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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the Kingston Community Profile 2006-2016 is to analyze the changes that have occurred in demography, social-economic status and housing in the Kingston CMA. Information was analysed by comparing information from the 2016 Census against the 2006 Census, to reveal changes in the CMA over time.

The report uncovers variations that have occurred over the entire Kingston CMA, in addition to the differences that occurred in each of the City of Kingston districts from 2006 to 2016 (i.e. Portsmouth, Williamsville, Pittsburgh Districts). These changes are presented in this report in hopes that the report will be used to inspire further research or to aid in decision making.

Study Methods

The report uses ArcMap and ArcGIS with Statistics Canada Census data from 2006 and 2016 to produce a series of maps that show where changes occurred and to what severity. Statistics Canada data was used in conjunction with Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) data, and Canadian Real Estate Association (CREA) data to summarize the information in maps, tables and graphs. The information was then analyzed for deviations or similarities between 2006 and 2016.

Key Finding Themes

The report covered 4 themed topics:

- Population
- Families, Children and Seniors
- Income
- Housing

After examining the data between the 2006 and 2016 Censuses, the key findings for the Kingston CMA were:

Key Findings: Population

- The population of the CMA grew by 5.8%. This is a slower rate than Ontario and Canada. Approximate growth in the CMA was 9,000 people, from 152,000 in 2006 to 161,000 in 2016;
- Positive population growth occurred in the Country of South Frontenac, Loyalist Township, Pittsburgh District, and Loyalist-Cataract District;
- Declining population growth occurred in the Williamsville, Portsmouth, West Sydenham, and King’s Town Districts;
- Kingston is aging. Median age has increased from 41 years old to 43 years old, consistent with both Ontario and Canada-wide trends.
**Key Findings: Families**
- The number of young children aged 0-9 has increased from 2006 to 2016;
- The number of lone-parent families is increasing and are dispersed throughout the CMA;
- Most seniors are living either alone or with one another person in a single detached home;
- Pre-school and elementary school aged children have a high presence in the Loyalist-Cataraqui and Pittsburgh Districts.

**Key Findings: Income**
- Median household income grew, when adjusted for inflation, 9.8%, $70,143 in 2005 to $76,497 in 2015;
- Rate of poverty has declined from 9.8% in 2006 to 8% in 2016;
- Poverty remains highest and concentrated in the downtown and north end of the City of Kingston;
- Wealthier populations tend to locate in Kingston’s suburban areas and the urban-rural fringe.

**Key Findings: Housing**
- Rental rates have increased 14% above inflation since 2006;
- The price of the average home increased 18% above inflation since 2006;
- The number of households who spend more than 30% of income on shelter has increased by 3,445 households and represents 26.2% of all households in the Kingston CMA;
- The growth of the post-secondary education has created an excess rental demand of approximately 23,680 student renters.

**Overall Conclusions**

The Kingston CMA has seen a population decline in the downtown and inner-city areas and significant population growth in the new suburbs and peripheral areas. This may raise financial concern as these new growing areas will require further servicing.

The number of people over the age of 65 has grown tremendously since 2006. The population aged 65-69 and 85+ increased 50% or more. This has implications for services, as an aging population will alter demand levels of service.

Growth has also occurred in the youngest age group of 0-9 which has implications for services such as after-school care, location of schools, and transportation to and from these facilities.
Kingston has experienced a decrease in poverty from 9.8% of the population in 2006 to 8% of the population in 2016. This poverty is largely concentrated in Williamsville, King’s Town and Kingscourt-Rideau Districts. Although poverty has declined, the number of households spending 30% or more of income on shelter has risen 4% to 26% of all households. This is in part due to rental and home ownership prices rising by 14% or more above inflation.

**Key Findings by District**

After examining changes by District, the following similarities or differences were uncovered:

**Sydenham**
Sydenham continued to be the densest District in the CMA, and recorded positive population growth because of new multifamily development.

**Williamsville**
Williamsville experienced a population decline, but is the youngest district in the CMA. The median income is less than $40,000 resulting in 20-50% of the residents living in low income. Affordability continues to deteriorate with increased rental rates due to student demand.

**King’s Town**
King’s Town experiences similar trends as Williamsville with dense population. The population here is young and in experience poverty with a poverty rate of between (20-50%).

**Kingscourt-Rideau**
Kingscourt-Rideau saw an increase in population, as well as an increase in the number of children aged 0-4. Kingscourt-Rideau has continued the trend from 2006 with low median household income of primarily less than $40,000.

**Pittsburgh**
The Pittsburgh District is experiencing rapid population growth in all age groups with the construction of new housing. It is one of the wealthiest districts in the CMA with a household income of $85,000 - $102,000, as well as high median dwelling values.

**Portsmouth**
Portsmouth experienced a population decline, but this may not be accurate as the substantial number of students in this area may not be reported in the Census.

**Meadowbrook-Strathcona, Trillium and Lakeside**
These older suburban communities typical have lower population density due to the type of dwellings. A higher median age in this district is due to empty nesters continuing to occupy a single-detached home.
Loyalist-Cataraqui and Collins- Bayridge
Similar to the Pittsburgh District, Loyalist-Cataraqui and Collins-Bayridge have seen a large amount of construction activity since 2006. This has caused a growth in all population cohorts, requiring further servicing of this growth area.

Countryside
The Countryside District has had population growth with increases in affordable ownership dwellings. This trend of migration out of the urban area to rural is likely to continue should affordability continue to deteriorate within the City of Kingston.

Remainder of CMA: Township of South Frontenac, Loyalist Township, Amherstview
These Districts with proximity to the City of Kingston have seen positive population growth because of the affordable housing options available. The seniors population has grown between 45-69% and the median income is between $70,000 - $85,000.

Recommendations
We recommend the following to the Social Planning Council of Kingston (SPC):

1. The SPC investigate the implications of the socio-demographic trends presented in the report.
2. The SPC analyze the newly released 2016 Census data that was not included in this report.
3. The SPC to present the findings to Kingston’s community stakeholders.

Next Steps
This report only analyzes a portion of the Statistics Canada data. The data released on November 29th, 2017 should be further studied for trends in the Kingston CMA. These topics include:

- Mobility and migration
- Immigration and ethnocultural diversity
- Labour
- Education
- Aboriginal peoples
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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose the Report

The Kingston Community Profile 2006-2016 provides a picture of trends and changes in the CMA’s demographic, socio-economic and housing composition over the past decade. The report was prepared by planning students as a course requirement in the Queen’s School of Urban and Regional Planning for the Social Planning Council (SPC) of Kingston and District.

The current Profile report builds on the previous report, Kingston Community Profile 2009 - A Socio-Demographic Analysis of Kingston, Ontario, Canada, produced by planning students for the SPC. As a follow up to the 2009 Kingston Community Profile report, the 2016 Profile is intended to serve a broad audience including:

- All levels of government in the provision of services for residents;
- Businesses to better plan, develop and deliver goods and services to meet customer needs;
- Social services and community development agencies to enhance their ability to mobilize resources and bridge service gaps;
- Local media to report on community issues with greater depth and breadth of understanding;
- Individual residents and community groups to be better informed of the needs and potentials of their local communities.

1.2 Location of Kingston

The Kingston CMA is located in the Province of Ontario between Toronto and Montreal (Figure 1). Located on Canada’s busiest highway, the 401 it also has a major rail line and is only a 30-minute drive from the international bridge to the United States of America. Situated along the picturesque shores of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence Seaway, Kingston has a strong heritage linked to its past and is known as The Limestone City for its historic architecture that attracts many national and international tourists.

Today, Kingston is a midsized city with a population of 161,175 people in the metropolitan areas (Statistics Canada, 2017). Kingston has continued to grow over the past ten years and is consistently ranked as one of the best places to live and retire in Ontario (Brown, 2017).
1.3 Methods for the Study

1.3.1 Analysis of Census Data
Statistics Canada is the primary data source for the 2016 Profile. Based on the release dates of the 2016 Census Data, the 2016 Profile was able to retrieve and analyze data for four key themes: (1) General Population, (2) Income, (3) Families, Children and Seniors, and (4) Housing.

The 2006 and 2016 Census Data was retrieved from the Computing in Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS) Census website. This website allows for Census data to be downloaded in an accessible and pre-sorted format (Database or .dbf file) for importing it to GIS software.

Where Census data was unavailable from CHASS, the complete 2016 Census File was downloaded (in Census Tracts) from Statistics Canada (what is known as a Beyond 20/20 [.ivt] file) and sorted in the Beyond 20/20 data management program. From Beyond 20/20 it was converted to a Database file (.dbf) for import into Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software for mapping purposes.

1.3.2 Other Information Sources
Three other sources of data were also used for the 2016 Profile report. Scholars GeoPortal, a hardware and software tool was used for access to large-scale geospatial datasets.

The 2016 Profile used Scholars GeoPortal to obtain census boundary files for the Kingston Census Metropolitan Area (CMA) and Kingston Census Tracts.

Data from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) was used for analyzing housing trends in Kingston.

The City of Kingston Open Data was used primarily for reference layers to add points such as schools, hospitals, and care facilities to some of the profile maps.

1.3.3 Mapping of the Census Data by Census Tracts
All mapping for the Profile was carried out at the Census Tract level using ESRI’s ArcMap and ArcGIS programs. ArcMap is a program used to view, edit, create, and analyze geospatial data. Database census files were imported into ArcMap for geospatial analysis.
1.4 Level of Analysis (Districts)

The overall study area for the Profile is the Kingston CMA. The Kingston CMA is shown in the inset map, Figure 2 and includes:

- The City of Kingston
- Loyalist Township
- Township of Frontenac Islands, including Howe, Amherst, and Wolfe Islands, and the
- Township of South Frontenac

The City of Kingston municipality is shown in Figure 2 in dark green. The Statistics Canada definition of a CMA or a Census Agglomeration (CA) is an area consisting of one or more neighbouring municipalities situated around a major urban core.

Amherst and Wolfe Islands have been excluded from all maps in this profile. Overall trends in Census data from 2006 to 2016 was based on the total Kingston CMA area.

1.4.1 Study Area for Detailed Mapping

The detailed mapping of Census data for comparison of the 2006 and 2016 characteristics was based on what Statistics Canada describes as the major urban core, namely the City of Kingston.

The choice of the study area mapping was made for consistency with the 2009 Kingston Area Community Profile Report, and to allow for comparisons.

As shown in Figure 2, the area covered by maps includes most of the municipality of the City of Kingston including the rural area north of Highway 401. Howe, Amherst and Wolfe Islands (which are not shown on the map) are not part of the City of Kingston.

1.4.2 Grouping of Census Tracts within the Area Mapped

Given the large number of Census Tracts within the City of Kingston (a total of 27 numbered tracts), some groupings were required to allow for descriptions of areas of change.

The best known descriptive names for the parts of Kingston were the 12 Municipal Electoral Districts. The boundaries and names of the Municipal Electoral Districts are shown in Figure 2. The map analysis in the Report refers to these names of Districts.

One Census Tract (CT 5210016.00 [Kingston Penitentiary] recorded ‘0’ population for the 2016 Census because it had been closed. This CT is small and only includes the Kingston Penitentiary and the Correctional Service of Canada Museum. For this reason, this CT is listed as ‘No Data’ in Figure 2.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

Figure 2. City of Kingston Municipal Electoral Districts
1.4.3 Types of Maps
There are three ways that data are represented in the Profile maps: (1) graduated colour maps – where the colours change based on the value; (2) graduated symbol maps – where the symbols change based on the value of the attribute; and (3) dot density maps – where the number of dots reflect the value of the attribute. It is important to note that the location of dots in a dot density map do not represent the actual location of the person, household, or dwelling it is representing. ArcGIS randomizes the placement of the dots (attributes) within the boundaries of the CTs.

1.5 Limitations
1.5.1 Mapping and Geography
The 2009 Kingston Community Profile used both Census Tracts (CTs) and Dissemination Areas (DAs) for its analysis of demographic characteristics for 2006. At the time of this current study, Statistics Canada had not released the DA level data. Therefore, the 2016 Profile was based on CT level data.

Use of CT level allowed consistent analysis over time as the boundaries have remained the same between 2006 and 2016.

Further detailed analysis could be undertaken when the DA data become available. However, it should be noted that the boundaries of DAs are changed by Statistics Canada depending on the population size in each DA from Census to Census.

1.5.2 Data Availability
The 2016 Census data was released periodically throughout 2017 by Statistics Canada according to topic.

During the course of this study (September 2017 to November 2017), the following data for the Kingston CMA had been released by Statistics Canada:

- Aboriginal Peoples
- Age and Sex
- Families, households, and marital status
- Housing
- Immigration and ethnocultural diversity
- Language
- Income
- Population and dwelling counts
- Type of dwelling

The 2016 Profile did not include data released on November 29, 2017 on the following topics:

- Education
- Labour
- Journey to Work
- Language of Work
- Mobility and Migration

The additional data could be analyzed in any subsequent follow-up research and a separate update to the Kingston Community Profile could be issued.
1.5.3 Statistics Canada Data
When comparing the 2009 Profile and the 2016 Profile, it is important to note that some of the 2006 data could not be replicated because of changes made by Statistics Canada in definitions or data collection methods.

Minor changes to the 2016 Census include the use of different terminology to reflect society’s growth towards equity and inclusivity. According to Statistics Canada (2016), “the content of the 2016 Census of Population questionnaires (short and long-forms), has similar content to the 2006 Census of Population, with the exception of the income questions that are collected through administrative data. Statistics Canada obtained income information from personal income tax and benefits records.” The difference in income data collection from the 2006 Census to the 2016 Census must be considered when comparing incomes profiles and the two Profile reports.

According to Statistics Canada (2016), Census data is subject to errors including sampling, coverage, response, non-response, and processing. This must be taken into consideration when analyzing data, especially when making broad assumptions for populations that may be inaccurately represented, such as small rural communities and homeless populations. Additional research when making conclusions is recommended to reduce the potential impact of data error.

1.6 Outline of the Report
The main sections in this report are as follows:
- Chapter 2- Population
- Chapter 3- Income and Poverty
- Chapter 4- Families, Children, and Seniors
- Chapter 5- Housing
- Chapter 6- Conclusions

Following Chapter 6 there is an Appendix Section. The Appendix contains additional information and maps from themes and covers information that had insufficient data for an entire chapter, such as Indigenous Peoples, Immigration, and Languages. There is also a Glossary with relevant words used throughout the report and the corresponding definition.
CHAPTER 2 |
POPULATION
POPULATION

This chapter focuses on the population trends in the Kingston CMA and specific areas of Kingston. Trends include population growth, distribution of population within the CMA, population density, and age.

2.1 Population Growth Trends

Based on Census data, the population of the Kingston CMA has continued to grow from 152,358 people in 2006 to 161,175 people in 2016. This represents a growth of 5.8% over ten years.

Table 1. Population Change in the Kingston CMA 2006 to 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston CMA</td>
<td>152,358</td>
<td>161,175</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>12,160,282</td>
<td>13,448,494</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>31,612,897</td>
<td>35,151,728</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>75,406</td>
<td>81,032</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>48,821</td>
<td>50,716</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CMA’s population growth rate is lower than the national growth rate of 11.2% and the Ontario rate of 10.6%. However, these rates are heavily influenced by more rapid growth in the major metropolitan areas, particularly with the concentration of new immigrants to Canada in these centres.

Concerns are sometimes raised about under-counting of the large student population in the CMA. In the Census, students are encouraged to record their place of residence as their parents’ address rather than their locations while studying. Information from the three large post-secondary institutions in Kingston show increasing enrollments since 2006. Enrollment at Kingston’s post-secondary institutions has grown from 5,700 to 9,600 since 2006. This represents a large portion of population growth in the CMA, and at the high end of estimates is greater than the population growth that occurred from 2006 – 2016. It is not clear if the growing student population is captured by the Census data which may lead to under-estimates of Kingston’s growth rate.

2.1.1 Growth within the Kingston CMA

Within the CMA, most of the population growth has occurred in the Pittsburgh District, Loyalist-Cataraqui District and areas outside of the City of Kingston such as Amherstview and Bath.

Districts such as Portsmouth, Williamsville and King’s Town experienced declines in population from 2006 to 2016. This trend is related to the continued shrinking of household size in the Kingston CMA’s from 2.4 to 2.3 persons per household over this time period.
2.2 Growth in Population Diversity

Based on the Census data, the CMA has seen some growth in the numbers of people who self-identify themselves as belonging to specific groups such as Indigenous Peoples, immigrants or refugees, and Francophone.

In 2016, 5,585 Kingston CMA residents identified themselves as belonging to Canada’s Indigenous Peoples (that is, First Nations, Metis or Intuit). They represented 4.5% of Kingston’s population in 2016 and grew by 70% since 2006.

Some of this growth may be linked to an increased rate of self-identification. However, population age data demonstrates the presence of a significant number of children under the age of 10 who would not have been included in the previous 2006 Census. Moreover, further analysis of mobility data (more recently released) would be required to determine the rate of Indigenous people actually moving into the Kingston area.

The CMA has also continued to see growth in its population due to the arrival of new immigrants. Based on the Census data, approximately 3,440 immigrants arrived during the 2006 to 2016 time period and were living in the CMA. These people represent new arrivals to Kingston, although they may have moved from some other part of Canada. This could not be determined by the data available at the time of this study. Based on these data, recent immigrants\(^1\) make up 2% of the Kingston CMA population in 2016.

The CMA also has a Francophone population. In 2016, 4,965 residents or 3.5% of the Kingston CMA population identified French as their mother tongue. The Francophone population in 2006 was 4,305 in 2006, increasing by 17.7%. Additional information on the trends of the diverse population is included in Appendix A.

Many factors may affect the CMA’s population growth rate and its demographic structure. This study could not examine the rates of mobility of people to the CMA from other parts of Canada because those data were not released until the end of November. Follow-up research could examine other relevant topics such as the movement of seniors and retirees into the CMA that may be influencing demographics. Further research would be useful to improve understanding of these trends in the area.

2.3 Population Distribution

Approximately a quarter of the CMA’s population in 2016 was located in the Countryside District, Amherstview, Bath, and Odessa which are located outside of the City of Kingston. Figure 3 shows the distribution of population by Census Tract in the CMA.

\(^1\) Recent Immigrants refer to immigrants that landed in Canada between 2006-2016
Figure 3. Count of the 2016 Kingston CMA Population by Census Tracts (Statistic Canada, 2016)
Most of the population is concentrated in the suburban Districts of Loyalist-Cataraqui, Pittsburgh, Lakeside, Collins-Bayridge, and Trillium, all of which have 10,000 or more people per district (Figure 3). In contrast, Sydenham, Williamsville, and King’s Town Districts have higher population density.

2.3.1 Implications of Population and Employment Distribution

A large concentration of jobs exists in the Sydenham and King’s Town Districts and within industrial parks located near Highway 401. Figure 4 shows the location of the City of Kingston’s largest employers.

This has major implications for the delivery of services within the City of Kingston. In 2016, the majority of the population in the CMA was located in the Countryside, Loyalist-Cataraqui, Pittsburgh, Lakeside, Collins-Bayridge and Trillium Districts. Yet most employment areas are in or close to the Sydenham and King’s Town districts. This makes transportation through the city difficult and puts a strain on roads during peak rush hours.

Currently, the Lasalle Causeway is over capacity with the population growth and commuters from the Pittsburgh District to other employment areas (City of Kingston, 2015). Large infrastructure projects like the $63-million John Counter Boulevard widening are being constructed because of the distribution of people causing increased traffic on roads (Figure 5).

Figure 4. Location of Major Employers in Kingston (City of Kingston, 2017).

Figure 5. John Counter Boulevard Construction (City of Kingston, 2017).
Public Transit also becomes difficult and inefficient to deliver. Long travel distances are required to move the population to employment locations. The Districts of Loyalist-Cataraqui, Pittsburgh, Lakeside, Collins-Bayridge, and Trillium also have low population densities of less than 447 people per km², compared to Sydenham and Williamsville that have densities of 1500 or more people per km² (Figure 12).

Delivery of public transit becomes difficult as many people live in dispersed Districts, and are spread out. These districts are also far from major employment areas. Routes must meander through these sparsely populated Districts and then travel a long distance to employment areas making for inefficient and slow public transit.

2.4 Distribution of Age

The population of the Kingston CMA can be characterized as an aging population. The CMA’s median age was 40.7 in 2006 and increased to 43.2 by 2016. Ontario’s median age in 2016 was 41.3 years and the national median age was 41.2 years. The large urban centres of Ottawa and Toronto had a median age of 39 – 40 years. The Kingston CMA has a slightly older population when compared to major urban centers, national, and provincial comparators.

In 2016, the largest growth occurred in cohorts over the age 50, with cohorts 65-69 and 85+ growing 50% or more since 2006. The increase in median age can be explained by the growth in cohorts over the age of 50. The Kingston CMA has consistently ranked as one of the top 10 places to retire (Brown, 2017). This can be attributed to the large amount of healthcare facilities available, lower cost of living and strong community as compared to larger urban centers. Migration of retirees can explain growth in cohorts over the age of 65. Aging baby boomers are also largely responsible for the growth in cohorts 50 – 65 as they have aged 10 years since 2006.

These older cohorts may demand different forms of housing and services specific to changing needs such as hospitals, bungalows, independent senior’s apartment buildings, and assisted care centers. New development may be aimed at this group who will continue to be a large source of consumer demand. As Elliot Ferguson notes below, this cohort can put a strain on existing services and housing, spurring new development and product to meet their needs.

“The rapidly swelling senior citizen ranks will make it increasingly difficult to find housing, either in an assisted living centre, long-term care facility or retirement home.”

- Elliot Ferguson, 2017
2.5 Distribution of Age by District

The areas within the Kingston CMA with the highest median age were located outside of the City of Kingston. The County of South Frontenac and Town of Bath both had the highest median age in the Kingston CMA (Figure 7). The Town of Bath has recently seen the creation of a large new subdivision with attractive layouts such as bungalows and main floor bedrooms targeted towards a senior demographic. This has increased the median age in Bath significantly.

2.5.1 Distribution of Age Sydenham and Williamsville

The Districts with the lowest median age were Sydenham and Williamsville. These Districts have a large concentration of students between the ages of 18-24, and very few permanent residents/traditional families. This area has been named the “University District” for its prevalence of young people (City of Kingston, n.d).

The southern portion of the Pittsburgh District includes CFB Kingston and RMC, which typically include younger military families and students. This decreases the median age and makes it a younger area of the CMA.

2.5.2 Distribution of Age Pittsburgh, Loyalist Cataraqui

The Loyalist-Cataraqui and Pittsburgh Districts can also be categorized as younger district (Figure 7). The data suggests that younger families with children choose to locate to areas with new construction in the Districts of Pittsburgh and Loyalist-Cataraqui. New family housing is being built in these areas and this will continue to attract young families with children, decreasing the median age. Districts closer to the Sydenham District were significantly younger; Kingscourt-Rideau and King’s Town had a median age between 29-38 years.
Figure 7. 2016 Median Age of People Residing in Kingston by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2016).
2.6 Population Density

The Kingston CMA has areas of higher population density in the Sydenham, King’s Town and Williamsville District (Figure 12). The population density decreases in a radial pattern from the Sydenham District, with the lower population in the Loyalist-Cataraqui and Pittsburgh District and the lowest population densities being in the rural areas of South Frontenac and Odessa. In 2016, the higher density areas were the Sydenham, King’s Town and Williamsville Districts.

2.6.1 Population Density in Meadowbrook-Strathcona, Lakeside

Unsurprisingly, the Countryside District and older suburban Districts such as Meadowbrook-Strathcona, and Lakeside Districts have a lower population density. These older suburban Districts were planned and developed 50 – 70 years ago and are mainly single detached homes built on large lots. Today, these homes may be occupied by empty nesters with only one to two people in the home, leading to decreased population density.

2.6.2 Population Density in Amherstview

Amherstview, a new suburban enclave outside of The City of Kingston, has a higher population density. New family housing has been developed in Amherstview in the past twenty years. This new family housing was planned and developed with a mixture of dwelling types including higher density townhomes. The latter causes higher population density in these newly built areas, which is different than the old suburban districts that were planned with lower density.

2.6.3 Change in Population Density

Along with population growth, the change in population density is also important to analyze to gain an understanding of the Kingston CMA’s socio-demographic profile. Figure 11 represents the percent change in population density from 2006 to 2016.

Population density increased the most in both the Kingscourt-Rideau and Loyalist-Cataraqui Districts. While the Kingscourt-Rideau population density nearly doubled (similar to its population growth), its population density was very minimal. The density change was primarily from one new apartment building located on Leroy Grant Drive.

Like Kingscourt-Rideau, the population density increased significantly in the Loyalist-Cataraqui District. The increase in population density was mostly from new family housing built in the Cataraqui-Westbrook neighbourhood.

The Sydenham District experienced a significant increase in population density from 2006. This is likely due to the construction of condominium and apartment buildings along Ontario Street as well as the reasons listed in Section 2.6.5., below.
2.6.4 Population Growth Trends in Suburban Districts

Population growth was concentrated in the periphery of the CMA in the Loyalist-Cataraqui and Pittsburgh Districts. Both of these districts can be classified as suburban. The increase in population may be caused by the construction of new housing in the forms of single-family homes, row houses, and semi-detached dwellings.

Housing completions have been the greatest in the Districts mentioned above. In 2016, 453 housing units were completed in these districts with 57% of these completions being single family homes, semi-detached homes, and row houses, with the remainder being apartment-style dwellings (CMHC, 2016).

The western suburban Districts of Collins-Bayridge and Trillium saw population density decreases from 21 and 31% between 2006 to 2016 (Figure 11).

These neighbourhoods were built out between 1960 and 1990 in the form of single detached homes on large lots. In addition, these districts were popular with young growing families looking for affordable housing in the 1960’s through to the 1990’s, leading Collins-Bayridge and Trillium districts to become Kingston’s most periphery districts at the time.

This follows historic trends in the CMA where the most peripheral districts to the east and west have been extended out as new single detached homes are built, attracting the most population growth from new families moving to the area.
The lack of population growth in the older suburban Districts of Lakeside and Trillium may be caused by houses being occupied by empty nesters. This is due to children moving out of their parents’ homes or spouses passing away leaving only one occupant living in the dwelling a single-family home; a resurgence of population growth by young families into this area is possible.

*Figure 10. Housing Developed in the Trillium District.*
Figure 11. Percent Change in Population Density (Person per KM²) from 2006 to 2016 by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 12. 2016 Kingston Population Density (Person per KM2) by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 13. Kingston's Absolute vs. Percentage Population Change from 2006 to 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
2.6.5 Population Growth Trends Sydenham, King’s Town District

Figure 13 shows a growth in population in the western portion of the Sydenham District - the most central point of the city. Previously from 2001 – 2006, this area saw a population decline. Population growth has emerged since 2006, as a result of a substantial change in attitudes toward living in downtowns across Canada (Urban Land Institute, 2015). The population is realizing the benefits of living in downtowns and being within walking distance of many amenities. With consumer demand increasing for downtown dwellings, real estate developers are meeting this demand with new construction of mid and high rise multi-family housing in Sydenham (Figure 14).

Currently, re-zoning applications exist at 51 Queen Street (200 units), 155 Brock Street (153 units), 55 Ontario Street (292 units) confirming that demand exists for living in the Sydenham and King’s Town Districts. Real estate developers are taking advantage of this shift in attitude toward downtown living by proposing and building new multi-residential towers.

There has also been multiple completed projects have been completed in Sydenham from 2006-2016, including the development on Block D, the former Kingston Locomotive site that brought four high rise towers to the District. This trend should continue as multiple development applications currently exist in the Sydenham District calling for more multi-family development.

2.6.6 Population Growth Trends Williamsville, Portsmouth and King’s Town District

A population decline in the Williamsville, Portsmouth, and King’s Town Districts was seen in the 2006 to 2016 period, a continuation of the same trend from 2001 to 2006. These Districts are largely populated with transient student tenants from the area’s three post-secondary institutions. Many students will identify their hometown as their place of residence and not a temporary rental in the CMA. This skews the results of the Census, as these districts were heavily populated by students for eight months of the year, who were not being picked up by the Census as this is not their permanent residency.
The growth rate in these areas should be consistent with the number of new students at these post-secondary education institutes. Enrollment at Kingston’s post-secondary institutions has grown between 5,700 to 9,600 students since 2006. A majority of this student growth is coming from students locating from outside of the CMA (Queen’s University, 2016). Students typically locate in the Portsmouth and Williamsville districts that surround the post-secondary institutions for convenience and ease of access to school (Figure 15).

Even though there has been a significant increase in the number of students since 2006, the areas they typically located in show decline in population (Figure 13). In the Williamsville District there has been the completion of a 498-bed private student housing rental. In addition, Kingston developers suggest 300 homes have been converted to 4+ bedroom homes for students since 2011, largely located in the Williamsville District. Therefore, more bedrooms exist in this district from the strong and continued growth of students and this should increase population in these areas; however, the Williamsville District shows a decline in population.

The reason for these declines is that Statistics Canada suggests that students who temporarily locate while attending an educational institution, but return to live with their parents from time to time, should include themselves in their parent’s survey.

The Kingston CMA will continue to register population declines in areas where students locate, as students record their location in another city while spending a majority of the year in Kingston CMA. This has serious implications for the City of Kingston as student enrollments increase but are not captured by the census.

Permanent residents in Williamsville, Portsmouth, and King’s Town are also affected by smaller household sizes. The Kingston CMA household size decreased from the 2006 average of 2.4 to the 2016 average of 2.3. Four or more-person households declined by 405 households, while one-person households grew by 2,820 households. As household size decreases, the population in these Districts will continue to decline. This is because the popular areas for raising a family continue to be Districts such as Pittsburgh and Loyalist-Cataraqui. Here, new family housing is located as these kinds of areas are preferred by millennials (Toronto Dominion Bank, 2015). Households with
three or more people will continue to locate in suburban areas, causing a population decrease of inner-city neighbourhoods.

2.6.7 Population Growth Trends Countryside District

The Countryside District in the City of Kingston has seen increased population growth. This is due to the housing within the urban boundary of the City of Kingston seeing significant increases in price over the last ten years, with the average house price climbing from $275,000 in 2007 to $375,000 in 2016 (2017 current dollars) (CREA, 2017). This has made home ownership within the urban boundary of the City of Kingston unaffordable to some.

With increasing land values, prospective homebuyers are finding smaller lots sizes and smaller dwellings within the City of Kingston. The population is seeking a more affordable alternative to home ownership and is making a trade-off between commuting time and ability to own a home. The Countryside District offers lower land values than the city, making housing more affordable and offers more space/value to home buyers. People can have a larger home for significantly less than within the City of Kingston. This has caused the consumer to demand housing in the Countryside District areas such as Amherstview and Bath. This has created positive population growth in these areas as people migrate for affordability.

Figure 13 represents change in population by District since 2006; the Countryside District has seen positive population growth around 6%. Bath and Amherstview outside of the City of Kingston have seen growth of almost 20% since 2006. The population growth in these areas makes it more difficult to deliver city services such as police, firefighting, schools and recreational facilities. The sparse development still requires basic city services. New facilities such as a new fire hall built in Perth Road Village are required to service these sparsely populated areas (Figure 16). This is an inefficient use of services as the placement of them benefit a small portion of the population.

Figure 16. Fire Hall being built in Perth Road Village Outside of City of Kingston (Global News, 2017).
2.7 KEY FINDINGS

- From 2006 to 2016, the Kingston CMA had a moderate population growth of 5.8%, below the provincial and national growth rates.

- In 2016, most of the population within the Kingston CMA was in suburban Districts such as Loyalist-Cataraqui, Pittsburgh, Lakeside, Collins-Bayridge, and Trillium.

- With most of the population located in the suburban and rural District, and a majority of employment in the Sydenham District and business parks along highway 401; transportation to access these areas has to be improved to allow people to move freely between employment areas and residences.

- From 2006 to 2016 cohort above the age of 50 saw positive growth with cohort 65-59 and 85+ growing by more than 50%.

- Large growth in older cohorts will require growth in services and housing that caters to this age group.

- In 2016, population density per km² was highest in the Sydenham District. The highest increase in population density per km² from 2006 to 2016 was in the Kingscourt-Rideau and Loyalist-Cataraqui districts.

- The Sydenham District saw a resurgence in population as its population had a large increase from 2006 to 2016.

- Population growth increases were largest in Pittsburgh and Loyalist-Cataraqui District.

- These Districts will require significantly more servicing in terms of school, utilities, recreation facilities etc. as these districts were previously rural land.

- The Countryside District and the Towns of Amherstview and Bath saw positive population growth since 2006.

- Declining population density in the Sydenham, King’s Town and Williamsville Districts.

- Increasing population density in suburban and rural areas which will require more servicing in the area as these areas grow.
CHAPTER 3 | INCOME
This chapter will provide an overview of the trends relating to income and poverty in the Kingston CMA. First, a quick summary of individual incomes is provided, highlighting the changes in median income over the past ten years. Following this, a profile of family and household incomes is presented, with a focus on how variation in income affects spatial patterns.

Income of seniors is then briefly discussed, followed by incomes of other groups. Trends relating to the prevalence of low-income and poverty in the Kingston CMA are then explored in relation to different age groups and family types. A spatial analysis is also provided to illustrate the concentration of low-income areas in the Kingston CMA. The chapter is concluded with a summary of the key findings regarding both income and poverty.

### 3.1 Background Information

The 2017 Profile analyzes income in Kingston CMA by age, gender, family/living arrangements, and poverty as defined by Statistics Canada.

Income is defined by Statistics Canada in the 2016 Census as all money sources received from market income (employment, self-employment, investment, and private pensions) and government transfer payments (OAS-GIS, CPP, employment insurance, child benefits and social assistance transfers).

The income data for 2006 and 2016 are based on the previous calendar year (2005 and 2015 respectively). Statistics Canada adjusted 2005 data to 2015 constant dollars using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). All data displayed in this Profile has been CPI adjusted to 2015 dollars to show real changes in incomes unless otherwise specified.

As specified by Statistics Canada (2016) the Census “gathered income information solely from administrative data sources, [which] reduced response burden [and] increased the quality and quantity of income data available”. Therefore, incomes reflect data reported to Canada Revenue Agency for income tax purposes.

### 3.2 Profile of Family & Household Incomes

**Median Household Income: $76,497**

The population in Kingston CMA can be divided into individuals, households, and families (refer to glossary of terms). In this chapter, ‘families’ refers to census families. The median after-tax income when considering all types of census families increased from $70,143 in 2005 to $76,497 in 2015, a growth of 9.1%.

Figure 18 displays the total number of census families in Kingston CMA in each income bracket. Not only has median household income increased from 2005, but the income distribution of households has further shifted to the right, into the higher income range.

There is a considerable jump from the number of households earning a five-figure salary to a six-figure salary, indicating a large number of professionals living within Kingston CMA. For
the past ten years, most households in Kingston have been earning between $100,000-$125,000 (however this is not the median).

Income is widely dispersed based on different types of living arrangements (Table 2). Previously, from 2000 to 2005 the median income across different living arrangements increased by an average of 6.85% (Kingston Community Profile, 2009). Based on this trend, it can be assumed that every five years the median income increases, on average when considering all types of living arrangements, between 5-7%.

From 2005 to 2015, lone parent families experienced the largest increase in median income of 16.3%, from $39,605 to $46,050. Persons living alone had the lowest median income at $33,320 in 2015, an 11% increase from 2005. It is important to note that persons living alone account for 19,865 individuals, whereas couple census families include both partners. This translates into couple census families having a higher median income because there are typically two incomes contributing to the same household.

Couple families with children continue to dominate the higher income brackets when compared to couples without children. It is likely that the reason couple families without children have a lower after-tax income is because many of these families are retirees living on pensions, as opposed to families with children who are still working and often have two wage-earners.

Female lone parents continue to have lower incomes than male lone parents (Figure 18), with a median of $44,741, in comparison to male lone parents at $51,584. However, the
gender pay gap does show signs of slowly closing. In 2005, lone male parents earned $11,031 more than lone female parents; in 2015, lone male parents now earn $6,843 more. This trend is prevalent across Ontario and Canada.

Figure 18. The Proportion of Lone Female and Lone Male Census Families in each Income Bracket, 2015, in Constant 2015 Dollars (Statistics Canada, 2016).

3.2.1 Spatial Patterns of Household Incomes

Various spatial patterns emerge when mapping the 2015 after-tax median income for private households at the Census tract level (see Figure 20 below) and comparing it to the previous 2005 map. As explained in the introduction of this report the City of Kingston Electoral Districts are used when referencing the maps.

Spatial Patterns from 2015

In 2015, the median household income for Kingston CMA was $76,497. Lower income bracket patterns are as follows:

- **Less Than $40,000:**
  - Kingscourt-Rideau, Williamsville, King’s Town Districts, and the central portion of the Sydenham District which is part of the “student ghetto” of Queen’s University.
- **Median incomes of $40,000 to $50,000** are located mostly within and around the urban core.

In general, median incomes rise as households are further away from the urban core. For example, the rural areas in the Countryside District, as well as the Districts moving away from the urban core to the West, increase in median income towards the $70,000 to $90,000 income bracket as the distance from the urban core increases. This pattern suggests that higher income households continue to migrate to the suburbs and reside in larger, single detached homes.

However, there are exceptions to this pattern.
### Exception | Why?
---|---
The Eastern portion of District 10, Sydenham (consisting of Alwington and part of Sunnyside neighbourhoods), has a median income of $90,000 to $105,000. | The urban core exception is likely the presence of professional, higher earning households who prefer to live in downtown and more walkable neighbourhoods, which raises the overall median household income.
The Pittsburgh District has a high median income of $90,000 to $105,000. | The increase in median income in the Pittsburgh District is due to the newly constructed neighbourhoods in the area, especially along the waterfront.
The most northern tract above the Countryside District has a median income of $60,000 to $70,000. | The most northern tract may indicate that families who wish to have a lifestyle consisting of an affordable, single-detached home on a large lot are being pushed further out of the City of Kingston.

### Changes in Spatial Patterns: 2005 – 2015

When comparing the median after-tax income spatial changes from 2005 to 2015, a few prominent spatial patterns become noticeable.

1. The urban core remains the primary area consisting of low-income households, indicating that social services need to continue to focus on meeting the needs of the people in this area.

2. There is a small area located within the Kingscourt-Rideau District, specifically the Kingscourt neighbourhood that has increased in income over the past 10 years. It is likely that this trend will continue with the development of the new Kingston Secondary School in the area, which may increase property values and be a more desirable neighbourhood.

3. The suburbs located in the West of the City of Kingston have a higher median household income in 2015 than in 2005. This may be attributed to a variety of factors, such as the construction of new homes and high-quality schools for children.

4. The Pittsburgh District also has a noticeable increase in median income, which is again likely attributed to the recent growth in the property market. High rise developments are prominent in within the area, and the expensive house prices in the new neighbourhood of Barriefield may skew the median income of the tract.

5. The Sydenham neighbourhood, located in the East of District 10 Sydenham, has also experienced a rise in income. Due to the proximity of this area to the downtown, the waterfront, and Queen’s University, it is likely that properties values have risen and are no longer affordable for many households. As such, the Countryside District has risen in household median income, which may suggest that more households are leaving the downtown suburbs in preference for larger properties at an affordable price.

It is important that the Kingston CMA be aware that median income does not always accurately reflect the entire population, as it is the middle. Thus, there are likely many households that are underrepresented and living in poverty, despite the census tract depicting a stable median income.
Figure 20. 2015 Median Household Income After-Tax in Kingston City, by Census Tract, in Constant 2015 Dollars (Statistics Canada, 2016)
3.3 Income Profile of Seniors

The median income for seniors has increased over the past ten years from $28,819 in 2005 to $32,463 in 2015. However, there is still a considerable discrepancy between the income of male and female seniors. In 2005, the median income for senior males was $36,699, which increased to $40,151 in 2015, an increase of 9.4%. For the same time period, the median income for female seniors increased by 13.9%, going from $23,179 in 2005, to $26,410 in 2015 (Figure 21). Although the percentage increase of median income from 2005 to 2015 is higher for female seniors, their median income remains significantly lower than male seniors.

3.3.1 Income Sources of Seniors

Seniors obtain their income from market sources and/or government transfers. Market sources are made up of employment income, investment income, private retirement income and other income. Figure 22 shows a 10.2% increase in the percentage of seniors receiving employment income from 2005 to 2015, suggesting that people are staying in the workforce longer. Investment income decreased by 9.8% from 2005 to 2015, whilst private retirement income remained constant at 74.3%. Income sources from government transfers are made up of Old Age Security pension (OAS) and Guaranteed Income Supplement (GIS), Canada Pension Plan (CPP) and Quebec Pension Plan (QPP) benefits, employment insurance (EI), child benefits and other government transfers. The percentage of seniors receiving income from government transfers has not changed significantly since 2005.

Figure 21. Median Income of Senior Citizens in Kingston CMA, 2005 to 2015, in Constant 2015 Dollars (Statistics Canada 2016).

Figure 22. Market Income Sources of Seniors in Kingston CMA, 2005 to 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
3.4 Prevalence of Low Income & Poverty Rates

In 2011, a Community Round Table on Poverty Reduction was held in Kingston to produce a community strategy to reduce poverty in the City. According to the report,

“Poverty is always impacted by income. Wages have failed to keep pace with inflation and those on social assistance have a spending power that is 55% below what it was in the early 1990s. [...] This imbalance means that in Kingston, given high rental costs, poor families have to get by on even less.”

The final report from this Round Table identified some of the major consequences of poverty in Kingston which included the need for more affordable housing, need for social services, access to skills development and employment, need for community supports and education, health and systematic attitudes and barriers surrounding poverty.

3.4.1 Measuring Low Income

Statistics Canada determines low income using two different measures: low-income measures (LIM) and low-income cut-offs (LICO), each of which has a before and after-tax option. The LIM refers to 50% of median household income, adjusted for family size. LICO represents the income level at which families or persons not in economic families were expected to spend 20 percent more of their income than the average family on the necessities of food, shelter and clothing. For this profile, LICO-AT (after-tax) was used for two main reasons; (1) it considers the population of the city and family size; two important variables that have a considerable impact on income; and (2) it is the main poverty measure used by the federal government and is the most widely-used measure in general across Canada. Different LICOs are set depending on the size of the town or city and family size. The LICOs for Kingston (a large urban population centre – population between 100,000 and 499,999 persons) are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. LICO-AT Thresholds for Kingston, 2015
(Statistics Canada, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Family Size</th>
<th>Low-Income Cut-Off ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons not in economic family</td>
<td>17,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 persons</td>
<td>20,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 persons</td>
<td>26,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 persons</td>
<td>32,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 persons</td>
<td>37,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 persons</td>
<td>41,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or more persons</td>
<td>45,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Prevalence of Low Income among Individuals

Overall there has been a decrease in individuals in low-income status in Kingston from 2005 to 2015 (Figure 23). In 2005, 9.8% (or 14,170 people) of Kingston CMA was living in low income; in 2015, that number decreased to 8% or 12,485 people.

2 (Kingston Community Roundtable on Poverty Reduction, 2011, p. 12)
The categories that have increased is the 55 to 64 and 65 to 74 age range, but this is due to Kingston’s aging population, as there are now simply more people in that age range than before.

There is a particular concentration of poverty among young adults ages 18 to 24. This has remained unchanged in the past decade and may be a result of the data picking up students, but this needs to be investigated further.

Spatial Patterns from 2015

Figure 24 shows that the Kingston CMA follows a radius pattern for poverty. The urban core of the Kingston CMA experiences the highest percentage of people living in poverty, with the wealthier residents typically living further away from the core. The radius pattern is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of People Living in Poverty (LICO-AT)</th>
<th>District(s) and Township(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20% – 50%</td>
<td>Williamsville, King’s Town, and the Queen’s University Census tract within Sydenham District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% - 20%</td>
<td>Williamsville, Sydenham, Kingscourt-Rideau, Meadowbrook-Strathcona, Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% – 10%</td>
<td>Kingscourt-Rideau, Meadowbrook-Strathcona, Trillium, Lakeside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5% - 5%</td>
<td>Lakeside, Collins-Bayridge, Loyalist-Cataruqi, and most Northern Census Tract in Township of South Frontenac, Loyalist Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2.5%</td>
<td>Collins-Bayridge, Pittsburgh, Countryside, Loyalist Township, Township of South Frontenac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23. Prevalence of low-income by age range in Kingston CMA, 2005-2015. (Statistics Canada, 2016).

3.4.3 Spatial Patterns of Poverty

Mapping the locations of individuals who are living in poverty could help the City of Kingston to plan for social services aimed at reducing poverty and help Kingstonians have a higher quality of life.
The remaining areas have a prevalence of low income under 2.5%, indicating that the areas consist of mostly wealthy people. This data follows the pattern observed in Figure 20, the median after-tax income map. Hence, poverty is concentrated in the Williamsville, King’s Town, and Kingscourt-Rideau Districts. Wealthier residents have an increased tendency to move to the suburbs and the fringe of the city. The construction frenzy in the Pittsburgh District may keep feeding this trend unless more affordable and social housing is built in the inner city to accommodate a variety of incomes.

**Changes in Spatial Patterns: 2005 – 2015**

In general, the 2005 and 2015 LICO-AT trends both follow a radius pattern, with poverty levels decreasing with increased distance from the urban core. The areas experiencing a high prevalence of low income are concentrated in the downtown of Kingston CMA. Further, the trend of wealthier people living within the fringe has remained prominent in Kingston CMA over the past 10 years.

A few notable changes in poverty are visible from 2005 to 2015.

1. Amherstview to the West of the CMA has a prevalence of low-income rate of 51%-65% in 2005, which is dramatically reduced to 2.50%-5% in 2015.

2. There is also less poverty evident in the Countryside District in 2015 than there was in 2005. This may be due to residents leaving the urban core in preference for a larger property.

Comparing ten-year changes is challenging because many of the very low-income areas in the 2005 map are not displayed in the 2015 one, and this is due to a limitation of the data only being available at the census tract level rather than dissemination level. Poverty limitations that require more research and analysis include:

**Areas with a High Concentration of Poverty**

The North End of Kingston’s urban core continues to experience disproportionate levels of poverty compared to the rest of the CMA.

**The Williamsville District** and **King’s Town** District continue to have the highest percentage of people living in poverty.
### Limitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>In the 2015 map, Pittsburgh has under a 2.5% prevalence of low income, vastly reduced from the 2005 map of 66-80% at the CFB Military Base area.</strong></th>
<th>This may be inaccurate due to the new, high-income neighbourhoods towards the Northwest of the District. In the 2015 map, the entire area is in a single tract, skewing the income data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The 2005 map has pockets of suburbs in Western Kingston where many households are living in low income, but this is not displayed in the 2015 map at the census tract level.</strong></td>
<td>Either incomes have increased, low-income people have left, or the percentage of people earning a high income outweighs the number of people living in poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The dissemination areas in the 2005 map vary significantly more than the tracts in the 2015 map, especially in the downtown core. The 2005 map shows areas with high poverty levels living adjacent to those who are wealthy.</strong></td>
<td>This suggests that Kingston’s urban core possesses more mixed-income areas than the census tract level reveals. It may be the result of new, high-rise condo developments along the waterfront that cater to a wealthier demographic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, future research should consider investigating the prevalence of low-income measures at a dissemination level when, or if, the data is released.
Figure 24. 2015 Prevalence of Low Income in Kingston City, Based on the Low-Income Cut-Offs, After-Tax (LICO-AT) (%) (Statistics Canada, 2016).
3.5 Prevalence of Low Income among Families

When comparing different census family types, lone-parent families in Kingston in 2015 had a higher prevalence of low income status (13.2%), than couple census families (2.4%), which is consistent with 2005 trends. Within this lone-parent family group, a higher percentage of female lone-parents (13.6%) than male lone-parents (11.6%) were of low income status.

Lone-parents between the ages of 18 to 24 have a higher prevalence of low-income than the overall Kingston population of lone-parents. Almost 30% of lone-parent families between the ages of 18 to 24 years, with three or more children, are of low-income status. In comparison, Ontario follows these same trends, however has a higher percentage of the population in low-income status for all of these census family types.

![Prevalence of low-income by census family type in Kingston CMA and Ontario, 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).](image)

Figure 25. Prevalence of low-income by census family type in Kingston CMA and Ontario, 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

3.6 Prevalence of Low Income among Seniors

Prevalence of low income among senior citizens in both Kingston and Ontario has decreased from 2005 to 2015. In Kingston, prevalence of low income overall has decreased by 1.6%, and for seniors it has decreased by 0.9%, compared to Ontario which has seen decreases of 1.3% and 0.8% respectively (Table 4). When compared to the 0 to 17 years and 18 to 64 years age groups, by and large, seniors in Kingston are not experiencing low income in 2015. After tax, in 2015, there were 515 seniors in Kingston who were of low-income status, which has reduced from 580 in 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 17 years</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


When assessing the prevalence of low-income among seniors in Kingston in relation to census family and household type, there are some discrepancies across different living arrangements (Figure 26). Notably, 4% of seniors living alone are of low-income status compared to 0.6% in couple census families and 0.5% living with other relatives.
When compared to the median rate of low-income status among seniors in 2015 of 1.8%, seniors living alone are over two times more likely to be of low-income status.

3.7 KEY FINDINGS

- The rate of poverty is declining. In the past decade, the rate in Kingston CMA decreased from 9.8% to 8%.
- Poverty remains concentrated in the downtown and North End of the City of Kingston, indicating that social services need to continue to focus on meeting the needs of the people in this area.
- Wealthier residents have an increased tendency to move to the suburbs and the fringe. The construction frenzy outside of the City and Pittsburgh District may keep feeding this trend unless more affordable and social housing is built in the inner city to accommodate a variety of incomes.
- Employers and service providers need an increased awareness of the low income found among young adults.
- Additional studies may need to be undertaken to understand spatial patterns on a smaller neighbourhood-level scale.

**Figure 26.** Prevalence of Low Income by Census Family and Household Type among seniors in Kingston CMA, 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
CHAPTER 4 | FAMILIES, CHILDREN & SENIORS
FAMILIES, CHILDREN & SENIORS

This chapter provides an overview of trends relating to families, children, and seniors in the Kingston CMA and changes from 2006 to 2016.

This chapter describes family trends based on demographic data about individuals within “Census families”. A Census family is defined by Statistics Canada as a married or common-law couple with any number of children in the home. Lone parents regardless of marital status with one or more children in the home, and grandparents caring for and living with grandchildren are also considered to be Census families.

Census families data was not compared to Statistics Canada Household data in this report as this information was not available at the time of the study. The connections between these two data sets in the future study could provide further insight into the living conditions of families in the Kingston CMA.

4.1 Census Families

In 2016, there were 45,555 Census families in the Kingston CMA. This is a 6% increase from the 42,995 Census families present in the Kingston CMA in 2006. This number represents families of all sizes from 2 to 5+ individuals. The average of 2.8 individuals per Census family has remained the same in both 2006 and 2016. This represents the general size of families in the Kingston CMA and not necessarily the size of households. Future investigation into Household and Dwellings data released by Statistics Canada (December 2017) would help to shed light on the differences between Census family size and household size of individuals and non-families living as a household unit.

4.1.1 Couples with Children

According to Census data from 2016, it is most common for couples (married or common-law, including same-sex) with children to have 1 or 2 children. Of the total couples with children 42% had one child, 42% had two children and 16% had three or more children. Thus, of the total of 2,715 couples, there were significantly fewer couples having 3 or more children.

4.1.2 Lone-Parents with Children

Lone-parents with at least one child living with them are also considered to be Census families. The number of lone parents in the Kingston CMA could have been skewed due to double-reporting of shared custody children. Nevertheless, this section describes the trends as reported in the 2006 and 2016 Census.

In 2016 there were 7,520 lone-parent families in the Kingston CMA. This is an increase of 15% from the 6,540 lone-parent families reported in 2006. In 2016, the 7,520 lone-parent families represented 16.5% of the total 45,555 Census families. Of the total lone-parent population, 63% (or 4,725) lone-parents had only one child. Unlike couples with children, lone-parents were much less likely to have more than one child at home. Based on the Census data for 2016, 28% of the total lone-parent population had two children and only 8% of lone-parents had three or more children.
4.1.2.1 Lone-parent families by sex of parent

Even though the number of lone-parents has grown between 2006 and 2016, female lone-parents continue to significantly outnumber male lone-parents (Figure 27). In 2006, 81% of the total lone-parent families in the Kingston CMA were headed by a female parent. In 2016, this portion decreased slightly to 78% as the number of male lone-parents increased.

![Figure 27. Number of Lone Parents by sex, 2006 and 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2006 & 2016)](image)

4.2 Age of Children

While the average Census family size remained 2.8 individuals per family in both 2006 and 2016, this does not speak to the age of children within families. The number of children born from year to year has not been quite so stable. This section of the report examines the changes in the number of children in each age category of the Census.

For the purposes of this report, “children” refers to individuals between the ages of 0 and 19. Overall, the number of children in the Kingston CMA has declined by 5.5% between 2006 and 2016. The most significant decrease was among children 10 to 14 years of age who saw a decline of 15.2% over the ten years. Table 5 shows the percent changes in the number of children in each age category in 2006 and 2016.

Both the 10 to 14 and the 15 to 19 age categories saw decreases in the number of children between 2006 and 2016. The number of young children however, appear to be making a comeback with increases in both the 0 to 4 and 5 to 9 age categories.

Table 5. Percent of change in the number of children in the Kingston CMA 2006 to 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>7,275</td>
<td>7,625</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>7,880</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>9,445</td>
<td>8,005</td>
<td>-15.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>10,175</td>
<td>8,940</td>
<td>-12.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Children Population</td>
<td>34,780</td>
<td>32,850</td>
<td>-5.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each age category in Table 5 represents a combination of birth at a point in time and in-migration over time. For example, the children aged 10 to 14 in 2016 are the children who were aged 0 to 4 in 2006. One can see that in 2006 there were 7,275 children between 0 and 4. Fast-forward 10 years, there were 8,005 children aged 10 to 14.
This shows that the number of children in any age category is not solely dependent on the number of births in each Census year. In the example above, it would appear that in-migration would account for 730 “new” children. The number of “new” children is likely indicative how families who have moved to the CMA.

4.3 Distribution of Children

Trends in the location of pre-school-aged children (0-4) and elementary-aged children (5-14) are analyzed in this section. These categories were used as they relate to the needs and services of each group within that age category.

4.3.1 Pre-school-Aged Children (0-4)

Pre-school aged children saw an increase of 4.8% between 2006 and 2016. The most significant areas of increase occurred in the Loyalist-Cataraqui District and the eastern portion of the Sydenham District.

The increase of pre-school-aged in the Loyalist-Cataraqui District might be expected. Families may favour newer suburban areas which are common in this District.

4.3.2 Elementary-Aged Children (5-14)

Elementary school aged children have seen growth in the Loyalist-Cataraqui and Sydenham Districts. In addition, elementary-aged children have seen the most significant increase in the Kingscourt-Rideau District.

With growth in this group and the pre-school aged group defying the previous trend of a shrinking child population, school boards may need to consider the location and number of schools needed to accommodate these changes.

4.3.3 Distribution of Lone-Parents within Kingston CMA

Lone-parent families are present throughout the entire CMA. While the data shows the lone-parents are more likely to experience poverty, there are not clusters of lone-parents in areas marked by low-income (see Income and Poverty Chapter for more details on the location of these areas).

If compared to income data, it appears that lone-parent families are increasing in median to high income after tax areas.

Lone-parent families are spread throughout the entire CMA. Figure 28 shows that there has been a strong increase in lone-parent families in new and older suburban areas located in the Loyalist-Cataraqui District, the Kingscourt-Rideau District, the Pittsburgh District, and the Lakeside District.

In contrast, lone-parent families appear to be moving out of the Sydenham, Williamsville, King’s Town, and Kingscourt-Rideau Districts at a significant rate.
Figure 28. Percent Change in Kingston Lone Parent Families from 2006 to 2016 by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2006 & 2016)
4.4 Seniors

For the purposes of this report, seniors are defined as individuals aged 65 and over. According to the 2016 Census, there were 31,270 seniors in the total population of 161,175 in Kingston CMA. Therefore, 19.4% of the population was aged 65 and over in 2016. In 2006, there were 23,360 seniors in the Kingston CMA or 15.3%, of the total population. Thus, the numbers of seniors in the Kingston CMA grew by 34% between 2006 and 2016.

![Population pyramid of Kingston senior citizens](image)

Figure 29. Population pyramid of Kingston senior citizens (Statistics Canada, 2016).

In both 2006 and 2016 seniors between the ages of 65 to 69 years old were the largest age cohort. The number of seniors in each age cohort decreases as age increase which would be expected. This trend was only defied by the female 85+ age cohort, which saw an increase between 2006 and 2016. This could indicate immigration of seniors to the Kingston CMA indicating that there are amenities and features that are desirable for seniors in this age cohort. Further study into this may help to reveal what these draws to the CMA are and what impact this increase may have on the community moving forward.

4.4.1 Living Arrangements

The Census records three main living arrangements for seniors in the Kingston CMA. Their arrangements are: living with a spouse or partner, living with relatives or non-relatives in non-census families, or living alone. Living with a spouse or common-law partner was the most common living arrangement for seniors in both 2006 and 2016 (Figure 30). Seniors living alone was the second most common arrangement. In 2016, 27% of seniors lived alone which is a slight increase from the 26% in who lived alone in 2006.

![Living arrangements for Kingston seniors in 2016](image)

Figure 30. Living arrangements for Kingston seniors in 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
As of 2016, most seniors live in single-detached houses (57%), followed by apartments in buildings with 5 or more storeys (14%), and semi-detached houses (14%) (See Figure 31). This may indicate that seniors are in fact aging in place. Further study into the implications of seniors occupying older suburban areas may help to offer insight into the future of neighbourhood makeup as seniors move out of these areas.

4.5 KEY FINDINGS

- The number of young children has increased from 2006-2016 - interrupting the pre-2006 trend.
- Lone-parent families are increasing and are spread throughout the CMA.
- Couples with children are most likely to have 1 or 2 children. Lone-parents are more likely to have 1 child.
- The percent of the total population that makes up the senior population is increasing likely due to an aging baby-boomer population and in-migration of seniors.
- A large portion of the senior population (57%) reside in single detached dwellings.

*Figure 31. Dwelling types of senior citizens in Kingston, on 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).*
5.1 Overview of Kingston CMA Housing Market

This section concentrates on housing trends in the Kingston CMA. This section will focus on rental and vacancy rates by specified areas within the CMA, the affordability associated with renting or owning a home, impacts of the student rental market, and the emergence of condominiums in the CMA. Quotes will be used in this section of the report to highlight key points. Photos will also be used to illustrate different forms of housing that have been constructed or are proposed within the Kingston CMA.

Most of the CMA’s households are homeowners, and the ownership rate is close to the national average:

- In 2016, 67.4% of the Kingston CMA’s households owned a home;
- 68.4% of Canadians owned a home at the same time

The remaining 32.6% of the Kingston CMA rent as of 2016. Ownership has trended close to the national average with an increase of homeowners by approximately 2% since 2006. The cost of homeownership and the cost to rent have increased significantly since 2006, well above the rate of inflation. The home prices below are quoted in current dollars:

- 2006 average home cost $220,000;
- 2016 the average home cost $302,000.

This represents a 37% increase or 18% increase when adjusted for inflation (CREA, 2016). Rental rates have been consistently increasing as well. The rental rates below represent a two-bedroom apartment rent per month in current dollars:

- 2006, the rental rate was $841;
- 2016, the rental rate was $1,120.

This represents a 33% increase or 14% when adjusted for the rate of inflation (CMHC, 2016). The increased costs associated with owning or renting a home have been closely related. Figure 32 represents the average home price and average rental rate for the entire Kingston CMA from 2006 until 2016.
5.1.1 Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporate (CMHC) Rental Zones

This section of the report uses CMHC housing data, Canadian Real Estate Association (CREA) data, and Statistics Canada 2016 data. CREA data was used to track home prices while CMHC data was used for rental rates. CMHC consistently reports on rental rates within the Kingston CMA each year, information not available from Statistics Canada or CREA. CMHC tracks rental housing in four different rental zones within the Kingston CMA, these are outlined in Figure 33.

**Each zone includes the following Districts:**
- **Downtown Kingston:** Sydenham, Williamsville and the King’s Town Districts
- **Southwestern Kingston:** Portsmouth District
- **Northern Kingston:** Kingscourt-Rideau, Meadowbrook-Strathcona Districts
- **Remainder of CMA:** Lakeside, Trillium, Collins Bayridge, Loyalist Cataraki, Pittsburgh, Countryside Districts and all areas outside of the City of Kingston.

Although the remainder of CMA zone includes the majority of City of Kingston districts and is the largest in terms of area, it has the fewest rental units of all zones (less than 2,500 units in 2016) (Figure 34).

*Figure 33.* Boundaries of CMHC Rental Zones (CMHC, 2016).

*Figure 34.* Number of Rental Units per CMHC Zone (CMHC, 2016).
The next four pages will be using CMHC data to explain rental rates in each of the cities zones.

5.2 Rental Housing in Kingston CMA by Zone, Rents and Affordability

5.2.1 Downtown Kingston (Sydenham, Williamsville & King’s Town Districts)

The Downtown zone has the largest concentration of rental units of all zones, approximately 4,600 units were within this zone in 2016. This zone also has the most single and double-occupant unit types, offering 1660 bachelor and one-bedroom units. The Downtown zone has seen average rental increases of 1.6% above the rate of inflation per year from 2013 – 2016 (Figure 35).

These rental increases can be explained by the desirability to live in the amenity-rich downtown as noted by CMHC: “The downtown core remains a desirable community attracting individuals of all ages and commanding some of the highest rates for almost all bedroom types” (CMHC, 2016).

This area could continue to see strong rental growth as the population continues to migrate towards downtown living. The strategic location of this zone, which includes Queen University and Kingston General Hospital, may attract employees and students of the University, offering strong and consistent demand for units in the zone. The shrinking household size in the Kingston CMA will also make the rental stock in this area very attractive as it includes a majority of the one to two-person unit types.

5.2.2 Southwestern Kingston (Portsmouth District)

Southwestern Kingston is categorized by large unit types with two and three bedrooms making up 62% of the rental stock. This zone is strategically located near St. Lawrence College and Queen’s University. CMHC reports that this zone’s “rental market is supported by many full-time students enrolled at Queen’s University and St. Lawrence College. The increase in the number of students enrolled in Kingston’s secondary and post-secondary institutions has contributed to the decrease in the vacancy rate, especially among bachelor and 1-bedroom units.” (CMHC, 2016).

Student housing demand significantly increases in rent, on average 3% per year above inflation from 2013 to 2016.
Landlords continue to take advantage of student rentals that offer higher rental rates to increase revenue (Figure 36).

![Rent and Vacancy Rate Graph]

**Figure 36.** Average Rent in Current Dollars of All Apartment Types and Vacancy Rate Southwestern Kingston (CMHC, 2016).

### 5.2.3 Northern Kingston (Kingscourt-Rideau and Meadowbrook-Strathcona Districts)

The Northern zone can be characterized by older housing stock, with no new completions of any type of housing in 2015 and 2016. In 2016, 3,481 units existed in this zone with two-bedroom being most of the stock in the zone.

This area has seen a significant increase in rent from 2013-2016, outpacing inflation by an average of 1% per year from 2013 to 2016 (Figure 37). Northern Kingston also experienced a decrease in vacancy from three percent in 2013, down to just two percent in 2016. Strong employment growth was a contributing factor to the decrease in vacancy (CMHC, 2016). Supply has been stagnant, while demand has increased causing rents to surge in the cities most affordable zone.

![Rent and Vacancy Rate Graph]

**Figure 37.** Average Rent in Current Dollars of All Apartment Types and Vacancy Rate Northern Kingston (CMHC, 2016).

### 5.2.4 Remainder of CMA

This zone includes Lakeside, Trillium, Collins Barridge, Loyalist Cataraqui, Pittsburgh and Countryside Districts as well as areas outside the City of Kingston. This zone has seen 300 units of new rental housing completed in 2016 (Figure 38). The majority of the rental stock consists of two-bedroom units: This zone saw decreases in average rents by 1.49% per year from 2013 to 2016 (Figure 39).
The increased rental rate from $1,135 in 2015 to $1,190 in 2016 was due to the construction of new rental housing - approximately 300 units come online during the last two years and have begun to slowly lease up. These new apartments command high rents for the added amenities and luxury. This zone is not following the normal correlation between increased vacancy and lower rents, as the newly constructed units are affecting the average rent. This suggests that it is older units that are vacant and the newly constructed higher-end apartments are being rented by the population.

Figure 38. New Rental Housing Completed in Remainder of CMA Zone (Homestead, n.d).

Figure 39. Average Rent in Current Dollars of All Apartment Types and Vacancy Rate Remainder of CMA (CMHC, 2016).

5.3 Households Spending More than 30% of Income Shelter

A benchmark for affordable housing is spending less than 30% of your pre-tax household income on shelter. Spending more than 30% of your pre-tax household income on shelter is considered unaffordable. Shelter costs for rental households is considered payment of rent and any payments for electricity, fuel, water and other municipal services. For owner household’s shelter costs are mortgage payments, property taxes, any condominium fees, along with payments for electricity, water and other municipal services. The larger proportion of income that is attributed to shelter, means less income can be dedicated toward other of life necessities.
The number of households in the Kingston CMA who spend more than 30% of income on shelter has grown by 3,445 since 2006 (Figure 40) representing 26.2% of all households in the Kingston CMA. This figure includes both renter and ownership households. Previous data from 2006 showed that 22.74% of households were spending 30% or more of income on shelter costs.

According to Statistics Canada, Kingston CMA is ranked 7th highest of all CMA’s in Canada for households that paid 30% or more of income toward shelter costs. Nationally, 24.1% of households who spend more than 30% on shelter costs. Local comparators of Peterborough have 27% of the population in this category while Belleville stands at 24.6%.

5.3.1 Affordability of Renting

Section 5.2.1 through to 5.2.4 outlined that all rental zones in the Kingston CMA have seen increases in rental rates from 2013 - 2016. As seen in Section 5.1 rental rates have increased 14% above the rate of inflation over the past ten years. This has caused an increased stress on the affordability of renting.

The 2016 Census data show that 48.2% of rental households in the Kingston CMA spend more than 30% of income on rental housing in 2016, meaning that they do not have the yearly income required to obtain affordable rental housing. In comparison only, 13.2% of ownership households spend more than 30% of income on shelter. Rental households struggle the most in terms of affordability as almost half spending more than 30% of income on shelter. This suggests a lack of affordable rental units in the Kingston CMA.

“48.2% of rental households spend more than 30% of income on rental housing.” -Statistics Canada (2016).

Table 6. Yearly Income Required to Rent Different Apartment Types in the Kingston CMA (CMHC, 2016).
The Kingston CMA has an average rent of $1,120, requiring an annual income of approximately $45,000. As stated in section 3.2 the median individual income is only $32,609, making it unaffordable to live in the privacy of the average one-bedroom rental apartment that required an income of $37,680.

### 5.3.2 Affordability by Household Type

One-person households struggle the most of all household types in terms of affordability, as this family group only relies on one income. One-person households account for 52% of households who spend more than 30% on shelter, an increase since 2006 (Figure 41). Within this group, females make up 62% of the one-person households and people aged 65 years and over make up 32% of this group.

One-person households can be on fixed low-incomes such as Old Age Security, Ontario Works or Ontario Disability Support Program which does not provide enough income to rent the average apartment in the Kingston CMA. All other household types saw a decrease in the percentage of household that spend 30% or more on shelter.

![Figure 41. Family Types that Make up Tenant Household Spending More Than 30% of Income on Shelter (Statistics Canada, 2016).](image)
Figure 42. Percent of Tenant Household in 2016 Spending 30% or More of Its Income on Shelter Costs (Statistics Canada, 2016)
5.3.3 Home Prices
The average home price in the Kingston CMA was $302,000 in 2016, below the national average of $609,000 (CREA, 2016).

Housing prices vary across the Kingston CMA.
The most expensive were Sydenham, Portsmouth and part of Collins Bayridge. These areas are amenity-rich, close to major employment centres, and have good schools that make them attractive to potential homeowners and investors. The city’s most affordable districts, with median home values below $250,000 are concentrated in the King’s Town and Kingscourt Rideau District. These districts have been perceived as less desirable due to the quality of construction in the area, a large concentration of social housing, poor property upkeep and smaller home size.

New homes in the Kingston CMA has higher purchase prices than resale homes. The average purchase price of a new home in 2016 was between $390,000-$460,000 compared to the average of $302,000 for resales (CMHC, 2016). New construction is more expensive than resales as the costs to construct are significantly more expensive per square foot than resale homes. New homes are larger than homes previously built, thus more square footage requires a higher sale price.

In addition, a recent change has occurred as out-of-town investors have begun purchasing newly constructed housing for speculation. One Toronto realtor has sold over 300 homes in the past year in the Woodhaven subdivision located in Loyalist-Cataraqui District.

“One Toronto Realtor has sold over 300 Kingston homes to out of town investors.”
-The Whig Standard November 3rd, 2017

These new homes have become sought after by Greater Toronto Area (GTA) investors looking for an affordable real estate investment. Home owners of the GTA are also selling their personal residences for a large profit, and moving to more affordable home ownership areas like the Kingston CMA. This population has been able to either retain their job in the GTA through teleworking or are finding work within the Kingston CMA (MacAlpine, 2017). Investors and relocation have increased demand for housing, adding new supply lag demand as constructing a new home requires ample time. This causes an increase in prices that benefits current home owners, but makes home ownership more expensive for those who have not entered the market.

5.3.4 Home Ownership Rates
Table 7 presents homeownership rates in Kingston CMA, Ontario and Canada in 2016. Homeownership rates continued to rise in the Kingston CMA in the face of rising prices, increasing to 67.4% in 2016. This is still below the National average of 68.4% and the Ontario average 69.7%. Nationally and provincially home ownership rates declined, while the Kingston CMA rate continued to trend upwards.
Ownership households are concentrated in Countryside, Loyalist, Pittsburgh, Collins-Bayridge, Lakeside and Trillium Districts. Home owners are typically better off financially the renters with only 14.2% of home owners reported spending more than 30% of income on shelter.

5.4 Student Rental Market

Most students in the Kingston CMA relocate here from other cities, with 95% of the Queen’s University student population being from outside the Kingston CMA. The number of full-time students on Queen’s campus in 2006 was approximately 18,500 students, but this has swelled to 23,500 students in 2016 (Queen’s University, 2016). Combined with St Lawrence College and Royal Military College a total student population of approximately 30,180 exists within the Kingston CMA.

Available capacity of residences is approximately 5,500 students with 1,000 students living at home. Nearly 23,680 students are in the market for rental housing. This will continue to grow as Queen’s University is calling for a growth target of an additional 500 students per year. St Lawrence College is increasing its program offerings and conducting a campus expansion in hopes of attracting more students.

The 23,680 student renters are not accounted for by Statistics Canada. This portion of the population competes with the 55,444 permeant Kingston CMA residents who identify as renters or 34.4% of the total Kingston CMA population. In total, 79,124 people are in the market for rental housing when the student population is considered. This puts pressure on the rental supply in the Kingston CMA and is a reason why vacancy rates of two percent in 2016 are found in the Downtown and Southwestern areas.

“Approximately 23,680 Students are in the market for Rental Housing”
-Andrew Eberhard (2017)

Post-secondary institutions have made it a priority to grow, and new student growth will come from outside of the Kingston CMA. These institutions do not want to provide more housing for students, citing unprofitability due to management and administration required. Instead, institutions opt to house only 90% of first year students. With Queen’s University’s first year class growing significantly in the last 6 years, the University has built two new facilities to accommodate approximately 445 people (Figure 43).

### Table 7. Homeownership Rates in the Kingston CMA (Statistics Canada, 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>65.60%</td>
<td>67.00%</td>
<td>67.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
<td>71.40%</td>
<td>69.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>67.80%</td>
<td>69.00%</td>
<td>68.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 43. New Residences Built in 2015 by Queen's University (Queen’s University, 2015).

Only 18-20% of students are in residences, and these units are not included in CMHC rental market survey. The remaining students are in the rental market predominately being provided by private landlords. This mass concentration of students has put immense pressure on low-density neighbourhoods surrounding post-secondary institutions. Sydenham, Portsmouth and Williamsville Districts have had many single-detached homes converted to rooming houses and multiplexes specifically targeted at the student rental market. One real estate developer suggests that since 2011, 300 homes have been lost to student rental conversion to meet the demand for student housing (Schleismann, 2012).

Housing provided by these institutions has not kept pace with student enrollment. Furthermore, only one purpose-built rental targeted at students has been completed to date with a capacity of just 498 occupants (Figure 44).

Figure 44. Purpose Built Student Rental Housing in Williamsville District (Patry Developments Inc, n.d.)

Many development applications exist to construct more private student rental apartment buildings but have been held up due to opposition and lack of infrastructure in the area. This has put pressure on districts surrounding post-secondary institutions as the demand continues to rise for student rentals. This demand is being met with supply of converted single family homes some with massive additions to create more living space.

“Many long-term residents in the surrounding community are already feeling “pushed out” by the growing demand for rental housing.” (AMS, 2013).

The downtown rental zone and the southwestern rental zone benefit from the growth in student enrollment. CMHC noted that that growing student population is a large driving force behind the low vacancy rate in the Southwest zone and Downtown zone, especially among bachelor and one-bedroom units.
“Rental market demand in the city’s center continued to be supported by a large number of full-time students enrolled at Queen’s University and St. Lawrence College”
- CMHC Rental Market Report Fall 2016

Undergraduate students are concentrated in districts adjacent to Queen’s University and St Lawrence College. These areas have a high prevalence of 4+ bedrooms that cater to the student population. Typically, real estate investors add extra dwelling units or increase the number of bedrooms to generate more revenue.

Most dwellings in Sydenham and Portsmouth district were not designed or large enough to support four or more bedrooms when initially constructed. Conversions of communal areas and additions have allowed these older homes to be modified to support more bedrooms.

Figure 45 shows a common sight for dwellings in the Sydenham, Williamsville and Portsmouth districts; additions in the rear lots to increase the size of dwellings. This has caused many 4+ bedrooms in the Sydenham and Portsmouth District to accommodate student rental demand. Figure 46 show’s a large concentration of 4+ bedroom homes in the Sydenham and Portsmouth district.

Figure 45. Addition on Kingston Home in the Portsmouth District to Accommodate Student Rental Demand (Kingston Region, 2017)
Figure 46. Location of 4 or more Bedroom Homes in the Kingston CMA Statistics Canada, 2016).
5.5 Condominiums in Kingston CMA

Condominiums (hereafter referred to as condos) are not the majority form of home ownership in the Kingston CMA. Figure 47 shows housing starts from 2007 until 2016. Most housing starts have been freehold units such as single detached homes. While rental has remained steady with 100 – 400 housing starts per year, condo has seen numerous years of 0 housing starts with only two projects of 112 units and 44 units stated completed since 2006 (CMHC, 2017).

The highest concentration of condominiums is in the Sydenham and Trillium Districts (Figure 50). This form of ownership is popular in high rises to divide the common elements such as hallways, parking areas and amenity areas among individual owners. High rise condos are popular in built-up areas as it offers new home ownership opportunities when land has been completely developed in an area.

Condos are also available in the form of condo-townhomes, which are like traditional freehold townhomes, except that common elements such as private roads, snow clearing, landscaping etc. are performed by the condo association and paid for by the condo owners. This type of condo is popular in areas where land is more available such as the Trillium and Strathcona districts.

Figure 47. History of Housing Starts in Kingston CMA

The Condominium Ownership Survey performed by CMHC, show’s that in a condo, 75% of owners are primary residents, while the remaining 25% are investors who will rent the unit (CMHC, 2016). In the Kingston CMA, new low, mid and high-rise condo developments are being proposed, with the target market being investors. With strong rental demand from students, as of November 2017, one new condo development (Sage Prestige) is under construction that will deliver 360 units to market. New condo developments are being proposed to

Figure 48. Examples of High and Low Rise Condos in the Kingston CMA.
capture this rental/investment market. Condo developments such as University Suites and Capitol Condos together are proposing 360 new condo units. Together, these three projects triple the number of units started in the last 10 years.

![Sage Prestige](image)

*Figure 49. Current Condo Project under Construction Sage Prestige (IN8 Development, n.d.)*

These units are being targeted at investors who can take advantage of low vacancy in the downtown zone and rent units out to students or young professionals to carry costs. Also, the lack of high-quality housing in the downtown zone allows for the retrieval of high rental rates. These condo projects are all offering sale-leaseback opportunities to purchasers. This is where a purchaser is guaranteed a rental income for about 2-3 years from the developer which secures the investment.

Developers are also offering property management services for the out of town investors/landlords. These developments have even been put on real estate agent’s website in Toronto as investment opportunities for people who are outpriced of the Toronto market.

The investor portion of the condo market will have a significant impact on rental housing in the downtown zone. It will first supply high-quality housing to the rental market, in a zone that experiences just 2% vacancy. This creates more choice for renters in the downtown zone, and increases the standard of housing, forcing sub-par rentals to either upgrade or decrease the rental rate. These projects also take pressure off low-density neighbourhoods as the projects supply many rental units in central locations. All three projects are proposed in the Sydenham or Williamsville District, as section 5.4 states as these districts are most affected by conversions. These projects will slow the need for new conversions and take pressure off low-density neighbourhoods.

Although these new projects will add much needed supply to the rental market, these units will be unaffordable and out of reach for most rental households. The rents forecasted for these units is well above current market rates. With 48.2% of tenant households already spending more than 30% or more of income on shelter, most will not be able to upgrade to a higher end unit offered by these projects.
Figure 50. 2016 Percentage of Occupied Dwellings that are Condominiums Kingston CMA (Statistics Canada, 2016)
5.6 KEY FINDINGS

- From 2006 – 2016 home ownership grew from 65.6% to 67.7% of the Kingston’s CMA population.
- Homes prices have increased 18% above inflation since 2006.
- Rental rates have increased 14% above inflation since 2006.
- Downtown, Southwestern and Northern rental zones have a landlord-friendly market with vacancy rates below 3%.
- Rental households struggle more than ownership households in terms of affordability, with 48.2% of rental households spending more than 30% of income on shelter.
- Within rental households who spend more than 30% of income on shelter, one-person households make up 52% of this group.
- The growth of the post-secondary education has created an excess rental demand of approximately 23,680 student renters.
- Most of the student rental demand has been met through conversion of single detached homes in low-density neighbourhoods.
- Condos still represent a small portion of home ownership in Kingston CMA, but with strong student rental demand is poised to take off with investors purchasing these condo units.
- Condo units proposed in the Williamsville and Sydenham district are over 750+ units; this is more condo units then has been completed in the Kingston CMA in the last 10 years.
CHAPTER 6 | CONCLUSION
CONCLUSIONS

The subjects presented in this report were divided into separate Chapters but they are very much connected. This Chapter summarizes the key findings found in each individual Chapter. First, a table is presented to help summarize key trends. Following this table, a summary of findings by District is provided.

Following these summaries, recommendations for the Social Planning Council of Kingston, The City of Kingston, and Queen’s University are provided. The recommendations in this chapter are intended to address the implications presented in this table as a way to help manage the implications of the changes.

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

The key findings presented in each chapter may have shared implications for the City of Kingston and the agencies concerned with the well-being of all Kingstonians.

The following table summarizes the trends from each chapter. Each key trend is then further described in its context to geographic changes. Interpretations describe how the trends may impact social planning decisions and research. Following this table, key trends by CMA District will be presented.
### Key Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Trends</th>
<th>Changes Within the City of Kingston</th>
<th>Interpretations for Social Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Population** | - Ageing population | - Significant increase in population over 65 years  
| | - Peripheral areas are seeing substantial growth | - Changes in demand for services may occur  
| | | - Strategies to replace working force as employees retire continue to be important |
| **Income & Poverty** | - Continued concentrated poverty in same areas  
| | - Lone-parent families likely to experience poverty | - Areas of concentrated poverty are the same in 2006 and 2016: Williamsville, King’s Town, and Kingscourt-Rideau  
| | | - Income is higher with increased distance from the downtown area | - Increasing rental prices create challenges for low-income families  
| | | | - No intervention may result in low-income trends continuing |
| **Families, Children & Seniors** | - Increase in number of young children  
| | - Increase in number of lone-parent families | - More families with children are locating to new suburban areas  
| | | - Seniors continue to live in single-detached houses that they own; they are ageing in place  
| | | - Lone parent families are spread throughout the CMA but appear to concentrate in areas of general high population | - Growth in the number of families in new suburban areas may increase demand for schools and other services  
| | | | - Seniors aging in place may face transportation challenges to services or may require increased neighbourhood distance services |
| **Housing** | - Increasing cost of rent and ownership  
| | - Increased developments along the fringe | - New family housing is growing in suburbs away from the urban core  
| | | - High number of rentals in low-income areas  
| | | - Student demand leading to increase in rental pricing in the downtown | - Affordable housing concerns  
| | | | - Different types of housing may be required to accommodate young families and increasing number of seniors  
| | | | - Affordability may continue to decline if no intervention is taken |
6.2 Summary of Geographic Change in Districts, 2006 – 2016

6.2.1 Sydenham
Sydenham District is highly dense in the downtown area of the City of Kingston, but has patterns of change from the last decade that are different from nearby Districts. Previously, from 2001 to 2006, the area saw a decline in population; but from 2006 to 2016, the most Eastern portion of the District along the water has experienced positive population growth. The number of young children (ages 0-9) and seniors in the area has grown significantly. Unlike the other downtown Districts, Sydenham also has a slightly higher median household income of $55,000 - $70,000. This exception in the downtown area is likely the presence of professional, higher earning households who prefer to live in downtown, walkable areas. The higher median household income is evident in housing as well, as there are many high-rise condominiums being developed in the area. The new condominiums have altered the housing market in the area and caused the median dwelling value of Sydenham to rise significantly. However, similarly to the other downtown Districts, Sydenham continues to be more likely to have residents living in poverty than the suburbs, and has a prevalence of low-income of 10-20%. There is a high student population in the area, which causes increased pressure on the rental housing stock in the district, a trend which requires further investigation.

6.2.2 Williamsville
Williamsville is the downtown area and borders the North End of the City of Kingston. It is highly dense, and continues to experience similar trends from 2006. The neighbourhood is very young, with a median age of 23.2 – 29.7, but this may be influenced by the student population. Similarly, to other downtown Districts, Williamsville has experienced a negative population change, suggesting that residents are leaving the downtown in preference for the suburbs and rural areas. The District continues to have a concentration of poverty, with a median household income of less than $40,000 and 20-50% of residents living in low-income. The Williamsville and King’s Town Districts experience the highest rate of poverty in Kingston CMA. The majority of Williamsville residents, 55-75%, continue to rent their household, and the student population living in the area continues to put increased pressure on the housing stock. As a consequence, prices have been increasing, but incomes have not increased accordingly, resulting in affordability issues.

6.2.3 King’s Town
King’s Town is in the downtown area and the North End of the City of Kingston, bordering the Great Cataraqui River. The District follows similar trends to Williamsville, as it is very dense, with a young median age (29.9 – 38.5), is declining in population and experiences a high rate of poverty (20-50%) with a low median household income ($less than $40,000). These trends continue from 2006, suggesting that continued efforts to improve affordability are in need.
6.2.4 Kingscourt-Rideau
Kingscourt-Rideau is considered the North End of Kingston, as it is adjacent to Williamsville and King’s Town to the South and Highway 401 to the North. The District is unique in that its lower half experiences the same trends as King’s Town and Williamsville, but the upper half has experienced a change from 2006 patterns. Unlike its neighbouring Districts, Kingscourt-Rideau is growing in population. The most Northern portion of the District in particular has experienced a 20-49.9% growth in the number of young children, ages 0-4. However, the District continues to have a low median household income of primarily less than $40,000, and most areas with a prevalence of low income of 20-50%. Interestingly, the most Northern portion with a growth in the number of young children has a low-income rate of 5-10%, suggesting that revitalization efforts in the area by the City of Kingston may be successful.

6.2.5 Pittsburgh
Located on the Eastern side of the Great Cataraqui River, the Pittsburgh District is rapidly growing with some of the most construction activity in the City. Many of the homes offer 4 or more bedrooms, creating new family suburbs with a median dwelling value higher than the downtown and older suburban areas. The number of young children and seniors has increased in the district to support this trend. The District also has a high median household income of $85,000 - $102,000, with less than 2.5% of the population living in low income. The rapid increase in new, expensive family housing suggests that wealthier residents are choosing to live in new suburban areas outside of Kingston’s downtown.

6.2.6 Portsmouth
The Portsmouth District is located to the West of Sydenham along Lake Ontario. A population decline was seen in the District, a trend which continues from 2001 to 2006. However, the area is affected by post-secondary students who are not picked up in Census data. Thus, it is likely that despite data showing a decline in population, the number of people in the area may have increased due to homes being turned over as student rentals. The area is a transition zone from the downtown to the new suburbs and urban fringe, demonstrating a strong radial pattern of income and poverty; the further away from the downtown a household is, the higher the median household income of household tends to be. Likewise, poverty decreases with increased distance from the downtown.

6.2.7 Meadowbrook-Strathcona, Trillium, and Lakeside
The Meadowbrook-Strathcona, Trillium, and Lakeside Districts are older suburban communities with a lower population density. Older suburbs in the area consist of many single-detached homes, many of which “empty nesters” (senior residents with adult children who have moved out) continue to occupy. The area remains relatively stable and has similar trends from 2001 to 2006, with a variety of incomes, housing types, and age ranges co-existing. Similar to Portsmouth, the District is a transition zone of income and poverty from the downtown to the newer suburbs and the fringe.
6.2.8 Loyalist-Cataraqui and Collins-Bayridge

Loyalist-Cataraqui and Collins-Bayridge districts are experiencing similar trends to the Pittsburgh District. Since 2006, the population has largely grown across all age groups. In particular, construction activity is the most active in Loyalist-Cataraqui and Pittsburgh, respectively. Most of the new housing has been single family housing. The influx of people in the areas indicates that servicing needs for the area, such as transportation to school for children and medical access for seniors, may have to expand to meet the needs of residents living further away from the downtown.

6.2.9 Countryside

The Countryside District is located North of Highway 401, and consists of a rural landscape with larger homes and lots. The District has seen increased population growth in the past decade in all age groups, which is due to housing within the urban boundary of the City of Kingston experiencing significant increase in price. Countryside District offers lower land values than the City with larger home and lot size, offering affordable housing for potential buyers. Likewise, the area has a low poverty rate with a median household income between $70,000 to $85,000. The trend of movement out to Countryside District is likely to continue unless housing affordability issues improve.

6.2.10 Kingston CMA: Township of South Frontenac, Loyalist Township, Amherstview

The areas outside of the City of Kingston within the CMA follow similar population, income, and housing trends as the Countryside district. In general, population has been increasing in all age groups over the past decade; interestingly, the senior population has grown between 45-69% in the Township of South Frontenac. Single detached homes on larger lots remain the prominent housing type, and are a lower cost than within the City of Kingston urban boundary, offering an affordable option for residents. As such, median household incomes remain at a steady $70,000 - $85,000, and less than 2.5% of residents live in poverty. However, the most Northern area of the CMA has a slightly higher prevalence of low income at 2.5-5%. This area was not investigated closely, and the reasoning behind why more poverty exists at the furthest point away from the City of Kingston should be studied.
6.3  Key Themes from the Study

The trends presented in this Chapter have shown that patterns of changed in population, families, children, seniors, income and housing are highly interrelated. Overall, four themes have emerged.

6.3.1. Rapid Growth in New Suburbs and the Periphery

Over the past decade, population growth in Kingston CMA has been concentrated in the new suburbs and peripheral areas. New families and seniors alike are increasing in number in the Loyalist-Cataraqui and Pittsburgh districts while the downtown declines in population. This pattern is increasingly problematic in a society that is aiming towards sustainability, which includes aspects like intensification and increased public transportation usage. As populations continue to leave the downtown, services have to meet the needs of residents moving out – this includes schools, water and wastewater servicing, roads, and so on. This puts financial pressure on the City, and reduces the financial assistance that other areas receive, such as providing more affordable housing options in the downtown. As such, there is an increased pressure on the existing downtown housing stock, which continues to be heavily occupied by students.

6.3.2 Growth in Young Children and Seniors

The community has become accustomed to the number of children continuously declining for some years. However, the 2016 Census shows a change to this pattern as the number of young children, ages 0-9, saw an increase. This will have a variety of planning implications for services, such as after-school care, locations of education facilities, transportation to and from said facilities, and social service providers. Similar to across Ontario, the Kingston CMA is experience significant growth in the number of seniors who live within the CMA. This is particularly so for the age cohort 65-69 which saw an increase of 56%. An ageing population is not a unique trend in Kingston, but it is nonetheless a challenge with an abundance of potential impacts that requires a massive amount of investment in services. For example, changes in demand for services such as transportation, health care, and retirement homes are likely to rise. This is especially problematic for seniors who live far away from the downtown, where many services are located. As some seniors lose the ability to drive, the CMA will have to consider alternative modes of care to reach residents, which will once again place a financial strain on the CMA, reducing the investment that could be placed elsewhere.

6.3.3 Increase in Lone Parent Families

Patterns of family structures are changing. In the Kingston CMA, the number of lone parent families is on the rise; this trend continues from 2006. Lone-parent families mean that there is typically only one wage-earner to support the family. Although lone-parent families are more likely to experience poverty, they are widely dispersed across the CMA.

There are unique services and supports that lone parent families would benefit from. For example, this includes after-school care, easy access to camps for P.A. days and the summer months,
financial and social service providers to help the next generation of children receive the same opportunities as their peers. If the needs of vulnerable families are not met by a lack of funding in social services, the rate of lone-parent families experiencing poverty may continue to rise.

6.3.4. Poverty and Affordable Housing

Poverty has declined but affordability of housing remains high. The Kingston CMA is fortunate to have had a declining poverty rate in the past decade, moving from 9.8% to 8% of the population living in low-income. However, there is still a lack of affordable housing options, creating a challenge for low-income families and individuals. Families with middle and higher incomes are locating in outer areas of the City of Kingston and the CMA due to lack of affordable housing located in the downtown area, where single detached houses on larger lots are prevalent. Low-income families continue to remain concentrated in the downtown of Kingston CMA and the North End, consisting of Williamsville, King’s Town and Kingscourt-Rideau Districts of Kingston. Thus, the trend of wealthier people living in the suburbs and along the urban fringe has been prominent in Kingston CMA over the past 10 years.

While this study has identified a number of socio-demographic trends, more studies are required to fully understand the many factors affecting trends in the Kingston CMA. Limitations such as the lack of student reporting in the Census has a consideration impact on planning in the City of Kingston, and requires more research to interpret and understand. Additionally, there is opportunity to explore all Census topics at the Dissemination Area level as this geographic product become available.

6.4 Recommendations

The data analysis produced has a wide range of important demographic information that the SPC, the City of Kingston, Queen’s University, and other stakeholders would benefit from using when planning for the future. To further improve the quality of life within the CMA, services and supports may need to be reorganized and re-planned to better meet the needs of the population. The wide-ranging implications of changes identified suggest that follow-up action from many organizations and agencies would need to be considered. Given the roles and responsibility of various sectors, there some steps that could be undertaken by the SPC of Kingston, the City of Kingston and the post-secondary institutions, especially Queen’s University which has the largest enrolment of students in the area. However, other branches of social services and the education sector may need to be involved.

**Based on the findings of this report, it is recommended that:**

*The Social Planning Council:*

1. Accept this report and make it easily available to a wide audience by broadcasting the results to other organizations,

2. Continue to investigate the implications of the socio-demographic trends presented in this report, and
3. Continue to support research initiatives as further data becomes available through Statistics Canada.

_The City of Kingston:_

1. Investigate what has contributed to the reduction of poverty between 2006 and 2016, and focus initiatives on continuing these strategies,

2. Consider how the newly revised Official Plan and other policy addresses the socio-demographic trends and challenges addressed in this report,

3. Strengthen partnerships with Queen’s University to develop effective affordable housing strategies to address increased enrolments and help mitigate the current pressure on rental stock in the downtown area.

4. Collaborate with the SPC to continue to investigate the implications of the socio-demographic trends presented in this report.

_Queen’s University:_

1. Strengthen partnerships with the City of Kingston to develop effective affordable housing strategies to help mitigate the current pressure on rental stock in the downtown area

2. Investigate the role of students on the City of Kingston’s housing stock and the economy

Analyzing socio-demographic trends over the past decade can provide some insight how to plan for the decade ahead. This Profile and the information it provides is only a first step to a broader understanding of how the Kingston CMA may continue to grow and evolve.

For the first time in ten years, communities have access to long-form Census data. Statistics Canada provides reliable, understandable information about demographics across the country. Sharing the socio-demographic information uncovered throughout this Profile will help to guide future planning endeavors throughout Kingston CMA. It is highly recommended that further research be completed with the community and potential partners to gain a comprehensive understanding of why socio-demographic trends are occurring, and what indicators in the past decade are responsible for change. Additionally, analysis should be conducted to determine how trends may impact service in Kingston CMA (i.e. location of employment centres, drivers in Kingston’s housing sector, success of intensification policy, how students affect housing affordability for locals in the downtown, etc.).

The Appendix provides additional research in the creation of the Profile, which should be considered when planning for the future of Kingston CMA. Next steps should consider what research derived from the information in this Profile to prioritize further studies, including how understanding the socio-demographic trends will create opportunities to support growth and opportunity in Kingston CMA.
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APPENDIX A

INDIGENOUS PEOPLE

Kingston has a rich Indigenous history that continues to contribute to the community’s social diversity. This is reflected through the presence of different indigenous groups within the Kingston CMA. In 2016, 62% of the total Kingston CMA Indigenous population identified as First Nations, 33% as Métis, and 1% as Inuk (Inuit).

The number of people in the Indigenous community has been on the rise since 2006, experiencing a 70% growth between 2006 and 2016. The number of people who identified as Indigenous within the Kingston CMA went from 3,290 individuals in 2006 to 5,585 by 2016. Consequently, the Indigenous community represented 4.5% of the total CMA population in 2016.

Corresponding with the growth of the Kingston CMA’s Indigenous population, the number of individuals Registered or with Treaty Indian status also increased. According to Statistics Canada, Registered Indians are persons who are registered under the Indian Act of Canada, while Treaty Indians are persons who belong to a First Nation or Indian band that signed a treaty with the Crown. In the case of the Kingston CMA, there were 1,005 individuals with Registered Indian Status in 2006. By 2016, that number increased to 1,475 (out of the total 5,585). Note that the remaining 4,110 individuals do not have official Status under the Indian Act, but self-identify as Indigenous.

Young Indigenous Population

Kingston’s Indigenous community is very young in comparison to the rest of the CMA. Families are characterized by a high number of children in census families, where individuals aged 25 years and under represent 39% of the total Indigenous population (Refer to Figure 52 and 53).

Only 8% of the Indigenous population is over the age of 65 years. The growth of the Indigenous population in the Kingston CMA over the last decade could also be related to the young nature of the Indigenous population. This trend contrasts with the non-Indigenous population of Kingston and Canada, where there is a decrease in the number of children and the Baby Boomer generation is resulting in an aging population.
The growth of the Indigenous population in the Kingston CMA over the last decade strengthens and contributes to the proud and vibrant Indigenous culture, arts and heritage and add to Kingston’s social diversity.

*Figure 52.* Age range of Indigenous Identities in Kingston, 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

*Figure 53.* Family Characteristics of Indigenous people in Kingston, 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
SOCIAL DIVERSITY

Canada is a multicultural society that has been shaped over time by immigrants and their descendants. Each wave of immigration to the Kingston CMA has added to the area’s ethnic background, cultural composition and linguistic characteristics. Over time, patterns of immigration have shifted, and the City has become more diverse.

Growth in the City’s cultural diversity is reflected in the increasing popularity of the annual Multicultural Arts Festival. Sunita Gupta, Kingston Immigration Partnership (KIP) facilitator and one of the main organizers of the annual festival explains, "We’ve grown every year and over the last four years we have doubled the number of pavilions at the festival. This year, we had 18 cultural pavilions and three new countries participating, and that is wonderful to see". The festival highlights Kingstonian’s desire to support a diverse community that learns from one another and continues to provide a welcoming environment for all.

The following section will provide an overview of immigration trends to Kingston CMA, and then investigate the different languages that are present in the community.

---

Immigration to Kingston CMA

Immigration to the Kingston CMA has remained relatively stable over the past few decades, resulting in an increasingly diverse community. According to Statistics Canada, before 1981 the City of Kingston had received more than 7,000 immigrants. Since then, the number of incoming people has been slowly increasing (Refer to Figure 56). From 1981 to 2016, Kingston CMA received 9,335 immigrants and 1,710 non-permanent residents.

Recent Immigrants

Statistics Canada uses the term ‘recent immigrant’ to refer to an immigrant who first obtained his or her landed immigrant or permanent resident status between January 1, 2011 and May 10, 2016. For the Kingston CMA, a total of 1,720 individuals identified as a recent migrant. Of them, 56% were from Asia (including the Middle East), 16% from the Americas, 14% from Europe, and 12% from Africa (refer to Figure 57).

Over the past decade from 2006 to 2016, there have been about 3,440 people who immigrated to Kingston. Recalling the previous Population chapter, the Kingston CMA population grew from 152,358 to 161,175 people from 2006 to 2016 – a

---


5 Non-permanent residents' includes persons from another country who have a work or study permit or who are refugee claimants, and their family members sharing the same permit and living in Canada with them.
growth in 8,817 residents. **This means that immigration made up almost HALF of the growth in Kingston CMA.**

*Figure 54. Recent immigrants by selected places of birth for Kingston, 2011-2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).*

**Age of Immigration**

The majority of individuals who have immigrated to the Kingston CMA prior to May 10, 2016 are between the ages of 25 and 44 years, which accounts for 39% of the total immigration population in private households. The largest age bracket of immigrants is under the age of 25 years, accounting for 54.7% of the immigrant population (Figure 57). The latter indicates that the majority of the immigrants are usually young and able to contribute to Kingston’s workforce and growing economy.

*Figure 55. Age at immigration for Kingston immigrant population (Statistics Canada, 2016).*
Languages

The growth of Kingston social diversity is also reflected through the abundance of languages present. Language is intrinsic to the expression of culture and essential to communicate and preserve values, beliefs and customs of diverse community members⁶. The Kingston CMA is home to a rich variety of languages, which contribute to Kingston’s growing diversity.

While the English language may be the most prevalent in the area, there are over 75 different languages that residents identified as their mother tongue in the 2016 Census. Mother tongue refers to the first language learned at home in childhood and still understood by the person at the time of data collection. According to Statistics Canada (2016), English is the mother tongue for 136,340 Kingstonians, French is for 5,065, and other languages is for 13,185 people. Figure 58 below highlights the most common languages within Kingston CMA. The assortment of other languages demonstrates that immigrants are arriving from all around the globe to Kingston. Figure 60 lists some of the most common non-official languages that are spoken in the community.

---

Francophone Population

In the Kingston CMA in 2016, there were 5,065 residents, or 3.2% of the population, who identified French as their mother tongue (see Figure 59). This population is referred to as Francophone. In addition, 720 residents identified both French and English as their mother tongue.

Since 2006 the number of Francophones increased from 4,305 to 5,065 individuals. This is a growth of 17.7%, which is significantly higher than the overall population growth for the Kingston CMA. This suggests that the Francophone population is continuing to grow and flourish. The Francophone population is remaining steady in the Kingston CMA, indicating that a strong Francophone presence continues to contribute to Kingston’s diversity.

The number of people who speak French, but have a mother tongue other than French (i.e. a mother tongue of English, but learning French) is also on the rise. There are slightly more people who speak French at home in the Kingston CMA that are not necessarily a Francophone. In 2016, 6,650 residents noted speaking French within their homes. This number suggests that the French language is becoming increasingly common in the Kingston CMA for residents whose mother tongue is a different language. Of the 6,650 residents, 5,565 reported speaking more than just French at home, mostly English. Thus, Kingston CMA is becoming more bilingual, which is a trend that will likely continue and contribute to the diversity of languages within the community.

KEY FINDINGS

- There is an increase from 2006 to 2016 in the number of Francophones in the Kingston CMA, strengthening the presence of the French language and culture in the community.
- The number of immigrants and newcomers to Kingston CMA remains steady in 2016, supporting the thriving Multicultural Arts Festival to display Kingston’s diversity.
- The Kingston CMA’s growing diversity indicates that the planning for multiculturalism will become increasingly important to foster an inclusive community.
The following glossary of terms was derived from the Statistics Canada 2016 Census Dictionary and from Statistics Canada.

**Aboriginal Identity** – Refers to whether the person identified with the Aboriginal peoples of Canada. This includes those who are First Nations (North American Indian), Métis or Inuk (Inuit) and/or those who are Registered or Treaty Indians (that is, registered under the Indian Act of Canada), and/or those who have membership in a First Nation or Indian band. Aboriginal peoples of Canada are defined in the Constitution Act, 1982, Section 35 (2) as including the Indian, Inuit and Métis peoples of Canada.

**Adjusted After-Tax Income** – Refers to after-tax income of the statistical unit that is adjusted for economies of scale. The adjustment factor, also known as the equivalence scale, is the square root of the number of persons in the statistical unit. The adjusted after-tax income is calculated by dividing the after-tax income by this adjustment factor. The adjustment made to income addresses the fact that individuals living together can share resources and the marginal increase in need decreases as the number of individuals sharing resources increases.

**Age at Immigration** – Refers to the age at which an immigrant first obtained landed immigrant or permanent resident status.

**Census Family** – A married couple and the children, if any, of either and/or both spouses; a couple living common law and the children, if any, of either and/or both partners; or a lone parent of any marital status with at least one child living in the same dwelling and that child or those children. All members of a particular census family live in the same dwelling. A couple may be of opposite or same sex. Children may be children by birth, marriage, common-law union or adoption regardless of their age or marital status as long as they live in the dwelling and do not have their own married spouse, common-law partner or child living in the dwelling. Grandchildren living with their grandparent(s) but with no parents present also constitute a census family.

**Census Family Structure** – Refers to the combination of relatives that comprise a census family. Classification of this variable considers the presence or absence of married spouses or common-law partners and children.

**Citizenship** – refers to the country where the person has citizenship. A person may have more than one citizenship. A person may be stateless, that is, they may have no citizenship. Citizenship can be by birth or naturalization.

**Collective Households** – Refers to a person or a group of persons who occupy a collective dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada. Data for collective households with foreign and/or temporary residents only are not shown.

**Households Outside Canada**: Refers to a person or a group of persons residing together outside Canada on government, military or diplomatic postings. Only limited data are available for these households.

**Composition of Income** – Refers to the composition of the total income of a population group or a geographic area refers to the relative share of each income source or group of sources, expressed as a percentage of the aggregate total income of that
group or area. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Condominium** - A building or complex of buildings containing a number of individually owned apartments or houses.

**Couple Family** – Refers to a family that contains a married or common-law couple. A couple may be of opposite or same sex. In economic families, a couple family is a family where the reference person has a legally married spouse or common-law partner in the family (regardless of whether or not the reference person also has children).

**Couple Family with Children** – Refers to a census family that contains a married couple or a couple living common law and at least one child. A couple may be of opposite or same sex. Children may be children by birth, marriage, common-law union or adoption regardless of their age or marital status as long as they live in the dwelling and do not have their own spouse, partner or child living in the dwelling.

**Economic Family** – Refers to a group of two or more persons who live in the same dwelling and are related to each other by blood, marriage, common-law union, adoption or a foster relationship. A couple may be of opposite or same sex. By definition, all persons who are members of a census family are also members of an economic family. Examples of the broader concept of economic family include the following: two co-resident census families who are related to one another are considered one economic family; co-resident siblings who are not members of a census family are considered as one economic family; and, nieces or nephews living with aunts or uncles are considered one economic family.

**Economic Family Structure** – Refers to the combination of relatives that comprise a family. Classification of this variable considers the presence or absence of married spouses or common-law partners; children; and other relatives.

**Economic Immigrants** - includes immigrants who have been selected for their ability to contribute to Canada's economy through their ability to meet labour market needs, to own and manage or to build a business, to make a substantial investment, to create their own employment or to meet specific provincial or territorial labour market needs

**Employment Income** – All income received as wages, salaries and commissions from paid employment and net self-employment income from farm or non-farm unincorporated business and/or professional practice during the reference period. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Ethnic Origin** – Refers to the ethnic or cultural origins of the person's ancestors. An ancestor is usually more distant than a grandparent.

**First Official Language Spoken** – is specified within the framework of the Official Languages Act. It refers to the first official language (i.e., English or French) spoken by the person.

**Generation Status** – Refers to whether or not the person or the person's parents were born in Canada.

**Global Non-Response Rate = 4.6%** – Means about 4.6% of people did not respond to a particular question; data always has a risk of not being 100% accurate.
**Government Transfers** – All cash benefits received from federal, provincial, territorial or municipal governments during the reference period. It includes: Old Age Security pension, Guaranteed Income Supplement, Allowance or Allowance for the Survivor; retirement, disability and survivor benefits from Canada Pension Plan and Québec Pension Plan; Benefits from Employment Insurance and Québec parental insurance plan; Child benefits from federal and provincial programs; Social assistance benefits; Workers' compensation benefits; Working income tax benefit; Goods and services tax credit and harmonized sales tax credit; other income from government sources. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Household** – Refers to a person or group of persons who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada or abroad. The dwelling may be either a collective dwelling or a private dwelling. The household may consist of a family group such as a census family, of two or more families sharing a dwelling, of a group of unrelated persons or of a person living alone. Household members who are temporarily absent on reference day are considered part of their usual household.

**Immigrant Status** – Refers to whether the person is a non-immigrant, an immigrant or a non-permanent resident.

**Immigration** – Refers to a person who is, or who has ever been, a landed immigrant or permanent resident. Such a person has been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by immigration authorities. Immigrants who have obtained Canadian citizenship by naturalization are included in this group.

**Income Taxes** – Income taxes on income received during the reference period. It is the sum of federal income tax, provincial and territorial income taxes, less abatement where applicable. Provincial and territorial income taxes also include health care premiums and Yukon First Nations Tax in certain jurisdictions. Abatement reduces the federal income taxes payable by persons residing in Quebec or in certain self-governing Yukon First Nation settlement lands. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income taxes variables.

**Knowledge of Official Languages** – Refers to whether the person can conduct a conversation in English only, French only, in both or in neither language. For a child who has not yet learned to speak, this includes languages that the child is learning to speak at home.

**Knowledge of No-Official Languages** – Refers to whether the person can conduct a conversation in a language other than English or French. For a child who has not yet learned to speak, this includes languages that the child is learning to speak at home. The number of languages that can be reported may vary between surveys, depending on the objectives of the survey.

**Languages Spoken Most Often at Home** – Refers to the language the person speaks most often at home at the time of data collection. A person can report more than one language as "spoken most often at home" if the languages are spoken equally often. For a person who lives alone, the language spoken most often at home is the language in which he or she feels most comfortable. For a child who has not yet learned to speak, this is the language spoken most often to the child at home. Where two languages are spoken to the child, the language spoken most
often at home is the language spoken most often. If both languages are used equally often, then both languages are included here.

**Leaseback** - An arrangement where the seller of an asset leases back the same asset from the purchaser.

**Lone-Parent Families** – Those in which either a male or female lone parent is the economic family reference person.

**Low-Income Cut-Offs, after tax (LICO-AT)** – LICO represents the income level at which families or persons not in economic families were expected to spend 20 percent more of their income than the average family on the necessities of food, shelter and clothing. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Low-Income Measure, after tax (LIM-AT)** – Refers to 50% of median household income, adjusted for family size. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Low-Income Status** – 'Low-income status' refers to the income situation of the statistical unit in relation to a specific low-income line in a reference year. Statistical units with income that is below the low-income line are considered to be in low income. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Major Source of Income** – The income source, or group of sources, that makes up the largest proportion of an individual's total income during the reference period. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Market Income** – The sum of employment income (wages, salaries and commissions, net self-employment income from farm or non-farm unincorporated business and/or professional practice), investment income, private retirement income (retirement pensions, superannuation and annuities, including those from registered retirement savings plans [RRSPs] and registered retirement income funds [RRIFs]) and other money income from market sources during the reference period. It is equivalent to total income minus government transfers. It is also referred to as income before transfers and taxes. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Median Income** – The median income of a specified group is the amount that divides the income distribution of that group into two halves, i.e., the incomes of half of the units in that group are below the median, while those of the other half are above the median. Median incomes of families are calculated for all units, whether or not they had income.

**Membership in a First Nation or Indian Band** – Refers to whether or not a person is a member of a First Nation or Indian band. An Indian band is defined as a body of Indians for whose collective use and benefit lands have been set apart or money is held by the Crown, or who have been declared to be a band for the purpose of the Indian Act. Many Indian bands have elected to call themselves a First Nation and have changed their band name to reflect this. With the 1985 amendment to the Indian Act of Canada (Bill C-31), many Indian bands exercised the right to establish their own membership code, whereby it was not always necessary for a band member to be a Registered Indian according to the Indian Act.
**Mother Tongue** – Refers to the first language learned at home in childhood and still understood by the person at the time the data was collected. If the person no longer understands the first language learned, the mother tongue is the second language learned. For a person who learned two languages at the same time in early childhood, the mother tongue is the language this person spoke most often at home before starting school. The person has two mother tongues only if the two languages were used equally often and are still understood by the person. For a child who has not yet learned to speak, the mother tongue is the language spoken most often to this child at home. The child has two mother tongues only if both languages are spoken equally so that the child learns both languages at the same time.

**Occupation** – 'Occupation' refers to the kind of work performed in a job, a job being all the tasks carried out by a particular worker to complete his or her duties. An occupation is a set of jobs that are sufficiently similar in work performed. Kind of work is described in terms of tasks, duties and responsibilities, often including factors such as materials processed or used, the industrial processes used, the equipment used, and the products or services provided. Occupations are generally homogeneous with respect to skill type and skill level. Occupation applies to the contribution of labour to that part of an economic activity that is within the production boundary defined for the System of National Accounts.

**Other Economic Families** – Those in which the economic family reference person does not have a spouse or common-law partner, nor a child in the family, only other relatives.

**Other Government Transfers** – All government transfers received during the reference period other than those from the following sources: Old Age Security pension, Guaranteed Income Supplement, Allowance or Allowance for the Survivor; Retirement, disability and survivor benefits from Canada Pension Plan and Québec Pension Plan; Benefits from Employment Insurance and Québec parental insurance plan; Child benefits from federal and provincial programs.

The key components of this variable are social assistance benefits, workers' compensation benefits, working income tax benefit, goods and services tax credit and harmonized sales tax credit, refundable provincial tax credits, provincial income supplements for seniors, other provincial credits, benefits and rebates, veterans' pensions, war veterans' allowance, pensions to widow(er)s and dependents of veterans. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Period of Immigration** – Refers to the period in which the immigrant first obtained landed immigrant or permanent resident status.

**Private Household** – Refers to a person or group of persons who occupy the same dwelling and do not have a usual place of residence elsewhere in Canada or abroad. The household universe is divided into two sub-universes on the basis of whether the household is occupying a collective dwelling or a private dwelling. The latter is a private household. For census purposes, households are classified into three groups: private households, collective households and households outside
Canada. Unless otherwise specified, all data in census products are for private households only.

**Rate of Inflation** - Expressed as the year-over-year increase in the total consumer price index (CPI).

**Registered or Treaty Indian status** - refers to whether or not a person is a Registered or Treaty Indian. Registered Indians are persons who are registered under the Indian Act of Canada. Treaty Indians are persons who belong to a First Nation or Indian band that signed a treaty with the Crown. Registered or Treaty Indians are sometimes also called Status Indians.

**Shelter-to-Income Ratio** – Refers to the proportion of the average total income of household which is spent on shelter cost.

**Visible Minority** – Refers to whether a person belongs to a visible minority group as defined by the Employment Equity Act and, if so, the visible minority group to which the person belongs. The Employment Equity Act defines visible minorities as "persons, other than Aboriginal peoples, who are non-Caucasian in race or non-white in colour". The visible minority population consists mainly of the following groups: South Asian, Chinese, Black, Filipino, Latin American, Arab, Southeast Asian, West Asian, Korean and Japanese.

**Wages, Salaries, and Commissions** – Gross wages and salaries before deductions for such items as income taxes, pension plan contributions and employment insurance premiums during the reference period. While other employee remunerations such as security options benefits, board and lodging and other taxable allowances and benefits are included in this source, employers' contributions to pension plans and employment insurance plans are excluded. Other receipts included in this source are military pay and allowances, tips, commissions and cash bonuses associated with paid employment, benefits from wage-loss replacement plans or income-maintenance insurance plans, supplementary unemployment benefits from an employer or union, research grants, royalties from a work or invention with no associated expenses and all types of casual earnings during the reference period. For the 2016 Census, the reference period is the calendar year 2015 for all income variables.

**Year of Immigration** - Refers to the year in which the immigrant first obtained landed immigrant or permanent resident status.
LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

Figure 1. Location of the City of Kingston, Ontario (Google Maps, 2017)

CHAPTER 2

Figure 4. Location of Major Employers in Kingston (City of Kingston, 2017).

Figure 5. John Counter Boulevard Construction (City of Kingston, 2017).

Figure 6. Population Pyramid of the 2006 and 2016 Kingston CMA (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 8. Newly Construction Apartment Building on Leroy Grant Drive (Homestead, 2015).

Figure 9. Newly Constructed Housing the Loyalist-Cataraqui District.

Figure 10. Housing Developed in the Trillium District.

Figure 12. Housing Developed in the Trillium District.

Figure 14. New multi-family housing in Sydenham District.

Figure 15. Location of undergraduate students in City of Kingston (Chong, 2008).

Figure 16. Fire Hall being built in Perth Road Village Outside of City of Kingston (Global News, 2017).

CHAPTER 3

Figure 17. Total Number of Census Families in each Income Bracket, Kingston CMA 2005-2015, in Constant 2015 Dollars (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 17. Proportion of Lone Female and Lone Male Census Families in each Income Bracket, 2015, in Constant 2015 Dollars (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 21. Median Income of Senior Citizens in Kingston CMA, 2005 to 2015, in Constant 2015 Dollars (Statistics Canada 2016).

Figure 22. Market Income Sources of Seniors in Kingston CMA, 2005 to 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 23. Prevalence of low-income by age range in Kingston CMA, 2005-2015. (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 25. Prevalence of low-income by census family type in Kingston CMA and Ontario, 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 26. Prevalence of Low Income by Census Family and Household Type among seniors in Kingston CMA, 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

CHAPTER 4

Figure 27. Number of Lone Parents by sex, 2006 and 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2006 & 2016)

Figure 29. Population pyramid of Kingston senior citizens (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 30. Living arrangements for Kingston seniors in 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 31. Dwelling types of senior citizens in Kingston, on 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

CHAPTER 5

Figure 32. Change in Average Home Price and Rental Rate of Two Bedroom Apartment Kingston CMA, Current Dollars (CREA, 2016; CMHC, 2016).

Figure 34. Number of Rental Units per CMHC Zone (CMHC, 2016).

Figure 35. Average Rent in Current Dollars of All Apartment Types and Vacancy Rate Downtown Kingston (CMHC, 2016).

Figure 36. Average Rent in Current Dollars of All Apartment Types and Vacancy Rate Southwestern Kingston (CMHC, 2016).

Figure 37. Average Rent in Current Dollars of All Apartment Types and Vacancy Rate Northern Kingston (CMHC, 2016).

Figure 38. New Rental Housing Completed in Remainder of CMA Zone.
Figure 39. Average Rent in Current Dollars of All Apartment Types and Vacancy Rate Remainder of CMA (CMHC, 2016).
Figure 40. Number and Percentage of Households in the Kingston CMA who Spend 30% or More of Pre-Tax Income on Shelter Costs.
Figure 41. Family Type that Make up Tenant Household Spending More Than 30% of Income on Shelter (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 43. New Residences Built in 2015 by Queen's University (Queen’s University, 2015).
Figure 44. Purpose Built Student Rental Housing in Williamsville District.
Figure 45. Addition on Kingston Home in the Portsmouth District to Accommodate Student Rental Demand
Figure 47. History of Housing Starts in Kingston CMA
Figure 48. Examples of High and Low Rise Condos in the Kingston CMA.
Figure 49. Proposed Condo Project Sage Prestige.

APPENDIX A
Figure 51. Indigenous Identity for Kingston Indigenous population, 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 52. Age range of Indigenous Identities in Kingston, 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 53. Family Characteristics of Indigenous people in Kingston, 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 54. Recent immigrants by selected places of birth for Kingston, 2011-2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 55. Age at immigration for Kingston immigrant population (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 56. Mother Tongue Language for Kingston CMA population, 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
Figure 57. Other common Mother Tongue Languages for Kingston CMA population, 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).
MAPS

Figure 2. City of Kingston Municipal Electoral Districts

Figure 4. Count of the 2016 Kingston CMA Population by Census Tracts (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 7. 2016 Median Age of People Residing in Kingston by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 11. Percent Change in Population Density (Person per KM2) from 2006 to 2016 by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 12. 2016 Kingston Population Density (Person per Square KM2) by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 13. Kingston's Absolute vs. Percentage Population Change from 2006 to 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 20. 2015 Median Household Income After-Tax in Kingston City, by Census Tract, in Constant 2015 Dollars (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 24. 2015 Prevalence of Low Income in Kingston City, Based on the Low-Income Cut-Offs, After-Tax (LICO-AT) (%) (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 28. Percent Change in Kingston Lone Parent Families from 2006 to 2016 by Census Tract (Statistics Canada, 2006 & 2016).

Figure 33. Boundaries of CMHC Rental Zones (CMHC, 2016).

Figure 42. Percent of Tenant Household in 2016 Spending 30% or More of Its Income on Shelter Costs (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 46. Location of 4 or more Bedroom Homes in the Kingston CMA Statistics Canada, 2016).

Figure 50. 2016 Percentage of Occupied Dwellings that are Condominiums Kingston CMA (Statistics Canada, 2016).
TABLES

Table 1. Population Change in the Kingston CMA 2006 to 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).


Table 3. LICO-AT Thresholds for Kingston, 2015 (Statistics Canada, 2016).


Table 5. Percent of change in number of children in the Kingston CMA 2006 to 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016).

Table 6. Yearly Income Required to Rent Different Apartment Types in the Kingston CMA (CMHC, 2016).

Table 7. Homeownership Rates in the Kingston CMA (Statistics Canada, 2016).
REFERENCES


