slightly above both that of the CMA and the Island.
At the census tract level in Saint-Henri, CT 79 and CT 83 showed the most marked increase in the proportion of professionals and senior managers. However, CT 80 showed a dramatic decrease in the proportion of senior managers and professionals, a drop of approximately 15% in 10 years. Nonetheless, even in 2006, CT 80 has the highest proportion of senior managers and professionals, at over 35% of the active working population.22 In CTs 82 and 84, the proportion of professionals and senior managers living in these areas are considerably lower than in the other CTs in the neighbourhood.

22 One possible explanation is that perhaps many of the condos were either too poor quality or too small for the tastes of professionals and managers. Overtime, households of 2-income white collar or techies could have moved in, in their place.
Percentage of Professionals and Senior Managers in the working population, 1996 and 2006, Lower NDG

At the census tract level in Lower NDG, the most marked increase in the proportion of professionals and senior managers was in CT 95, although increases also took place in CT 96 and 97.01. However, in CT 94.01 (Saint-Raymond) there was a decrease in the proportion of the active working population employed as senior managers and professionals between 1996 and 2006.
**Conclusion: What have we learned?**

The preceding analysis has revealed a number of salient findings. At the most general level, what is clear is that the two case study neighbourhoods (Saint-Henri and Lower NDG) have had significantly different trajectories of neighbourhood change and gentrification over the 1996-2006 period.

In Saint-Henri, overall the story is fairly straightforward. It is clear from a large number of the indicators assessed that there is considerable gentrification underway in the neighbourhood. Previous analyses highlighted that standard gentrification (i.e. transformation of the older building stock) was already underway in some census tracts within the neighbourhood, including CT 80, 81 and 82. This work provides a useful supplement, in documenting the continued process of standard gentrification between 1996 and 2006, as well as the more recent consolidation of ‘new-build’ gentrification, concentrated along the Lachine Canal (in CTs 79 and 83), which has occurred primarily in the last 10 years. Indicators that reinforce this conclusion include: the marked increase in the proportion of owner-occupied households; the increases in average dwelling values and average rents; marked increases in average household and average personal incomes; increases in the proportion of the population aged 15+ with a university degree or certificate; and increases in the proportion of professionals and seniors managers in the neighbourhood. It is worthy of note however, that CT 84 is somewhat of an anomaly in that indicators of gentrification are less evident there. It experienced a slight decrease in the proportion of owner-occupiers; the lowest average gross rents in the neighbourhood; and only a very slight decrease in the proportion of renter households paying more than 30% of their income to gross rent. Further, it was the only census tract to experience both a decrease in average household and average personal incomes between 1996 and 2006. It also had a lesser proportion of residents with a university degree or certificate; and a lower proportion of residents employed as professionals and senior managers, compared to other CTs in Saint-Henri. As such, this tract could be characterized as experiencing ‘not gentrification, [but] other trends,’ as Walks and Maaranen characterized it 2001.

However, it should be noted that while considerable gentrification is underway in Saint-Henri as a whole (except CT 84), it is still not as extreme as what is observed in the Plateau Mont-Royal, Montréal’s most gentrified neighbourhood. The Plateau Mont-Royal experienced larger increases in the proportion of owner-occupiers, average gross rents, average household and average personal
incomes, the proportion of the population aged 15+ with a university degree or certificate and the proportion of the population in professional and managerial occupations then was observed in Saint-Henri. Thus, had Walks and Maaranen’s analysis covered the period up until 2006 (rather than just until 2001), most census tracts in the neighbourhood would no doubt still be in a state of ‘incomplete gentrification,’ a term which refers to instances where although an area is in the process of gentrifying, the average income of the neighbourhood still remains below the metropolitan average.

In Lower NDG, the story is more complex. There is considerable variation among census tracts. CT 95 and 96 – north of the railway tracks and closest to Westmount - are experiencing continuing ‘standard’ gentrification, as can be ascertained from the combination of the following indicators: the increase in the proportion of owner-occupied households, average dwelling values and average gross rents; increases in average household incomes and average personal incomes; the high proportion of the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate; and increases in the absolute numbers and proportions of residents working in professional and managerial occupations. This is consistent with Ley’s analysis (1996), which showed that these census tracts exhibited evidence of gentrification between 1971 and 1981; these trends have continued in the last 20 years. In the case of CT 96, it could be argued that this census tract is very close to ‘complete’ gentrification, which is defined by Walks and Maaranen to refer to instances in which a neighbourhood or census tract that began a time period with below metropolitan average incomes attains above average metropolitan incomes by the end of the time period assessed. In fact, this census tract has average household incomes above the Island average, but still just below the CMA average in 2006. Census tract 97.01 – also north of the railway tracks - also shows many indicators of gentrification (or ‘recapture’ to use the Walks and Maaranen’s terminology) as evidenced through increases in the proportion of owner-occupied dwellings and in average household and average personal incomes; the high proportion of the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate; and the increase in both the absolute number and proportion of professionals and senior managers in the census tract. However, many of these changes have been less extreme than in the case of CT 95 and CT 96 cited above. This would seem consistent with Walks and Maaranen’s (2008) findings that CT 97.01 was characterized according to the 2001 census as exhibiting the ‘potential for future recapture’ (i.e. when a census tract regains its prior
above-average income status after spending a minimum of two consecutive decades below the metropolitan average) (Walks and Maaranen, 2008: 27).

Last, Saint-Raymond (CT 94.01), between the railway tracks and the escarpment, does not exhibit all the same indicators of gentrification and would likely be characterized as ‘not gentrification, other trends,’ as it was in Walks and Maaranen’s analysis, which covered the period up until 2001. Between 1996 and 2006 in Saint-Raymond, indicators of gentrification included increases in average household incomes (though they are still below the neighbourhood average), and increases in average personal incomes (though again they are below the neighbourhood average). On the other hand, indicators that are not associated with gentrification were observed here: there was a decrease in the proportion of owner-occupiers between 1996 and 2006; there is a far lower percentage of the population aged 25-64 with a university degree or certificate in 2006 than elsewhere in the Lower NDG; there was virtually no increase in the absolute number of residents employed in the professional and managerial occupations; and there was a decline in the proportion of residents employed in professional and managerial occupations, whereas all the other CTs in Lower NDG exhibit an increasing proportion of residents employed in these occupations. The conclusion that this part of Lower NDG (Saint-Raymond – CT 94.01) had not experienced gentrification up until 2006 is consistent with Walks and Maaranen’s research (2008) in which the census tract exhibited a far lower social status than the other census tracts in Lower NDG as well as continually diminishing average income ratios over time up until 2001.

The key findings of this study are: 1) that the trajectories of neighbourhood change in the neighbourhoods surrounding the proposed MUHC are not uniform. Indeed, looking at neighbourhood change at the scale of census tracts reveals that within each neighbourhood there is a fair amount of heterogeneity. This is true in terms of the degree of gentrification (complete gentrification vs. incomplete gentrification vs. potential for future recapture) as well as the type of gentrification underway (i.e. standard vs. new-build); 2) the CTs that are exhibiting trends other than gentrification (CT 84 in Saint-Henri and CT 94.01 in Lower NDG) are both enclave neighbourhoods with impermeable physical barriers surrounding them. In the case of CT 84, the barriers surrounding the neighbourhood include railway tracks, the Turcot Interchange and the Lachine Canal. While in 94.01 (Saint-Raymond), barriers include the Décarie Expressway, the commuter rail track and the St.
Jacques Escarpment. Interestingly, it is also these census tracts which house a high proportion of immigrants compared to elsewhere in their respective neighbourhoods, as well as very high proportions of residents who speak non-official languages as a mother tongue.

In terms of needs for future research, it is likely that there have been considerable changes (for example new construction) that have taken place since the 2006 census was taken. For instance, there has been new construction in Lower NDG since 2006, particularly in the census tract closest to the proposed MUHC (CT 94.01) (such as the recent construction on the radio tower site on Upper Lachine). Such new construction could create an increase in gentrification pressure as competing land-uses may lead to increased property values and speculation. A systematic photographic survey of all new construction in the case study neighbourhoods since 2006 as well as recourse to municipal administrative data sources would help in the documentation of the most recent changes in the housing stock of certain census tracts. There may also be increased demand for housing in the adjacent neighbourhoods as professionals seek to move closer to their new place of employment. Additionally, there may have been significant changes in the commercial services available in the neighbourhoods, as businesses begin to cater to incoming higher income groups. A commercial inventory on key commercial streets (such as Notre-Dame in Saint-Henri and Upper Lachine Road in Saint-Raymond) would provide a useful baseline against which further shifts in commercial services could be measured.
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