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Abstract

The Master’s thesis, “LGBTQ2+ Experience of Public Safety in the Urban Form”, seeks to find out how LGBTQ2+ inclusive cities can be planned and designed. Geographies of identity around visibility and passing are used to frame perceived safety in public spaces. Using the City of Toronto as a case study, the thesis unpacks the current state of perceived and experienced public safety as articulated by LGBTQ2+ people. Focus groups, interviews, an online survey and secondary readings are the data sources used. Quantitative and qualitative data on hate crimes and discrimination in Toronto are also triangulated to contextualize queer and trans experiences of harassment, physical assault, discrimination, microaggressions, verbal harassment and sexualized violence. This study challenges conventional feminist safety planning and the concept of normal/abnormal uses espoused by proponents of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) by bringing queer intersectionality to the forefront of discussion. Recommendations stemming from the collected data include sensitivity and inclusivity training for authority figures, poster campaigns on inclusivity, gender neutral bathrooms, better programming, and the breakdown of systemic barriers faced by LGBTQ2+ communities.
Preface

The research is conducted in partnership with METRAC, a Toronto based consulting non-profit that conducts safety audits with the goal of creating safer spaces for women and youth. METRAC was involved in the qualitative data collection for this thesis. A METRAC staff member co-facilitated with the researcher the focus groups conducted for this thesis. The interviews and online survey were conducted by the researcher alone. The data collected from the focus groups and interviews were coded and used to inform a report compiled by the researcher for METRAC.

The UBC Behavioural Research Board at the UBC Office of Ethics Research approved this study on April 29th 2015 under the project title ‘Embodied Mobility Differences and Safety in the Urban Form: Participatory Planning and Design Strategies in Toronto’. An amendment to the study to include the online survey was approved July 14th 2015. The study was assigned the UBC BREB Number H15-00314.
# Table of Contents

Abstract .......................................................................................................................... ii
Preface............................................................................................................................ iii
Table of Contents .......................................................................................................... iv
List of Tables .................................................................................................................. vii
List of Figures ................................................................................................................ ix
Glossary of Terms ........................................................................................................... x
Acknowledgements ......................................................................................................... xiii
Dedication ....................................................................................................................... xviii

Chapter 1 – Introduction ............................................................................................... 1
  Background and Research Problem Context ................................................................ 1
  Research Goals and Significance .................................................................................. 3
  Organization of the Thesis ......................................................................................... 4

Chapter 2 – Toronto Case Study Context: Safer City, Safer Spaces ............................... 5
  Introduction ............................................................................................................... 5
  Mobilization and Polarity: Toronto LGBTQ2+ Context ............................................... 10
  Contemporary LGBTQ Safety Issues in Toronto ........................................................ 20
  Conclusion ............................................................................................................... 24

Chapter 3 – Understanding CPTED, Gendered Identities and Queering Safety in Urban Spaces .............................................................................................................. 26
  Introduction ............................................................................................................... 26
  Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) ........................................ 27
  Feminist Intersectional Analyses of Gendered Spaces ................................................. 33
    Gendered Spaces ..................................................................................................... 33
    Intersectional Analysis ............................................................................................ 35
    Feminist Critiques of Planning and Designing for Safety ....................................... 37
  Queer Interventions .................................................................................................. 38
    Queering Planning .................................................................................................. 38
    Enclave Anxiety ....................................................................................................... 40
    Queering Safety ...................................................................................................... 42
    Trans Inclusive Safety ............................................................................................. 45
  Conclusion ............................................................................................................... 47
# Table of Contents

Chapter 4 – Methodology: Using Mixed Methods Research on LGBTQ2+ Perceptions and Experiences of Safety ................................................................. 48
  Introduction ..................................................................................... 48
  Interviews ....................................................................................... 49
  Focus Groups ................................................................................... 51
  Online Survey ................................................................................. 53
  Ethical Considerations ..................................................................... 60
  Limitations ....................................................................................... 62
  Conclusion ....................................................................................... 63

Chapter 5 – Perceptions of Public Safety: Framing Safety, Framing Identity ......................................................... 65
  Introduction ..................................................................................... 65
  Feeling Unsafe Defined ................................................................. 68
  Passing and Visibility ...................................................................... 80
  Spatiality and Perceptions of Public Safety ..................................... 87
  Conclusion ....................................................................................... 96

Chapter 6 – Discrimination and Reporting ................................................................. 97
  Introduction ..................................................................................... 97
  Discrimination: A Comparative Analysis ....................................... 98
  Reporting ........................................................................................ 102
    Introduction ................................................................................ 102
    Reporting to Police ...................................................................... 102
    Other Resources .......................................................................... 108
  Conclusion ....................................................................................... 111

Chapter 7 – Planning for Safer Communities ................................................................. 112
  Introduction ..................................................................................... 112
  Built Environment Interventions .................................................. 118
  Social Planning Interventions ...................................................... 130
  Conclusion ....................................................................................... 137

Chapter 8 – Conclusion ........................................................................... 138
  Reflections for Future Research ..................................................... 140

Bibliography ...................................................................................... 142

Appendix ............................................................................................. 158
  Appendix 1.1 - Interview Questions ............................................... 158
  Appendix 1.2 - Focus Group Schedule with Questions ..................... 159
Appendix 1.3 - Consent Forms ........................................................................................................... 163
Appendix 1.4 - Online Survey ............................................................................................................. 165
Appendix 1.5 – Online Survey Results ............................................................................................. 194
List of Tables

Table 1 - Types of Violence........................................................................................................... 66
Table 2 - Recommendations for Safer Cities from Participants .................................................. 114
Table 3 - Gender Identity ............................................................................................................. 194
Table 4 - Pairing of Multiple Gender Identities by Respondents .................................................. 195
Table 5 - Sexual Orientation ........................................................................................................ 196
Table 6 - Pairing of Multiple Sexual Orientations by Respondents ............................................ 197
Table 7 - Age .................................................................................................................................. 198
Table 8 - Religion .......................................................................................................................... 199
Table 9 - Pairing of Multiple Religions by Respondents ............................................................... 200
Table 10 - Race ............................................................................................................................. 201
Table 11 - Pairing of Multiple Racial Identities by Respondents ................................................ 202
Table 12 - Ability ......................................................................................................................... 203
Table 13 - Income .......................................................................................................................... 204
Table 14 - Occupation .................................................................................................................. 205
Table 15 - Pairing of Multiple Occupations by Respondents ...................................................... 206
Table 16 - Education ..................................................................................................................... 207
Table 17 - Housing Status ............................................................................................................ 207
Table 18 - Amount of Time Living in Neighbourhood ................................................................. 216
Table 19 - Neighbours Known by Participants ............................................................................ 216
Table 20 - Sense of Community ................................................................................................... 217
Table 21 - Safety Around Residence ......................................................................................... 218
Table 22 - Feeling of Safety around Residence by Gender Identity ............................................. 219
Table 23 - Daytime Safety ............................................................................................................ 220
Table 24 - Feeling of safety alone or in a group daytime by gender identity ............................... 220
Table 25 - Nighttime Safety ......................................................................................................... 221
Table 26 - Feeling of Safety Alone or in a Group nighttime by Gender Identity ......................... 221
Table 27 - Overall Neighbourhood Safety .................................................................................... 223
Table 28 - Feeling of Safety Overall by Gender Identity ............................................................... 224
Table 29 - Discomfort Entering Spaces ....................................................................................... 225
Table 30 - Visibility, LGBTQ2+ and Neighbourhood Comfort .................................................. 232
Table 31 - Visibility, Race, LGBTQ2+ and Neighbourhood Comfort ........................................ 235
Table 32 - Visibility, Religion, LGBTQ2+ and Neighbourhood Comfort .................................... 236
Table 33 - Ability and Safety ....................................................................................................... 237
Table 34 - Age and Safety ............................................................................................................ 238
Table 35 - Safety Affected by Following Determinants ............................................................... 240
Table 36 - Has Discrimination Been Experienced ....................................................................... 241
Table 37 - Identity Targeted by Discrimination .......................................................................... 242
Table 38 - Pairing of Multiple Reasons for Discrimination by Respondents ............................. 243
List of Figures

Figure 1 - Former Municipal Boundaries Before the Amalgamation of Metropolitan Toronto...... 6
Figure 2 - Hulchanski’s (2007) Three Cities 1970 .......................................................... 8
Figure 3 - Hulchanski’s (2007) Three Cities 2005 .......................................................... 9
Figure 4 - Men loving boys loving men 1977 article.......................................................... 12
Figure 5 – Photographs from Riots Post-Operation Soap .................................................. 16
Figure 6 - Photographs from Riots Post-Operation Soap ................................................... 16
Figure 7 - Queer Spaces in Toronto .................................................................................. 19
Figure 8 - Crowe’s (2013) Container Theory .................................................................. 32
Figure 9 - Survey Representation by FSAs in Toronto ....................................................... 55
Figure 10 - Toronto Density Map by 2011 Census Tract Data .......................................... 56
Figure 11 – Participant Experiences of Violence ................................................................. 67
Figure 12 - Streetcars Old ............................................................................................... 120
Figure 13 - Streetcars New ............................................................................................. 120
Figure 14 - Subways Old ................................................................................................. 121
Figure 15 - Subways New ............................................................................................... 121
Figure 16 - Bloor Viaduct ............................................................................................... 123
Figure 17 - St. James Town ............................................................................................. 126
Figure 18 - Humber Loop ............................................................................................. 128
Figure 19 - Mural in Toronto’s Gay Village ....................................................................... 131
Glossary of Terms

Note: Terms referring to sexual and gender identity are subject to personal usage and interpretation. The use of ‘man’ and ‘woman’ in the glossary includes anyone who self-identifies with these terms. These definitions are merely a guide to be used for clarity when reading the thesis, and they are subject to self-identity.

Agender: Someone who is genderless, and/or does not identify with a gender, and/or gender neutral.

Androsexual: Someone who is attracted to masculine presenting people.

Asexual: Someone who has little to no sexual attraction.

Bigender: Someone who experiences two gender identities, either simultaneously or at different times.

Bisexual: Someone who is attracted to men and women.

Cisgender (or ‘cis’): Someone who identifies with the gender they were assigned at birth.

Cross-Dresser: Someone who dresses in the clothes and style of the opposite gender.

Demisexual: Someone who only feels a sexual attraction to people once an emotional bond is formed.

Female to Male (or ‘FTM’): Someone who was assigned female at birth who has transitioned, either medically or not, to identifying as male.

Gay: A man or a woman attracted to the same gender.

Genderqueer: Someone who does not identify with normative gender categories of being a man or woman. They may identify as both a man and woman, neither a man or woman or some other manifestation of gender identity.

Gynosexual: Someone who is attracted to feminine presenting people.

Heterosexism: Systemic discrimination in favour of normative heterosexual relationships.

Heterosexual: Someone who is attracted to the opposite gender. Generally referring to a man and a woman.

Homonormative: The process of homosexuality becoming more acceptable in society, to the detriment of members of the LGBTQ2+ community marginalized due to identities like gender, race, ability, class, education, colonization, and size.
Homophobia: Hatred of homosexuality, and homosexual people (including gay, lesbian, bisexual, and other non-heterosexual people).

Homosexual: Someone who is attracted to the same gender.

Intersex: An umbrella term for people who were born with reproductive and/or sexual anatomy that is inconsistent with normative definitions of male and female.

LGBTQ2+: Acronym standing for lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer and two-spirit. The plus sign at the end of the acronym is indicative that there are many other members of queer and trans community who may not use the listed identities.

Lesbian: A woman attracted to other women.

Misogyny: Hatred of women and girls.

Male to Female (‘MTF’): Someone who was assigned male at birth who has transitioned, either medically or not, to identifying as female.

Pansexual: Someone who is attracted to people of all genders.

Queer: An umbrella term reclaimed by some to describe typically non-normative sexual and gender identities. Often used to describe the totality of the LGBTQ2+ community.

Questioning: Someone who is in the process of exploring their gender and sexual identity.

Sexism: Discrimination stemming from someone’s gender identity. Generally used to describe discrimination towards women.

Skoliosexual: Someone who is attracted to people who do not identify within the gender binary of woman and man.

Straight: Someone who is attracted to the opposite gender, most often used to describe men who are attracted to women, and women who are attracted to men.

Third Gender: Someone who identifies with a gender that is not woman or man.

Trans: An umbrella term for transgender, transsexual, and other gender identities used by people who do not identify with the gender they were assigned at birth.

Transgender: Someone who does not identify with the gender they were assigned at birth, who may or may not decide to transition medically. Transgender is also used as an umbrella term.

Transition: The process of a person changing their physical appearance, medically or not, in order to fit their gender identity.
Transsexual: Someone who does not identify with the gender they were assigned at birth. Some consider ‘transsexual’ to be a dated term. Often, but not necessarily exclusively, transsexual is used by a trans person who either has or seeks to transition medically.

Transmisogyny: The mixture of misogyny, which scrutinizes women and girls with hatred, and transphobia, which is hatred towards trans people. The specific barriers and challenges experienced by transwomen, as well as the transphobia present in many feminist circles and literature, makes the specificity offered by the term ‘transmisogyny’ pertinent.

Transphobia: Hatred towards people who do not identify with the gender they were assigned at birth.

Two-Spirit: An English language term used by to describe various Indigenous genders and sexualities.
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Chapter 1 - Introduction

Background and Research Problem Context

Starting in the early 1960s, urbanists began correlating a strong relationship between crime prevention and urban design. Thinkers like Jacobs (1961), Newman (1973), and Wilson & Kelling (1982) developed links between surveillance opportunities and isolation, as well as a sense of ownership over spaces and their maintenance and upkeep with the opportunity to perpetrate crime. These thinkers fundamentally changed how spaces are planned and designed through an intermingling of psychology, criminology and design interventions, the conglomeration of which was eventually coined ‘Crime Prevention through Environmental Design’ (or CPTED). The concept of public safety planning more broadly was framed as an urban planning and design issue most strongly with the advent of CPTED.

From the 1990s onwards, many feminist researchers, such as Pain (1991), Whitzman & Wekerle (1997) and Campbell (2005), began working with municipalities to deal with perceptions of danger in cities. METRAC, a Toronto based non-profit consulting firm, was one of the first organizations to facilitate a women’s safety audit to give voice to concerns around numerous violent attacks around the city (METRAC, n.d.). Policy makers, politicians, police and activists began to address perceptions of public safety due to poor planning by using design, community development, education and women’s safety audits. This period marks a move away from the previous focus on reported abuses alone, towards a more holistic approach of perceived and reported violations in mainstream dialogues around public safety (Sweet & Ortiz Escalante, 2010).

Feminist planners and designers point out the flaws with CPTED and conventional safety planning. Triangulating the qualitative data around perceptions of safety, and reported gendered violence demonstrates that although there are perceptions that isolated and poorly lit public spaces are where women feel most afraid of assault, women are statistically much more likely to encounter violence in private and domestic settings, with the perpetrator being someone they know (Sweet & Ortiz Escalante, 2010; Weseley & Gaarder, 2004). The complexity of perceived danger, which is also often racialized and filled with class-based stigma, compared to the prevalence of assault perpetrated by a familiar perpetrator, complicates urban planning and design with public safety for society’s most vulnerable in mind.
The literature around LGBTQ2+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer, two-spirit and other facets of these communities) people’s involvement in planning is generally quite limited. Compared to the literature on heterosexual cisgender identities in planning and designing for safer spaces, there is even less written on LGBTQ2+ identities, specifically. This gap in both academic and practitioner literature is surprising, considering the role LGBTQ2+ communities have played in creating diverse urban forms.

There is a lot of literature around safety and women in planning, but the literature assumes a static heterosexist notion of vulnerable women and privileged men occupying urban spaces. Doan (2010) argues that there is a ‘tyranny of gender’ that has profound consequences not only for women, but also intersex and trans populations. Gender non-conforming, transgender and those who identify outside the gender binary have their own complex urbanized embodiments, which constructively problematize the mainstream feminist discourse around planning safer spaces.

Exploring the gap in addressing sexuality, or more specifically, queer-identified people, in discussions around safety in the urban environment must further problematize feminist discourses in planning and geography. D’Emilio (1993) traces back the history of homosexuality to individuals discovering their sexual identities in isolation, and consequently flocking to cities to find connections to other gay and lesbian people. D’Emilio (1993) argues that 19th century capitalism in industrial cities is integral to the creation of modern lesbian and gay identity, and that non-heteronormative sexualities often manifest themselves in the intimacy and anonymity provided by dense urban cities. Lesbian, gay and other gender non-conforming people have been a part of city formation since the inception of the modern industrial city, and yet, they are not a dominant part of the urban planning discourse (D’Emilio, 1993; Forsyth, 2001). Although gender and sexual identities are distinct, a link can be made between the paradoxical need for anonymity and community, which can be found in cities and generally appeal to LGBTQ2+ identified people. The historic and ongoing risks association of gender-diverse people with police and street violence also impacts all individuals who identify under the queer umbrella (Hanhardt, 2013).

The Master’s thesis seeks to boldly innovate the literature on LGBTQ2+ experiences of public safety from a planning perspective, building upon the emerging literature on planning for

---

1 Many different acronyms are used to refer to the lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer, two-spirit and other facets of the non-heteronormative community. The thesis opts for LGBTQ2+, which is the current acronym used by the City of Vancouver’s LGBTQ2+ Advisory Committee (City of Vancouver, 2014). The City of Toronto does not have a similar advisory committee from which to draw appropriate language.

2 It is notable that the word ‘queer’ is fraught in the LGBTQ2+ community. Many members of the community still consider the word to be a slur, particularly among older community members. ‘Queer’ was arguably reclaimed by activists in the early 1990s, with the collective ‘Queer Nation’ publishing a manifesto promoting the use of the word to reflect the anger the queer community felt, as well as claiming that it is a more inclusive that the implicit masculinity of the word ‘gay’. The word ‘queer’ is deployed in the thesis as a catchall for the LGBTQ2+ community, as well as an identity used by participants (Cara, 2013; Published anonymously by Queers, 1990).
LGBTQ2+ experiences and communities. This study expands on the limited literature dealing with the urban environment and LGBTQ2+ identity and safety by using three existing bodies of literature on (1) Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which seeks to design out crime through physical built environment changes, (2) feminist literature on gendered violence and safety in planning and design, which looks at the perceptions of fear in the context of societal stereotypes on victimization and perpetration of crime, and (3) building on contemporary queer planning literature. Classic CPTED theorists like Newman (1973), Wilson & Kelling (1982), and Crowe (2013) deal with physical environment and safety. Feminist thinkers like Koskela and Pain (1999), Sweet and Ortiz Escalante (2010), and Campbell (2005) are brought into conversation with CPTED principles to critique the limitations of designing out crime. Notably, crime is a limited signifier that often does not appropriately encapsulate broader violence that goes unreported or violence that is not recognized institutionally by the criminal justice system. Hanhardt (2013) and Doan (2015a) frame queerness and public safety using an intersectional lens that bring race and class into the discussion. Existing scholarship and collected data is brought into conversation in this thesis in order to conceptualize how cities can be planned for safety that considers queer and trans inclusivity.

Research Goals and Significance

The Master’s thesis seeks to examine how urban design, social planning and public safety intersect to create safer, more inclusive cities for all by capturing the voices and lived experiences of LGBTQ2+ individuals. The objective of the thesis is to deepen our analysis of safe and inclusive cities and provide recommendations on how public safety experiences of LGBTQ2+ people can benefit planning for safe inclusive communities across various urban forms. Elements of physical planning, including CPTED guidelines, and social planning, such as programming and territoriality, are embedded in planning for safer communities. The thesis looks at both perceptions of fear and safety as well as incidents of harassment, assault, and hate crimes. Perceptions and experiences are analyzed in separate chapters, demonstrating how both impact whether LGBTQ2+ feel comfortable accessing public spaces. The thesis examines how these various elements are intertwined. It addresses the key question and sub-questions:

How do we make cities safer for LGBTQ2+ people?

How do LGBTQ2+ individuals experience public safety in cities? How are perceptions of safety different for LGBTQ2+ communities? Do LGBTQ2+ people report incidents of discrimination and hate crimes? How can we understand and plan for both the perception of safety as well as the prevention of hate crimes and other forms of violence? What does an intersectional analysis of gender, sexual, class and racial identities tell us about how we can plan effectively for safer communities?
The research has the potential of engaging queer and trans communities in conversations on safety and the built environment. These communities have not often been included in planning research, and their involvement in this project could set a trend for future dialogue.

The published results of the study hopes to influence urban designers, architects, developers, community housing advocates, politicians, and other service providers to create design and planning interventions that better serve inclusive safety needs more broadly.

**Organization of the Thesis**

The following thesis is organized in eight chapters. The first chapter, ‘Introduction’, frames the problem context, research questions, goals and outline of the work. The second chapter, ‘Toronto Context’, positions the thesis within the urban and identity geographies of the City of Toronto, and makes a case for its appropriateness as a case study site. The third chapter, ‘Gendered Identities, and Queering Safety in Urban Spaces’, provides an overview of existing literature in the field and positions the thesis within this broader work. The fourth chapter, ‘Methodology’, explores the methods used to gather research for the thesis. The fifth chapter, ‘Perceptions of Public Safety: Framing Safety, Framing Identity’ attempts to define safety and harassment, as well as offering introductory information regarding how LGBTQ2+ identity influences urban safety. The sixth chapter, ‘Discrimination and Reporting’, cross-references data collected by the researcher with police records and reports back on similarities and discrepancies. The seventh chapter, ‘Planning for Safer Communities’, proposes social and physical planning interventions addressing LGBTQ2+ needs around safety planning. Finally, chapter eight, ‘Conclusion’, is a concluding discussion around the topics and themes raised in the thesis presented with clearly stated recommendations. The final chapter is followed by a bibliography and appendix.
Chapter 2 - Toronto Case Study Context: Safer City, Safer Spaces

Summary of Chapter 2

- The City of Toronto is the case study context of this thesis.
- 1970s marked the start of much of the visible gay organizing against gay bashing and police brutality in Toronto. The early movement was dominated by gay men, while women and trans people, as well as other diverse facets of the community are less visible.
- 1980s were marked by Operation Soap and subsequent efforts to confront homophobia in policing in Toronto as well as the AIDS crisis.
- 1990s-2000s involved a broadening of queer visibility around trans and racialized organizing.
- Contemporary theorists argue that queer geographies are expanding beyond the traditional Gay Village in Toronto.
- Safety Planning in Toronto is generally still aimed at protecting against men (straight or gay).
- Violence and distrust of police is still an issue in Toronto’s queer community, seen with the assault of Ryan Boa, and the response to the death of Sumaya Dalmar.

Introduction

Toronto provides a diverse and layered landscape as a case study to explore LGBTQ2+ public safety in planning and design. As Canada’s largest metropolis, the 2.79 million people living in Toronto help make it the financial centre of the country (Statistics Canada, 2012). Toronto also houses a large immigrant population as well as a diverse LGBTQ2+ population. Metropolitan Toronto was created in 1954 as a regional governing body linking the former City of Toronto, Scarborough, East York, York, North York and Etobicoke (see Figure 1). In 1998, Premier Mike Harris forced the amalgamation of the six Metropolitan Toronto municipalities. The newly amalgamated City of Toronto tried to harmonize zoning ordinances, without success, between 2009-2010 (Valverde, 2012). Inconsistencies still exist between the former municipalities’ zoning ordinances and the City of Toronto’s current policies. These inconsistencies, as well as the appealing oversight of the Ontario Municipal Board, complicates planning politics in Toronto (Moore, 2013).
Figure 1
Former Municipal Boundaries Before the Amalgamation of Metropolitan Toronto
All the while, the City of Toronto has been a part of the global trend of economic polarity in cities, including New York, San Francisco and London. In the “Three Cities Within Toronto” report, David Hulchanski argues that there are three distinct cities within Toronto. He defines the cities as City #1 (which has had a high rise in income), City #2 (middle income area, income remained stagnant), City #3 (low-income, incomes have fallen substantially). City #3 has the highest proportion of people of colour and immigrants (see Figures 2 and 3). Hulchanski (2007) writes:

In the 35 years between 1970 and 2005, the incomes of individuals have fluctuated, owing to changes in the economy, in the nature of employment (more part-time and temporary jobs), and in government taxes and income transfers. These changes have resulted in a growing gap in income and wealth and greater polarization among Toronto’s neighbourhoods. (p. 3).

Hulchanski (2007) argues that inclusionary zoning and the end of vacancy decontrol, which allows landlords to increase rent after a tenant leaves, would be actionable planning interventions that would help mitigate the Three Cities’ polarization. If nothing is done, the rapid income polarization that has occurred over thirty five years will only increase.
Figure 2


MAP 2: AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL INCOME, CITY OF TORONTO, Relative to the Toronto CMA, 1970

Census Tract Average Individual Income Relative to the Toronto CMA Average of $30,800* (estimated to 2001 census boundaries)

- **Very High**: More than 40% Above 36 Tracts, 7% of City Average = $54,700*
- **High**: 20% to 40% Above 41 Tracts, 8% of City Average = $39,000*
- **Middle Income**: 20% Below to 20% Above 341 Tracts, 66% of City Average = $29,800*
- **Low**: 20% to 40% Below 91 Tracts, 18% of City Average = $22,300*
- **Very Low**: More than 40% Below 6 Tracts, 1% of City Average = $17,000*

* Average incomes in constant 2005 dollars
Figure 3

Hulchanski’s (2007) Three Cities - 2005

MAP 3: AVERAGE INDIVIDUAL INCOME, CITY OF TORONTO, Relative to the Toronto CMA, 2005

Census Tract Average Individual Income Relative to the Toronto CMA Average of $40,704 (estimated to 2001 census boundaries)

- **Very High**: More than 40% Above
  - 76 Tracts, 15% of City
  - Average = $104,000

- **High**: 20% to 40% Above
  - 21 Tracts, 4% of City
  - Average = $53,500

- **Middle Income**: 20% Below to 20% Above
  - 152 tracts, 29% of City
  - Average = $39,000

- **Low**: 20% to 40% Below
  - 206 tracts, 40% of City
  - Average = $28,000

- **Very Low**: More than 40% Below
  - 67 Census Tracts, 14% of City
  - Average = $22,500
Toronto has often been seen as a ‘City of Neighbourhoods’. Valverde (2012) argues that this approach leads to microlevel planning which leaves lower income communities behind. She states that we need to start to look at cities more holistically, getting away from the neighbourhood level concept of a city of villages espoused by thinkers like former Toronto resident Jane Jacobs (Jacobs, 1961; Valverde, 2012). The macro and micro levels are important to consider in mapping and analyzing public safety in a city as large and diverse as Toronto.

**Mobilization and Polarity: Toronto LGBTQ2+ Context**

The history of gay enclaves in Toronto is a history of mobility and polarity. Nash (2006) argues that there has been a tension between the ‘gay ghetto’, and so-called ‘upstanding’ suburbanized gays and lesbians throughout Toronto LGBTQ history. Nash (2006) traces the historic clashes between gays embracing or rejecting respectability back to the 1960s-1970s, with the rise of assimilationist gay movements, particularly with the founding of the Community Homophile Association of Toronto (CHAT) and University of Toronto Homophile Association (UTHA). Both organizations argued against the manifestation of so-called ‘deviant’ homosexual identities. They saw sexualized gay businesses like bathhouses as exploitative as they profit on marginalized gay people. These organizations were both against the treatment of homosexuals caught having public sex by police, and public sex itself. They were both fighting against concentrated gay enclaves, and for the inclusion of gays in all spaces. Such anti-sex assimilationist movements parallel the work done at that time by organizations across several North American cities (Hanhardt, 2013).

The mid-1970s marked the beginning of the liberationist gay movement in and around Toronto. The Gay Alliance Towards Equality (GATE) and the Coalition of Gay Rights in Ontario (CGRO) both had a human rights agenda, and wanted to add sexual orientation to various human rights codes, notably those enacted in the public sector. GATE operated at the local, municipal and provincial levels, whereas CGRO operated at the provincial level alone. Both organizations distinguished the ‘respectable’ suburban homosexual as deserving of rights from the ‘abject’ urban ghetto gay (Bruner, 1981; Nash, 2006).

The late 1970s marked a series of public events that changed the causes mainstream gay organizations would rally around. The first major turning point was the murder of a young shoeshine boy named Emanuel Jacques in August of 1977. He was murdered by three men, one of whom was associated with the gay community. The backlash against the gay community in the popular consciousness of Torontonians was profound, as for many, the murder confirmed stereotypes around gay pedophilia and perverse behaviours (Koul, 2013; Nash, 2006).

The Toronto gay newspaper, the *Body Politic*, published an article in the fall of 1977 by Gerald Hannon entitled “Men loving boys loving men” (*see Figure 4*). The offices of the Body Politic were subsequently raided by the police, and three publishers of the newspaper were
charged with indecency (Bruner, 1981; Nash, 2006). The prolonged legal battle ended in victory in 1983. Gerald Hannon has been the subject of more recent scandal, having been outed as a sex worker while teaching at Ryerson University (Houston, 2011).
Figure 4
Men loving boys loving men 1977 article
Notoriously anti-gay activist Anita Bryant visited Toronto in January 1978 to publically argue that gay people were untrustworthy pedophilic perverts. Her visit galvanized both pro-gay and anti-gay activists, and fueled anti-gay propaganda in the popular Toronto press (Koul, 2013; Nash, 2006). Her conflation of gay people with pedophiles was also shared by Paul Walter, president of Metro Toronto Police Association, who did not want to hire gay people because he was afraid they would demonstrate pedophilic attraction to young boys while on the job (Bruner, 1981).

The Metropolitan Toronto Police raided the Barracks bathhouse in December of 1978. The police raid unleashed an unprecedented support for the sexualized gay business and its patrons from formally assimilationist ‘respectable’ gay activists. It is notable as the same people supporting the Barracks bathhouse criticized such businesses in years past. The Right to Privacy Committee (RTPC) was formed to address the human rights concerns brought up due to the raid, as well as funding the legal defense of the Barracks bathhouse (Nash, 2006). Twenty-eight people were arrested and charged with bawdy-house offences after the raid. Five people were charged with keeping a common bawdy-house, two of whom were acquitted and three were given conditional discharge in 1981 (Bruner, 1981; Nash, 2014).

In April of 1979, members of the Toronto gay community presented a brief to the Police Commission entitled ‘Our Police Force Too!’ (Members of Deputation from the Gay Community, 1981). The brief demanded that the police serve and protect the gay community in Toronto, instead of ignoring their concerns and profiling them as criminals. The brief stated that since February 18th, 1975, there were fourteen gay men brutally murdered in Toronto. Eight of these murders remained unsolved. They demanded that the police solve these crimes and enact preventative measure to combat future murders and gay bashing. They also stated that there was a rumored ‘gay queer parade’ in the Toronto Gay Village on Halloween, which attracted gay bashers to the gay enclave. The brief stated that for straight attendees of the pseudo-parade, the “great sport of the evening has traditionally been to throw eggs at the ‘queens’. The surrounding streets and laneways are generally unsafe on that night for gay people out alone” (Members of Deputation from the Gay Community, 1981, p. 8). They asked the police to quell this egg-throwing tradition, as well as end the entrapment of gay men cruising in bathrooms and public spaces. The brief was not acted upon, and entrapment, ignoring gay bashing and profiling gay people continued (Bruner, 1981).

Members of the Toronto gay community protested in front of Metropolitan Toronto Police headquarters in June 1979. The protestors demanded that the records seized during the 1977 raid on the Body Politic office and 1978 raid on the Barracks be returned. June 1979 also marked thirty-four arrests of gay men cruising, resulting from the surveillance of Greenwin Square public washrooms (Bruner, 1981). In the same month, David Balfour Park, another cruising area for gay men, was “terrorized by gangs of ‘queer bashers’ who roamed the park looking for ‘faggots’ to ‘beat the shit out of’” (The Gay Liberation Union, 1979, p. 3). Two victims of the hate crime were hospitalized. One attacker tried to poke out the eyes of one victim.
with a sharp stick, and the other victim had his head bashed with a metal bar. Two men escaped the altercation, and tried to get the help from a nearby police cruiser on patrol. The police did not investigate the incident (The Gay Liberation Union, 1979).

The over-policing of gay embodiments and under-policing of gay-bashers led to interventions like the ‘Toronto Gay Patrol’ and courses on self-defence for gay men and lesbians created through the RTPC. Gay patrols were formed to:

patrol the parks, populat [sic] cruising areas, the back allies [sic] behind bars, and the main streets in the ‘ghetto’ where the majority of the attacks seemed to be taking place.
The patrol would protect gay men, lesbians and women by breaking up attacks that were seen and hopefully with their very visible presence prevent and discourage such attacks.

(The Gay Liberation Union, 1979, p. 2).

The self-defence courses and patrols were purposeful in identifying homophobia and sexism as the driving force behind attacks on gay and lesbian individuals. The Gay Liberation Union stated that they were in the business of defending gay men attacked because they are gay, and lesbians attacked because they are gay and women (The Gay Liberation Union, 1979). The ‘Toronto Gay Patrol’ was also explicitly formed due to a lack of police support for the gay community, stating that although “most of these attacks have taken place on or near the city’s busiest thoroughfare, the police have generally been conspicuous by their absence” (Toronto Gay Patrol, 1981).

The Toronto Gay Patrol had an eye for built environment improvements as well, stating that the lighting in the laneways running behind Yonge Street near the Gay Village needed to be improved for safety reasons. In their brief, they also asked for more police foot-patrol in the laneways, as well as open communication between the Toronto Gay Patrol and the Metropolitan Toronto Police. The Toronto Gay Patrol wanted mandatory anti-homophobia training for police as well (Toronto Gay Patrol, 1981, p. 1). The Toronto Gay Patrol ceased by 1991, when the RTPC had their last annual general meeting (Krawczyk, 1991). Although it is unknown if the Toronto Gay Patrol was directly inspired by similar groups in other cities, it is notable that vigilante patrolling was a common tactic used by marginalized sexual, gender and racialized communities in cities across North America at the time (Hanhardt, 2013).

February 5th, 1981 marked the largest bathhouse raid, and one of the most violent police-instigated attacks on the gay community, in Toronto. Later dubbed ‘Operation Soap’, the police raided four bathhouses -- the Richmond Street Health Emporium, Club Baths, Romans II Health and Recreation Spa and the Barracks. Over three hundred men were arrested by approximately two hundred police officers. Most of the men arrested were charged of being found in a bawdyhouse. Twenty people were also charged with keeping a common bawdyhouse (Malcom, 1981; Thomas, 2011). There were many accounts of unnecessary brutality towards both the bathhouse property owners and their patrons. The Richmond Street Health Emporium was so badly damaged by the police during the raid that it never reopened (Thomas, 2011).
The bathhouse raids were seen as an attack on the entire gay community (Bruner, 1981; Thomas, 2011). Protests against police brutality began the day after Operation Soap. Three thousand people marched on February 6th 1981. By February 20th 1981, protestors occupied Yonge and Wellesley St., which is a major thoroughfare near the gay village (see Figures 5 and 6). These protests evoked anti-activist sentiments among police officers, and there were reports of homophobic slurs and violence enacted against protesters (Bruner, 1981). The spring of 1981 marked Toronto’s first Pride Parade. In September 1981, Arnold Bruner released a report to then Mayor Arthur Eggleton and the Council of the City of Toronto entitled “Out of the Closet: Study of Relations between the Homosexual Community and the Police”. The report is explicitly not an inquiry on Operation Soap, but examined instead the relationship between the gay community and police.
Rioters and passersby brawl during the riot  
(CLGA, 1981a)

‘Enough is Enough’ - activists line the streets with their banner  
(CLGA, 1981b)
Bruner (1981) provided a time-capsule into the state of policing and the gay community in the early 1980s in Toronto. He explored cruising, public sex, bathhouse culture, gay activism, and police demographics in this document. In the field research involving cruising parks, Bruner (1981) recounted how his “guide warned [him] of three dangers: of running across ‘queer bashers’ — thugs who beat up gay men for pleasure, of being arrested, and of falling of the narrow path into the ravine,” (p. 55) while noting a number of ‘escape routes’ in case anything dangerous happens. The creation of multiple exits and pathways is a fundamental recommendation in planning for safety in both crime prevention and feminist design guidelines (Crowe, 2013; Loukaitou-Sideris, 2006; Newman, 1973). A basic principle of designing for safety was already employed by gay communities prior to the publication of official studies like Bruner’s (1981) report.

Bruner’s (1981) report recommended built environmental interventions around safety and morality as well. Bruner (1981) stated that the use of public bathrooms for sex in Greenwin Square Complex, Parkside Tavern, Biltmore Theatre, Kipling Station, Islington Station and the Hudson’s Bay Store at Fairview Mall could be dissuaded through some physical changes. He suggested the lowering of wall and doors in toilet cubicles and the addition of partitions between urinals. He also suggested that the Toronto Transit Commission use security guards to patrol Kipling and Islington Station for public sex to lessen the use of heavy handed police enforcement (Bruner, 1981).

Bruner (1981) also offered a snapshot into the demographics of the police force in the early 1980s. He stated that 83% of the Metropolitan Toronto Police speak English exclusively and 47% were hired outside Metropolitan Toronto. A Grade 10 education was the only requirement for joining the force at the time, so 45% of senior officers and 40% of staff sergeants have only a Grade 10 education. One of his recommendations was to improve not only the education of police officers around homophobia, but also offer a more holistic education program.

Bruner (1981) received a number of statements and briefs from local gay and lesbian organizations. The briefs clearly influenced his writing of the report, and the recommendations presented by community members were incorporated. This included the Right to Privacy Committee (RTPC) recommending that the Province of Ontario and the Metropolitan Board of Commissioners of Police recognize lesbian and gay rights, and that the professional training and management of the police be improved. Both of these recommendations made it into Bruner’s (1981) study (The Right to Privacy Committee, 1981). However, recommendations like addressing the racism and sexism in the police force were not included in the report (Bruner, 1981; Lesbians Against The Right, 1981). There was also no mention of transgender, transsexual, cross-dressing or other gender variant embodiments in the literature around Toronto based gay and lesbian self-defence, nor in the Bruner Report. Ultimately, City Council heard the Bruner Report, and asked the Police Chief to issue a statement on the legitimacy of the gay community, and began setting up a gay awareness program for new recruits to the force (CLGA,
1997). Despite these efforts, tensions still exist between the LGBTQ2+ communities and the police in Toronto.
Figure 7

Queer Neighbourhoods in Toronto (Based on Focus Group Data and Secondary Readings)

(Fred Victor, 2015a; Kulanu, 2015; Marvelous Grounds, 2015b; Nash & Gorman-Murray, 2014; Watson, 2015)
Contemporary LGBTQ Safety Issues in Toronto

The events of the late 1970s and early 1980s acted as a catalyst for greater unified gay and lesbian activism in Toronto. That being said, the geographies of queer spaces alone show a community in sprawl (see Figure 7). The late 1980s did mark a shift towards activisms addressing the AIDS crisis, and the government’s slow response to the epidemic. The politics of inclusion in Pride Parades also shifted as the festivities ostensibly became less political and more exclusive. The Dyke March was founded in 1996 to give space to women during Pride. The first Blockorama, a Pride stage dedicated to Black LGBTQ people, started in 1998. Mel Lastman, the first mayor of the newly amalgamated Toronto, marched in the 1998 Pride parade. By 2005, gay marriage became legal across Canada (CBC News, 2012; Chambers, 2014).

The Trans March began in 2009 to address the lack of trans visibility during Pride. Without media support or funds, the Trans March continued to grow, while Pride Toronto tried to squash it by blocking, misdirecting and funneling marchers year after year. Despite the lack of cooperation, the largest Trans March in the world took place during Toronto Pride on June 18th 2013 (Ward, 2013). The 2014 Trans March also demarcated a division in the trans community. Two marches took place during the World Pride festivities that year. One march, headed by Pride Toronto, led participants down Yonge St., a main thoroughfare in the downtown core, to Yonge and Dundas Square for a concert. Marches in the past berated Pride Toronto for not securing the appropriate permitting to allow the march to legally take place on Yonge. The other march, led by Trans March Toronto, short turned and led marchers to a park, celebrating the Trans March’s political roots (Watson, 2014). Clashes between the mainstream gay community represented by Pride Toronto and facets of the trans community represented by Trans March Toronto are significant in the face of trans people’s erasure from the early years of queer activism in Toronto, as well as the particular safety needs of trans people which are markedly different that those of cisgender people.

The late 1980s and early 1990s marked the beginning of the ‘Toronto Safe City Committee’. Founded in 1988 by City Council, the Toronto Safe City Committee has released a number of guidelines around creating a safer built environment, and has influenced the Official Plan of the City of Toronto. The Toronto Safe City Committee is explicit in stating that it does not believe that “bad planning and design cause criminal acts, or that modifying urban environments will singlehandedly prevent crime” (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997). Changing the built environment is just a small piece of safety planning that should occur.

On July 20th, 1993, Toronto City Council approved the Official Plan, which for the first time included a section on “Safety in Design”, which frames Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) safety standards as being central to future and current development standards (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997). Toronto’s most recent Official Plan was created and approved by City Council in 2002, and consolidated in 2010 after eight years’ worth of Ontario Municipal Board appeals that directly addressed issues in the Plan (Wright, 2010).
The most recent Official Plan has no mention of overt safety needs, nor CPTED principles. The closest mention of public safety in the Plan is the policy item in the “Public Realm” subsection which reads that the City will take “measures which promote pedestrian safety and security” (Wright, 2010). The current plan is a far cry from the 1993 Plan which had its own subsection on planning for safety and CPTED. It also became apparent that the City of Toronto used to employ a Safety Planner in the Planning Department, but now, safety has been relegated to the department dealing with emergency management, which conceptualizes safety in terms of first response, not long term social and physical changes to urban spaces (Kilgour, Eyre, & Banon, 2013). The Toronto Safe City Committee continues to meet, and is hosted by METRAC, a community-based, not-for-profit organization. METRAC has recently begun to develop materials around creating queer and trans inclusive safety audits (metracadmin, 2015a).

In the fall of 2010, Rob Ford was elected mayor of Toronto on a populist platform on ending the ‘gravy train’ of wasteful public spending. The Core Services Review undertaken by Mayor Ford led to devastating cuts to organizations serving queer people of colour living with HIV and AIDS. Although the cuts were part of a longer history of organizations fighting with City Hall for better funding, Mayor Ford added a homophobic slant to wanting to cut such services (Catungal, 2015). Mayor Ford was quoted saying in 2006 that “If you are not doing needles and you are not gay, you wouldn’t get AIDS probably” (Rider, 2010). Mayor Ford apologized for his comment on AIDS during his 2010 run for office, and was not reported in the media as using homophobic slurs until his infamous crack video surfaced in 2013 where he allegedly called Justin Trudeau a “fag” and the members of the football team he coached “just fucking minorities” (Doolittle & Donovan, 2013). The scandalous tenure of Rob Ford’s mayoral period ended in most of his powers being stripped and giving up his second term mayoral run to his brother, Doug Ford, who lost to John Tory in 2015. Rob Ford’s overt neglect and hatred of LGBTQ2+ communities has left the city’s services and civic identity damaged (CBC News, 2013; Peat, 2015). The divided community mapped in Figure 7 was never more apparent than during the Ford era for many Torontonians.

Nash & Gorman-Murray (2014) argue that mobility politics are a useful tool for analysis of LGBT people in Toronto because increasingly young LGBT people live outside of the Gay Village. They use the concept of ‘motility’, which describes the ability to be mobile and is limited by identities and constructs like class, race, gender, and sexuality.

Nash & Gorman-Murray (2015) argue that lesbians in Toronto create opportunities for place-making in inner-city locations, like the 519 Community Centre, but are more likely to live in hip affordable residential neighbourhoods outside of downtown in areas like Parkdale and the Junction. They state that in Toronto, “certain LGBT people fit comfortably into a middle-class aesthetic, this offers a partial explanation for the increasing visibility of LGBT people in alternative downtown neighbourhoods, such as Parkdale in Toronto” (p. 760). They cite Parkdale as an ‘alternative’ queer neighbourhood, without addressing the area’s history as a hotspot for deinstitutionalized mentally ill folks, low income people, new immigrants, and drug
addicts (Slater, 2005). The gentrification narrative around Parkdale and the scapegoating of queer people as its beneficiaries are too fraught to not mention in Nash & Gorman-Murray’s (2014) article. Nash & Gorman-Murray (2014) do state that the appeal of areas like Parkdale for trans, bisexual, queer and LGBTQ2+ community subgroups has to do with their not feeling comfortable in the White gay, male-centric, traditional Gay Village. However, they do not explicitly address the displacement of marginalized people in gentrifying areas like Parkdale, nor the potential that some displaced people may also be LGBTQ2+ community members.

Even with queer geographies extending beyond the Village, LGBTQ2+ communities continue to have a fraught relationship with the Toronto Police. Notably, the police brutality and mass arrests during the 2015 G20 Summit, which was a fundamentally class-based protest against uneven distribution of wealth, paired with a subsequent lack of police accountability, as well as recent criticism over racial profiling of young Black men through the practice of ‘carding’ and police brutality leading to the murder of young men of colour has led to media reports on mistrust of police by Torontonians (CBC News, 2015; Mendleson & Poisson, 2015; The Globe and Mail, 2015). Notably, activists involved in the ‘Black Lives Matter’ movement blocked Allen Road, a highway located in Toronto, as a protest against the murders of two Black men, Jermaine Carby and Andrew Loku, by police (Hong, 2015). The reporting of hate crimes enacted against queer and trans communities is complicated by the mistrust of police, as these communities intersect with Toronto’s Black community.

Hate crimes are underreported due to fear of retaliation, whether criminal justice system will take report seriously, and a fear that they will be stigmatized when reporting to police (“Checking-In on Evan Solomon allegations, herding sheep, daydreaming and more,” 2015). The history of police brutality against gay, trans, and lesbian communities in Toronto grounds the ongoing lack of trust and tensions between the LGBTQ2+ community and the police.

Rage and mistrust recently erupted on social media and in local publications after the under-investigated death of Sumaya Dalmar, a transwoman of colour living in Toronto’s East End. Sumaya was found unconscious February 22nd 2015 by Toronto Police in her apartment. The police did not issue further information on the circumstances of her death until two days later, after the hashtag “#JusticeforSumayaYsl” trended on Twitter (Mohyeddin, 2015). The Toronto Police Service issued the following statement on Facebook:

On February 22, 2015, police responded to a call for service in the Danforth Road/Main Street area of Toronto.

A woman was found unresponsive. She was pronounced dead at the scene.

---

3 Signifiers of race, including White, Black, and Brown, will be capitalized as per the formatting standards in the 6th edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The capitalization additionally strives to put race at the forefront of the conversation on public safety.
Police from 55 Division are conducting a thorough investigation. An autopsy has been completed; the results were inconclusive. As with other investigations, toxicology tests are pending. To protect the privacy of the victim, no further details on the cause of death will be released.

At this time, we have no evidence to indicate the death is suspicious. If the investigation leads us to believe otherwise, we will provide an update.

If anyone has any information, they can contact police at the 55 Division Criminal Investigations Branch directly at 416-808-5504 or Toronto Crime Stoppers anonymously at 1-800-222-TIPS. (Toronto Police Service, 2015).

In response, one commenter wrote:

I know that a young woman has come forward stating that she likely saw someone who looked very similar to Sumaya before her death and no one at the Toronto Police Services has returned her phone calls. You promised to follow up with her and you have not. This is absolutely ridiculous and unacceptable. Why are you not taking these concerns seriously? Because she's black? Because she's trans? You must be accountable to the communities you insist on 'serving'. (Toronto Police Service, 2015)

Accusations that the police were not adequately investigating Sumaya’s death continued. There were reports that Sumaya was last seen being chased by a man near her home, yet the police did not appear to follow-up on that lead (Strapagiel, 2015; Thériault, 2015). One article on Sumaya’s death included a statement from a Toronto trans activist, Sophia Banks, where she stated that in the summer of 2014, she was assaulted in Toronto’s East End, and when she reported the incident to police, they kept asking her ‘what is trans?’ and calling her ‘sir’ (Mohyeddin, 2015). Toronto Police Services spokesperson Meaghan Gray stated in a different article that she is aware of the fraught relationship between the police and trans communities, saying that the police has “worked very hard over the last little while to improve that relationship” (Strapagiel, 2015).

By November 2015, twenty one trans women, many identify as women of colour, were reported murdered in the United States. Sumaya’s death is a part of the overall trend in transphobic and racist violence in North American cities, alongside community anger towards the police for their perceived inaction (Ennis, 2015). Within Toronto’s LGBTQ2+ community it is striking that the anti-police gay activists of the 1970s and 1980s have remained silent on the current movements to recognize that police brutality continues to be a problem for Black communities. Some have critiqued these activists for having only cared about police brutality when it was enacted against white gay men (Seitz, 2015).

Beyond the specific tensions between police and the LGBTQ2+ community, homophobic and transphobic violence has continued to flair in Toronto. In August 2013, in Bloor West
Village, a neighbourhood in Toronto’s West End, a couple had a Pride flag bumper sticker ripped off of their car, another Pride flag torn down, and their car tires slashed with feces thrown onto the hood. In December 2014, Bloor West Village business owner Carolyn Eby had a Pride flag repeatedly vandalized on her storefront. Both incidents involved a vandal spray painting the sentence “Be Happy Not Gay” onto the property of the victims. The victims of the hate crime were in both cases White, and reported the crimes to Toronto Police (CBC News, 2014; Hauch, 2013).

In May 2015, Toronto Drag Queen Ryan Boa was attacked and robbed by a man he brought home from the bar. Ryan Boa contacted police and received support from them, as well as from the LGBTQ2+ community, in the search for the perpetrator. It is notable that the police were not criticized for their response to the crime, despite ruling out that it was a hate crime and treating it as an assault. It is also notable that Ryan Boa is White.

In July 2015, homophobic graffiti was found on a LGBT-themed mural erected on a recreation trail in honour of the Pan Am Games. The mural was vandalized twice with the words “Heterosexual Only”, “heterosexual pride day” and “a dick and a (sic) asshole is not a family” scrawled on the artwork. The vandalism took place near the 2013 and 2014 instances of “Be Happy Not Gay” graffiti scrawled on private property (Watson, 2015b).

The suspicious death of Sumaya Dalmar, the attack on Ryan Boa, and the vandalism in Bloor West Village are only a few cases of recent well-publicized crimes against LGBTQ2+ community members. It is also impossible to speak of them, and the activism around inclusivity, without also looking at current conversations around the over-policing of Black and Brown bodies through movements like Black Lives Matter – Toronto Coalition. Overall, racial identities matter in policing as White LGBTQ2+ victims were generally more satisfied with police responses than LGBTQ2+ community members of colour.

Despite some achievements, homophobia and transphobia remain safety issues in Toronto. The exclusion of trans, lesbian and queer people in the Village is an ongoing concern. Misogyny, transmisogyny, ableism and racism are all issues both internal and external to the LGBTQ2+ community in Toronto (Nash, 2006). This Master’s thesis hopes to further develop the narrative around police accountability and reporting hate crimes to law enforcement.

Conclusion

The Toronto context is rich in historical and ongoing conflict within and outside queer and trans communities. Tensions between the police, LGBTQ2+ activists and other marginalized communities in Toronto are layered, revealing the multiplicities of intersectional identities, especially around race and class. Activists and community leader continue to rail against a lack of police accountability that is currently framed by the ‘Black Lives Matter’ movement, which has exploded across North American cities. The Toronto context is unique in its historic
specificities, from Operation Soap to amalgamation. However, as a case study, Toronto faces similar challenges as most other North American cities around giving voice to the LGBTQ2+ communities in municipal safety planning.
Chapter 3 - Understanding CPTED, Gendered Identities and Queering Safety in Urban Spaces

Summary of Chapter 3

- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) theorizes that safer spaces can be planned and designed through mixture of territoriality, surveillance, and a mix of private and public uses.
- Feminist CPTED theorists bring the often overlooked experiences of women to safety planning and CPTED.
- Feminist theorists are also critical of the exclusiveness and ineffectiveness of CPTED and safety planning.
- Queer planning theorists spatialize safety planning and placemaking differently than heterosexist planners.
- Particular considerations are needed around the experiences of trans people in planning.
- The thesis hopes to contribute to the conversation on queerness, planning and safety.

Introduction

This literature review chapter provides an analysis of previous work done on perceived public safety as experienced by LGBTQ2+ identified individuals. The selected literature has been taken from the field of queer theory, gender studies, criminology, equity studies, urban studies, sociology, urban planning, as well as architecture and urban design.

There are three bodies of literature reviewed for this study. The first body of literature reviewed frames the use of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) in planning for safety. The second body of literature unpacks the feminist writings on gendered safety in urban spaces. The third body of literature focuses on the queer and transgender experiences that will help fill the gaps that the heteronormative feminist texts miss. It will help inform the thesis in filling existing gaps and connect previous work which, although disparate, deals with similar challenges and issues.
Jane Jacobs revolutionized the way people talk about urbanism, city planning and safety in her seminal text *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. In the realm of public safety, her text rails against what was at the time planning ideals of low density sprawl, which makes neighbourhoods less livable for a plethora of reasons, including safety concerns. Jacobs (1961) advocates for a mixture of uses throughout the day in urban spaces through density, appropriate demarcation of private and public spaces, and mixed uses that bring people into a neighbourhood at all times of the day and night. On planning for safety, she writes:

First, there must be a clear demarcation between what public space is and what private space is. Public and private spaces cannot ooze into each other as they do typically in suburban settings or in projects.

Second, there must be eyes upon the street, eyes belonging to those we might call the natural proprietors of the street. The buildings on a street equipped to handle strangers and to insure the safety of both residents and strangers must be oriented to the street. They cannot turn their backs or blank sides on it and leave it blind.

And third, the sidewalk must have users on it fairly continuously, both to add to the number of effective eyes on the street and to induce the people in buildings along the street to watch the sidewalks in sufficient numbers. Nobody enjoys sitting on a stoop or looking out a window at an empty street. Almost nobody does such a thing. Large numbers of people entertain themselves, off and on, by watching street activity. (Jacobs, 1961, p. 35).

Critiques of Jacobs (1961) working in criminology have brought up that although more people can lead to more eyes on the street and consistent sidewalk usage, and subsequently less crimes, more people can also lead to having more offenders and more crimes in an area. The perception of crowds and safety can vary depending on the time of day, size and purpose of the crowd. More people can lead to more litter, more rowdiness and more anonymity for perpetrators, which leads to a feeling of insecurity for some users of public space (Crowe, 2013).

Despite these critiques, the three principles espoused by Jacobs (1961) continue to be the pillars of CPTED. The term Crime Prevention through Environmental Design was coined in the book of the same title by C. Ray Jeffery in 1971. In his book, Jeffery (1971) uses the principles outlined by Jacobs (1961) to argue that the focus should be shifted from case-by-case policing of offenders to a broad approach around changing to built environment to reduce the opportunity for criminal activity to occur. Jeffery (1971) offers a psychological analysis and theoretical approach around using the built environment to lessen the motivation for crime.
Oscar Newman develops CPTED further with defensible space theory in his 1973 book *Defensible Space, Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*. Newman (1973) anxiously describes the social breakdown of American society, analyzing increasing crime rates and the victimization of poor people. He argues that criminology has focused too much on the motivations and psychology of the offender, and that his proposed design guidelines are actionable ways to create defensible space for “residential environments which inhibits crime by creating the physical expression of a social fabric that defends itself” (Newman, 1973, p. 3). Newman’s (1973) guidelines to create defensible residential spaces consist of the following four items:

- Territoriality (sense of ownership defined by physical markers like fences, shrubs, signage, etc…)
- Surveillance opportunities (design that gives residents the opportunity to survey public and semi-public spaces both indoors and outside like windows and balconies that are oriented towards such spaces)
- Confronting stigma, isolation and uniqueness (design that addresses symbolic stigma of housing projects and the isolation and vulnerability of its residents)
- Juxtaposition of public and private amenities (have infrastructure deemed conventionally safe and well populated near dwellings)

The defensible space guidelines borrow principles from Jacobs (1961), who Newman (1973) quotes in his text, as well as Jeffery (1971). Despite being influenced by these thinkers, Newman (1973) comes off as anti-high rise, anti-density and anti-mixture in his work. He specifically rails against buildings taller than seven stories, which he considers a hotbed for crime due to their tendency to ignore territoriality and other place-making practices. He also believes high-rise buildings are not successful if they are too diverse. He writes on a housing project in New York City that fails to allow “residents to distinguish neighbor from intruder … this is accomplished not through design but by isolating a large, uniform population” (Newman, 1973, p. 18). A racially homogenous population, according to Newman (1973), means that a perpetrator would be easily identifiable. Implicitly this means that the perpetrator would be a person of colour. He affirms this when he explicitly identifies that the segregation strategy in public housing only works if the population is older, White and middle class. Newman’s (1973) ideas around segregation is untenable within the racial diversity of contemporary cities, as well as being politically unpalatable to anti-oppression frameworks, which seek to critically embrace challenges of diversity instead of promoting segregation.

In the 1980s, Wilson & Kelling (1982) theorize the linkage between policing and environmental aesthetics to disorder and crime. They state that although foot patrols done by police do not reduce crime incidents, they are useful in reducing community members’ perception of the amount of criminal activity that occurs in their neighbourhood, as well as promoting better relationship between the community and the police. On the other hand, if there
is perceived disorder in an area, whether it is because of derelict buildings or the presence of socially undesirable people (i.e. the homeless, drunks, addicts, youth, etc…), and the community’s perception of crime and unsafe behaviour is disproportionately high. Wilson & Kelling (1982) coin the term ‘Broken Windows Theory’ to describe the disorder and crime that comes out of the run-down aesthetics of a neighbourhood. They synthesize their theory as being rooted in observing that:

if a window in a building is broke and is left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken. This is true in nice neighborhoods [sic] as in run-down ones. Window-breaking does not necessarily occur on a large scale because some areas are inhabited by determined window-breakers whereas others are populated by window-lovers; rather, one unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares, and so breaking more windows costs nothing. (p. 3).

Wilson & Kelling (1982) describe the breakdown in social control paired with vandalism and attribute it to increased mobility away from problem neighbourhoods, those not marginalized by class and race. They also describe changes in policing from being a night watcher in charge of keeping order to fighting crimes. Wilson & Kelling (1982) criticize the police for worrying too much about case by case crime, and not enough on long term crime prevention.

Wilson & Kelling (1982) offer a limited and less nuanced analysis of race and class, and offer nothing around gender or sexuality. They reference the Broken Windows Theory’s the implicit bias in the perception of crime as being perpetrated by low income Black and Brown young men by stating that in reality, the vandals in a Broken Windows scenario are often middleclass to affluent White people. On the other hand, Wilson & Kelling (1982) speak out against decriminalizing vagrancy, or letting a drunk stay in public. They argue that any social disorder, including perceptions of dangers that make people afraid of embodiments intersecting along masculinity, poverty, Blackness, and addiction, can destroy an entire community. Not only does this clash with their earlier claim that most vandals are White men who are not living in poverty, but also supports an inaccurate stereotypical picture of criminal behaviour.

In the 1990s, feminist organizations were in full force providing analysis around gender and violence in the context of CPTED. In 1997, the Toronto’s Safe City Committee, which was formed by feminist activists, published revised Safer City Guidelines, which provide CPTED recommendations around how spaces in Toronto should be designed with greater awareness of the social and systemic root causes of criminal behaviour. The Guidelines state that it does not intend “to suggest that bad planning and design cause criminal acts, or that modifying urban environments will singlehandedly prevent crime … This tool is a guide to help build safer cities” (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997). Unlike previous CPTED, the Guidelines seek to acknowledge the pertinence of social facts in crime prevention, and the limitations of using physical environmental changes to reduce crime.
The Safer City Guidelines provide tools for planners to address safety concerns in Toronto. The Guidelines outline three steps to address safety:

1. an awareness by planners of the issues and an acknowledgement that they have a positive role to play in promoting safety in public environments;
2. using these guidelines in their day-to-day planning practice;
3. engaging in a process of mutual learning with the community to add to and modify these guidelines. (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997, p. 14).

The guidelines speak to the importance of community consultation when planning around safety and crime prevention. They state that locals are often more aware of where and when crime occurs in their neighbourhood, as they are attuned to incidents that are not always necessarily reported to police. Valuing local knowledge and recognizing community members as safety experts frame the practices of METRAC’s safety audit process, as well as the use of qualitative data collection through focus groups, interviews and the survey.

The Safer City Guidelines has a chapter on making public spaces in Toronto safer. The Guide states that the planning and design factors relevant to public spaces are the ability to be aware of the environment through lighting, clear sightlines and eliminating entrapment areas, little isolation through a mixture of land uses to promote space use throughout the day and night, as well as activity generators that draw people to the space, and the ability to escape and/or communicate that help is needed when in danger through improved signage, and access to communication devices. The Guidelines provide nuanced details around what constitutes appropriate lighting (i.e. four foot-candles, or bright enough to see a face from fifteen metres away), appropriate signage (i.e. located near an entrance and readable from twenty metres away), advice on how to improve sightlines (i.e. using convex mirrors at the corners in hallways, and cutting down overgrown vegetation), curbing entrapment (i.e. making sure there are no areas small areas confined by three barriers near movement predictors like sidewalks and paths), and the importance of maintenance to providing territorial ownership over space (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997).

The Safer City Guidelines include recommendations around traditional planning interventions like zoning and intensification. The Guidelines state that mixed-use zoning is a useful tool to ensure that areas are being used throughout the day and night to promote vibrancy and ‘eyes on the street’. The guidelines also recommend intensification to rid high density high-rise oriented neighbourhoods of large amounts of unused empty public spaces (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997).

Although the Guidelines provide a feminist lens with some gender analysis in its introduction, stating that women are overrepresented in fearing crime and attack in poorly designed spaces, there is no analysis around race or sexuality in the document. The Guidelines do not delve into the fraught relationship some communities have with the police, and how
advocating for over-policing can make some people feel less safe or unwelcomed. Focusing on women’s experiences without recognizing the intersectional differences between women is a serious limitation in the text. The text provides physical CPTED interventions related to the literature written by Jacobs (1961), Newman (1971), and Jeffery (1971). The physical interventions around how far away someone has to be to see a sign or a stranger’s face are more empirical than social factors, but their effects on communities around over-policing and feeling unwelcome are profound considerations for analysis in this thesis.

More recent CPTED texts have updated their analysis around social issues and criminal activity. Crowe (2013) proposes an integrated approach to safety, where education, health, urban planning and traditional CPTED principles are brought together in an integrated approach to crime prevention in the context of immigration, poverty, and other systemic determinants of crime. Crowe (2013) proposed a “Container Concept”, which views crime, fear of crime and the physical urban environment as three separate but complementary perspectives (Crowe, 2013, p. 245). The crime contained is full of various real life offences, each needing their own specific responses by law enforcement and other institutions. The fear of crime container is a box full of varying responses to feeling insecure in urban areas, which vary depending on age, gender, and other identity-based determinants. The physical urban environment container contains both the social environment (e.g. residents, employees, police officers, offenders, etc…) and the physical environment (e.g. houses, streets, officers, laptops, mobile phone, etc…). The physical urban environment is the focus of CPTED interventions, but Crowe (2013) recognizes that focusing on that container alone will not deal with the full problem context around crime, and that a holistic approach linking these containers is necessary. Crowe (2013) uses a visual to help demonstrate the interwovenness of these three pillars (see Figure 8).
Figure 8

Crowe’s (2013) Container Theory
Crowe (2013) provides a contemporary look at CPTED strategies. He uses the same fundamental CPTED strategies as other theorists: 1) Natural control; 2) Natural surveillance; and 3) Territorial reinforcement. However, Crowe (2013) frames his CPTED guidelines as explicitly allowing for community members to report on their own experiences of safety. The guidelines are limited by being most usefulness at the early stage of urban planning, as it is much more difficult to change the physical form once it is built. Crowe’s (2013) use of binary language differentiating ‘normal’ and ‘abnormal’ uses of urban spaces alludes to an oppressive understanding of social desirability. He explicitly states that CPTED should design out uses of urban spaces for sex workers, addicts and other social undesirables. CPTED and urban planning more broadly are a form of social control, which privileges some people, most often some mixture of middle to upper class, White, cisgender, straight embodiments, over others, most often those who are lower income, people of colour, LGBTQ2+ and other marginalized identities. The following review of feminist and queer planning for safety hopes to disrupt the imaginary of social desirability put forth by conventional public safety planners.

Feminist Intersectional Analyses of Gendered Spaces

Feminist writings on gendered safety in urban spaces are reviewed in the following section. The literature on feminist planning for safety exists in three strands of thought. The first strand consists of scholars who write on gendered spaces and examine how the masculinized public sphere is unsafe for women, and what can be done to lessen crimes enacted against women. The second strand offers an intersectional analysis of the lived experiences within gendered spaces, recognizing that race and class play a significant role in perceptions of safety. The final strand offers a feminist critique of CPTED interventions, as well as the overall concept of designing out crime.

Gendered Spaces

Feminist safety planners and theorists bring gendered differences to CPTED strategies in order to argue for planning that considers women’s experiences. Pain (1991) writes that the cues provoking fears are different between men and women. This is particularly true in cases of sexual violence, which disproportionately targets women. Pain (1991) also states that sexual violence is also often conceptualized as rape by a stranger (often a ‘psychopath’ or ‘pervert’), despite its prevalence in the domestic sphere by a person the victim knows. By being educated early on that strangers are the perpetrators of violent crimes against women in public spaces, more power is allotted to men as women depend upon them for safety. It gives these men more power to abuse women in private while the common notion that sexual violence occurs in public continues to be espoused. Pain (1991) writes that even with the association of public spaces and
sexual violence, the male-dominated world of planning and design tends to ignore opportunities to design spaces with women’s issues and needs in mind.

Lynch and Atkins (1988) explore women’s fear of attack on public transportation. Similar to Pain (1991), they identify that women’s issues are often neglected by male transportation planners. They identify women, elderly people, ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, lesbians and gay men as groups who experience greater threats to safety on various transportation modes. Lynch and Atkins (1988) however, lack an intersectional analysis of how these groups are in fact quite intertwined. The suggestions in the article (e.g., low-income young people should not be allowed to take public transportation) include excluding social undesirables from buses, which is based on both classist and ageist notions of respectability.

Another article by Koskela (1999) explores the gendered power relations behind women’s spatial exclusion in Scandinavian countries. Koskela (1999) argues that the city is divided into masculinized areas without women and presumably safer areas that are more feminized. She argues that there is a virtual curfew around feeling safe in the city for women. Koskela (1999) addresses the prevalence of violence in the domestic sphere, compared to the perception that it is mostly a public space problem.

Koskela (1999) looks at how elderly people are isolated and more vulnerable compared to younger people, and how pregnancy changes the perception of safety for women (who report that they go out less often, were treated as more fragile and vulnerable when they did go out, etc…) She also states women who are not White and/or are able-bodied are at higher risk of threat. Despite including a statement of safety and racialization in her piece, Koskela (1999) does not unpack a comment said by one of the participants in her qualitative data collection that reinforces fears of Blackness. One of her participants is quoted in the article saying that “One night I was in a tram… and there was a big black man who was staring intently at me … I was terrified” (Koskela, 1999, p. 117). Koskela (1999) does not acknowledge that the fear of a ‘big Black man’ is rooted in White supremacist assumptions of what bodies are safe or unsafe to be around. Neither did she offer a nuanced analysis that could challenge legitimizing her participant’s fears and interrupt the perception that Black men should inherently be feared.

Although both Koskela (1999) and Lynch & Atkins (1988) mention race in their pieces, neither of them do so in a way that intersects with their gender analysis. Racialization is mentioned as an afterthought or as a source of fear. Both of these authors, as well as Pain (1991) and Fisher and May (2009) also address gender as a strict binary of women and men, which is not inclusive of gender variant, transgender or queer identified individuals.
Intersectional Analysis

There is paradoxical over-representation of oppressed embodiments as the perpetrators of violence and crime, while in reality, people embodying oppressed identities are more likely to be victimized by both state-sanctioned and non-state sanctioned forms of violence (Hanhardt 2013). It is important to frame this paradox within intersectionality. The term ‘intersectionality’ was coined in an article written by Black feminist Kimberlé Crenshaw, who argues that the experiences of Black womanhood exists at the intersections of Blackness and womanhood, not two separate conversations about race and gender. Intersectionality has been evoked since to describe instances where an analysis of multiple marginalities around race, gender, class, sexuality, ability, colonialism, and so on is necessary (Crenshaw, 1989). Collins’ (1993) work on intersectionality states that “Race, class and gender may all structure a situation but may not be equally visible and/or important in people’s self-definition” (p.28). Collins (1993) recognizes the race, class, gender and other sites of identity formation are interlocking but also distinct in the way in which they cultivate personal biographies. The importance of intersectionality and affirming self-identity frames the results of this thesis. The limitations around visibility of self-defined identities are also critical to the discussion of safety in this work.

The increased acceptance of the need for more intersectional analysis of gendered spaces and lived experience within those spaces propelled writers to provide more complex and nuanced analysis. For example, Pain (2001) wrote another piece ten years after “Space, sexual violence and social control”, called “Gender, Race, Age and Fear in the City”. In her more recent piece, Pain (2001) unpacks the complexities of age, gender and race as categories of fear to challenge previous literature. Pain (2001) writes that although people of colour are often assumed to be perpetrators of fear and crime, they are statistically more likely to be the victims. In particular, men of colour are more likely to be harassed by police compared to their White counterparts, while women of colour are more likely to be hypersexualized due to the notions of (White) men’s entitlement to access their bodies. She concludes her argument by stating that the fear of crime is structured by age, race and gender, and that when these structures are called into question, it is then possible to analyze the unequal distribution of power between different groups. The relationship between age, race and gender begins to explain who is most affected by crime and fear.

Green & Singleton (2006) and Weseley & Gaarder (2004) join the growing number of researchers who unpack the intersectional relationships between race, class, gender, and safety. Green & Singleton’s (2006) research in England analyzes the cultural specificity of South Asian women’s experiences in the city around protecting their honour and modesty in their community, compared to the experiences of White women. Although they found that both White participants and South Asian participants in their research identified the same poorly lit, secluded and boarded up places as places of risk, the South Asian women in the Green & Singleton (2006)
study felt that they were framed as outsiders to other people on the streets, and had to deal with racist and xenophobic verbal harassment.

Weseley & Gaarder (2004), on the other hand, interviewed predominately White college educated women who use a recreational park in Phoenix, Arizona, which is surrounded by a community dominated by people of colour. The women they surveyed said that they would prefer an increased presence of park rangers around the space to mitigate men from surveilling their bodies while they exercise and recreate. They also said that they avoid areas with lots of homeless/transient men, due to perceptions of these vulnerable populations as dangerous.

There was little connection between the transient and/or homeless park users and the perpetuation of violence against women. Weseley & Gaarder (2004) write that “these groups [the homeless] are already targeted, harassed, and removed from parks, the women’s related fears and coping strategies actually perpetuate the negative constructions of oppressed groups while doing little to improve the safety of women” (p. 657). Although Weseley & Gaarder (2004) say that incidents of assault are unlikely in the park, and that the perpetrators of assaults that do happen are unlikely to be groups already marginalized and targeted by police, they do not state the well-known fact that assault is more likely to occur in the domestic sphere (Loukaitou-Sideris, 2006; Pain, 2001; Sweet & Ortiz Escalante, 2010). Although more assaults, especially sexual assaults, take place more often in the domestic sphere and likely to be perpetrated not by strangers but by family members or people known to the victims, there remain serious concerns over violence and lack of safety in public spaces (Koskela & Pain, 2000; Sweet & Ortiz Escalante, 2010).

Loukaitou-Sideris (2006) explores neighbourhood safety and walkability, arguing that people who are afraid of victimization walk less. She writes that there is a predominant “perceived risk and fear because of gender; however, classifying all women and their perceived agoraphobia under a broad and uniform [gendered] category ignores important differentiations that exist among them because of age, race, class, cultural and educational background, sexual orientation, and disability status” (Loukaitou-Sideris, 2006, p. 223). Loukaitou-Sideris (2006) uses some of the basic principles of CPTED, including fixing broken windows, peopling streets, better lighting and getting rid of bad neighbours, to provide suggestions on how to improve neighbourhood safety. Loukaitou-Sideris (2006) writes that design interventions need to be put in place to remove anti-social elements in cities. Although she claims to be aware of the intersections of age, race, class, cultural, sexual orientation and ability, calling particular groups of people “anti-social” is fundamentally oppressive and perpetuates exclusion.
Feminist Critiques of Planning and Designing for Safety

Feminist writers like Koskela & Pain (1999) recognize the limits of CPTED, arguing that too much emphasis has been made on environmental design in feminist geography and planning. They state that focusing on fear through design instead of ending violence overall is counterproductive to reducing prevalent domestic violence against women. Koskela and Pain (1999) also say that gendered analysis of crime is unintentionally essentialist and the connection between crime, fear, design and gender is spurious. They say that many “women empower themselves through their own negotiation of danger, but crime prevention policies, be they in the form of behavioural advice, rape alarms, or redesigned streets, have rarely done so.” (Koskela & Pain, 2000, p. 279).

Although Koskela and Pain (2000) make many good points about designing out crime, they do not acknowledge that they have both written academic articles on the validity of analyzing gendered space in terms of CPTED interventions (Koskela, 1999; Pain, 1991). They write about the ‘scholars’ who were ‘naïve’ in proposing that the built environment is a product of gender relation without strengthening their positions by self-reflexively referring back to their previous work (Koskela & Pain, 2000, p. 271).

Sweet and Ortiz Escalante (2010) explore the significance of violence prevention planning around the breakdown of constructed divides between the public and private sphere. They do so through three case studies on the limits of top-down planning in Vilafranca del Penedès, how planning has facilitated femicide in Ciudad Juarez, and an eco-development in Chicago used to address and prevent gendered violence. A principal tenet of their argument is that CPTED principles only deal with stranger-driven crime in public spaces. Sweet and Ortiz Escalante (2010) argue that CPTED does not deal with overwhelming preponderance of domestic abuse experienced by women.

Campbell (2005) argues that crime literature around rape prevention is not merely a reaction to a reality, but instead instills rape as a fixed reality with gendered notion of vulnerable femininity and potent masculinity. The piece argues that men and children can also get raped, but despite this reality, the act of rape remains feminized. This feminization leads to a pervasive fear of rape from strangers, which changes the routinized life of women. The constant fear of rape means women are kept in perpetual vulnerability. Rape, argues Campbell (2005), is:

a highly effective mechanism of social control, as women are maneuvered into controlled and dependent relationships with men on the basis that those men will protect them from other men. The fact that the majority of rapes are committed by close intimates, family members, and acquaintances of the victim, and thus by the very men that women turn to for protection, has long been noted. (p. 120).
Pain (1991) makes a similar argument around male power derived from rape culture. Campbell (2005) likewise states that rape prevention literature distributed by police, campuses, and rape-crisis centres are misleading because they do not deal with prevalent domestic roots of rape. Furthermore, the safekeeping strategies for women keep them in perpetual threat of being raped by a stranger. The advice given to women includes avoiding dark streets, walking in a group, especially after dark, and to avoid walking near bushes where perpetrators can be hiding. Campbell (2005) takes issue with CPTED strategies, focusing too much on the victim’s sense of fear, and not enough on the entitlement of the perpetrator. For Campbell (2005), this reinforces the normalization of the male body as sexually potent and out of control, and plays into victim-blaming by perpetuating the focus on how women should and should not act.

Feminist scholars open the discussions of men and women experiencing safety differently, with an emphasis on men’s privileged status, which is important to consider in inclusive planning. Feminist safety planning has the potential of opening up the conversation around planning for gender variant and other LGBTQ2+ community members. Queer and trans perspectives, deepen the analysis of inclusive safety planning for all.

**Queer Interventions**

The third body of literature that deals with queer and transgender experiences is explored in this section to fill the gaps of the largely heteronormative feminist texts reviewed above. In general, planning literature has often neglected the experiences of LGBTQ2+ communities, despite queer theory and geography having a robust long-term relationship in academia (Doan, 2015b; Forsyth, 2001). There are four strands of ideas that are productive to examine here: Queering Planning, Enclave Anxiety, Queering Safety and Trans Inclusive Safety. ‘Queering Planning’ explores the lack of work, consultation, and analysis done around LGBTQ2+ experiences in planning practice. The sparse literature critiquing planning’s heteronormative practices will be explored and analyzed in this subsection. ‘Enclave Anxiety’ looks at the current literature emerging on the supposed ‘straightening’ of traditionally gay and lesbian enclaves in urban settings. ‘Queering Safety’ looks at the texts explicitly exploring LGBTQ2+ experiences of safety in urban settings. ‘Trans Inclusive Safety’ looks at the literature written on transgender experiences and planning, which is marginal within the sparse literature on LGBTQ2+ planning, despite it bringing forth crucial perspectives.

**Queering Planning**

Queer geographies and queer subjectivity have existed at odds of most planning practices and interventions. A determining factor in the exclusion of queer embodiments in planning is heteronormativity, which Kath Browne (2006) calls the “normalisation [sic] of man/woman as opposites meant to come together within heterosexual relationships … [which] are based on
specific class and race-based relations” (p. 886). Heterosexism exists in a heteronormative society, and it describes the valorization of opposite-sex heterosexual relationships as the normative superior form of sexuality (Browne, 2006). The previous readings cited on feminist planning intervention on safety for women assume a fixed gender binary between men and women, as well as assuming heteronormative relationships between women and men, an assumption that could be considered heterosexist.

Michael Frisch (2002) argues that urban planning has always supported heteronormative standards and is therefore a heterosexist project. Frisch (2002) states that inclusive planning would have to promote, not just tolerate, different sexual orientations. He states that forefathers of planning were invested in promoting morality, which excluded so-called sexual ‘perverts’. Planning forefather Patrick Geddes in particular wanted to regulate sexual ‘perversion’ through promoting marriage and planning for morality. Lewis Mumford, who was heavily influenced by Geddes, writes with admiration that Geddes brought “into the movement for sexual development … he brought the sense of family, the need for children, the acceptance of mature responsibilities. With the wand of life he tapped the rock and made water flow forth” (Frisch, 2002, p. 259). Frisch (2002) uses the historic instance of heterosexism to analyze how ongoingly planning prioritizes zoning, housing rights, and public spaces that are “built around heterosexual constructs of family, work, and community life. Planning reproduces structures of heterosexual domination” (p. 256).

Ann Forsyth (2001) writes about the disconnect between planning practices and queer embodiments in “Sexuality and Space”. In her piece, she aims to make the body of research on queer theory, as well as political activism, comprehensible and relevant to planning. She does this by analyzing queer enclaves, zoning, business development and public spaces. Her main findings are that there is a tension between queer activists (more radical, non-conformist populations who take up public space for protest) versus gay and lesbian assimilationists (people and organizations working within existing systems). According to Forsyth (2001), the boundaries between these groups are blurry. Doan & Higgins (2008) cite that these tensions, as well as the mounting social capital of residents, were fundamental in shaping the Toronto Gay Village (see Chapter 2).

Forsyth (2001) writes that there are gay and lesbian people living in enclaves where they must embrace collective living and economic sacrifices as a trade-off for proximity to safety and community. She notes that many gays and lesbians live outside gay city enclaves due to varying incomes and housing prices, but will use the enclaves as service centres for non-residential use (e.g. bars, clubs, businesses, etc…). Neighbourhood zoning for families discriminates against gays and lesbians throughout residential areas. Zoning for families also discriminates against collective households, group homes for people with special needs and other non-heteronormative family structures.
Frisch (2015) argues against planning as a tool of exclusion and proposes an intersectional approach to integrating queer experiences, as well as other interwoven marginalities, into the fabric of planning and design. Frisch (2015) recommends that the American Planning Association (APA) reinstitute sexual orientation as a criteria of standardized diversity considerations in planning. It is notable that in the Canadian context, the Canadian Institute of Planner (CIP) and the Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI) do not mention sexual orientation or gender as part of their diversity mandate. The code of conduct used by both the CIP and OPPI simply reads “CIP Members respect and protect diversity in values, cultures, economics, ecosystems, built environments and distinct places” (CIP, 2015; OPPI, 2015).

Frisch (2015) states that planning and real estate development is already a technology of Whiteness and a technology of heteronormativity. He employs Leonie Sandercock’s concept of managing cities of difference through dialogue as a possible intervention that could circumvent unequal power balances in planning, noting that adding intersectionality to Sandercock’s analysis strengthens her work on multiculturalism. Sandercock (1998) advocates for the recognition of experiences and communities who are remain invisible through much of the White cisgender male history of urban planning. She refers to insurgent planning as a form of planning that exists outside the norm (Sandercock, 1998).

Frisch (2015) takes up Sandercock’s ideas and frames it within a contemporary understanding of intersectionality. Intersectional identities, according to Frisch (2015), are chosen by individuals and imposed upon them by a normative society. The expression of identity, and its imposition, imposes a tyranny of constant negotiation of safety by non-normative embodiments. According to Frisch (2015), LGBT inclusion is often the lowest priorities, even among proponents of intersectionality. Although this point is debateable based on geography, context, and subjective perspective, Frisch’s (2015) argument that planners must stop serving a normative ‘general public’, and instead actively include intersectional embodiments in community engagement, is sound and relevant to the results of this thesis.

Enclave Anxiety

Much of the planning literature around gay and lesbian populations deals with anxieties over the ‘straightening’ of gay enclaves through an increased use of the space by heterosexual people. In *There Goes the Gaybourhood*, Ghaziani (2014) argues that gaybourhoods have fundamentally lost their need in the face of modern technology and greater social acceptance of queer embodiments. Ruting (2008) and Collins (2004) reference a four space model of gay neighbourhood lifestyles, starting with pre-conditions (small clusters of gay residents), emergence (gay venues enter or expand), expansion and diversification (more gay households and businesses), secondary explosions of gay services, precincts (this stage is intertwined with gentrification, the redevelopment of the desirable bohemian enclave), and finally integration (gay
bars become popular with wider audience and non-gay local culture exists peacefully). They frame the ‘straightening’ of gay enclaves cyclically.

Collins (2004) argues that rooted in the ‘straightening’ of gay enclaves is its “well-known” reputations as a “safe zone for heterosexual women to socialize [sic] in, such that heterosexual men now also use this social space in pursuit of heterosexual women” (Collins, 2004, p. 1794). However, both Collins (2004) and Ruting (2008) take a limited view of gentrification in the lifecycle of gay enclaves. Not all enclaves follow this model, but all cycles of gentrification require an in-depth analysis of race, gender, and class, which both of these articles, and Ghaziani’s (2014) book lack.

Adler and Brenner (1992) analyze the gendered differences in the creation of gay enclaves, which is also often left out in the discourse on their demise. They do this by building upon Castells’ (1983) argument that the difference in lesbians and gay men taking up urban spaces is fundamentally gendered. He argues that lesbian women attach importance to networks and relationships, while gay men dominate space through territorial aspirations. Adler and Brenner (1992) complicate Castells’ analysis through their survey of multiple female households. They found that lesbian women are more likely to have lower incomes than their male counterparts, and are more likely to be primary child caregivers, which explain why lesbian communities tend to be more heterogeneous than their gay male counterparts who have more resources to take up space.

Doan & Higgins (2011) agree with Collins (2004), Ruting (2008) and Ghaziani (2014) regarding the displacement of gay enclaves, but argue that while rising housing values have dispersed LGBT neighbourhoods, those neighbourhoods have consequently become less queer tolerant. The case study used by Doan & Higgins (2011) looks at the lack of LGBT involvement in Atlanta planning processes around the historically gay Midtown neighbourhood. The planning for Midtown Atlanta redesigned the area for heterosexual families, not bearing in mind that the local adult entertainment they wanted to get rid of catered to the LGBT community. In response, White gay Midtown residents began to take over the Kirkwood neighbourhood, which is a historically Black neighbourhood. Although the argument that White gay people, presumably often men, take over communities of colour does have historical relevance, Doan & Higgins (2011) conceptualize queer spaces and communities based upon businesses that cater to gay White clients. It would be relevant to take this work further to see how this displacement affects Black LGBTQ2+ communities.

In the introduction of Petra Doan’s edited anthology Planning and LGBTQ Communities, Doan (2015a) argues that compared to many urban centres in North America, Toronto’s LGBTQ population is dispersed throughout the city, which makes attempts to centralize planning for queer spaces to a traditional Gay Village untenable, given contemporary geographies. She argues that for many queer and trans people of colour, spaces organized outside the traditional Village have been stronger sites of safety and community.
Ehrenfeucht (2013) argues that design interventions and other planning tools cannot be used to intentionally include gender nonconforming people or activities. Using West Hollywood as a case study, Ehrenfeucht (2013) says that the City’s redesign made it less hospitable to vulnerable street users, while privileging affluent gay and lesbian populations, and their straight counterparts. In particular, a group of trans sex workers were displaced after a trans-friendly restaurant was priced out and sold to a condo developer. Ehrenfeucht (2013) fears that the influx of middle class residents will lead to the displacement of sex workers, addicts, homeless people, street vendors and other so-called ‘undesirables’. Ehrenfeucht (2013) argues that planners and designers exclude gender nonconforming populations from their work because “planning interventions respond to community feedback and envision desirable outcomes, and thus the interests of influential populations dominate” (p. 60). Ehrenfeucht (2013) does make good points around power and privilege, but does not allow for much agency for resistance to displacement on the part of the city’s vulnerable street users.

Doan (2015b) writes about the experiences of queer and trans inclusive communities in small cities and rural communities in the America south. She writes that although there are some liberally leaning communities, like the Indian Head Acres in Tallahassee, Florida, safety often trumps visibility, even in areas that are coded as inclusive. She writes that for participants surveyed in smaller communities, safety has more to do with proximity to other LGBTQ neighbours than Pride flags or other visible signifiers of queerness than what “might attract unwanted attention” (Doan, 2015b). Doan’s (2015b) work demonstrates that there are multilayered dimensions to safer spaces outside of a traditional White gay male centric Village.

Queering Safety

In “Capitalism and Gay Identity”, D’Emilio (1993) argues that capitalism during the industrial revolution facilitated the creation of gay and lesbian identities. He states that capitalism drove the social order away from self-sufficient family rural structures where having children was essential in order to survive on a landownership-based structure created by capitalism, which moved individuals to cities in the 19th century. He writes that it was only “when individuals began to make their living through wage labor, instead of as part of an interdependent family unit, was it possible for homosexual desire to coalesce into a personal identity” (D’Emilio, 1993, p. 470). He deconstructs the myth that gays and lesbians discovered their identities alone and in shame in the 1960s, by referencing the existence of homosexual themes and spaces in blues music, butch/femme relationships, and public cruising in early 20th century urban centres. He also points out that Black communities in urban areas have been historically more accepting of homosexuality and so-called ‘sexual perversions’.

During the McCarthy Era, the formal exclusion of gays and lesbians from working in the federal government, as well as purging gay and lesbians from the military, greater FBI
surveillance and urban vice squads began. D’Emilio (1993) marks the 1970s gay and lesbian victories over securing more safe social spaces as movements against the creation of formalized exclusion of gays and lesbians. He argues that “the enforcement of gay oppression has merely changed locales, shifting somewhat from the state to the arena of extralegal violence in the form of increasingly open physical attacks on lesbians and gay men” (D’Emilio, 1993, p. 473). This analysis begins to unpack the history of exclusion and violence experienced by LGBTQ2+ individuals, and could be taken further with an in-depth analysis of race and class.

Hanhardt (2013) traces the complex history of violence and antiviolence in American LGBTQ politics and activism, looking at the interplay of gay (White) respectability politics and radical (more likely, but not always, lesbian, queer, transgender, non-White) conceptualizations of racialized ‘stranger danger’ and police protection versus police brutality. Hanhardt (2013) provides a thorough analysis of queer and trans political organization in San Francisco and New York City, tracing a history that started in the mid-1960s with Glide, Vanguard, Street Prophets and the homophile movement to contemporary organizations like FIERCE.

Hanhardt (2013) argues that racist stereotypes that antigay violence is committed by people of colour are problematically rooted in gay organizing. Many of the street patrols formed to protect gay enclaves and gay people from attack disproportionally blamed low-income racialized people as the supposed perpetrators of violence. This assumption not only negates the existence of queer and trans people in racialized low-income communities, but also failed to realize that the perpetrators of violence are more often young White men and/or the police (Hanhardt 2013). The Society to Make America Safe for Homosexuals (SMASH) in New York City, for example, used street patrols to combat violence around gay enclaves. Despite the fact that “violence was often associated with White youth in the middle-class Greenwich Village, the members of SMASH continued to patrol areas that were largely home to low-income people of colour” (Hanhardt, 2013, p. 112). Doan (2015b) writes that such neighbourhood watch programs may further marginalize non-normative populations, including most notable trans women of colour who face multiple interlocking forms of oppression.

Hanhardt (2013) writes that the perceived gentrification of communities of colour by more affluent White gay men furthers these tensions. The territorial protection of emerging gay enclaves fails to recognize that the communities of colour and/or low income folks they fear also have ties and claims to the spaces they are claiming as belonging to gay men. It also reveals the inherent racism and classism present in the mainstream LGBTQ community, which results in the exclusion and erasure of embodiments of queer and trans low-income people of colour.

Hanhardt (2013) writes about groups like FIERCE, who today continue to address gentrifying areas like Christopher Street in New York, and the subsequent increased policing and creation of new curfews around public use, which disproportionally target the homeless, youth, people of colour, queers and the intersections of these groups. FIERCE brings together issues of gender, economic, racial and gendered justice in light of policing and brutality (Hanhardt 2013).
Goh (2015) furthers the discussion around contemporary organizing of queer people of colour in New York City who are staking out safe spaces in the face of gentrification, police brutality and bashing. Goh (2015) argues that in light of FIERCE’s organizing against a proposed revitalization of Christopher Pier, which is home to street involved homeless young queer people of colour, planners must not only deconstruct heterosexism but also homonormativity. The proposed park at the pier would cost $330 million dollars, and would emulate many elite parks like the Brooklyn Bridge Park and the High Line, which include privatizing public spaces in order to create more so-called desirable areas.

FIERCE responded to the proposed park by attempting to acquire space on the pier for a community based drop-in centre for underserved queer and trans people. Goh (2015) writes that “real estate development pressures combined with ongoing on-the-ground distrust and fear of queer youth rendered it impossible to stake out a physical, permanent space” (Goh, 2015, p. 226). The project eventually fell through, and FIERCE is now focusing on creating safer spaces in the neighbourhood and nation-wide through awareness of and organizing around police brutality and capacity building with queer youth of colour.

Goh (2015) also writes about the Audre Lorde Project (ALP), another New York based community organization for queer and trans people of colour. ALP launched a ‘S.O.S Collective Sticker’ campaign that sought to physically mark local organizations and businesses as safe for queer and trans people of colour to seek refuge from assailants on the streets. Goh (2015) notes that the project has not been entirely successful, as employees at businesses displaying the sticker often do not know what the sticker signifies. Goh (2015) ends by envisioning a dialectic between activists and planners, where radical planners can engage with activists through mapping violence and safety as well as collecting data. The sources of funding to pay the planner, the potential paternalism on the part of the ‘planner as an expert’ and the emotional labour of working for free for a cause, are not tackled by Goh (2015).

In The Revolution Starts at Home, Confronting Intimate Violence Within Activist Communities, there are several essays, personal narratives, anti-violence guidelines and academic pieces on the paradoxes of negotiating and balancing the need to dismantle institutionalized violence against racialized vulnerable communities, with the want to hold perpetrators of sexualized violence in communities accountable. In the volume’s preface, Smith (2011) writes that the existing ‘Restorative Justice’ model used by many organizations and communities insufficiently protects victims and does not hold perpetrators, other than the police, accountable. She says that if we “focus only on community accountability without a larger critique of the state, we risk framing community accountability as simply an add-on to the criminal legal justice system” (Smith, 2011).

Bassichis (2011) chapter in The Revolution Starts at Home detail the anti-violence work undertaken by organizations prioritizing queer and trans people of colour. Bassichis is involved with Community United Against Violence (CUAV), a thirty year old organization out of the Bay
Area working with queer and trans communities, which is prioritizing its most vulnerable members (i.e. youth, low income people, people of colour, and immigrants). CUAV’s core question is “Is the state primarily a perpetrator of violence against our communities, or the protector it claims to be?” (Bassichis, 2011). CUAV has envisioned a community response to violence against LGBTQ2+ communities that rejects the criminal justice system’s use of shame, punishment and isolation. CUAV’s tactics include using art to reclaim public space, direct conversations with people who have been harmful, and creating a rapid-response violence prevention network in the community. They recruit volunteers, many of whom are queer people of colour, and train them to have support skills like active listening, healthy boundaries, direct communication, story sharing, and education around the linkages between systemic and interpersonal violence (Bassichis, 2011).

Forsyth (2001) also explores the dilemma in addressing spaces and safety in a queer context. She argues that enough police presence is wanted for safety, but in doing so, there is an imperative to protect marginalized people, including the homeless, racialized people and other marginalized populations, from police harassment. Doderer (2011) argues that displacing “social undesirables” from cities negatively impacts the LGBTQ community. Paradoxically, some LGBTQ people are involved in pushing for the ‘cleaning up’ of such areas. Doderer (2011) points out that “To be LGBTQ is no guarantee of a critical and self-reflexive position and way of thinking” (p. 435). Privileged members of the LGBTQ community have historically pushed out and blamed the most vulnerable members of their community on the grounds of ‘safety’. This occurs despite the fact that the most vulnerable members of the LGBTQ community, which includes racialized people, trans people, and other groups labeled ‘undesirable’, suffer the highest rates of violence and brutality (Hanhardt, 2013; Testa et al., 2012).

Trans Inclusive Safety

There is little literature on LGBTQ2+ experiences in planning, and what little does exist looks mostly at sexual minorities, and not at the experiences of trans and gender variant individuals. The exclusion of trans people from lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) spaces goes beyond just the literature. Doan (2007) explores the gender normativity of gay and lesbian spaces and neighbourhoods. She argues that many explicitly gay and lesbian spaces exclude trans people in order to conform as much as possible to mainstream acceptability. An example she draws upon is the exclusion of transwomen from the Michigan’s Womyn’s Festival, which is open to only to so-called ‘womyn-born-womyn’. In response, Doan (2007) writes, trans people created their own festival across from Michigan’s Womyn’s Festival called Camp Trans, which acts as a pop-up safe space for trans people. Doan (2007) points out that the women’s movement has done a lot of work around urban safety, including pushing for built environment changes along with more police protection and better treatment of rape victims. She argues that the trans community needs this too, claiming that they are also vulnerable to male violence, but are not on political radar due to being such a small population.
Doan’s (2007) argument that the lack of a concentrated trans population or enclaves is the reason why trans people are excluded from mobilizing a presence in planning does not put the responsibility to work towards better inclusivity on cisgender members of society, the LGBTQ community and beyond. The accountability of allies is essential to rethinking the way cities can be planned to include gender variant and trans people, in hopes of actively including their stories and needs.

Doan (2010) argues that the ‘tyranny of gender’ polices non-normative gender manifestations in an autoethnographic account of her trials and tribulations as a non-passing transwoman in urban spaces. She has experienced public street harassment, harassment in quasi-public classroom spaces and semi-private sphere of the public bathroom. Her account personalizes the experiences of LGBTQ2+ people using a personal account of oppression. She also provides a strong argument for planning all gender inclusive public bathrooms. In her later work, Doan (2015b) recognizes that trans women of colour are frequently demonized on the intersecting axis of race, gender, class and sexuality. Trans women of colour are “often categorized as sex workers by both straight and gay neighborhood residents who feel their non-normative presence threatens to undermine property values and the presumed attractiveness of the neighborhood” (Doan, 2015b, p. 121). Doan (2015b) provides a strong intersectional approach around multiple marginalities.

Testa, Hendricks, Goldblum & Bradford (2012) argue that increased exposure to physical and sexual violence relates to suicide ideation, suicide attempts, and substance abuse in trans populations. They sampled 350 trans men and women to study the relationship between violence, suicide and addiction. Testa, Hendricks, Goldblum and Bradford (2012) state that it is the first study of its kind conducted. An overwhelming proportion of the respondents (97.7%) had experienced violence due to gender identity. They reported that the perpetrators were strangers, acquaintances, family members, and primary partner (with strangers being the most common and primary partners being the least common). The study is limited by the small sample size, lack of racial diversity in respondents (the majority were White) and the small geographic catchment (all respondents lived and studied in Virginia). However, Testa, Hendricks, Goldblum and Bradford’s (2012) study demonstrates the prevalence of transphobic violence and assault by strangers outside the domestic sphere, which demonstrates why planners and designers must address urbanized public safety from a queer and trans inclusive lens.
Conclusion

The thesis hopes to provide recommendations on how to create LBTQ2+ inclusive cities using safety as a lens. It also hopes to further the work done on the built environment and the limitations of CPTED, as developed by feminist scholars from a LBTQ2+ lens. The research recognizes that much of the work done on this topic is heterosexist and depends on a rigid gender binary. The work done by scholars and activists on queering planning and design will help inform the ways in which LBTQ2+ experiences relate to safety in public spaces. The literature on LBTQ2+ experiences in urban planning and design is limited in scope and breath of content. The literature on transgender and gender variant experiences in particular is sparse. There was no relevant literature found on the experiences of two-spirit or bisexual identities.

The lack of literature on queer and trans safety in planning affirms the need for this thesis in the field. The literature that does exist on LBTQ2+ safety demonstrates that queer and trans people experience a great deal of harassment, displacement and violence in the urban spaces. It is imperative to bring to light queer and trans experiences of safety to the forefront of planning to negotiate the gaps present in the way cities are planned and designed along heterosexist, homophobic and transphobic terms.
Chapter 4 - Methodology: Using Mixed Methods Research on LGBTQ2+ Perceptions and Experiences of Safety

Summary of Chapter 4

- The thesis hopes to contribute to the conversation on queerness, planning and safety.
- The thesis uses feminist triangulation to bring together quantitative and qualitative data.
- Qualitative data was collected through interviews, focus groups and an online survey.
- Quantitative data was collected through the online survey and secondary reading.
- The research faces a number of limitations, including ethical considerations, funding, timing and the inherent imperfection of data collection.

Introduction

The thesis at hand examines how cities can be made safer for LGBTQ2+ people. Qualitative and quantitative data collected and analyzed through triangulation explore the research question. Qualitative data was gathered through interviews, focus groups and an online survey. Quantitative data was collected through the survey and secondary reading.

Hesse-Biber (2012) argues that male bias in research can be addressed in feminist empiricism through mixed methods research, or the triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. Hesse-Biber (2012) states that the common usages of triangulation privileges quantitative data over qualitative finding, which plays into western patriarchal epistemologies. The research at hand seeks to create a more fruitful dynamic of qualitative research informing the gaps in quantitative data, and vice versa, while also considering all data collected as valid and worthy of analysis.

The research takes a firm anti-oppressive intersectional framework in order to responsibly represent the safety experiences of marginalized groups. The principle of challenging oppression and power complicates the process of objectively acquiring data from participants without influencing their responses. No mention of the study as taking an anti-oppressive framework was included in the call for participation, nor in the data collection, in order to avoid influencing participant responses. The consent form signed by participants does however includes feminist research principles of respecting privacy, and allowing space around triggering
conversations (Gay, 2012). In following chapters analyzing the data collected, oppressive comments made around safety and class, race, or other identities are critically deconstructed.

The research was conducted partially in partnership with METRAC, a Toronto based consulting non-profit, which was the host agency for the researcher’s summer internship that facilitated the data collection process. METRAC conducts safety audits with the goal of creating safer spaces for women and youth through natural and built environment interventions. They do work in neighbourhoods, campuses and workplaces. The internship report and published results of the thesis will also help update METRAC’s safety audit kit. METRAC’s concept that everyone is the expert of their own sense of safety is a core principle of the framework used to analyze the collected data (metracadmin, 2015b).

The thesis intends to use the data collected to unpack the interactions between perceived safety, which is covered in Chapter Five, and discriminatory incidents, which is covered in Chapter Six. The goal of the thesis analysis is to provide recommendations on how cities can be planned for LGBTQ2+ safety, which is covered in Chapter Seven and Eight. The details of the methods used in the interviews, focus groups and online survey are explored below. It details the methods used to collect data, and ends with a section detailing the thesis’ limitations and other ethical considerations.

Interviews

Individuals and organizations representing clients and communities affected by LGBTQ2+ experiences of public safety were contacted at the outset of the research process in order to identify key issues around safety. Although the interviews were intended to be a loosely structured conversation with service providers and community organizers, the sessions became more rigidly structured compared to the focus groups. Wilkinson (1998) writes on feminist epistemologies that prioritize marginalized voices and experiences by challenging power and patriarchy. She claims that interviews and focus groups differ in research because interviews allow for a decontextualized analysis that detracts from critiques of power and privilege, whereas the fundamentally messy social nature of a focus group forces researchers to contextualize the dynamics amongst participants and the researcher (Wilkinson, 1998).

Organizations were selected for interviews from various religious, ethnic, racial, and gendered identities within the LGBTQ2+ community in Toronto in the hopes of collecting a holistic take on queer and trans urbanized safety. The groups contacted include religious groups (Salaam, Dignity, and Kulanu), social service providers (Elizabeth Fry, Fred Victor’s Thrive program, Support Our Youth, Youthline and the 519), community groups (Primed, Maggie’s, Queer Ontario, 2-spirits, Marvelous Grounds and the Ethno Racial People With Disability Coalition of Ontario) and healthcare resources (Rainbow Health Ontario, Black CAP and the AIDS Committee of Toronto). Out of the groups contacted, it was anticipated that between five
and eight representatives from these groups would be available for an interview on public safety and LGBTQ2+ experiences.

Six interviews were conducted in total. The representatives from organizations interviewed were from Supporting Our Youth, Egale, Kulanu, Fred Victor, Rainbow Health Ontario and Marvelous Grounds.

Supporting Our Youth (SOY) is a community development program for youth between the ages of fourteen to twenty-nine who identify as LGBTQ2+. SOY coordinates several groups, including the Monday Night Drop-in, which caters to homeless and/or street involved youth, as well as youth who are new to the community. SOY also coordinates a group called Express, which is for LGBTQ2+ new immigrants; BQI, which is for Black queer youth; Fluid, which explores gender variance; and TFC, which is for trans and gender variant youth.

Egale’s Youth OUTreach counselling centre and drop-in serves LGBTQ2+ youth under the age of twenty nine. Their counsellors primarily work with youth experiencing homelessness, or are at risk of homelessness, and youth experiencing mental health concerns, specifically around suicide prevention.

Kulanu represents the larger queer community, as well as various aspects of the Jewish community, in a non-denominational and all-denominational capacity. They put on various educational and cultural events, as well as offering support to community members having trouble coming out, or who are grappling with a family member coming out.

Fred Victor’s THRIVE! is a pre-employment and employment program for trans people. THRIVE! is a sex worker positive and trans positive program that helps develop life skills for clients of various ages and backgrounds.

Rainbow Health Ontario is a province-wide organization whose mandate is to improve services and access to healthcare for LGBTQ communities. They have a trans health coordinator who does capacity building workshops for healthcare providers around trans inclusivity.

Marvelous Grounds is a collective of three people who are part of a larger community of queer people of colour doing work as artists and organizers. Marvelous Grounds has secured a grant to do some mapping and other research around documenting the ways that QTBIPOC (queer and trans Black, Indigenous and people of colour) create communities, innovate projects and foster connections within Toronto and beyond.

Interviewees were asked a series of questions on LGBTQ2+ experiences of safety in Toronto. The interview questions are available in the Appendix (see Appendix 1.1). The main themes brought up by the interviewees in the context of safety were passing and visibility, spaces and places that are safe or unsafe and the politics of reporting incidents of assault or violence.
The analysis of thesis data is framed by the participants’ understanding of harassment in public urban spaces.

Focus Groups

A series of focus groups were conducted to inform queer and trans safety in Toronto, with the intention of getting community input on perceived safety and ideas for planning interventions to create safer spaces. Snowball sampling was used to recruit participants. Participants were recruited through contacts made in the interview stage of data collection, as well as personal contacts the researcher has in the LGBTQ2+ community. Focus groups were selected because of their leveling potential in the power dynamics between researcher and subject. Focus groups allow for community members to talk amongst themselves and create what Wilkinson (1998) calls “interactive data” (p.113). Wilkinson (1998) writes that interactive data in a focus group is collected through recording the conversations occurring during the session. Wilkinson (1998) argues that focus group discussions allow for a greater potential for participants to set the agenda of the session themselves. In the focus groups conducted for the research, participants often did just that, anticipating the following questions before it was asked by the facilitator in the conversation. Although the focus groups were guided by a series of questions, they were generally much looser and more informal than the online survey or interviews.

In total, four focus groups were conducted in August 2015. Participants received food, public transportation fare and a fifteen dollar honorarium for their participation, all provided by METRAC. The focus groups were envisioned as consisting of a brief introduction of METRAC, an affinity diagram activity involving participants writing on post-it notes their own personal ideas of what makes a city/community/space safe, a description of what METRAC’s safety audit process involves, a facilitated group discussion guided by a series of questions on LGBTQ2+ experiences of safety, an individual cognitive temporal mapping of safe spaces, and a concluding check-in with participants. The focus group schedule and questions are included in the Appendix (see Appendix 1.2).

The affinity diagram, a verbal data organizing technique used predominantly in brainstorming sessions, was thought to be used in this research to help structure the participants’ ideas on safety. The affinity diagram typically involves participants writing ideas on a post-it paper, and then attaching the post-it to a wall or another surface for display. The workshop facilitator then asks the group to organize the post-it notes under thematic categories that the group decides upon through consensus (Widjaja, Yoshii, Haga, & Takahashi, 2013). The cognitive mapping exercise was similarly intended to visually organize local knowledge of paths, edges, districts, landmarks and nodes within the context of safe spaces in the City of Toronto by asking participants to identify and draw where safe spaces exist for them in the city (Fenster, 2009).
During the first focus group, it was evident to the researcher that it would not be possible to do both activities in the time allotted. In order to respect the time of the participants, the activities were blended together. Participants put their ideas up on the wall on sticky notes at the start of the session unorganized, and during what would have been the cognitive mapping exercise, they were asked to close their eyes and visualize a map of their version of a safe city. While their eyes were closed, the researcher read out loud the ideas, places and people written on the post-it notes to help participants visualize their idealized safe city. Participants were then asked to open their eyes after all the post-it notes were read, and then asked to tell the group anything else they saw on their mental map. The ad hoc activity demonstrates the social messiness of focus groups that Wilkinson (1998) writes about. The same ad hoc activity was used in the following focus groups for data consistency.

The first focus group was with Fred Victor’s Thrive Program on August 10th 2015. Recruitment for the first focus group was done by the Thrive program coordinator, who was interviewed earlier in the data collection process. Eleven people who identify as trans participated. Participants spoke of personal experiences encountering systemic oppression due to gender identity, transphobia and racism. Racism and colonialism affecting Indigenous communities, as well as Black and Brown people, was mentioned by many participants. Although participants did not identify their race in the focus group, some speak to their experiences as racialized people during the discussion. The larger sample size of this particular group led to many people talking over each other, and having their own inner conversations throughout the discussion.

The second focus group was conducted on August 12th, 2015 with the ballroom organization, House of Constantine, which is a part of the City’s ballroom scene. The ballroom scene involves queer drag and other performances in the form of competitions that prioritize youth of colour (Quinton, 2011). The House of Constantine has its own formalized, chosen family structure, with the House mother, father, founder and many of their kids in attendance. Two participants were also biologically related. Focus group participants chose to self-identify their race in this focus group. The biological family members were one woman and one man, both Black. There were also three self-identified femme presenting people, one White, one Black and one Filipina. Three other participants were gay men, one White and two Black. The family dynamic and structure of the House of Constantine came forth throughout the focus group discussion, with the House mother, father and founder reigning in the kids’ discussions and antics. Contact was made with the House of Constantine by the researcher through personal connections with members of the House.

The third focus group was conducted on August 13th, 2015, consisting of people recruited through the contact interviewed from Marvelous Grounds. Upon the request of the Marvelous Grounds organizer, only people who self-identify as queer and/or non-binary people of colour were invited to participate in this focus group. Experiences of racism, transphobia and homophobia framed much of the discussion in this focus group. Six people attended the focus
group. Only one person in attendance was a member of Marvelous Grounds. The other participants knew the main organizer from Marvelous Grounds who attended, except one who found out about the group through a Facebook post made on the organizer’s personal account.

The fourth focus group was conducted on August 27th, 2015 through an open poster call-out. Participants were recruited through the researcher’s social media network and METRAC’s listserv and community partners. Three participants said that they found out about the workshop from the Facebook posts made by the researcher and METRAC staff. Six participants found out about the focus group through the Black Coalition for Aids Prevention (Black CAP) listserv. The six participants recruited from Black CAP all knew each other before attending the workshop. The call-out for focus group participation asks people who live in Toronto and self-identify as queer, trans, and/or genderqueer to attend. The workshop was hosted at the 519 Community Centre in the Toronto Gay Village. Gender was one of the main determinants of safety described by the Open Call focus group participants. The presence of cisgender, trans and non-binary people at the focus group added greater complexity and nuance to conversations around polarizing ideas of femininity and masculinity.

**Online Survey**

An online survey was developed to collect quantitative data and supplement the data collected through the interviews and focus groups. The survey was launched in the hopes of getting a larger sampling of data from its results. Online surveys have been used increasingly in academic and market research due to its potential to reach a large sample size fairly quickly (Puleston, 2011; Selm & Jankowski, 2006). The internet has been cited as a driving force to creating LGBTQ2+ communities, which can be seen in the queer and trans specific groups and pages on Facebook and other social media (Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network, 2013). The internet is also increasingly a place where hate crimes, discrimination and harassment occur (Intelligence Services, Hate Crime Unit, 2014). Online communities also tend to be younger, which is reflected in the average age range of the survey respondents (Selm & Jankowski, 2006).

Survey participants were recruited through snowball sampling (Goodman, 1961). The survey was sent to service providers contacted in the focus group and interview stage of data collection, and asked to be shared in their newsletters, on their websites and on their social media pages. The survey was also shared on the personal Facebook and Twitter accounts of the researcher. Community organizers and other members of the LGBTQ2+ community were tagged in the Facebook post promoting the survey, and were asked to share the link to the survey on their own individual networks. Statistical analyses were done using SPSS, and Excel to code the trends linking survey responses and LGBTQ2+ experiences.

The survey launched on July 14th 2015, and was closed five weeks later on August 18th 2015. The anticipated sample size was one hundred people living in the City of Toronto. A total
of two hundred and two (202) responses were recorded for the survey. The survey has a total of one hundred and sixty six (166) responses that fit the qualification criteria for participation. The survey questions and results are included in the appendix (see Appendix 1.4 and 1.5).

Participants were asked three mandatory qualifying questions at the start of the survey: Do you consent to the terms of this study?; Do you identify under the LGBTQ2+ Umbrella?; and Do you live in the City of Toronto?. Participants who answered ‘No Response’ or ‘No’ to these questions were automatically sent to a disqualification page that thanked them for their participation. Twenty eight people were disqualified automatically. Out of the surveys completed, seven people live outside of the catchment area and were disqualified since the first three digits of their postal codes, also called a forward sortation area, provided indicated that one participant lives in Vancouver, two in Mississauga, one in Caledon, one in Thornhill, one in Bradford, and one in Oshawa (Canada Post Corporation, 2008).

Two postal codes were imputed incorrectly by participants. One participant put down their postal code as M2S and another as M4I. Neither of these postal codes are assigned by Canada Post. Using these two participant’s survey responses on what major intersection is closest to their home, the research was able to deduce that the person who put their postal code as M2S and lives near Bathurst Street and Steeles Avenue West should have put down M2R. The person who put their postal code as M4I lives at Coxwell Avenue and Gerrard Street East, where the postal code is M4L (Canada Post Corporation, 2008). The data provided by both participants is included in the analysis of the survey results.

Survey participants were asked to provide information on their postal codes and neighbourhood location not only to determine their eligibility for the survey, but also to facilitate mapping the neighborhood representation of survey respondents throughout the City of Toronto. Known as a ‘City of Neighbourhoods’, various areas in the amalgamated City of Toronto have their own diverse character, as well as class and race composition (Hulchanski, 2007). The diverse composition of Toronto frames the importance of gathering a sample of residents from across the city.

Out of the one hundred and two forward sortation areas (FSAs) in Toronto, fifty three, or 51.9%, of the FSAs are represented in the qualifying survey results. Geographically, survey responses are concentrated on the inner core of the city, with some representation in the suburban areas around at the periphery of the City. Four FSAs are represented in the former city of North York, seven FSAs in the former city of Scarborough and three FSAs in the former city of Etobicoke (see Figure 9). Participant FSAs were mapped to ensure that the survey sample was distributed across the city, and represented its most dense neighbourhoods (see Figure 10).
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Survey respondents are represented in FSAs across the city, and in Toronto’s highest density areas. Survey respondents are concentrated in the Former City of Toronto, which includes the Central Business District and the rest of the downtown core, and several census tracts with between 25,000 to 49,999 people. The rest of the high density areas in the City of Toronto with a population between 25,000 to 49,999 people are in North York and Scarborough. They are represented in the survey responses as well.

Survey respondents were given the option of choosing more than one gender identity, sexual orientation, religion and race. Although selecting multiple options complicates the analysis of data in SPSS, it was deemed worth the extra effort in order to get a complete picture of what identities are represented in the sample. Feminist mixed methods research prioritizes the opportunity to properly position the sample respondents over getting quick quantitative data (Hesse-Biber, 2012).

Participants were given the option of choosing more than one gender identity. Two hundred and fifty gender identities were chosen in a sample of one hundred and sixty seven responses. Sixty three respondents, or 37.7% of the sample, chose more than one gender identity. Overall, most survey respondents identify as female (48.5%), followed by male (34.1%). Survey respondents identify themselves overwhelmingly as cisgender as well (20.3%), with all respondents identifying as cisgender also identifying as either male or female. Genderqueer (13.7%), transgender (10.1%), other (7.1%), Female-to-Male (FTM) (3.5%), transsexual (2.9%), bigender (2.4%), agender (2.4%), Male-to-Female (MTF) (1.8%), two-spirit (1.2%), and cross-dresser (1.1%) represent a sizable portion of responses as well. Only intersex and third gender are not represented in the sample.

The respondents who responded that their gender is ‘Other’ state that they identify as androgynous, non-binary, non-binary male, genderfluid, femme, assigned female at birth (AFAB), and cisgender but questioning. One participant identifies as female, but added in the comment section that they think gender is an oppressive construct.

Out of the sixty three respondents who picked more than one gender identity, overwhelmingly respondents chose to identify as both female and cisgender (33.3%). The next most chosen identity combination is male and cisgender (7.7%). A total of 19.0% of respondents who picked more than one gender chose a combination of identifying as male and identities other than cisgender, while 25.3% chose a combination of female and identities other than cisgender. Also, 12.7% chose a combination of identities that did not include male or female.

Respondents also have the option of choosing more than one sexual orientation. Queer has the overwhelming majority of responses (50.3%), followed by Gay (30.5%), Bisexual (26.5%), Pansexual (16.8%), Lesbian (13.8%), Other (3.0%), Skoliosexual (2.4%), Asexual (1.8%) and Straight, Androsexual and No response are tied (1.2%). Only one person picked
Questioning (0.6%) and nobody picked Gynosexual. Out of the orientations selected, most respondents picked queer and another identity. Out of the eighty four people who picked queer, sixty two of them (73.8%) also picked another sexual orientation.

Out of the participants who chose other, there were people who wrote they are same gender loving, polyamorous, a dyke, that they mostly date guys, and like people. One respondent seems to have taken offense at including demisexual as an orientation respondents can choose to select. They write “oh my god, demi sexual isn't a sexual orientation, it's a descriptor of attraction, your survey is already terrible” (LGBTQ2+ Community, 2015). Demisexual was added to the list of potential sexualities based on its definition as a sexual orientation by various sexuality oriented resource centres, newspaper articles and social media (Brie, 2014; Demisexuality Resource Centre, 2015; Martinson, 2015).

The Demisexuality Resource Centre (2015) defines demisexuality as a “sexual orientation in which someone feels sexual attraction only to people with whom they have an emotional bond”. The respondent who took strong offense at the use of demi sexual proceeded to provide feedback throughout the survey, despite repeatedly criticizing its content. Anonymous surveys create a methodological vacuum where participants cannot fully engage in discourse with the researcher, which limits the interpretation of this person’s intention around providing both constructive and aggressive feedback. The opportunity for proper representation and conflict resolution was taken in the focus group and interview stages to the best of the researcher’s ability, but is difficult to manage while maintaining participant anonymity in the online survey platform. The participant’s constructive feedback will be integrated throughout the analysis of the survey, where possible and relevant.

When asked to define their race/ethnicity, participants overwhelmingly identify as White (75.4%), followed by Mixed (10.2%), Black (7.2%), East Asian (6.6%), Other (6.0%), Latino/Latina/Latin@ (4.8%), Indigenous/Metis/First Nation/Inuit (4.2%), South Asian (3.0%), and Brown and Arab tied last (1.2%). Not everyone who selected more than one race/ethnicity selected mixed, which could simply reflect that some of the choices where more ethnically centered around geography and heritage (e.g. East Asian, South Asian, and Indigenous), while others specifically referred to the colour of one’s skin (i.e White, Black, Brown, etc…). Out of the nineteen people who picked more than one race/ethnicity, only five did not select mixed. Three people who selected Mixed did not pick another option.

Ten participants used the Other option to elaborate how they identity their race and ethnicity. Out of the people who picked Other, they wrote that they are Canadian, French Canadian, Irish Inuit, Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, and Pacific Islander. Two people wrote that they are European, and three people wrote that they are Jewish.

According to the 2011 Census data, the racial representation of the survey results is comparable to the demographics of the City of Toronto. According to the census, 50.9% of
Torontoians are not a visible minority, followed by South Asian (12.3%), Chinese (10.8%) and Black (8.5%) (Statistics Canada, 2012). Despite the small sample size and different terminology around race used, the overwhelming Whiteness of the city as a whole helps explain its over-representation in the survey responses.

Participants were also asked their religious affiliations. Participants identify mostly as having No Religion (39.5%), followed by Agnostic (24.8%), Atheist (16.2%), Christianity (12.0%), Judaism (8.4%), Other (4.8%), Paganism (4.2%), Inter/Non-denominational (3.6%), Hinduism (2.4%), Islam and Indigenous Spirituality both tied (1.2%), and Taoism (0.6%). No respondents identify Confucianism, Shinto or Sikhism as their religion. The most commonly combined religions are Christianity and Agnostic. Out of the participants who chose Other, people describe practicing spirituality, having Jewish heritage, being non-practicing, practicing their own religion, as well as being Christian-informed and practicing Esoteric Christianity. One participant writes that they are Atheist in the Other option, but did not choose it out of the selected options.

Statistics Canada demonstrates a different religious make-up of the city in the 2011 census. Demographically, 28.2% of Torontoians are Roman Catholic, followed by 24.2% without a religious affiliation and 21.6% Christian (other). The perception of religion as inimical by many LGBTQ2+ communities due to certain religious institutions rejection of queer and trans experiences and identities could be among the reasons why there is a discrepancy in data between the online survey and the census (Statistics Canada, 2012).

Participants were asked to define their age, and ability. Participants predominantly are between the ages of nineteen to twenty four (36.5%), followed by twenty five to twenty nine (34.1%), thirty to thirty nine (16.8%), forty to forty nine (5.4%), fifty to fifty nine (4.2) and eighteen and under (1.2%). Three participants did not identify their age, which represents 1.8% of the total sample. According to the 2011 census, most Torontoians are between the age of twenty five to twenty nine years old, which reflects the representation in the online survey (Statistics Canada, 2012).

Participants were asked if they identify as disabled, crip, hard of hearing, deaf or differently abled. 19.8% of respondents said Yes, 67.7% of respondents selected that they identify as able-bodied, and the rest selected Other (7.2%), No Response (3.6%) or skipped the question (1.8%). Out of the participants who selected Other, people wrote that they have post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD/ADHD), depression, HIV, self-diagnosed anxiety disorders, and chronic health concerns. Many state that they have mental illness but are highly functional.

Income, renter status and employment range amongst participants. Respondents generally make between $0-29,999 a year. Overwhelmingly, participants rent their home (70.7%), followed by neither renting nor owning (12.6%), owning (8.4%) and No Response (5.4%).
who neither rent nor own describe living at home with their parents, with a small portion of people living with partners or other arrangements. Participants selected being Employed, Full-Time the most (43.1%), followed by Student (39.5%), Employed, Part-Time (30.5%), Volunteer (13.2%), Not employed, looking for work (9.6%), Other (8.4%), Not employed, attending school (3.6%), Caregiver (2.4%), and Parent and not able to work tied (1.2%). Nobody selected that they are not employed and not looking for work, nor retired. There is a strong correlation between the younger age of respondents, the large proportion of their incomes being less than $30,000 annually, the large percentage of full-time employment, and student status, as well as the high number of renters.

The sample of respondents of the survey is big compared to the number of people who participated in the interviews and focus groups. However, the income, age, race, gender, sexuality, income, ability and religion of participants all have strong majorities in the survey. In general, participants are younger female, queer-identified, cisgender, abled-bodied, White people with a lower income, who are probably either students or employed full-time. Although the sample size of the survey is bigger than the sample pool for interviewees and focus group participants, the breadth of the identities and experiences represented is narrower than in the focus groups and interviews. Despite the homogeneity of the sample, the quantitative and qualitative comparative data drawing upon the lived experiences of over a hundred and sixty members of Toronto’s LGBTQ2+ community is valuable and is analyzed in the subsequent chapters.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical approval for research with human subjects for this research was approved by the UBC Office of Ethics Research. The study was initially approved on April 29th 2015. An amendment to the study was made to include the online survey and was approved on July 14th 2015. The ethical considerations included in the application and subsequent consent form included provisions around privacy and comfort for research participants.

Confidentiality was assured as much as possible for all participants. During the interviews, service providers had the option of omitting their organization from the final product. During the focus groups, participants were told that their anonymity would be maintained as much as possible. Interview and focus group participants were asked to sign a consent form before participating, which outlines the research project’s guidelines around confidentiality. Participants are referred to using ‘they/them’ pronouns in this thesis to both avoid misgendering them as well as to protect their anonymity. Participants are referred to as a defining aspect of their identity (e.g. sexuality, gender identity, gender presentation, race, etc…) only if deemed
relevant to the aspect of the experiences being discussed, if they insisted on self-identifying, or if needed to distinguish between participants.

Unfortunately the investigators of this research cannot stop fellow focus group participants from talking to one another after the session, or telling others about what happened, but participants were encouraged to maintain the anonymity of others. Participants were recorded in the interviews and focus groups with their permission, and the recordings were only accessible to the Primary Investigator, who is the supervisor of this thesis, and the Co-Investigator, who is the student writing the thesis, also referred to as the ‘researcher’ throughout the thesis. The names of people and organizations were not recorded in the dialogue made from the audio recordings. Online survey participants had their IP address encrypted to protect their identities.

Participants were told that they could decline answering any question asked during the interview, focus group and/or survey. Participants could also leave the focus group, interview and/or survey at any point without penalty. They were told that they could withdraw from participating in the study up until November 2015, at which stage the data was coded and ready to be analyzed.

METRAC supplied a fifteen dollar honorarium, tokens, accessibility funds and food for the focus groups. Due to limited funding, no incentives or payment were offered for the interviews, nor for the online survey. Service providers are often paid by an employer and/or a grant for their time. Online survey participants submitted their surveys due to interest. The online survey took people approximately twenty minutes to finish. The interviews took approximately thirty to forty-five minutes to finish. The focus groups took between one hour and a half to two hours in total. Food, tokens and an honorarium were helpful to compensate people the extended period of time. People who had to leave the focus group early were still compensated.

Participants were given the contact information for the Primary Investigator and the Co-Investigator on their copy of the consent form. The consent form also includes the contact information for the UBC Office of Research Ethics in case participants would like to contact them directly. A copy of the consent form is attached to the appendix (see Appendix 1.3).
Limitations

The research faces a number of logistical and financial barriers. The thesis was originally conceptualized as being a conversation between LGBTQ2+ experiences of public safety and (dis)ability. Accessibility plays a fundamental role in the experiences of safety and whether or not people of varying abilities can access safer space. It was decided by the researcher and research supervisor that the scope of discussing ability, LGBTQ2+ identities and public safety would be too narrow for a Master’s thesis. The conversation around ability, queerness and safety is important, and would make a great future research topic.

Although the researcher acquired a Canada Graduate Scholarships under the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council in order to conduct the thesis research, not enough funds were allocated to properly compensate survey respondents and interview participants. Unforeseen additional costs, including needing to pay for data analysis software as well as a Survey Monkey membership to collect online survey responses, were paid out of pocket by the researcher. Focus group participants were paid by METRAC. They received a modest honorarium of fifteen dollars, along with some funds for food and tokens. The researcher and METRAC staff tried to appeal to stores in the downtown of Toronto and ask for donations in-kind. None of the businesses contacted could offer a gift card for every participant or another equivalent donation. The project is also limited by the researcher only being in Toronto between May to August in 2015. The short time span, and unforeseen logistical roadblocks, meant that only four out of the five planned focus groups could be done.

The project focuses primarily on the public sphere, which creates a false dichotomy between private and public spaces. The limitations of this came to light in the interviews with Rainbow Health Ontario and Egale. In the interview with Egale, the interviewee talks about how many of the youth they work with got kicked out of their houses due to their gender and/or sexual identity. The person interviewed from Rainbow Health Ontario says that people they contact often do not feel safe in their own homes. It is not uncommon for clients to tell them they should not contact them at their home number, and should instead wait for them to contact Rainbow Health Ontario.

The researcher was also unable to meet with members of the queer Muslim community in Toronto. Not engaging with groups like Salaam, which is a queer Muslim organization, means that there is no voice to balance the Islamophobic comments made during the Fred Victor focus group on the inherent misogyny, transphobia and homophobia of Muslim people. More details on that conversation are provided in the analysis of the data in Chapter Five. The researcher reached out to Salaam over email on two occasions. Although a representative answered one of the emails, no further contact could be made to set-up a focus group or interview. The focus group and interview recruitment also took place during the Muslim holy period of Ramadan, which lends itself to many people focusing on fasting, family and religious matters.
The format of the focus group and interviews are inherently limited. Wilkinson (1998) writes about how focus groups can lead to biased data, depending on who is at the table and if there are individuals overpowering the conversations. The researcher attempted to facilitate the conversation around making sure everyone had the opportunity to talk, and calling upon quieter participants to make sure they were heard. Despite the attempts to level some of the power imbalances in the room, there is no way to measure to what degree this was successful, or whether biases are still present in the data. Dynamics of power and taking up space are considerations for the interviews as well, which involves an unequal dynamic between researcher who has the power to interpret data, and willing subjects who hope their thoughts are appropriately interpreted. Bias is inevitable in the collection and analysis of data derived from interviews and focus groups in qualitative research. The size of the focus groups, with the largest group consisting of twelve participants, increases the risk of bias due to the difficulty of facilitating activities while paying attention to the varying responses and dynamics taking place in the group.

The online survey has a significant sample size when compared to the focus groups and interviews, but is not statistically significant of LGBTQ2+ people in Toronto, especially when the analysis is done relative to the participant’s specific postal codes. The participants were given multiple options for their identity, and in doing so, it was difficult to reject the null hypothesis across all identity categories. It was also difficult to provide an analysis of those who selected more than one option as multiple multivariate responses do not compare well in the statistical software used. Qualitative data and quantitative data analyses are limited by the inherent biases in the researcher’s interpretation.

The Snowball Sampling recruitment method risks providing a limited demographic profile that is self-contained and self-propelling (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). The survey responses reflect the limitations of snowball sampling by recruiting largely respondents that fit the same demographic as the researcher (White, female, cisgender, between the ages of 19-26 and making $15,000 a year or less). The snowball sampling that was done largely in partnerships with external organizations has a smaller overall sample, but represents the groups underrepresented in the survey.

Conclusion

The researcher collected qualitative data primarily through interviews, focus groups and an online survey in order to deepen the limited literature on LGBTQ2+ experiences of public safety in urban planning and design. The online survey and secondary data provide the quantitative basis for triangulation. Hesse-Biber’s (2012) feminist triangulation will frame the analysis done in the following sections through an anti-oppressive lens, which seeks to affirm that people are the experts of their own perceptions and experiences of safety in urbanized spaces.
Focus groups and interviews were initially selected as the methods of data collection in order to gather both formalized traditional data from reputable experts serving the LGBTQ2+ community through interviews, as well as asking community members more broadly what safety looks like to them through conversational informal focus groups (Wilkinson 1998). The online survey was identified as a useful means of gathering a larger sample for the thesis to get a full picture of what safety means in public spaces to LGBTQ2+ communities.

Using three methods of qualitative data collection allows for a large sample size of people of various backgrounds. The interviews represented members of various LGBTQ2+ religious, cultural, health-based and social communities. The focus groups drew upon lots of participants of colour who identify outside the gender binary and/or as transgender. The online survey has the largest sampling, but also is the youngest and Whitest sample gathered for the thesis. The data collected from these three methods frame safety as being influenced by incidents of, and fear that incidents will occur around verbal, sexual, physical, and institutionalized harassment. The following chapters will explore how these elements form LGBTQ2+ urbanized experiences that impact safety planning.
Chapter 5 - Perceptions of Public Safety: Framing Safety, Framing Identity

Summary of Chapter 5

- Participants frame harassment and violence differently, citing gender presentation, race, religion and other identity markers as determinants of safety.
- Some participants experience discrimination interpersonally from strangers, and others identify systemic forces like colonialism and institutionalized exclusion as most pertinent.
- Incidents of harassment as defined by participants as including physical assault, verbal harassment, systemic discrimination, and microaggressions.
- Participants link visibility and passing to perceived safety.
- Code switching is a tactic used by participants to mitigate feeling unsafe.
- Participants identify that harassment can occur anywhere, but also identify unfamiliar neighbourhoods, remote areas and spaces built around intoxication as feeling less safe.

Introduction

Safety in the city and LGBTQ2+ experiences are framed as in this chapter in order to better contextualize the triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data around incidents of discrimination and hate crimes experienced by participants, as well as perceived safety as experienced by LGBTQ2+ communities. The first subsection, ‘Feeling Unsafe Defined’, unpacks how safety, violence and the city are experienced by LGBTQ2+ participants. The second subsection, ‘Passing and Visibility’, opens up the dialogue around how LGBTQ2+ individuals experience sexuality, race, gender and class within the density and diversity of cities. The final subsection, ‘Spatiality and Perceptions of Safety’, explores perceptions of participant safety at the neighbourhood scale of city life framed within the City of Toronto.
### Table 1 - Types of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Violence</th>
<th>Symbolic Violence</th>
<th>Internalized Violence</th>
<th>Systemic/Institutionalized Violence</th>
<th>Microaggressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The use of one’s body or an object to control another person’s actions</td>
<td>Power relations that impose meaning while concealing inherent power relations</td>
<td>An oppressed person hold an oppressive view regarding their own group</td>
<td>Violence inherent in social structures or institutions, which often creates barriers to access</td>
<td>Subtle everyday verbal or nonverbal act that communicates hostility and derogatory feelings about someone’s identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Violence</th>
<th>Verbal Violence</th>
<th>Sexual Violence</th>
<th>Financial Violence</th>
<th>Interpersonal Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The use of words or actions to make someone feel stupid, or unworthy</td>
<td>Use of spoken or written language to cause harm</td>
<td>Unwilling non-consensual participation in a sexual activity</td>
<td>The use of control over someone’s finances to dictate other facets of their life</td>
<td>Violence that occurs between people who know each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spiritual Violence</th>
<th>Cultural Violence</th>
<th>Neglect</th>
<th>Lateral Violence</th>
<th>Horizontal Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of spiritual or religious beliefs to exert control over another person</td>
<td>A person is harmed due to their cultural beliefs or practices</td>
<td>A person who has assumed responsibility for a dependent does not adequately care for their needs</td>
<td>Violence enacted against one’s peers that have relatively the same standing in relation to power dynamics</td>
<td>Violence enacted between one individual or group against another person or group members of a larger group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11

Participants Experiences of Violence
Feeling Unsafe Defined

A focused definition of what constitutes unsafe spaces in cities is needed to contextualize the thesis. Interview and focus group participants were asked to define the experiences of their clients and communities of safety and harassment in public spaces. The difficulty of such a definition is furthered by the blurred distinctions between private and public spaces, especially when incidents happen in semi-private spaces like nightclubs, bars or on public transit. Although all participants mention that harassment can happen to clients and other community members everywhere, and that incidents of assault vary from microaggressions, which is a subtle forms of discrimination that occur through seemingly benign stares, comments, laughter and other reactions to someone’s perceived identity to verbal comments to physical attack, the meaning attached to harassment and perceptions of public safety vary between different organizations and communities (Vega, 2014). Access to health services and the mental health of participants are linked to forming safety. All of these forms of harassment have a systemic element that influences their reproduction and impact.

Theorists have created several matrixes to describe various forms of violence, including about fifteen definition of violence (see Table 1). The forms of violence most pertinent to participants in this thesis are narrowed down to systemic, interpersonal, lateral and specific acts of violence (see Figure 11). Systemic violence is related to overarching societal and institutional structures. Interpersonal violence occurs between two or more people and often, but not always, reflects systemic oppression. Lateral violence occurs between peers instead of true adversaries within communities where some sort of power dynamic and a leveling force is at play. Acts of violence reflect the nature of the violent incident, including physical and emotional violence, as well as sexualized violence and microaggressions. The following section will discuss these forms of violence as experienced by participants in public and semi-public spaces.

All interview participants mention that their clients fear physical acts of violence to a varying degree, even though they may have never experienced it. Focus group participants speak to frequent verbal harassment, and to a lesser extent physical violence, as a source of unequal power dynamics and fear. Participants offered countless stories of getting yelled at, jeered, and aggressively questioned about their gender, sexuality and race.

The interviewee from Fred Victor explicitly speaks of systemic transphobia, as well as racism and the ongoing effects and presence of colonialism, as influencing the safety of their clients. Although the frame used by the Fred Victor staff is broad and systemic, they reference specific interpersonal acts of discrimination to illustrate institutionalized transphobia. They say “systemic oppression is really rough. I see a lot of that in [my clients trying to get] employment. People might have an excellent resume and cover letters but when they go in to get a job, it’s a quick glance and then it’s a write off …. If you’re a non-passing trans person [especially]” (Fred Victor, 2015a). During the focus group at Fred Victor, a participant confirms the occurrence of
transphobia in the workplace. They say that “lots of employers are not educated. Even though you give them the Human Rights gender identity expression – they’re like, what is this?” (Fred Victor, 2015b). Institutionally, the lasting violence of transphobia and colonialism is enacted upon participants.

The trans people who access the THRIVE! program at Fred Victor only have access to two shelters that are trans friendly, even though City of Toronto policy states that a shelter cannot ban someone from accessing their services due to gender presentation (Toronto Community & Neighbourhood Services, 2015). The divide between being actively trans inclusive versus a space that merely has trans inclusive policies without acting on them demarcates the difference between policy and addressing pervasive institutionalized forms of violence. An act of inclusion, albeit generally a positive step forward, cannot dismantle pervasive systemic barriers while existing within the same institutions.

Even within the limitation of policy, a shelter can be mandated to accept trans clients, but it does not mean trans people feel safe there or feel actively included. Frish (2002) believes that inclusivity planning must go beyond tolerating queer and trans people through policy, and must instead actively incite and promote LGBTQ2+ participation. Bearing in mind Frish’s (2002) analysis of inclusivity necessitating promotion over tolerance, it is easier to see why only two shelters are recognized as actively trans inclusive. They are all forced into paying lip service to inclusivity, but only two are recognized as promoting inclusivity.

Healthcare institutions, such as doctors and treatment centres, are places focus group participants have been pathologized and harassed because of their gender identity. Rainbow Health Ontario and Egale’s OUTreach counselling and drop-in both serve LGBTQ2+ communities in a healthcare capacity because conventional mainstream healthcare fails to adequately treat queer and trans people. The counsellor from Egale speaks to people not accessing mental health services because they fear their identity will be pathologized and stigmatized (Egale, 2015). One survey respondent writes, “My friends and I were physically attacked by a man with a hammer. They (the police) were very helpful but the hospital just saw as another drunk native and didn't provide me any proper health care” (LGBTQ2+ Toronto, 2015). Colonization and racism impact how this participant is received by the hospital as an Indigenous person. Many LGBTQ2+ people, who experience a multiplicity of embodied identities, are neglected by the health care system due to institutionalized discrimination.

Participants are deeply impacted by the mental health effects of safer spaces. In the Open Call focus group, one participant speaks to the psychological aspect of feeling safe and unsafe as a queer person navigating public spaces. They say that they “don’t think I look gay, but think people [are] thinking I am … we’re so alone in our head that we scare ourselves into thinking that we can’t survive” (Open Call, 2015). The psychological impacts of homophobia and transphobia are apparent as several participants mention feeling isolated, alone and like they cannot reach out for help. The homophobia ingrained in the health care system, paired with
mental health services being overcapacity, makes this participant unwilling and unable to reach out for help.

The Rainbow Health Ontario staff speaks to doctors refusing to treat transgender patients because their needs are “outside their scope of practice” (Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015). Many trans people are also asked about their gender identity and genitals by doctors in inappropriate situations. The Rainbow Health Ontario staff says that “a common trans story is ‘I went in because I had the flu, and somehow, I got asked about my genitals’. It sounds preposterous but it happens so often. There is no distinction between medical curiosity and clinically indicated questions. People just feel free to ask trans people about their surgical histories and bodies” (Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015). The participant says that doctors will ask trans people questions because they are curious as medical practitioners, not because the question is relevant to the patient’s needs or medical wellbeing. People feel free to ask trans people personal questions with a sense of curiosity and entitlement, which perpetuates the objectification of trans and gender variant people. The transphobia inherent in rendering a trans body into a medical curiosity reflects systemic institutionalized forms of harassment and violence.

The Rainbow Health Ontario staff members points out that misogyny is a significant determinate that effects trans inclusivity in healthcare. They say:

So from what we know from trans people who are more binary identified, like transmen, don’t face in general as many difficulties in terms of blending. Transwomen really do [experience difficulties]. That’s because there is a huge discrepancy between services offered for transwomen and transmen. For transwomen, if you want facial hair removal it’s not covered, hugely expensive, and really painful. Some of it is physiology, but a lot of it is misogyny. All women are scrutinized, and transwomen are really scrutinized. The ability to pass has to do with that we don’t scrutinize men as much as we scrutinize women. There are all these things you need to have to be read as a woman in the world, and if even one of them is not there then you’re done. But if you just have facial hair, then people are like, “oh…sure” … [As a transman] even if your voice is really high, and you’re a smaller built, people are [still] like “oh, ok – I’m not going to question your personhood”. (Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015).

Transmisogyny describes how transwomen in particular are over scrutinized for so-called inauthenticity and whether or not they adequately pass. Transmisogyny means that transmen often have their identity erased by passing, especially if they are binary identified, whereas transwomen have their actual “personhood” questioned much more often (Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015).

House of Constantine and Marvelous Grounds affiliated participants bring up dealing with racist incidents on public transit, which demonstrates the intermingling of systemic racism with interpersonal acts of violence. Several participants from the House of Constantine focus
group have stories of being physically and verbally assaulted by people on public transit because they are Black. One participant had a woman tell them and their friends, “why don’t you Black motherfuckers just shut the fuck up or get off the bus” (House of Constantine, 2015). Another participant littered on a bus, and then was followed by an elderly woman who kept poking the participant and tugging at their shirt telling them to pick up their litter. When asked what the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) can do about this sort of incident, the participant says, “nothing because they’re going to assume I started the fight” (House of Constantine, 2015). Another participant says that a White woman assumed that they would help them with their groceries on the bus without asking them respectfully. The participant says, “Don’t look at me like I’m your servant. Those days have gone” (House of Constantine, 2015). During the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group, participants said that they found that TTC staff in particular have no patience for passengers who speak little or poor English.

In general, transit systems are a public site of blatant systemic oppression. One participant in the House of Constantine focus group points out that anyone who appears to be poor, disabled, grappling with mental health problems, racialized, or in any other way vulnerable, are treated terribly on the TTC. The participant says:

All kinds of people use the TTC, and you see class conflict, and racial conflict, and intergenerational conflict, and conflict around ability and disability happening all the time and it just feels tense and there is nothing to do about it. There’s no way to stop it. If you step up, then suddenly you’re in the mix. I feel like I step up sometimes, and occasionally I do, but it feels like you’re adding fuel to the fire of an already violent situation.

All of the participants in all four focus groups had a story of involving act of violence occurring on the TTC.

Microaggressions are mentioned by the staff from Rainbow Health Ontario, as well as by the staff from Egale and at least one focus group participant in all four focus groups. The staff from Rainbow Health Ontario mentions that their clients experience stares on the subway, snickering and other behaviour around their gender identity and/or gender nonconformity. The interviewee from Egale said that their clients experience “microaggressions on a daily basis, in terms of verbal slants, the way people look at you, how you are handled in any store in terms of your customer service” (Egale, 2015). One participant says that “harassment has become more sophisticated” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). They say that the sophistication comes from the difficulty that comes with defining microaggressions and other more subtle forms of discrimination. They say that they find themselves often in situations where they feel confused because the harasser did not mean to make them feel unsafe.

Microaggressions enacted against someone based on their LGBTQ2+ status or other identities are insidious because they are hard to describe and can be readily brushed off, despite their lasting effects on people’s sense of public safety and managing anxieties around passing
and visibility (Egale, 2015). Microaggressions also reveal the value of intersectional lenses of analysis which layers the multiplicity of identities and safety. The existence of microaggressions and subtle forms of violence demonstrates that the conceptualization of ‘crime’, ‘assault’ and ‘harassment’ is limiting as it does not often include nuanced incidents of violence (Crowe, 2013; Pain, 2001).

The interviewee from Marvelous Grounds speaks to systemic racism and microaggressions impacting their view on what constitutes harassment. They recount a viral video that was popular on social media that shows a White woman walking around New York City and getting harassed with verbal comments on the street. They say that although the critiques of patriarchy stemming from the video are legitimate, a lot of people within queer people of colour communities in Toronto commented:

‘fuck that video’. That video was really irritating. It pits Black and Latino men as being aggressive towards this sanctity of White womanhood, and light skinned womanhood. People were very critical of it, like why can’t we incorporate Black men and men of colour into visualizing a city that is safe for everybody and not criminalize them as being the site of harassment. (Marvelous Grounds, 2015a).

The person from Marvelous Grounds is very critical of the video’s racist portrayal of safety and harassment, which actively privileges the experiences of White people. Participants of colour speak to encountering racist microaggressions and verbal comments in public spaces. One participant in the House of Constantine says that they get spoken to in Mandarin, Japanese, and Korean regularly by White people because they are Asian. They say that they don’t even speak their mother’s language, Tagalog, and insist instead that their second language is French. The rest of the focus group laughs at this comment, noting the absurdity of people’s behaviour. The participant says that they are resigned to such racist microaggressions because it happens so often.

Two Black male participants in the House of Constantine say that because they are Black, people often assume that they sell marijuana or cocaine. One participant says that when this happens they say “no sir, smoking weed is bad for you and someone should arrest you for doing it” (House of Constantine, 2015). A participant had a woman approach them once and got angry because they did not have any weed to sell. The person seemed to think that the participant just did not want to share. The critique of racism in safety planning is pertinent as CPTED strategies often do not acknowledge how people of colour, especially when they are young Black and Brown men, are designed out of spaces due to their so-called abnormal uses of it (Crowe, 2013).

Visibility as a queer and/or trans persona deeply affects personal safety and prevalence of microaggressions. In the Fred Victor focus group, participants describe navigating safety in Toronto as a “proceeding sense of doom” (Fred Victor, 2015b). Transphobia is experienced in public spaces across Toronto, both in terms of overt physical violence to emotional triggers
around misgendering and other microaggressions. Participants also mention that many are unaware of their rights and do not know where to safely report instances of transphobic hate crimes and/or violence.

Ehrenfeucht (2013) recognizes that planning is done with the interests of the most privileged, who are often White and middle class, and often the changes made to a community are detrimental to its most marginal members. CPTED strategies are not immune to the reinforcement of oppression in planning, and in fact often overtly support racial segregation and other forms of racism (Newman, 1973). The interviewee from Marvelous Grounds says that for members of their community, harassment has more to do with being “enraged by White privilege. Being with a group of Black and Brown people and having White people come up to you and say, ‘You’re so interesting looking’. They’re more like microaggressions” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015a). Harassment for the person from Marvelous Grounds is White supremacy, not perpetuating over-policing and surveillance of men of colour. The framing used by the Marvelous Grounds interviewee explicitly names the drivers of systemic oppression as the more significant source of violence and harassment. The police encounters as a site of violence are mentioned by many participants, and will be unpacked in the following chapter.

In the Fred Victor focus groups, many participants earn an income from engaging in sex work, and know how to operate the dangers associated with that particular trade in face of systemic shaming and stigmatization of the sex trade. The difference between indoor and outdoor sex work is explained by a participant. The participant says that outdoor work is less safe, you’re less likely to have a driver, and you’re not paid over $100 per trick. Indoor work is safer, less risky, you can work in your own place and know where things are, know your neighbours, have more control, and get someone else to screen your clients. Another participant points out that you are never truly safer while working as a sex worker, and they carry a weapon for protection when working at all time. The assumption that trans people are all sex workers impacts clients who are not sex workers, or who are not soliciting clients, as men will stop their cars and try to pick up the participants for sexual favours. CPTED strategies, even those who position themselves as feminist, actively design against uses for outdoor sex work (Crowe, 2013; Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997).

Despite being actively designed against and excluded from discussion of public space usages in planning, the sex workers in the Fred Victor focus group describe a complex negotiation of safety that does not rely on CPTED nor on planning, but instead on community and personal resilience (Pain, 2001). It would be beneficial to begin to take the experiences of sex workers, particularly those who identify under the trans umbrella and/or as people of colour, as they are disproportionately affected by violence in the public sphere and encounter very little support (Hanhardt, 2013; Testa et al., 2012).

The interviewee that most explicitly mentions sexualized violence is from Egale. It is notable that interview participants were asked to describe the harassment their clients and
communities endure in public spaces, and that they were not prompted to divide or categorize the experiences described in terms of verbal, physical or sexual violence. It is also notable that statistically, sexual violence happens most often in the domestic sphere, not the public sphere, and that it is heavily underreported by victims (Campbell, 2005). The divide between private and public space is not a clear chasm, as violence at home can quickly become violence in the street, violence in institutions and violence that affects whole communities. However, participants were prompted to speak to violence, harassment, and safety explicitly in terms of what they would consider public spaces in cities. The conversation around sexual assault and harassment within the context of the blurring of private and public spaces is important and layered, and should be had in future iterations of the analysis of LGBTQ2+ safety and planning outside the scope of this thesis.

Some focus group participants do talk about facing sexualized violence outside the domestic sphere. One of the participants in the House of Constantine states that they experience a lack of consent and casual sexual violence that occurs in queer spaces where people drink (e.g. clubs and bars). They say that they often get touched without their permission, and that the only time they feel like using violence to intercept a stranger is when they are being violated sexually. Another participant from the Open Call focus group was raped as a child in a parking lot. The non-binary participant spoke of their experience in a Toronto Bathhouse at the periphery of the Gay Village. They encountered sexualized violence through a person touching them repeatedly without consent. When they reported the person to the bathhouse staff, they were misgendered repeatedly. The assailant began to call them “it” without being rebuked by staff. The staff at the bathhouse eventually banned the non-binary person from the space, despite their innocence and victimization. It is disappointing that in a space that advertises itself as queer friendly and sex positive, the staff bans someone for essentially asserting their need for boundaries, respect and safety.

Although bars, clubs and other venues are technically privately owned spaces, they are treated as part of public life in cities and are impacted by perceptions of safety as experienced by participants. Femme presenting participants in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated group and the House of Constantine speak to people touching their breasts and asses without permission, provocation or consent, especially when alcohol is involved at a venue. They say that the unprovoked grabbing is often enacted by gay men, but straight men and women do it as well. Complaints of gay men overstepping their boundaries and not acquiring consent are important to bring into the conversation. It is not only people outside the LGBTQ2+ community that enact violence, but it is also a problem within the community as well.

Although much of the conceptualization of safety planning focuses on horizontal violence, which refers to overt violence enacted against a group or individual, lateral violence, which takes place amongst peers, is a significant determinant of LGBTQ2+ safety (College & Association of Registered Nurses of Alberta, n.d.; Korff, 2015). The harassment and lack of consent within the LGBTQ2+ community as a form of lateral violence is exemplified by another House of
Constantine member. One participant had nude pictures posted of them online in an advertisement by a photographer in the community without their consent. In the focus group, this person says that they saw the photo for the first time while on Facebook with their father, which was surprising and uncomfortable. They say in the interview that everyone in the gay scene knows this photographer, but nobody has called this person out on their behaviour. Notably the photographer made money off a picture posted without consent.

Although feminized bodies of people in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group, and in the literature more broadly, experience a greater amount of harassment, their potential to be the instigators of sexualized assault and harassment should also be considered in a queer context. One participant says that there is not enough conversation around queer women harassing other people, and that when non-consensual incidents occur, it is confusing to negotiate. They say that they know what harassment looks like from a man, but when a queer woman is the perpetrator, there is no adequate language to really talk about those problems. They note that feminized bodies have the privilege of harassing people without getting called out. They say, “I’ve found women to be even more aggressive than men. There’s a loophole where queer women get away with sexually harassing you, or pursuing you relentlessly even after you say no” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). They say that they once complained to an event organizer about the aggressive behaviour of a queer woman as a performer in a bar, and they were told to suck it up and continue working. In response, they have begun to put on their own shows where they have the power to kick people out.

The London Abused Women’s Centre released a pamphlet in 2002 on lesbian abuse that reads:

the existence of violence in lesbian relationships has rarely been openly discussed. The silence around lesbian abuse has been maintained by a variety of factors; homophobia (fear and prejudice about homosexuality), heterosexism (the assumption of heterosexuality leading to the invisibility of lesbian and gay men), an unwillingness to believe that women could hurt other women, and several myths surrounding lesbians and lesbian abuse. (London Abused Women’s Centre, 2002).

Queer women, including lesbians, are often excluded from conversations of accountability and interpersonal violence. Much of the work feminists have done around creating safer cities have created a binary representation of men as perpetrators and women as victims (Campbell, 2005). Although female bodied people do experience a great amount of violence in public spaces, they can also be the perpetrators of such behaviour. It is important to recognize that feminized bodies are not exempt from perpetrating assault, harassment and abuse, despite living within systemic misogyny and patriarchy.
Masculine presenting participants of colour in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated group speak to the emotional trauma resulting from oppressive laterally violent interactions with other queer people. One participant says:

I haven’t experienced more emotional trauma anywhere than I have inside the gay community, particularly in the gay male community, just because of the things that I am. Fatphobia, femmephobia, racism, White supremacy -- it makes it difficult to love yourself as a gay man because I don’t fit all the things I’m supposed to be according to these standards. I actually do crave more masculine folks in my life, but it’s also like hard to know how to negotiate that one. Most gay masculine men that I know are problematic. (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b).

Gay communities are a site of injury for many masculine queer people of colour. Another masculine presenting participant of color speaks to this when they mention an encounter in a gay bar in the Toronto Gay Village. They say that they went to a well-known gay bar with a White transman friend of theirs. Their White friend had a great night, and felt their gender was affirmed from the experience. The participant says that their night was awful, and that they “just got stared at, nobody hit on me. It was so obvious that the White men had all the power and these other Brown men were chasing them for attention” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). White supremacy negatively affects the participants who want to engage in masculinity but then are confronted with blatant racism and other forms of oppression.

All participants from Supporting Our Youth, Fred Victor, Egale Marvelous Grounds, and Rainbow Health Ontario point out that transphobia and transmisogyny are problems in the queer community as well. The counsellor from Egale describes how incidents of harassment happen often in spaces that are designated as safe, and how insidious feeling unsafe around one’s identity is in such spaces. The staff member from Rainbow Health Ontario says that part of transmisogyny is

that transwomen often don’t feel included in queer spaces. Intimate relationships and partnerships are almost always shrouded in that. If you don’t feel like you belong in a space then … you may not feel like you have as many choices in intimate partner relationships, makes you feel like you might not have as many choices in who you might take or not, and, you know, what you deserve. (Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015).

The exclusion of trans people from some queer spaces is a form of psychological violence. The privileging of normative gender presentation excludes and erases trans people, even in queer contexts. Those who do not pass, do not want to pass, or are exhibiting some form of gender non-conformity more generally are made to feel unsafe in certain queer contexts, and in public spaces more broadly. Those who do pass and exhibit some form of gender normativity experience the erasure of their trans identity, which can exclude them from queer contexts as well. Even a passing trans person experiences the risk of being outed as transgender as well,
which can lead to violence and exclusion in institutional spaces, such as hospitals or other healthcare centres, LGBTQ2+ positive spaces, and public spaces (Fred Victor, 2015a; Kulanu, 2015; Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015).

The interviewee from Supporting Our Youth sees clients who are impacted by verbal harassment and hate speech both within the queer community and outside of it. In the interview they speak to racist and ablest remarks that are made within LGBTQ2+ communities and actively serve to exclude people. They note that the exclusion of people within the queer community comes from an insidious power dynamic where people will “identify that they have power over somebody else they and [will] try to use it against that person” (Supporting Our Youth, 2015). Power dynamics and oppression intertwine to privilege some members of LGBTQ2+ communities over others. Power and oppression may be clearer in instances of horizontal violence, but remains just as insidious and harmful in the context of lateral violence.

A participant from the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group says that they often grapple with defining harassment that comes from their own communities. They say that:

as people of colour, you sometimes encounter that sort of harassment from someone in your community, and then you don’t know what to do. Ah here is a Black man treating me in a way that I don’t really feel comfortable, but I also know that if I call the police, he is going to be in trouble. I don’t want him to go down that path just for telling me something that I was uncomfortable with, so what do I do? (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b).

It is confusing for participants in this focus group to grapple with systemic racism in the institutions, like the police, that are supposed to offer support for victims of assault and harassment. Another participant addresses the conundrum of being harassed within the community by saying that they do not consider a man of colour asking them to smile harassment, but that incidents involving a power imbalance that reinforces White supremacy and patriarchy are, however, harassment. The anxieties around needing support and accountability in instances of violence and assault without propping up state sanctioned violence are expressed by the people in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated group, which reflects much of the work being done by anti-violence groups that prioritize queer and trans people of colour (Bassichis, 2011; Hanhardt, 2013).

A participant in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated group says they do not agree with the analysis made by the other participant that reserves the definition of harassment to incidents that reinforce White supremacy. They say that Black men often tell them to smile, which to them “felt like patriarchy” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Although they recognize that the power dynamic is different when harassment is happening internally to communities of colour, they say that harassment from men of colour still feel “totally uncomfortable and fucked up my day and wears on me to have that sort of shit happen” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). The room nodded along and affirmed the feelings expressed by this participant, acknowledging the legitimacy of
their feelings. The interplay of layered identities in this instance, where a queer person of colour is interacting with a Black man who makes them feel uncomfortable denotes the necessity of intersectional analyses. Intersectional analysis allows for the conversation to be framed around harassment being drawn from the participant’s femininity and Blackness as factors contributing to an aggressor’s entitlement to their body. Intersectionality also looks at why the perpetrator of harassment is almost always cast as a man of colour, while the sanctity of Whiteness is upheld. Instead of writing off facets of identity and community that may not directly impact them, the Marvellous Grounds affiliated group offers a fare about of nuance and layering to the way they see race, gender and public safety.

Participants generally did not offer a complex analysis around addiction and public safety. Several participants say that they feel unsafe around the homeless, street involved people and active drug users, all of which are visibly marked through assumptions around appearances and class. One participant who writes that race is a factor in their perception of safety also says they are “afraid of crack/drug addicts” (LGBTQ2+ Toronto, 2015). Again, the complications of vulnerability are unraveled. Power exists at the hand of the police who are known to reproduce racist and homophobic control on certain communities (CBC News, 2015; Cole, 2015; Hanhardt, 2013; The Right to Privacy Committee, 1981). Yet, this participant reproduces the fear of vulnerable people by stating that they fear addicts.

One respondent critically analyses their feelings of unsafety around vulnerable people. They write:

I've been accosted on the sidewalk before and still get nervous. That person seemed to be mentally ill. In my experience, most mentally ill street involved folks keep to themselves and are non-threatening. But I still get nervous. Mentally ill folks need more support. Sometimes I see cops picking them up and that doesn't make me less nervous. Quite the opposite.

The participant is able to parse the distinction between perceived fear of mentally ill people, their experience of being more often than not left alone by mentally ill street involved people, and the need to address mental health at an institutional level. Critics of CPTED have argued that safety planning is ineffective in addressing actual violence because it advocates for the continued over-policing and stigmatization of people of colour, mentally ill people and other marginalized groups who are in fact more often victimized (Ehrenfeucht, 2013; Koskela & Pain, 2000; Pain, 2001). Some survey participants also say they feel uncomfortable and unsafe because of the assumptions people make about their socio-economic status. They feel as though they are being judged for being read as low income. Giving voice to how people perceived as dangerous in public spaces themselves feel unsafe challenges safety planning’s focus on ‘normal’ users of spaces, which further marginalizes many groups and communities (Crowe, 2013).
The complications of oppressed groups enacting oppression against each other are explored when one participant says that they have experienced transphobic violence on the street in the Fred Victor focus group. They say that they were attacked by a “group of Muslims” (Fred Victor, 2015b). Muslim people, specifically immigrants from Somalia, are mentioned by focus group participants as “being the most transphobic and misogynistic” (Fred Victor, 2015b). Another participant takes a taxi to work as they don’t feel safe in their area because there are “lots of Muslims” (Fred Victor, 2015b). These Islamophobic comments intersect with the violence enacted against queer and trans people. The situations described by participants involve perpetrators who they read as being cisgender racialized Muslim men, who attack them as queer and trans people of various racial backgrounds due to their gender and/or sexual identity.

The situation assumes the gender, sexuality, religion and motivation of the perpetrators, as well as the intent of the attack. The complexity of oppressed groups enacting violence against each other is layered and multiple (Collins, 1993). One of the participants in the Open Call Focus group says that it is not uncommon for people from marginalized communities to behave oppressively towards each other. They say:

gay, straight, Black, White, mixed race, bisexual, etc … we live in the same world as everyone else and it’s not uncommon for us to internalize the same oppressive norms as everyone else, and then take it out on ourselves. (Open Call, 2015).

The Open Call participant is speaking specifically to the rampant discrimination against trans people both in the queer community and outside of the community. The analysis of lateral violence and intermingled systemic oppression holds true in a context where participant accuse Muslim people of being the most homophobic and transphobic as this claim strikingly erases the experiences and very existence of queer and trans Muslim people. This is particularly notable in the wake of the death of Sumaya Dalmar, a Somali transwoman who was active in Toronto’s queer Muslim and Somali community (Mohyeddin, 2015). Intersectionality is helpful in framing queer people being Islamophobic as a form of lateral violence as it arguably hurts queer Muslims the most intimately.

Safety is defined by participants in a multitude of ways, and along the lines of daily acts of violence, such as comments and attack, as well as a strong emphasis on institutionalized violence in spaces that are often semi-public, such as hospitals and workplaces. Participants frame harassment and violence slightly differently, but all include physical assault, verbal harassment, systemic discrimination and microaggressions as incidents considered harassment. Lateral violence within communities complicates the power dynamics of harassment and violence. The specific relationship participants have with certain geographies is analyzed in the following chapters, which will help envision what a city planned for LGBTQ2+ people can look like.
Passing and Visibility

Introduction

Safety is negotiated by focus group participants and the clients served by the interviewees through actively processing their experiences of visibility, passing and identity. All participants mention some elements of gender, race and class that impact their sense of safety. Specifically, Black and Indigenous participants speak to how their racial identities are inseparable from their experiences as LGBTQ2+. Feminized participants mention how their victimization and perception of fear is tied in with their appearance and stereotypes around their supposed weakness and interactions with masculinized embodiments who feel entitled to access their bodies. The experiences of femme participants is consistent with the feminist concerns around safety planning, although the affiliation of participants with the LGBTQ2+ community demonstrates how traditional feminist polarizations of men as perpetrators and women as victimized is not culturally appropriate when planning for queer and trans people. The participants speak to how these elements of identity formation intersect in a multitude of ways. Intersectional identities are inseparable from participant perception of safety in public space. The following section will first make participant experiences of ‘Gender and Sexuality’ legible, the interact with ‘Intersecting Racialization and White Supremacy’.

Gender and Sexuality

Participants in all focus groups who either present as femme, identify as femme or women, and/or are feminized say that they experience a pervasive and constant sense of scrutiny and misrecognition in public spaces. The femme presenting people say that they experience catcalling, getting approached and touched in public. They also speak to being verbally assaulted because of their gender and race. The experience of femme participants is affirmed in the interviews and online survey. In the survey, one participant writes “I often feel, because I am femme presenting, that people in my neighbourhood don't read me as queer”. Several more link feminized appearances to being rendered invisible as LGBTQ2+. However, when asked about their experiences of safety, participants who identify as femme presenting say that they experience greater feelings of unease and fear of violent attack compared to those who did not identify as femme. One participant in the survey writes “[I] don't feel uncomfortable being visibly queer, but sometimes made to feel unsafe/ experience scrutiny and harassment re gender/femme gender presentation” (LGBTQ2+ Toronto, 2015). Invisibility as LGBTQ2+ does not preclude femme women from experiencing the same harassment all women face.

One participant in the Open Call focus group who self-identifies as a ‘lipstick lesbian,’ which to this participant means that they identify as conventionally feminine and as a lesbian,
says that visibility is experienced differently for them based on how they look. The participant says that they “don’t experience what they go through [gesturing towards their male presenting friends], because they [strangers in public spaces] think I’m straight” (Open Call, 2015). The self-identified lipstick lesbian states that they experience feeling unsafe due to their identity as a woman, especially when being hit on aggressively by men. Another femme presenting female identified participant in the House of Constantine says that they are met with a lot of aggression when others assume that they are straight because they are married to a man and then are told otherwise. They say they are “married to someone I love, I’m not married to his dick” (House of Constantine, 2015). The participant coins the phrase “Hearts not parts” to describe the valorization of affective identity over biological sex, which was met with laughter from the rest of the group (House of Constantine, 2015). Although the topics of safety, assertiveness and visibility are serious and layered, the family dynamic in this focus group leads to a lot of laughter and jokes in this focus group.

Participants who present as femme women often are not read as belonging to the LGBTQ2+ community. One participant in the House of Constantine focus group says that they feel like they are afforded a lot of safety because they present femme, and that once they disclose their queer identity, they then feel exposed and unsafe in the face of being asking ignorant questions. They say that they “don’t owe anyone an answer for anything. Questions make me feel not so safe” (House of Constantine, 2015).

Harassment and involuntary feminization is not just a problem experienced by self-identified LGBTQ2+ women. A femme gay male participant in the Open Call focus groups says that because they look less masculine they often get harassed in either “a sexual way or homophobic way” (Open Call, 2015). Although the participant is a cisgender man, their feminization and vulnerability is clearly stated, which interrupts the narrative of vulnerability being tied exclusively to female identified individuals in feminist safety planning narratives (Koskela & Pain, 2000). The experience of the non-binary Open Call focus group participant also reveals that they experience persistent sexual harassment. The non-binary participant says that cisgender men hit on them because they think they are a woman. Once they realize that the participant is not a woman, the cisgender men “feel like they’re tricked and get violent quickly” (Open Call, 2015). Gendered violence is tied to feminization, but is not exclusively tied to womanhood.

The experience of the non-binary participant in the Open Call focus group layers the conversation around feminized and masculinized violence and harassment. The participant who identifies as non-binary says that they don’t experience safety ever. They mention that using the bathroom in public often leads to stressful and unsafe situations. They decide to use the men’s room in public, because the women’s washroom triggers gender dysphoria for them, but will always be told in the bathroom something along the lines of “yo miss, you’re in the wrong bathroom” (Open Call, 2015). When discussing gender in terms of polarizing ideas of
masculinity and femininity, non-binary people are erased. The non-binary participant says that feeling unsafe often leaves them spending most of their time depressed and alone.

The people interviewed from Fred Victor, Egale and Supporting Our Youth all explicitly say that gender non-conforming clients and non-passing trans clients experience greater instances of discomfort, harassment, assault and other violence due to their gender presentation. The person from Supporting Our Youth noted how their clients do dress comfortably as themselves in public, but they still run the risk of ending up in harm’s way. The person interviewed from Rainbow Health Ontario explains how passing impacts safety due to societal expectations around gender. They say:

when people see you on the streets, or other public spaces, and can’t easily identify your gender, then you’re going to experience a lot of shit. You’re going to experience a lot of discrimination. And if people see you and you’re not “performing” or “enacting”, being your gender in a way that’s legible to them, then you’re going to experience discrimination. For some people, their gender is not legible because they don’t want it to be. That’s who they are, right. And for others, it’s not legible because there are barriers around that. (Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015).

The Rainbow Health Ontario staff member points out that people whose gender is not readily categorized on normative terms experience a great deal of discrimination in public spaces. The systemic constructions of gender normativity also create a number of barriers to accessing services, employment, housing, education, and other institutions, as well as sexual reassignment procedures.

Clients at Fred Victor take on a number of strategies to pass in a transphobic world. One client at Fred Victor dresses in what they describe as “boy’s clothes”, despite not identifying as a boy, unless they are going to a friend’s house or a specific event, because they cannot deal with the harassment of what is described as “day to day life. Taking the subway or going to an appointment, they got to the point where they felt so unsafe that they cut off their hair” (Fred Victor, 2015a). Dressing to conform to normative gender presentation is one way clients embody agency in avoiding violent attack. The agency to have a normative gender presentation is however not without the psychological effects associated with living inauthentically to one’s gender identity. The client who cuts off their hair and changes what they wear also participates in what Koskela and Pain (1999) recognize as women’s empowerment through a negotiation of danger. Although Koskela and Pain (1999) do not speak from an overtly trans inclusive lens of womanhood, their analysis of self-identified women negotiating danger as being more effective than crime prevention policies and design is on point in this context.

A male participant in the Open Call focus groups says they had been gay bashed in the past for presenting more ‘femme’, and now decides to present more ‘butch’. They say that since the attack, they have “become really cynical and I always have my guard up” (Open Call, 2015).
The femme gay male participant says that although they have their guard up, they also feel as though the more homophobia they experience, the more visible they want to be. They also recognize that visibility comes with a cost to safety. They say, “the more you’re out there, the more people feel like they can go there” (Open Call, 2015). Similarly a masculine presenting participant in the focus group recruited through Marvelous Grounds says that: “I feel myself not wanting to dress in femme things anymore. I don’t know if that’s because I just feel more comfortable being ‘masc’ because the world hates femininity so much, or if generally, I just feel more comfortable being masculine presenting now” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Passing privilege as masculine in a misogynistic world polices what focus group participants wear in public spaces. The negotiation of embodying self-actualized gender identity and policing gender for safety complicates the way participants are legible to themselves.

The counsellor interviewed from Egale states that safety is always a concern for clients. The clients who visit the OUTreach experience safety as a pervasive concern, especially those who are as the interviewee says “visibly marginalized, visibly queer, visibly trans, and obviously intersecting people of colour as well” (Egale, 2015). The counsellor from Egale notes that none of their clients are immune to violence, whether “it be overt physical violence in the street or in the home, to psychological or emotional violence as well, which is more subtle, and there is more stigma around it in terms of the effects of that type of trauma” (Egale, 2015). Fear of violence and trauma around passing and gender variance is ripe for causing mental health problems.

**Intersecting Racialization and White Supremacy**

The conversation during the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group revolves around the intersections of race, sexuality and gender, definitely at least in part because the group consisted entirely of queer and non-binary people of colour. Constructs of masculinity and femininity are fraught when intersecting with White supremacy and White entitlement. One participant says that as a feminine Black woman who is read as straight, they are always read as available and White cisgender men in particular feel like they should be able to access their body. The way their body is marked as a feminine Black woman means that they are “never not thinking about safety as soon as I leave the house” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Feminized people attending the focus group talk about their experiences of unsafety being linked to geographies of feminized queer visibility and passing.

One masculine Black gay male participant says that they feel a lot safer now that they identify as queer than when they were hiding it, which speaks to a very different experience, compared to the feminized participants. They say that before they were out, they hung out with straight boys who wanted to roam streets. They say that their friends wanted to go out and be around people playing basketball and fighting each other. They feel like this behaviour is boring
and unsafe, and would prefer to stay home with their friends. Now that this person is out, they feel more comfortable living authentically and doing what they want to do.

A participant says that they feel as though their presentation as a Black woman makes people disregard their need for safety. They say that there is a myth of the strong woman of colour who is unbreakable and strong. They say that this means that people will not suspect that something has happened to them or that they need support when harassment is occurring. Another participant speaks to the dehumanization of women of colour when they say that the myth of the strong woman of colour comes from the fact that they get harassed a lot, and that they have learned coping skills to appear strong when they may, in fact, feel weak. They say, “we’ve become that way because we’ve experience a lot of harassment, and I have to put on that persona” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Interestingly, the persona put on by the self-identified women of colour in the group to feel safe in the face of rampant harassment means that they feel less likely to receive support around safety. Participants can choose to a certain extent what façade they put forth when navigating public spaces, but cannot choose to live outside of a racist sexist society that puts women of colour at risk. Women of colour live in an imaginary that is laden with dehumanizing symbolic violence.

The intersections of transmisogyny and racism are unpacked in the participation of a transwoman of colour in the group recruited through Marvelous Grounds. They talk about how daily life is full of unsafe encounters on the street due to their identities. The participant talks about being in Nathan Philips Square, a public space in downtown Toronto, and having to deal with people asking inappropriate questions. The participant says that they were aware that they would have to answer people’s questions about them due to their non-normative gender presentation. The participant does say that grown adults will ask childish questions however. They say, “they come up and ask ‘are you a boy or a girl’, and fine you’re five, you can ask that question. But if you’re thirty something years old, then no, this isn’t a question of being cis or trans, this is a question of being a grown-up” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). The room erupted in laughter as the participant compared adults who ask naïve and offensive questions about gender presentation to children.

After the laughter died down, another participant talked about feeling conflicted trying to promote education around queer and trans issues from an anti-racist perspective, while also not always being in the mood to engage in such conversations. They say, “sometimes I’m ok answering questions, but I feel like, you know nobody was sitting with me and being like, ‘let’s talk about these things’ as a little Black girl in White suburbia, and I was like, ‘I guess I have to figure these things out on my own’” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). The room erupted in affirmations of this statement. A person responded in the interview by saying that the participants “don’t owe people that” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). There is an understanding that education creates safer spaces for people through engaging with members of the community on issues of transphobia, homophobia, classism, racism, ableism and other forces of systemic oppression. However, self-care is needed for the marginalized people doing the work of making
such education happen. The participants speak to how they do not owe privileged people an education on their identity, and that the onus should be on them to learn.

The transwoman of colour from the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group describes their experience as masculine presenting, before starting to transition, as being perpetually perceived as a threat. They say that “before I was perceived as a threat, because I have a beard, because I am masculine, because I’m a person of colour, because the male person of colour is perceived as dangerous, even if they are not” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). They say that now that they present more feminine, people try to attack them. The contrast in their experience reveals the polarizing experiences of masculinized and feminized people in a far more complicated, non-binary racialized trans context.

The biologically related participants in the House of Constantine have a committed stance of not feeling unsafe in Toronto. A masculine participant says that they even tell their family off for being homophobic. They say that their aunt will ask them how the girlfriend is going, to which they respond, “bitch, I have a man” (House of Constantine, 2015). Both of the biologically related participants, one Black woman and one Black man, could care less about the comments and actions of others, and feel able to assert themselves if needed. The male participant recounts walking through their neighbourhood half-naked, dressed in a Caribbean headpiece and underwear, without any fear of assault motivated by racism or homophobia. They say that if anyone messes with them, they will regret it. The female participant says that they also feel safe everywhere and can assert themselves if necessary. They say while gesturing emphatically that, “if you touch me, it’s on and popping” (House of Constantine, 2015). On again agency is enacted by participants through a negotiation of identity. Although both family members were speaking to their genuine experiences, it is notable that the rest of the focus group participants laughed at their responses. Humor is used in the focus group to affirm what the other participants feel, as well as lighten the mood of the session. The experiences of these participants are important to bring some nuance and agency of marginalized individuals to the experiences of anti-Black racism and agency in planning for safer cities.

The masculine presenting cisgender focus group participants, especially those who identify as men, generally express feeling that they can handle harassment and assault themselves. The same participant who began to dress more butch after they were gay bashed for being femme in the Open Call focus group asserts that they are able to deal with any incidents of assault now. Another male cisgender participant says that “if you call me a fag I’ll punch you in the face” (Open Call, 2015). The only female-identified participant who asserts that they can handle themselves in cases of violence, and do not feel afraid in public, is the cisgender Black woman from House of Constantine with a biologically related family member in the group. All other participants who express feeling safe in public at all time are cisgender men.

Interestingly, the masculine presenting participant says that their physical safety is not “threatened because I’m queer, but because I’m racialized. In my experience being racialized is
way more difficult than being queer” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Although gender presentation is a factor in both experiences, racialization and gender intersect on different levels of power and privilege when comparing the stories of feminized racialized participants to masculine presenting racialized participants, particularly when looking at the experiences of the transwoman in the focus group as being conceptualized as a masculinized threat compared to a target as feminized.

Many participants in the Fred Victor focus group speak of colonialism and racism impacting their perceptions of safety moreso than their gender or sexual identities. One participant in particular abstains from answering the question asking how their LGBTQ2+ identity impacts their sense of safety as they feel like their Indigenous identity and the racism they experience to be the greatest determinant of their sense of safety. Indigenous participants also mention the inherent misogyny in the Indian Act, which they describe as being rooted in undervaluing women based on colonial systems, as a systemic determinant of their sense of agency and safety. Unequal status among Indigenous people in Canada, as well as a need to relearn the ways prior to colonization are emphasized by participants.

Participants of colour from the focus group recruited through Marvelous Grounds say that in a way, they enjoy the racist projection onto men of colour as being assumed to be the most threatening people in public spaces, because it helps them feel more secure. Other masculine presenting participants agree with the statement, noting that they have people crossing the street to avoid them out of fear because they are masculinized Black people. Although the reason this happens to participants is due to racism and racialization, they laugh about it amongst themselves in the context of the focus group. Laughter is an affective tool of resiliency in light of marginalization.

Although many participants find refuge in the LGBTQ2+ community, it is also a site of racism and other forms of oppression for many participants. Survey respondents selected most that they feel safer in areas with a reputation for LGBTQ2+ inclusivity sometimes (34.7%), followed by yes (24.0%), and no (7.2%). About 34.1% of participants did not respond to the question. Survey respondents are fairly divided on whether or not they have encountered discrimination or feeling unsafe in a space that advertises itself as being LGBTQ2+ inclusive. Only 31.1% selected that they have encountered discrimination, harassment, or feeling unsafe in LGBTQ2+ positive spaces, while 32.3% selected that they have not and 36.5% did not respond.

Participants point out in the qualitative data collected that neighbourhoods, venues, organization and simply being amongst a group of queer and trans people increases their visibility as a member of the LGBTQ2+ community greatly. Participants differed in opinion on whether they feel as though they have safety in numbers, or if more people and increase visibility make them a target. One participant in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group who passes as straight says that being in a group can increase the sense of safety, but one’s behaviour when
surrounded by other queer people can increase visibility. The following section will delve more into the specific geographies of queer inclusivity.

**Conclusion**

Visibility and passing are important tenets to LGBTQ2+ experiences of safety in cities. Men of colour report feeling as though they were unfairly cast as an aggressor, due to racist projections regarding the assumed inherent violence of men of colour, whereas women of colour talk about people seeing them as unwanting or undeserving of their help when they are being harassed in public. Visibly feminized participants generally experience more harassment than their masculinized counterparts. The polarity between feminized and masculinized bodies is complicated by the experiences of trans and non-binary participants, who also experience a great amount of misrecognition and oppression in public spaces.

The literature on feminist safety in planning addresses the misogyny experienced by implicitly cisgender women. The feminist analysis of gendered safety lacks the knowledge drawn from trans experiences of safety, which is a demographic that experiences a disproportionately high amount of harassment and violence in public spaces (Doan, 2007; Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network, 2013; Testa et al., 2012). Bringing in the experiences of gender variant people further disrupts the gaps in feminist literature on safety planning. Gender variance disrupts the polarizing analysis of women/men experience safety in specific ways. This disruption has the potential of creating a new understanding of gendered safety along the lines of a fluctuating and impermanent continuum of gender identity and presentation. The intersections of gender presentation, sexuality and race further disrupt the narratives of perceived safe/unsafe embodiments in the urban form.

**Spatiality and Perceptions of Public Safety**

Neighbourhood reputation and configuration are sites of perceived safety and unsafety. Identity and embodied within societal norms, as well as specifically CPTED’s conception of ‘abnormal’ versus ‘normal’ uses of spaces, significantly factor into creating perceived safety in neighbourhoods. Familiarity with a space is essential perceptions of safety as well. Certain spaces created and inhabited by marginalized communities are a fraught site of safe versus unsafe perceived uses. Participants use code switching to fit their embodiments within the contexts they face to create safer spaces for themselves.

Participants have various opinions on what neighbourhoods in the city are deemed safe and which are to be avoided. Participants are asked to define their relationship with their neighbours, the sense of community in their neighbourhood, how safe they feel in their neighbourhood, and how safe they feel in specific spaces around their neighbourhood. Survey participants generally do not know many of their neighbours, with only 1.3% knowing all of
their neighbours, 59.3% knowing a few of them, 26.0% knowing none of them, and the rest selecting that know either a few of them, or about half. Participants select that the sense of community in their neighbourhood is not at all strong (30.9%), followed by slightly strong (26.8%), moderately strong (24.8%), very strong (14.1%) and extremely strong (0.7%).

Despite lacking strong community connections geographically centered in their neighbourhoods, participants report feeling safe overall in their neighbourhoods. About 12.0% of participants select that they feel extremely safe in their neighbourhood, 35.3% selected that they feel very safe, 30.5% moderately safe, 7.8% slightly safe and 1.8% selected that that don’t feel safe at all. All of the respondents who selected feeling not safe at all identify under the trans umbrella. No cisgender respondents selected that they feel not at all safe in their neighbourhood. These statistics reflect the overrepresentation of trans people as victims of violent crimes in urban settings, which influences the actual and perceived safety of transgender individuals (P. Doan, 2007; RHVP, 2012; Testa et al., 2012).

Specifically on LGBTQ2+ identity as a determinant of perceived safety, participants are asked in the online survey if they feel safe being a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community in their neighbourhood. The majority selected ‘Yes, I have no problem being visibly LGBTQ2+ in my neighbourhood’ (41.3%), followed by ‘It depends’ (22.2%), ‘No, I don’t feel comfortable’ (8.4%), and finally ‘Yes, but only if I’m not alone’ (6.6%). Interestingly, most interviewee and focus group participants speak to a general unease around being read as LGBTQ2+ throughout the city’s various neighbourhoods. The qualitative data collected in the focus groups and interviews, and to a lesser extent the comment box of the survey, will triangulate the hidden knowledge and experiences of those who only feel safe being visible, some of the time, or not at all.

The respondents who report feeling the most unsafe in their neighbourhood in the survey cite their gender, race, class and mental illness as factors contributing to their experiences of perceived unsafety. One participant explicitly writes that gender influences safety in the area around their residence as it is “occupied by groups of roaming young men who are not respectful to women and if they knew i was trans would be much worse” (LGBTQ2+ Toronto, 2015). In this statement, trans identity and identifying as a woman intersect to create a layered experience of safety and comfort.

Religious identity is a factor influencing perceived safety as well. The representatives from Kulanu experience safety and LGBTQ2+ experiences as being inseparable from Jewish identity. Although there was a sense that everywhere was relatively safe for members of their community to inhabit as a visible member of the Jewish and LGBTQ2+ community, they noted that the private sphere around more conservative homes and religious institutions feel unsafe for some LGBTQ2+ Jewish people. About 62.5% of survey respondents who identify with a spiritual or religious community confirm that they do not have a problem being visibly LGBTQ2+ and a member of a religious community in their neighbourhood. However, the private
realm as a site of urbanized lack of safety is not explored explicitly in the quantitative data in this thesis.

Many participants are afraid of intoxicated people in a way that challenges pervasive intoxication culture but also adds to the stigmatization of users and addicts. Although many write that explicitly male presenting homeless addicts are those who scare them the most, many explicitly state that men as a whole frighten them, especially when they appear intoxicated in public spaces. The fear of drunk men is strongly linked with gender identity and presentation. One participant writes that they dislike the “bars in the area where the clients are mostly older straight men...kind of feels like their own private club.” Another participant writes “there are rough-looking guys in the neighbourhood, either having come out of a sports bar, or wandering the streets. While I have not been the target of harassment by these individuals, I have often felt their gaze, which I attribute to some part of my outfit or mannerisms”. Another participant writes, “I would avoid going to a bar/pub in Scarborough. Mostly lower/working class White (cis straight) older men being excited about sport”. The privilege of territoriality in public spaces, especially spaces centered on drinking, belongs to, likely older White cisgender, men (Campbell, 2005). Those whose gender presentation does not align with normative maleness are not the bodies marked with the privilege of existing in those spaces without the discomfort of not belonging.

Intoxication culture plays a profound role in identifying safe spaces. A participant who self-identifies as an able-bodied White man with still feels uncomfortable around drunk straight men. They say that the Richmond Street club area, as well as the street parties that occur during the annual ‘Nuit Blanche’ art festival, are very uncomfortable. The participant says that they do not “feel threatened by street people … mostly it is strangers who are intoxicated who make me feel unsafe” (House of Constantine, 2015). Interestingly this participant identifies that the power dynamic between them and a vulnerable street person does not give them cause for fear, whereas a drunk White man has significantly more power and is therefore more threatening. Similar to the Pride festival, Nuit Blanche is a festival that would be promoted by the “Safer City Guidelines” , without citing the limitations or dangers around such events (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997).

Fear around intoxication and drug abuse layers belonging in public spaces. The Gay Church and Wellesley Village are uncomfortable for some participants because of the casual drug and alcohol abuse happening there at all times of the day, especially around the Pride Festival. Participants talk about the number of needles found after Pride this past year around the Village, as well as the unpredictable behaviour of intoxicated people partying. The City of Toronto’s “Safer City Guidelines” do not address the dark side of street festivals and vibrancy, and instead speak to a glowing support for all activities promoting vibrancy on the street without critique. Street festivals are a great way to promote vibrancy in an urban setting, but by not effectively critiquing its possible downsides, Whitzman & Wekerle (1997) are not able to
provide strategies on such dangers can be mitigated through effective and anti-oppression policing, programs and outreach.

Other participants talk about feeling uneasy in areas that are built around intoxication culture. Participants point out that areas on College St. and in the Annex feel unsafe because they often have encounters with drunken cisgender White men there. One participant works as a performer in bars and clubs, and has found that people assume that they are sexually available due to their profession. Despite the construction of White cisgender male entitlement and privilege, they find that queer women in particular get away with sexual harassment in their profession. Heterosexism and the lack of discourse around women enacting violence are cited as the reason for the invisibilizing of women as perpetrators (London Abused Women’s Centre, 2002). Bar and club intoxication culture heightens the harassment experienced by participants, and the performer has to negotiate a particular realm of power, privilege and gender.

Some participants brought up particular areas that feel more unsafe than others due to identity-based concepts of safety. A couple of participants say that they feel less safe in suburbs around Toronto, because they feel like less queer tolerant areas. One participant says that in Etobicoke, they “feel like I’m being discriminated [against] all the time” (Open Call, 2015). Participants also bring up incidents of harassment and assault that occurred throughout Toronto. A transwoman of colour says that they were assaulted in a pub in the Junction a few years before. They asked the pub for the footage of the incident to give to the police, but the pub owner had deleted it. Another participant who lives in the Lansdowne and Dupont area says that they cannot walk their dog too late at night, or else they’re running the risk of getting gay bashed. The same participant was picked up and carried in an elevator by a drunk man when they got home late. They had to fight the man off to escape the encounter. They say that the man “thinks because I look a certain way, he has the right to manhandle me. But no, [I’m] still a person!” (Open Call, 2015). Geographies of safety for queer, trans and genderqueer people in Toronto are varied and personally tied to identity and visibility.

Participants cite various other locations as feeling unsafe. One participant writes that they feel “less safe on public streets i.e Queen [St.], based on looks, comments and body language of strangers”. Another participant writes that high schools feel uncomfortable because of homophobia among students. Another participant writes, “Everywhere feels unsafe at night if you're queer, but night clubs, public transit, and parks are especially uncomfortable at all times of the day, especially at night. People get angry if they find out you're queer sometimes”. Finding out someone is a part of the LGBTQ2+ community, or reading someone as having a non-normative gender presentation, leads to fear of violence and the enactment of violence (Doan, 2007; Testa et al., 2012). It is notable that although CPTED includes an analysis of fearing social undesirables, it does not offer an analysis around how it reinforces a binary of normal/abnormal uses and embodiments that further reproduces transphobia and other forms of oppression (Crowe, 2013). Feminist implementations and critiques of CPTED involve bringing patriarchy into discussions of safety, but often ignore the experiences and intersections of people of colour,
LGBTQ2+ communities and people living in poverty (Pain, 2001; Sweet & Ortiz Escalante, 2010).

Participants speak to areas outside of Toronto feeling less safe as well. One participant says that they feel less safe in more rural and remote areas, where they say that discrimination is “more explicit. Not to set-up a dichotomy that things are great here. I’ve definitely been harassed here too, but I would say that the kinds of harassment I’ve experienced outside of Toronto are very different. It’s way more explicit and in your face” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Isolation is brought up by participants as a source of unease, especially in rural areas where there is less queer and racialized visibility in communities. In the brainstorming session, participants in the House of Constantine group and the Marvelous Grounds group reflect upon wanting to inhabit areas where there are stores opened at all hours, people on the streets at all hours and a lack of isolation. The principles espoused by the participants reflect Jacobs' (1961) “eyes on the streets” which advocates for multiple uses throughout the day in the name of safer cities.

Familiarity is a crucial factor in defining safe spaces across private and public spheres. Private space is somewhat addressed in the questions asking participants what design elements affect their perception of safety. Although feminist scholars have noted that CPTED strategies are insufficient because more violence occurs in the domestic sphere and perpetrators are often someone the victim knows, survey responses demonstrate that the perception of fear still resides outside the home. The blurry distinction between the private and public are exposed in the messiness of perceived safety and rates of violent attacks. Participants say that they feel extremely safe in the shared areas around their residences (25.7%), followed by very safe (32.3%), moderately safe (24.6%), and slightly safe (4.8%). None of the respondents picked not feeling safe at all around the residents. Participants identifying under the trans umbrella chose feeling extremely safe and very safe less proportionally compared to those who selected cisgender, but the overall trend indicates that generally people feel safe around the home. It is notable that the factors that make people feel unsafe domestically often has little to do with the built environment, and that domestic private spaces are often most familiar to people using them.

Participants speak to the power of familiarity, saying that they know when a neighbourhood is safe. A participant who identifies as femme presenting says that they “live in Parkdale and I feel safe there because I know the sketchiness out there … If I’m out anywhere else in the city, like Yorkville or the Annex, it’s a free for all for people” (House of Constantine, 2015). Interestingly, Parkdale has the reputation as a refuge for addicts and the mentally ill, whereas the Annex and Yorkville are more affluent areas. The participant’s comments reflect Nash & Gorman-Murray (2014) article which argues that queer and trans people in Toronto are attracted to areas like Parkdale because of its middle class aesthetic. Unlike Nash & Gorman-Murray (2014) the participants talk about how there is a ‘sketchiness’ in the area that they have learned how to navigate. Unfamiliar neighbourhoods are where they feel unsafe.
Another femme presenting participant says that they have “lived all over the city and I know which neighbourhoods I’m comfortable with after a certain time of the day” (House of Constantine, 2015). This participant lived in Moss Park, a neighbourhood with a similar reputation to Parkdale, which the Fred Victor interviewee says is a site where many clients encounter transphobic verbal harassment and assault (Fred Victor, 2015a). The participant says that while they lived in Moss Park, they would leave their window open so that they could hear the sex workers call them for help. They also left a garbage can for sex workers to dispose of their condoms in their backyard. Similar to the participant living in Parkdale, this participant says that they like “knowing my neighbourhood and knowing the people in it” (House of Constantine, 2015). CPTED theorists note that familiarity is essential to feeling territorial ownership over a space, but perhaps overemphasize the need to demarcate private versus public spaces as this has little significance to participants (Crowe, 2013).

Familiarity helps designate the users of the space, as well as their potential uses, which is a recognized facet of safety planning. Once someone knows how others operate a space, it becomes easier for them to learn how to navigate it (Crowe, 2013). Another femme presenting participant affirms the need for familiarity and recognition when they say that the West End of the city feels uncomfortable. They get catcalled there aggressively with comments regarding their gender and race. They feel unsafe in neighbourhoods were there very few people of colour, and they consequently get met with stares and menacing glances. The participant feels safer in Scarborough, where they have lived almost their whole life, because they know how operate in that setting. They like how their neighbourhood in Scarborough is community oriented and well-lit. CPTED strategies recognize the need for community and lighting to create safer communities, but do little to address racism and how recognition is important to combating exclusion and oppression (Crowe, 2013). CPTED strategies need to recognize how racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia and other forms of systemic oppression affect perceptions of safety in order to truly design safer cities for everyone.

The layering of spaces created by and for marginalized people complicates safety planning. Notably the Gay Village is a fraught site of inclusion. A participant, who lives in the Gay Village, says that they feel unsafe when they encounter harassment in the neighbourhood. The participant says that “for people who are really homophobic, there is something about this neighbourhood that makes them more on edge” (Open Call, 2015). They also recount that they were once walking home in the Village and had someone lean out of their car and ask them, “are you going out to spread AIDS?” (Open Call, 2015). Another participant was physically attacked in a gay bashing incident in the Village. The participants point out that perhaps gay bashing happens in the Village due to the area being marked as visibly queer.

The interview participant from Fred Victor says that their clients often see strength in numbers as superseding the risk arising from visibility. Many of their clients are harassed in the area near Fred Victor, notably around Moss Park in Toronto’s downtown east end. In the interview, Moss Park is described as a public park where “there’s lots of people who hang out,
lots of shelters around that corner, so there’s a lot of foot traffic, a lot of people around, and yeah... I’ve heard a lot of times of [my clients] being verbally harassed” (Fred Victor, 2015a). Clients have been chased from that corner, assaulted and verbally harassed regularly. The interviewee mentions that the Thrive program taking place during the day on a weekday makes clients feel safer accessing the space, as well as travelling in a group.

Interestingly, although strength in numbers is identified by the Fred Victor interviewee as important to their clients, in the previous subsection, their clients do not necessarily want to live in the Village. They say that in general their clients live there

for housing, they don’t want to leave the downtown core. They don’t want to go far east. They don’t want to go far north. They don’t want to go far west. It’s a thing. That’s been identified many times. A lot of people feel like the downtown core is the safest. Not necessarily the Village, but the downtown core … it’s really tough for people, they will say ‘oh but it’s in Scarborough, oh but it’s in North York. So they’ve had hesitations to go. (Fred Victor, 2015a).

Clients identify that the Village, although visibly associated with LGBTQ2+ communities, can actually be exclusive and transphobic. The downtown core is identified as a place that is safer, but not all clients feel safe in the Village. Feeling safe or unsafe in the Village is identified as a divide amongst the trans people who access the Thrive program.

Because the downtown is more expensive to rent compared to the periphery of the city, lots of clients have to take a “crappy downtown apartment over a nice apartment farther away. A lot of people share a space or wait in the shelter” (Fred Victor, 2015a). Nash & Gorman-Murray (2014) use the concept of ‘motility’ in a case study of gentrification and queerness in Toronto. Motility describes the ability to be mobile and is limited by identities and constructs like class, race, gender, and sexuality (Nash & Gorman-Murray, 2014). Class is a significant factor mentioned in the interview with Fred Victor staff as a barrier to mobility and housing, which intersects with race, colonialism, gender and sexuality.

Participants of colour note that race is a factor in the creation of public safety. In the online survey, 66.7% of racialized survey participants selected that they have no problem being a member of a racialized community and the LGBTQ2+ community in their neighbourhood. About 26.7% of racialized participants selected that they do feel safe as long as people do not know that they are LGBTQ2+, and only 6.7% of racialized participants selected that they do not feel safe being visibility racialized and LGBTQ2+ in their neighbourhood. It is noteworthy that the overall sample of the survey overwhelmingly selected that they are not a member of a racialized community (59.9%). Although they are not quantitatively represented, localized community creation for queers of colour and learning how to operate certain neighbourhoods are closely linked.
A Marvelous Grounds interviewee expands upon the experiences of queers of colour in their neighbourhoods and communities (see Figure 7 in Chapter 2 for map of queer geographies). The interviewee speaks to the specific experiences of queer people of colour in Toronto. They speak to how queer people of colour experience harassment differently than other groups in Toronto. On street harassment, they say:

I live right now in Scarborough, it’s like a Caribbean community. I’m Caribbean and my family is Caribbean. And being told to smile, being asked where I’m from, being told I’m pretty, and a lot of things on the regular is something that happens. A lot of people would walk through that neighbourhood and be like, ‘Oh my god, that’s harassment’, and I’m not going to be like that ... It would be fair for somebody to be like ‘when I walk through that neighbourhood I think it’s unfair, I think that is harassment’. If they wanted to define it as harassment, that’s their thing to do. But for me to call it harassment, it would be erasing of a lot of things. It would be not helpful, I think. I find it a lot easier to call it harassment when I lived in the Gay Village for several years. It was the most incredible examples of harassment from police, specifically to Indigenous communities. For me, that was harassment. When I saw street involved Indigenous people pick up off the street and moved by cops, that’s harassment. When I see people calling the cops on people because they’ve been sitting there for too long, that’s harassment. When I see things like, you know of Church Street for Halloween, there’s a ton of really racist costumes, a lot of mockery of communities of colour by gay communities, that’s harassment. (Marvelous Grounds, 2015a).

The person from Marvelous Grounds is careful to state that people can feel however they wish regarding safety and experiences of street harassment and catcalling. They recognize that some people feel safer in the Gay Village because they are gay and are surrounded by gay people there, and that the same people may feel unsafe in Scarborough as a visibly queer person. Just because they see safety differently doesn’t necessarily create a definite view of what areas are safe and unsafe in the city. This analysis deconstructs the CPTED principles of “normal” and “abnormal” uses and behaviour by interrupting a static notion of what makes a space feel safe or unsafe. The Marvelous Grounds participant allows for multiple legitimized views of safety within different geographic and cultural contexts.

One of the interview participants from Kulanu says that they feel the most comfortable in the Village, as well as navigating Queer West and Kensington Market. Outside of the core, this person feels increasingly more comfortable in midtown in the Yonge and Eglinton area, but still a bit guarded. They said that in the “Financial district I don’t feel comfortable. Certainly up in Thornhill … big Jewish population, more Orthodox, more traditionally Jewish, I don’t feel like they’re more open minded compared to this area or downtown. So, I would say certain pockets downtown” (Kulanu, 2015). The comparison between the person from Marvelous Grounds’ experience of safety compared to Kulanu reveals the different geographies navigated by various communities in Toronto. The person from Marvelous Grounds speaks to the Caribbean community and their familial affiliation to said community in Scarborough, whereas the person
from Kulanu speaks to navigating Jewish neighbourhoods in northern Toronto and Thornhill. It is not only identities that mark differences between experiences of safety, but the geographies that identity formation takes that are essential to spatializing safety.

A uniting factor between geographies of culture, community and queerness in Toronto is code switching. The person from Marvelous Grounds brings up code switching in their interview. Code switching refers to changing between different languages or patois of the same language, using elements of various dialects while conversing (Kracht & Klein, 2014). The code switching the participants is speaking to is more spatial than linguistic. They say:

> a lot with queer communities of colour is learning how to code switch, from neighbourhood to neighbourhood, home to home – it’s something that often happens. Learning to dress differently, learning how to act differently, express yourself differently, mannerism and walking differently, from space to space based on the reactions you think you’re going to get. (Marvelous Grounds, 2015a).

Both interview participants from Kulanu speak to a spatial code switching as well. They both mention avoiding hand holding and visible cues that they are in a queer relationship in conservative Jewish neighbourhoods, as well many spaces outside the downtown core (Kulanu, 2015). The interview participant from Fred Victor mentions that one of their clients will not dress in feminine clothes, given the risk of harassment for presenting as gender nonconforming. Code switching is a queer survival tool in a homophobic and transphobic society to help secure feelings of safety in public spaces.

The broader social and psychological aspects of space are also very important to consider. The person from Egale says in their interview that they believe that the way we talk about safety is often too focused on the individual. They say, “it’s not that the identity of the person is triggering or inflicting violence against them, but it is very much so the social context that legitimize violence against certain [bodies] … the people who need to be securing safety for marginalized folks are not necessarily marginalized folks” (Egale, 2015). CPTED seeks to get away from the individualized policy of addressing perpetrators, and instead advocates for a holistic approach of analyzing fear generating factors. Campbell (2005) takes the holistic approach further while criticizing CPTED. Campbell (2005) writes that CPTED focuses too much on the victim’s sense of fear. Campbell (2005) believes that analyzing safety and crime should focus not only on the victim but instead on the entitlement of the perpetrator. The onus of creating safe spaces should not be entirely places on marginalized people. The onus of listening to their experiences of marginalized people and validating their right to live free from fear of profiling, harassment and other instances of violence is on those who experience privilege.

Feeling safe is essential to the comfort and well-being of LGBTQ2+ people in cities. Familiarity with certain neighbourhoods and spaces is mentioned as a source of perceived safety for participants. Code switching is a survival tool used by several participants to self-police their
behaviour and visibility in order to operate the city’s various geographies. Although participants have specific locations they associate with a lack of safety, on the whole, concerns regarding safety are pervasive throughout various geographies in the city along the axes of identity, visibility, and marginality.

Conclusion

LGBTQ2+ individuals experience safety and selfhood differently than those outside these communities. Once an intersectional approach is brought into the analysis of safety and identity formation, it is clear that even within the LGBTQ2+ community, there are varying conceptions, and expectations of urbanized safety based on participant’s answers regarding the visibility of class, gender and race. The factors that make participants feel unsafe in cities include an interlayering of interpersonal incidents, with a strong emphasis on institutionalized neglect and violence. Acts of violence are interlocking for participants on systemic, interpersonal and lateral terms. Systemic tenets of inclusion and exclusion permeate throughout the image put forth by participants in their perceived safety and incidents of discrimination and assault throughout various urban spaces. Familiarity with certain neighbourhoods, self-regulation and self-policing, as well as spatial code switching, demonstrates the ability of LGBTQ2+ individuals to create safer experience of public spaces in the face of adversity due to discrimination and normativity.
Chapter 6 - Discrimination and Reporting

Summary of Chapter 6

- Participants generally do not report incidents of discrimination to the police.
- Participants do not report to the police because they are afraid of being retraumatized, having the police not take them seriously, and that the police will blame them for a crime they did not commit.
- Participants go to service organizations, friends, social media, partners and to nobody at all when confronted with discrimination.

Introduction

Discrimination and reporting of hate driven crimes are an important launching point to safety looking at creating safer cities for LGBTQ2+ people. Although much less story rich than the previous chapter defining safety, violence and harassment on primarily qualitative terms, the collection of quantitative data in triangulation with the interviews and focus groups conducted broadens the narrative of the thesis more broadly. The overarching argument that the LGBTQ2+ community experiences safety differently than those who enjoy the privileges of fitting into a heteronormative mold remains throughout this work (Doan, 2011). The following subsection, ‘Discrimination – Comparative Analysis’, looks at the participant responses regarding whether discrimination was experienced in public spaces, on what grounds was their harassment experienced, and whether or not it measures up to the data being collected by Toronto Police Services. The comparative analysis broadens the narrative around LGBTQ2+ hate crimes, especially since the Toronto Police provides little detail on the nature of hate crime data they provide to the public. The results hope to reconcile the underreporting of hate crimes to the Toronto Police with participant concerns around the police being a site of institutional violence. Reporting to police, or other resources, is covered in greater detail in the second subsection ‘Reporting’. The fraught relationship between the LGBTQ2+ community and the Toronto Police is contextualized by participants in the second subsection. The chapter provides an image of what mechanisms are already in place to address LGBTQ2+ safety, recognizing that traditional concepts of crime, safety and policing do not sufficiently address institutionalized violence and layered meanings of ‘unsafe’.
Discrimination: A Comparative Analysis

The Toronto Police provides data regarding the current landscape of hate crimes in the city. Their most recent report is the “Toronto Police Services 2014 Annual Hate/Bias Crime Statistical Report”. The report defines hate crimes as “criminal offense which are committed against persons or property and are motivated by the victim’s race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, or other similar factors” (Intelligence Services, Hate Crime Unit, 2014, p. 2). The online survey asks participants to record incidents of discrimination as well, but uses the wording from the Ontario Human Rights Code, which protects against discrimination due to race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, disability and conviction for an offence for which a pardon has been granted or in respect of which a record suspension has been ordered. The Ontario Human Rights Code was used because the definition of hate crime used by Toronto Police does not include gender. In this subsection, quantitative data from the online survey and from the Toronto Police will be coded to create an image of the statistical landscape of hate crime reporting in Toronto, in order to triangulate the results with qualitative data in the next subsection.

The Toronto police report states that the three most targeted groups since 2006 (in order of most to least) are the Jewish community, the LGBTQ community and the Black community. In 2014 alone, there were forty four occurrences of Jewish hate crimes (30%), twenty seven occurrences of LGBTQ hate crimes (18%), twenty anti-Black hate crimes (14%), and sixteen Anti-Muslim hate crimes (11%). Other groups were generally targeted due to nationality, and in some cases also implicitly targeted race, but did not have over five incidents of hate crime per group. Most other groups targeted, such as Iranian, African, Croatian and Somali people, had one incident of hate crimes in 2014. Other groups make up 17% of total reported hate crimes.

The Toronto Police do their own form of intersectional analysis around the multiplicity of identities. When more than one group is targeted at the same time in a hate crime, the Toronto Police considers it to be a ‘multi-bias’ incident. There were fourteen multi-bias occurrences (10%), which are coded in the report based on affiliation to the Black community, Jewish community and LGBTQ community. About 52 occurrences are affiliated with the Jewish community (45%) and another identity, 34 with the LGBTQ community and another identity (30%), and 29 with the Black community and some other identity (25%). The most common offences victimizing LGBTQ people were assault, followed by criminal harassment and mischief.

The online survey conducted by the researcher paints a slightly different picture. Less than half of the survey respondents select that they have encountered discrimination (34.1%). Out of the survey respondents who have experienced discrimination, they are overwhelmingly targeted for sexual orientation (thirty six participants, or 21.6% of participants who have
experienced discrimination), followed by gender (twenty eight participants or 16.8%), and sex (fourteen participants or 8.4%). Out of those who were targeted for their sexual orientation, most identify as queer, and their gender as trans and/or as female. The Toronto police recorded twenty seven LGBTQ hate crimes, while the survey has thirty six reported incidents of discrimination due to sexual orientation, twenty one of which happened in the last twelve months, which is shocking as the Toronto Police’s sample size is arguably all 2.7 million people who live in Toronto, whereas the online survey has a qualifying sample of a hundred and sixty seven. A notable reason for this discrepancy is the stricter definition of hate crimes used by police, versus the emphasis on subtle harassment and microaggressions in participant survey responses.

Gender is notably not included in the Toronto Police Services report on hate crimes, which indicates that they are missing a large number of discriminatory incidents. The category of ‘sex’ has been included in the Toronto Police’s definition of hate crimes since 2006, but they do not have any recorded incidents of hate crimes motivated by sex until 2014 (Intelligence Services, Hate Crime Unit, 2013, 2014). It is notable that until 2014, the Toronto Police categorized anti-trans violence under ‘sexual orientation’ and changed the designation of anti-trans crime to ‘sex’, which sparked the first reported accounts of discrimination due to sex. The change in hate crime categorization indicates that previously the police conflated sex, gender and sexual orientation into one category, ignoring the different experiences and layering of these identities. The change in reporting took place because of Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) report that recommends “that police services report hate/bias crimes targeting members of the Transgender community under either the sex or gender category for the purpose of comparability across jurisdictions” (Intelligence Services, Hate Crime Unit, 2014, p. 3). On top of allowing for better cross-comparability, in the LGBTQ2+ community, trans is generally considered to be a gender identity, and not a sexual orientation (Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network, 2013).

Reflecting this view, one participant in the online survey points out why using ‘sex’ instead of just ‘gender’ in the survey is problematic by writing “Why the hell is gender separate from sex? Can people on the street tell what's in your pants?!?” in the comment box. The distinction of gender as an identity and sex as a biological designation often imposed by normative medical institution is important. The Ontario Human Rights Code specifically refers to sex in terms of breastfeeding and pregnancy, whereas gender identity and gender expression has less to do with chromosomes, genitals and other biological determinants. Calling sex into question is relevant since many people may not have a normative sex designation that matches their lived gender. Although the participant makes a strong point, other participants did select sex in the survey as a source of discrimination, which makes the case that such terminology is useful to some people. Particularly if data is being collected on discrimination in a medical context, such as hospitals, biological sex may be pertinent. Not including gender as a source of discrimination, however, is an oversight on the part of Toronto Police, which can be rectified in future iterations of their reporting on hate crimes.
Survey respondents have a lower rate of response around religion and race compared to Toronto Police data. 4.8% of the survey respondents were targeted due to race or ethnicity, 2.4% due to national origin and 1.2% due to colour. Religion has a low response rate of 0.6%, or one respondent, who selected that they faced discrimination due to being a Muslim. No respondent who selected that they are Jewish selected that they faced Anti-Semitic discrimination, despite seven times the respondents identifying as Jewish (14 respondents or 8.4%) compared to Muslim (two respondents or 1.2%) in the survey overall. It is notable that there is an underrepresentation of people of colour in the survey responses, as well as a strong representation of people who identify as having no religion, which strongly influences the low response rate of these two categories. The survey also specifically sought to recruit members of the LGBTQ2+ community to gather their experiences of safety in public spaces, and so the emphasis on sexual orientation, gender and sex in the results are unsurprising.

Many of the forms of discrimination faced by participants are not physically violent, but instead are in the realm of microaggressions. Glance or staring as well as verbal comments (other than threats) are the most selected form of discrimination enacted against participants (66.7%), followed by verbal threats (59.6%), and being chased or followed (29.8%). The ethereal verbal and behavioral nature of harassment and discrimination through microaggressions and verbal comments are untenable to the limitations of defined crime.

Participants were asked if they have been ever harassed, assaulted or encountered an unsafe situation in their neighbourhood for reasons other than discrimination. Only 12.6% of participants selected yes to encountering incidents that would not be considered discrimination, compared to 34.1% who selected yes to encountering discrimination. The importance of collecting data around normalized daily occurrences of harassment is highlighted in the comments made by participants on their experiences of unsafe encounters. Several participants say that they experience catcalling regularly, while others write that they have been accosted by people with mental health issues on the street. Others say that they have been in physical assaults with members of the LGBTQ2+ community. The complexities of violence, safety and multiple marginalities are covered in the previous chapter in detail. In the context of discrimination, however, the multiplicity of incidents and types of assault encountered demonstrates the limitations of what institutions like the police would consider to be criminal or even worthy of reporting.

The Toronto Police report only gathers data on physical assault, damaged property or threats of physical violence. The criminal justice system often requires exhaustive evidence and proof, which is most easily found in blatantly violent and easily definable cases of harassment (Campbell, 2005; Crowe, 2013). Being stared at, or encountering verbal harassment is normalized daily behaviour encountered by many women, members of the LGBTQ2+ community and other marginalized groups (Campbell, 2005; House of Constantine, 2015; Marvelous Grounds, 2015b; Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015). The emphasis put on
microaggressions and nuanced harassment by participants reveals that the concept of hate driven crimes used by the Toronto Police is insufficient to formulating a complete picture of experienced safety in the city. The emphasis on microaggressions, in the age of newspaper articles deriding the language around microaggressions and triggering students on college and university campuses is striking (Lukianoff & Haidt, 2015). Although much effort has perhaps been made on campuses to police what is considered offensive, much to the chagrin of some, this is not the case in most other public and semi-public domains.

The Toronto Police hate crime report recognizes the number of limitations they face in trying to collect reports of discrimination and hate crimes. The report points out that victims may be reluctant to report because the police might not recognize crime as hate driven, and/or they fear of retaliation, and/or feel uncertain of how criminal justice system will respond, and/or they fear of being outed to family, friends or co-workers. People may also feel embarrassed about the occurrence. The Toronto Police works with the Report Homophobic Violence, Period (RHVP) program in partnership with Egale, as well as their internal Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (LGBTQ) Liaison Unit in order to address LGBTQ2+ issues in policing. The gaps around trans reporting of incidents and improving trans policing is in the works through a Trans Media Campaign that hopes to launch in 2015 to educate the Toronto Police on the trans community, as well as increase reporting and decrease incidents of assault (Intelligence Services, Hate Crime Unit, 2014). No further information has been provided by Toronto Police as of December 2015.

It remains to be seen what happens out of the Toronto Police initiatives around LGBTQ2+ issues. Unfortunately, the report does not address that the possible perpetrators of hate crimes could be the police, which might be the reason why people are reluctant to report. In particular, the past year has shown an explosion of extensively publicized anger towards racial profiling in policing throughout North America, which is not addressed in the police report (Hong, 2015; Reynolds, 2015; The Globe and Mail, 2015). The subsequent subsection will delve more into the complicated relationship between various facets of the LGBTQ2+ community and policing in order to provide a clearer picture of institutionalized harassment and the limitations of crime driven safety planning.
Reporting

Introduction

Quantitative survey responses and qualitative data collected through interviews and focus groups triangulate to create an understanding of reporting incidents of discrimination and hate crimes. Overall, participants do not seek help from the police, and instead form their own community based support systems. Qualitative data from the interviews and focus groups helps form a fuller picture of why LGBTQ2+ people do not go to the police when they encounter hate crimes and discrimination, beyond the admittedly self-reflexive reasons presented by the Toronto Police in their annual hate crime report and in the previous subsection. The first section will specifically look at reporting to police, and the second will delve into other community resources used by participants.

Reporting to Police

Introduction

Data collected demonstrates a low rate of reporting incidents of discrimination to the police in LGBTQ2+ communities. The online survey asks participants if they have ever reported any incidents of assault, discrimination or violence to the police. Only three participants, or 5.3% of all participants who selected that they have experienced discrimination period, reported the incident to police. Participants instead contacted friends for support (63.2%), partners (43.9%), or did not reach out for support (29.8%). The qualitative data from the survey, focus groups and interviews helps illuminate the distrust and apprehension towards the police.

All of the interview and focus group participants were asked if they, or if their clients and communities, report incidents of harassment and assault. They were first asked if they report to the police, and why or why not, and then they were asked if they report anywhere else. The responses revealed how differently police relations are with various communities in Toronto, explicitly how such relations intersect with race, class, gender and sexuality. All interviewees said either only some of their clients and communities reported to police, or that none of them did because they view interactions with police as unsafe and traumatizing. Focus group participants similarly did not report to the police, and have mixed feelings about interacting with law enforcement. Many focus group participants feel unsafe in the presence of police, and do not trust their actions. Distrust of police flies in the face of CPTED literature which advocates for increasing police visibility to improve the perception of safety in cities (Crowe, 2013). Interactions with police are framed in the following subsections, ‘Inaction & Accountability’ and ‘Power & Trauma’.
The fear of police inaction and their perceived lack of accountability frames why many participants do not officially report incidents of harassment. Many participants who report to police are afraid that nothing will come of their report. Out of the people who do report to police, the interviewee from Egale says that little comes of it. They say that “mostly we’ve seen people make a report and then it sort of drops out of our consciousness. Very rarely we have someone coming back saying ‘this is the outcome of the report’. I think the reason why that’s happening is that often there is no outcome” (Egale, 2015). The lack of police response to violence decreases trust in their operations and leads to people thinking that they do not care about their concerns.

Conceptions of what is worthy of police attention limits participant’s willingness to report. One survey respondent writes, “I haven’t reported the incidents to the police because I know that being called faggot is not against the law, and having assisted others who were verbally harassed, unless it is consistently coming from the same person for a period of weeks, they won't do anything” (LGBTQ2+ Toronto, 2015). Participants speak to police being ineffective when called for help. One participant in the Open Call group says they call the police so there is a statistic on reported hate crimes, but they do not expect anything to happen from it. Most participants who selected that they do not report to the police wrote that they don’t trust the police, don’t feel comfortable around the police, and that they find the police dismissive.

The interviewee from Fred Victor speaks to the lack of trust towards the police in trans communities. They said that their clients “have had previous bad experiences with police, they’re afraid of the police, and sort of get brushed off often …. They’re kind of at the point of frustration of ‘why bother?’, because it’s painful to tell those stories and nobody is going to do anything about it” (Fred Victor, 2015a). The person from Marvelous Grounds (2015) similarly says, “I would be really surprised if people went to police when they knew they wouldn’t do anything about it”. The police are known through stories told within the LGBTQ2+ community to be insensitive towards gender presentation, sexual assault victims and other forms of marginality, which impacts people’s likelihood to report (Marvelous Grounds, 2015a).

The interviewee from Egale brought up that there is a sense that after you report incidents of assaults to police, you are supposed to be done processing the events that have taken place. They say in the interview that after you report “once that’s finished you’re left to deal with it … some people think that after you report, the trauma ends, and you don’t have the “right”, quote-unquote, to talk about it anymore because you already dealt with it. I think that’s definitely a fear, especially with sexual assault” (Egale, 2015). Processing and healing after incidents of sexual, emotional and physical assault do not involve the police for many LGBTQ2+ communities.
Participants recount the police coming to the scene of a recent assault and not helping them. Another participant says they were raped for three hours when they were thirteen in their natal country in the Caribbean, and were found by the police. The police insinuated that they were interested in the sexual encounter, and shamed them. On the incident, they say:

I wasn’t even embarrassed, I was so confused. I was confused because the police actually made me feel like I insinuated interest in this person. This person was thirty and I was thirteen … [I was] giving police and hospital reports, transferring from station to station, to tell the story one too many times … I honestly think people don’t want to go through all that. (Open Call, 2015).

Another participant had a similar story involving the police in Toronto not taking their complaint seriously. They say they were being harassed while giving a performance during Pride in Etobicoke. The participant’s ex-boyfriend called the police on the aggressor. The police showed up after the aggressor and the ex-boyfriend had left, and began to question the participant. The police insinuated that there was no harassment, and that the participant’s ex-boyfriend called them in because he was jealous. In both examples, police officers brought their biases to the scene of violent assault to the detriment of victims.

The interviewee from Egale points out the complications of reporting to police for marginalized people. Notably many of the youth who access Egale’s OUTreach counselling and drop-in are struggling with housing insecurity and homelessness, meaning that they are often trying to figure out where to stay on a nightly basis, if not also trying to find access to food. The interviewee says, “if I have to figure out what I’m eating tonight and I have to figure out where I’m sleeping tonight, the last thing on my mind is reporting something that is unlikely to bring me restoration or compensation or any sort of justice” (Egale, 2015). They also bring up that if assault happens within a family, reporting it is more complicated and fraught.

The interviewee from Supporting Our Youth also says that their clients have mixed views on reporting to police. They say that whether someone who accesses their services decides to report to the police:

comes down to the individual and who they are. Whether they trust the police. Certainly Black youth in Toronto have little reason to trust the police. I’ve had trans youth who are sex workers talking about the harassment they’ve received from police. For many folks that we work with the police are a last ditch effort if they comfortable with that. (Supporting Our Youth, 2015).

The interviewee from Supporting Our Youth brings up the complicated relationship between people of colour and the police in Toronto. There has been many reports of police profiling of young Black men, and over surveilling their activities (Cole, 2015). They also bring up that for many communities of colour, sex workers, and other marginalized people, the police are the instigators of assault and violence. The view of the police as unsafe and ineffective is not
addressed in much of the public safety planning literature, despite it complicating the concept that surveillance and policing help communities feel safer. The concept of policing as a source of safety directly addresses the framing of ‘abnormal’ versus ‘normal’ uses of city spaces in CPTED literature. Those outside the norms are viewed as undeserving of police protection, and instead are often unjustly treated as criminals.

*Power & Trauma*

Intersectional identities, along the axes of religious, gender, sexuality, and race, are strongly linked to the likelihood of participants feeling safe enough to report incidents of harassment, assault or other violence to police. Many participants feel re-traumatized by the police due to their at times violent interpretation of crimes reported to them. The importance of positionality when reporting to police frames the systemic nature of violence that permeates throughout participant experiences.

Law enforcement is a site of trauma for many participants. One participant in the House of Constantine focus group recounts being detained for three days after reporting a crime, because the police assumed they were involved. Another participant was detained for nine hours for similar reasons. Another participant was punched on the street by a stranger. When they reported the incident to the police, the police asked if they were in the person’s way. These responses to reporting victimization dissuade participants from going to the police again.

The interviewee from Kulanu speaks to a complicated community relationship with the police. They say that they would imagine many younger people would be hesitant to go to police expecting help. They also further complicate their community’s relationship with the police by pointing out that the mainstream Jewish community has a great relationship with the police, whereas lots of queer people have a fraught relationship with the police. The intersections of Jewish and queer relationships with the police create a mixed response to reporting assault in those communities.

The complicated intersections of queerness and Jewish identity are reflected in the online survey results as well, which did not include any incidents linking Anti-Semitism to experiences of discrimination. The reason for this underreporting in the survey can be attributed to many factors, including the small sample size and recruitment of exclusively LGBTQ2+ identified individuals, without a strong focus on recruiting religious groups. The low response rate around reporting incidents to police in the survey results overall reflects a systemic distrust which must be addressed institutionally. Further, no matter whether discrimination is reported in an online survey, or to the police, or not at all, the incident is still a sign that accountability and safety planning is essential in cities.

The Marvelous Grounds and House of Constantine focus groups unanimously say that they do not contact police to report incidents of harassment. One participant in the former group
says that if they go to the police, they “don’t trust I’d be taken care of” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Another says that going to police is re-traumatizing because of the way they get treated by them, and that their goal when trying to deal with incidents of harassment is not to get someone in trouble with the police, but instead to address systemic oppression and allow themselves to heal.

One participant in the Open Call group similarly does not call the police because they are afraid the police will abuse their power. They say that police have a lot of power to make-up their own version of events. The participant says when you deal with the police “you go in there as a victim, and you are treated like you are far from a victim … they [the police] have so much power that they can create anything out of nothing. So why give them seed for them to do that?” (Open Call, 2015). Fear that the police will either abuse their power, or neglect to do their job, drives not wanting to report incidents of harassment or asking them for help.

Much of the data on discrimination and the misuse of police power in Toronto reveals that people of colour, specifically Black and Brown people, are disproportionally profiled, harassed and assaulted by police and civilians (CBC News, 2015; “Checking-In on Evan Solomon allegations, herding sheep, daydreaming and more,” 2015; Intelligence Services, Hate Crime Unit, 2014). Racism is mentioned in all the focus groups and interviews, and participants were asked whether their race or ethnicity impacted their feelings of safety and likelihood to report incidents of assault. Several survey respondents also mention race as being a factor in whether or not they report to the police, highlighting that the American landscape of the ‘Black Lives Matter’ movement is something experienced in Canada as well.

One participant says in the House of Constantine focus group when asked if they go to the Police, “do you see that most people here are Black?” (House of Constantine, 2015). Interestingly, this comment comes from out of the biologically related participants who were affirming their assertiveness around not feeling unsafe in Toronto throughout the focus group. They later on say that they do not trust the police and would rather deal with situations themselves. The assertiveness and lack of trust in the police on the part of Black participants in this focus group is a crucial portrayal of agency. Black embodiments are portrayed in the literature as either the victims of systemic brutality or as the instigators of random acts of violence (Koskela & Pain, 2000; Pain, 2001). Here, these two participants demonstrate an awareness of distrust of institutions like the police due to racial profiling and other racist practices, while also embodying an incredible amount of agency and sense of community.

Race and age intersect in one of the participant’s stories of why they do not report incidents to the police. They say they called over the police during a fight between two teenagers at a Toronto high school. The police shot one of the youth involved because he was pulling a pencil out of his pocket, and the police presumably thought it was a weapon. The participant describes this high school as a “half Black school and police are always there” (House of Constantine, 2015). Seeing their unarmed schoolmate get shot confirmed the participant’s fear of the police.
One participant says that they do not go to the police because they are afraid of being racially profiled and shot. They say:

In the past month, three Black men have been shot by police officers. In the last month. Things that are happening in the [United] States are happening in Toronto too. They’re shooting our brothers down without a second thought. So no, I’m not going to report to police officers. I’m afraid of talking to them because I’m afraid of becoming a victim. (House of Constantine, 2015).

Tensions have been high in Toronto after multiple shootings of unarmed Black men throughout Toronto by police (Reynolds, 2015). It is unsurprising that in this current political climate of police mistrust that participants, especially participants of colour, would not go to police to report instances of assault and harassment. Much like for the trans people interviewed in the Fred Victor focus group, for these participants, the police is a site of violence.

Another participant in the Open Call group says that as a non-binary person, they are aware that lots of trans and non-binary people experience violence enacted by the police, and they would not go to them for help because of that. They say that the police need to step up and be educated on how to ethically deal with sex workers, trans and non-binary people, as well as people of colour. Other participants say that police need sensitivity training, as well as training offered to the public on how their reporting system works. Participants in the House of Constantine, Marvelous Grounds affiliated group and Fred Victor all mention the Toronto Police needing some form of sensitivity training.

Calling the police for help during a violent situation is the last resort for many participants. The Fred Victor focus group participants say that they would exclusively call police if they were dying. They say that systemic change is needed. They speak to carrying knives and being prepared to defend themselves in public spaces, and that such “vigilante justice reflects a broken system” (Fred Victor, 2015b). There is a long history of LGBTQ2+ vigilante justice through community patrols and self-defence classes, all of which are explicitly in response to a justice and policing system that does not serve the need of diverse queer and trans people (Nash, 2014; The Gay Liberation Union, 1979; The Right to Privacy Committee, 1981).
**Conclusion**

Overall LGBTQ2+ community support trumps the need to formally report incidents of harassment and assault to police. Not only is there a sense that nothing can or will be done by police after reporting, but in many communities, the police are a site of violence and assault. The qualitative data collected on whether community members report to police calls into question how accurate police data is on incidents of LGBTQ2+ hate crimes in Toronto. Participants of colour, trans and non-binary participants in particular have little reason to trust the police. The layering of identities and lived experiences complicates the likelihood of reporting to police, as discussed by the Kulanu interviewee in regards to the great relationship mainstream Jewish communities have with the police compared to the fraught relationship many queer people have with the police. The intermingling of these determinants of safety and reporting complicates experiences of urbanized violence.

**Other Resources**

Participants use many methods of reporting and processing incidents of violence, harassment and assault in public spaces. Many of these strategies do not involve reporting incidents of harassment and assault to the police. The strategies utilized by participants include talking to friends, going online, and even doing nothing at all. The following subsection will look at the various coping mechanisms used by LGBTQ2+ people in Toronto when confronted with safety issues.

Interviewees speak of community members wanting affirmation and acknowledgement after incidents of harassment and assault, and that such reactions come most readily from LGBTQ2+ service providers. LGBTQ2+ communities often access resources and services that either cater to their respective communities or personal communities. Although the interviewee from Rainbow Health Ontario could not speak to whether their clients report to the police, due to the nature and scope of their work, they did say that people will access their organization after encountering harassment in the healthcare system. It is notable that institutionalized incidents of microaggressions and assault may not lend itself to going to the police and feeling heard. Service providers help provide support to community members in incidents that may not necessarily be within the scope of what the police conventionally considers to be criminal discrimination or assault.

The interviewees from Kulanu, Fred Victor, Supporting Our Youth and Egale also mention that clients and community members will access their services after incidents of assault or harassment. The only organization interviewed that does any formalized reporting around LGBTQ2+ violence is Egale. Many organizations mention that they do not have the capacity to deal with reporting incidents of assault. Kulanu says that they send people to other organizations for support, and hope to work towards a world where members of the LGBTQ2+ Jewish community feel comfortable talking to their rabbi about their gender and sexual identity. Fred
Victor’s Thrive program offers informal counselling to trans people who have encountered transphobic violence. The interviewee from Fred Victor says clients go to Maggie’s, which is a program for and by sex workers, as well as Elizabeth Fry and Meal Trans which both offer a drop-in program for trans people. Fred Victor offers support around coping with transphobic violence, and will support clients going through the reporting process (Fred Victor, 2015a).

The interviewee from Supporting Our Youth explicitly says that for their clients “it’s more about coping with what happened than it is about pressing charges, finding who is guilty” (Supporting Our Youth, 2015). They say that people go to the Supporting Our Youth program for support, as well as the Griffin Centre and Egale. If they are in need of legal help or want to press charges, clients go to the Justice for Children and Youth, which is a legal service for low income youth (Supporting Our Youth, 2015).

Some participants document incidents and try to file a complaint to authority figures who are not the police. One participant was being stalked while living in social housing, and documented the stalker’s behaviour and brought their concern with documentation to security. Security in the social housing unit said that they knew about the stalker, but subsequently did nothing about it to make the participant feel safer. The participant says that they felt like “nobody took me seriously” (Fred Victor, 2015b). Feeling brushed off, or that reporting instances of harassment leads to no results, is a serious problem expressed by several focus group and interview participants regarding law enforcement authorities in particular.

Other participants go to family, chosen family, friends, social service workers, security guards in housing or use music as a release. Many participants deal with instances of assault and harassment themselves. The ones who assert that they do not need help dealing with assault say that they will not go looking for a fight, but if the encounter goes there they are ready. Some participants pray or talk to God. Another participant goes to a therapist weekly. Another participant says that they are their own therapist (House of Constantine, 2015). These are only among some of the tactics used for queer survival.

Participants mention how, who, and if they do talk to someone, depends heavily on context. One person says that if they are in an altercation, they may leave their friends out of it because they do not want both of them to get beaten up. Another participant says that depending on the context, they will “find someone I trust who either has authority or has experience in conflict resolution. There are people I trust around that but not many” (House of Constantine, 2015). The focus group participants from House of Constantine have a way of conceptualizing safety that prioritizes chosen family and community but is weary and mistrustful of institutions and privilege.

One participant in the Open Call focus group likes to talk to neutral friends who are not in the LGBTQ2+ community. Another Open Call focus group participant finds support from their mom, who does not understand queer identities but understands love of her child. Another
participant says they cannot talk to their mom because they are afraid she will worry too much and that it will affirm their mom’s fears that being queer is really hard. Dealing with both their personal feelings of fears, as well as a loved one’s concerns, can be taxing on some participants.

Other resources accessed by participants to cope with feeling unsafe and incidents of harassment include reaching out to community members and seeking seclusion and time to heal. Many participants go to social media, like Facebook, to post about incidents of harassment in order to receive affirmation.

Supporting Our Youth, Egale and Marvelous Grounds all mention community members going online for support. The interviewee from Supporting Our Youth says that Tumblr is a useful tool for venting about hate crimes, discrimination and violence for queer and trans youth. They say that Tumblr is a “way of feeling heard” (Supporting Our Youth, 2015). The interviewee from Marvelous Grounds mentions people going on Facebook to see affirmation from friends after incidents of assault or harassment in public spaces. Crowe (2013) updates CPTED strategies by recognizing the role online spaces play in 21st century lives. Interview participants frame the internet as a positive space for community building and recognition for LGBTQ2+ people, Crowe (2013) points out that anonymized online spaces and hacking can also make these spaces unsafe.

Interestingly, social media and the internet are also cited as a source of harassment for participants. One participant says they encounter the most aggressive messages while playing online games, which are not necessarily tied to their gender, sexuality or race, but instead are linked to their ability to play the game. Another participant says that when reading articles online and checking the comments section, they encounter a lot of oppressive language and opinions on their identities that are very hurtful.

Participants do not always reach out for support after incidents of unsafe behaviour, assault or harassment. Some say that they prefer to keep the incidents to themselves and do not reach out for support. Some participants do not talk to people in the communities, because they are afraid of gossip and rumors being spread about them. One participant says “I don’t tell people shit … I don’t like to talk to people because one day, they’re your friends and the next day, they’re not” (Open Call, 2015). One participant says that seclusion is their coping strategy of choice, but they feel guilty at times for doing this because they feel their experiences of harassment could be worse. One participant points out that language can be a barrier to accessing help, and reaching out “becomes especially difficult when people don’t have the privilege of speaking the language we are speaking right now” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Participants speak to not knowing where to access services that are safe and will not make them feel worse. Several participants in this focus group session say that they cannot reach out to anyone.

Common coping mechanisms used by participants in lieu of reporting or talking about the incident to an organization or person involve self-medication and self-care. Two participants in
the Open Call group say that they turn to self-medication when they need to release experiences of harassment and assault. They both turn to consuming marijuana and alcohol at home alone when they need time to heal. One participant says they smoke weed, put their headphones on, and play inspiration music to relax. Another participant goes for run and meditates when they need to relax. Another participant likes to write.

Participants exhibit a great amount of agency around what they choose to do when trying to cope with incidents of harassment or assault around their gender, sexual, racial or other aspects of their identities. Participants stress that often reporting has less to do with punishing a perpetrator, and more to do with coping with the incident. Reporting to the police is undesirable because they operate from a punishment based model, on top of the inaction and trauma mentioned in the previous chapter. Although participants may not be able to control when someone decides to act hatefully towards them, they seem to have their own ways of dealing with specific conflicts by negotiating safety for queer survival.

Conclusion

The qualitative data collected through the focus groups and interviews shed some light on why there is such a low response rate in the survey on whether participants reported incidents of discrimination to the police. All of the participants in the focus groups and interviews report mixed feelings towards engaging with the police. The participants fear inaction, abuse of power and traumatic experiences when dealing with the police. For many communities, the police is the instigator of hate motivated assault and negligence. CPTED literature that promotes the presence of police to curb feeling unsafe in cities are not necessarily considering how this dynamic may impact their guidelines (Crowe, 2013). Participants find solace in community connections with friends and partners, or they do not reach out for support at all. The reporting and coping mechanisms used by participants highlight the institutional failings of the police, as well as a need for sensitivity training, which must be addressed further to create safer cities for LGBTQ2+ individuals.
Chapter 7 - Planning for Safer Communities

Summary of Chapter 7

- Participants have a number of social planning and physical planning recommendations to create safer cities.
- Participants recommend gender inclusive bathrooms, community gardens, physical accessibility in new and retrofitted buildings, better creative lighting on the street and around residential buildings, less isolation, and clear sightlines in planning processes and other forms of city building.
- Participants also want clear air, open spaces, greenery, love, peace, happiness and warmth in their cities.
- Sensitivity training is emphasized for everyone in the city, with a special emphasis on the police, public transit employees and private security.
- Participants were prompted to talk about creating an anti-discrimination poster campaign for public transit.
- Participants want more contact with the conductor, garbage bins, an updated request stop program, more night buses and an app or texting service for reporting harassment and discrimination on public transit.
- Video cameras, panic buttons, more security and police, as well as curbing public intoxication are contentious recommendations brought up by participants.

Introduction

Focus group participants were asked to identify both social and physical interventions that could be done in cities to make them safer. Participants were prompted to address their recommendations to speak to planning, but also reflect on city building as a whole. The interventions are meant to address both perceived safety as well as curbing incidents of harassment and assault. Participants’ stories and recommendations on possible interventions are collected to prioritize expert community knowledge of safety. Although participants are asked about social and physical planning, they are most passionate about social interventions. They speak of wanting better programming and more effective education around LGBTQ2+ issues and anti-racism. Even though participants seem to care more about social planning, the use of mixed methods in the thesis is relevant. The methods used focus on participant experiences, which inherently leads to a conversation that focuses on social interventions. Methods that work more towards physical data collection, such as exploratory walks, photo maps, and community and perceptive maps, would likely yield results that would focus more on the built environment.
Participants in the focus groups are asked to specifically speak to how public transit could be made safer in Toronto. They are asked this to help inform a future project that will involve METRAC’s collaboration with the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) on a campaign against sexual violence. The proposed interventions are for transit staff, city planners, law enforcement and other city builders (see Table 2). The answers provided on improving urban spaces more broadly, as well as the TTC specifically, are interwoven in the following two subsections: ‘Built Environment Intervention’ and ‘Social Planning Interventions’.
Table 2 - Recommendations for Safer Cities from Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Planners &amp; Other Policy Makers</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built Environment Interventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Inclusive Bathrooms</td>
<td>• Amend building code by-laws to require gender inclusive bathrooms</td>
<td>• Retrofit existing bathrooms on transit to be gender inclusive</td>
<td>• Retrofit existing bathrooms on police property to be gender inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Amend human rights code to mandate bathroom access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retrofit existing bathrooms in public spaces to be inclusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Transit Vehicles for Comfort and Safety</td>
<td>• Transit planners to consider safety oriented design guidelines where jurisdiction is given</td>
<td>• Use subways where people can walk between cars to get away from perpetrators</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain connection between streetcar and bus conductor and passengers</td>
<td>• Put garbage cans on transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Accessibility</td>
<td>• Human rights code to be updated or built upon for accessibility (e.g. AODA in Ontario)</td>
<td>• Design all stations, buses, streetcars and subways to be accessible</td>
<td>• Make all police stations accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mandate queer and trans inclusivity in healthcare</td>
<td>• Administer staff training on respectfully serving clients with accessibility needs</td>
<td>• Train police to better serve people with disabilities, including most notably mental health issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planners &amp; Other Policy Makers</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Better Creative Lighting** | • Plan well-lit interesting spaces  
• Update building guidelines to include lighting needs  
• Illuminate streets and sidewalks                                                                                                                                     | • Make sure stations and bus stops are well-lit                                                                                                      | N/A             |
| **Reduce Isolation, Poor Sightlines and Seclusion** | • Implement mixed-use zoning to promote vibrant streetscapes  
• Design guidelines should include details on reducing tree foliage, lighting requirements and lack of secluded spaces                                                                                      | • Transit stations and vehicles should be designed to reduce entrapment and poor sightlines  | N/A             |

### Social Planning Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planners &amp; Other Policy Makers</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Community Gardens**   | • Promote turning public green spaces into community gardens  
• Garden must be well programmed to be most useful                                                                                                                  | N/A                                                                                         | N/A             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Planners &amp; Other Policy Makers</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Upgrading Transit Safety and Inclusion Policies** | • Support transit commission within scope of planner jurisdiction  
• Poster campaign on anti-discrimination on all transit modes | • Improve request stop program  
• Increase night bus service  
• Address discrimination through power campaign and sensitivity training for employees  
• Use timed transfers to make it easier for people to switch between transit vehicles to get away from a harasser | N/A |
| **Sensitivity Training**                | • Training administered on LGBTQ2+ inclusivity, anti-racism and anti-classism, as well as respectful dialogue and de-escalation skills  
• Training should be available to everyone (e.g. could organize trainings in schools, workplaces, etc…) | • Training recommended for transit staff | • Anti-oppressive sensitivity training is emphasized as being of particular importance for law enforcement and other authority figures with a significant amount of power |
**Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Services Improved</th>
<th>Planners &amp; Other Policy Makers</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• App or other online interface to report incidents of assault separate from the police needs to be developed in partnership with community organizations</td>
<td>• App or other online reporting system outside of the police is of particular importance on transit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Overall CPTED must reconsider the conceptualization of 'abnormal' and 'normal' uses of spaces to instead build spaces for everyone*
Built Environment Interventions

The built environment and physical planning interventions are not emphasized by the focus group participants, despite its prominence in CPTED and the general literature on safety and planning. The interventions focus group participants mention do reference CPTED interventions, and participants bring in some nuances around the limitation of purely physical interventions. Participants frame physical environmental interventions around the perception of safety in certain neighbourhoods, and other public spaces. Proposed built environment interventions for both state and non-state actors are proposed through areas of need and ideas for change framed by participant positionality.

Certain built environments illicit a greater feeling of fear than others. Survey participants are given a list of public spaces around their neighbourhoods, and asked if they are uncomfortable entering any of the listed spaces. Participants are given the option to choose more than one space. Participants selected that they feel uncomfortable on the street the most (28.7%), followed by bars (25.1%), parks (24.0%), nightclubs (21.6%), public transit (17.4%), stores (10.2%), restaurants (8.4%), workplace (3.6%), and schools (3.0%). Only 3.6% of respondents selected no response, and a high proportion, 26.3%, chose that they feel safe in all these spaces at all time. Out of the participants who selected that they feel safe in all spaces all the time, none of them identify as trans.

Participants elaborated on what physical elements of particular spaces make them feel uncomfortable. In particular, participants emphasize that bars and nightclubs that attract cisgender White men make them feel most uncomfortable. In particular, respondents feel as though their gender is heavily policed in those spaces. One participant writes “depending on the bar/nightclub, I feel like I do not conform to the strict gender division sometimes enforced socially - like I am not ‘female enough’” (LGBTQ2+ Toronto, 2015). Another participant says that gender policing occurs most strikingly in a venue’s bathroom. They write:

I'm just beginning to transition medically, and I'm not recognized as male, yet much of the time even when I'm presenting that way, so I often visit places where I can time when the bathroom will be empty, rush and make sure no one else will enter. I often avoid using the bathroom if they're crowded and worry about future experiences in the washroom.

Participants who are trans or gender variant are highly susceptible to violence due to gender presentation. Bathrooms in particular are a site of gender policing faced by trans and gender variant people, which is a impactful source of anxiety and discomfort (Open Call, 2015). Gender inclusive bathrooms are a strong tenant of built environment changes for LGBTQ2+ people. Public spaces under the mandate of planners, like recreation centres, should strive to be gender inclusive through signage and retrofitting spaces. Recreation centres in Vancouver and Toronto
have had successful trials in all gender change rooms and bathrooms (On the Coast, 2015; Rac, 2014). The onus can additionally be put on business owners to through building codes and by-laws to mandate gender inclusive facilities.

On gender inclusive bathrooms, a participant mentions their disappointment that the newly renovated Union Station, which is a centrally located TTC station, still has gendered bathrooms. As a public entity, transit stations should be designed to serve Toronto’s diverse populations. Trans and non-binary people are often at risk using public bathrooms, and can develop health problems if they opt to not use the bathroom for extended periods of time due to safety concerns. The issue of bathroom access goes beyond just the TTC.

Public transit is discussed by participants with positive feedback about the TTC’s design as well as areas of improvement. Many participants say that they sit near the conductor or near the driver while on the TTC to avoid incidents of harassment, and they like the older streetcars where they have close proximity to the driver. They do not like the new streetcars where the driver is separated by a glass barrier (see Figures 12 and 13). One participant from the Fred Victor focus group said that they like how passengers can go between cars on the new TTC subways to get away from harassers between stops. On the old subways, people would have to wait to get to a subway station to get off and change cars. They would like to see all subways to be designed like the new ones (see Figures 14 and 15). Participants in the House of Constantine focus group said that TTC buses and streetcars need garbage bins to avoid littering.
**Figure 12**

**Streetcars Old**

Old Streetcar with direct access to the conductor  
(Simon 2015)

**Figure 13**

**Streetcars New**

New Streetcar where the conductor is enclosed in the front by a glass barrier  
(RedPat 2011)
Figure 14

Subways Old

Old subway with blocked access between cars (Viloria 2010)

Figure 15

Subways New

New subways with open access between cars (Kalinowski 2010)
Physical accessibility throughout the city is prioritized by several participants. One participant in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated group mentions wanting to put ramps everywhere in the city to grant greater access to those in wheelchairs, using strollers, walking bicycles, using some other device or transportation mode with wheels, and those who have limited physical mobility. Participants in the Fred Victor group talk about wanting greater access to sexual reassignment surgery (SRS) and healing centres. They say that they want doctors to create a free ‘outplant’ machine to be used in Toronto where people can go get top surgery on the spot. Another participant says they would also want to have access to breast implants on the same machine. Accessibility is negotiated as access to healthcare needs as well as the accommodation of space for people living with disabilities. For trans participants in particular access is interlocked with gender presentation.

Gender presentation and recommendations for change are linked outside of marginality. The participants who did not self-identify as femme presenting generally speak to feeling safe everywhere in Toronto. Despite feeling safe overall, most of them could name a couple areas where the physical environment is unpleasant. One participant says that they feel uneasy walking across the Bloor Viaduct bridge because it is a very long stretch of road with only the ability to get on or off of it at either end (see Figure 16). The bridge is also poorly lit and has the reputation of being a place where people jump off and commit suicide. This participant still chooses to walk along the bridge because they think it looks nice at night.
Colourful lighting was installed on the Bloor Viaduct in 2015. Despite the use of blue lighting, the street lamps remain unchanged and work poorly.

(Torstar News Service 2015)
Poorly lit areas exasperate the risk of entrapment because of limited exit and entrance spaces; these are classic CPTED problems exhibited on the Bloor Viaduct. Unfortunately, the nature of the bridge lends itself to offering limited entrance/exist points, which cannot be readily adapted. In anticipation of the 2015 Pan Am Games, however, the City of Toronto installed lighting along the safety barrier of the Bloor Viaduct (Freeman, 2015). The lighting will change with the seasons, veiling the sidewalk in blue light over the summer of 2015 to kick-off its usage. Crowe (2013) notes that the colour and usage of lighting is important in CPTED planning, noting that lighting makes people feel safer and that existing lighting can be modified to reflect behavioural effects. He writes that blue lighting is often associated with authority and concentration, which might be beneficial to use for safety on the viaduct. Crowe (2013) also says that lighting along roadways is only effective when the lighting is not so high that it only illuminates the road and not the sidewalk. The installation on the safety barrier of the viaduct effectively illuminates the sidewalk and helps create a safer feeling on the bridge (Freeman, 2015).

Participants in the Fred Victor focus group mention lighting as well. In the brainstorming session at the end of the focus group, one participant says they would like the entire city to be lit in red, as a symbol that everywhere is a safe red light district. The same participants also want stripper poles at every corner. The symbolic meaning behind red light districts and red lighting as a normalizing force working to the benefit of sex workers is significant. The stripper pole idea is in the same vein. Many participants also want to see more rainbow flags and symbols around the city as a sign of acceptance. Although the symbols can be limited, as homophobia, transphobia and stigma towards sex workers can exist in spaces designated positive and safe, the territorial ownership symbols give to certain groups is noteworthy (Crowe, 2013).

Lighting is a commonly cited physical design CPTED issue that needs to be addressed to create safer cities, and is heavily gendered in the survey responses. Participants react strongly to being asked if they feel safer alone or in a group alone at night in their neighbourhood compared to during the day. About 2.4% of respondents say they feel safer alone in the daytime, all of whom identify solely as male, which falls down to 1.8% preferring to be alone at night. Similarly, 12.0% say they feel safer in a group and 72.5% say it does not matter during the day. At night, 54.5% prefer to be in a group, and 31.1% state it does not matter. Crowe (2013) argues that people have strong psychological reaction to lighting, noting that it can be used to draw people into a space and the lack of lighting can make people stay away from a space at night in fear due to a lack of visibility. The cover of darkness can make people feel safer expressing their authentic selves as well, which is perhaps why someone identifying as a cross-dresser put down that they feel safer alone at night., darkness and fear is a contributing factor to this temporal distinction (Crowe, 2013). Non-normative gender presentation in public spaces is associated with ‘abnormal’ uses in CPTED literature. The cover of night can make ‘abnormal’ embodiments feel
safer whereas daytime’s normativity can make someone non-normative stand out and increase risk.

Lighting, dark, and night were mentioned the most as key words in the comments on why certain spaces feel unsafe overall. About 50.6% of respondents who added a comment on why certain spaces in their neighbourhood feel uncomfortable mention lack of lighting, unclear visibility, or nighttime being overall less safe. Lighting and time of day are impactful when participants are asked to select what factors affect their feeling of safety in their neighbourhood. Participants selected time of day (after dark) the most (44.9%), followed by poor lighting on the street (41.3%), and poor lighting in parks (38.9%). Time of day (before dark) has a low response rate of 4.2%, indicating that darkness and nighttime are strongly associated with perceived safety. Lack of LGBTQ2+ visibility (32.3%) is also a significant factor selected by participants, despite it not finding a clear niche in existing CPTED literature. The need to expand CPTED to include LGBTQ2+ experiences on the axes of race and class is clear.

Interestingly, a follow-up to the recommendations presented to crime prevention planners in the Safer City Guidelines are unintentionally revisited in the House of Constantine focus group. Some focus group participants live in a housing complex written about in the Safer City Guidelines. Four participants in the focus group live in St James Town, which is a high density group of rental high-rise towers with a high rate of low income tenants (see Figure 17). The Safer City Guidelines identifies St. James Town as a place where CPTED interventions are needed around better lighting, better use of outdoor spaces for play, better maintenance and better sightlines. Although the Guidelines state that changes were being implemented when it was published in 1997, focus group participants speak to encountering problems around isolation and lighting in the housing complex at night. One participant says that the only light in some of the neighbourhood’s superblocks comes from the lighting people have on their balconies and from the lights inside projecting out of their apartment windows. The Safer City Guidelines state that the Rose Avenue Community Centre is “the impetus for lighting upgrades around the Community Centre and school” (Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997). Participants specifically cite the area outside the Rose Avenue Community Centre in St. James Town as needing better lighting outside at night. It is unclear if the lighting upgrades were ever done around St. James Town, or if they were done back in the late 1990s, and poor maintenance has revered the area back to its prior state. The challenges of implementing change and subsequent upkeep are clear.
St. James Town in the daytime. The area remains relatively unchanged since its inception in the 1960s. (Harris 2010)
Participants also selected other elements of CPTED planning as influential in their feelings of safety. About 25.7% of participants selected that not having a lot of people around is a factor in their feelings of safety; followed by narrow or single access pathways (19.2%); hedges, trees or other landscaping blocking sightlines (16.8%) and the season (e.g. less foliage but less people around in the winter months) (15.0%). The respondents did not respond as strongly to poor lighting inside residential hallways or outside main entrance of residence (13.2%), which is consistent with perceptions of unsafety residing largely outside the home.

Seclusion, poor sightline, and isolation are mentioned by participants as reasons why they feel unsafe in certain areas. Notably, public transit and parks are cited often as a place where entrapment and isolation are a problem. One participant writes that on the “subway (and Sherbourne or Castle Frank are my neighbourhood's stations) there is a sense of 'nowhere to go' or of quick escape is something happens”. Another participant writes that they dislike the Humber loop, which is an isolated streetcar intermediate turning loop where streetcars at times short turn (see Figure 18). They say, “if you're waiting for a streetcar late at night is awful. You can be waiting for half an hour or 45 minutes with one or two other people. I've been hassled and I'm scared if anything ever got physical there would be no one to hear screaming” (LGBTQ2+ Toronto, 2015). Limiting isolation and having a consistent use of a space throughout the day is one of the founding principles of CPTED that is taken up in feminist CPTED guidelines. Mixed use zoning to assure users of streetscapes at all times is among the tools used be planners to maintain vibrancy (Jacobs, 1961; Whitzman & Wekerle, 1997).
Humber Loop

Patrons wait for a streetcar in darkness at night. (ttcgeek 2013)
Gender is a determinant in comfort around being isolated in public spaces, which is reflected in the participant responses. One participant writes that parks are “secluded and [have] lots of coverage [which] make me nervous. The park’s history of serial sexual assaults puts me on edge”. Fear of sexual assault is heavily gendered and enacts a form of social control on women in particular (Campbell, 2005). The participant that links isolation and sexualized violence identifies as female and as a crossdresser. The layering of feminized fear of violence with gender variance contributes to the trend of those under the trans umbrella and other gender variant people experiencing heightened and distinct fear of violence in public spaces.

Despite the emphasis on appearances in Wilson and Kelling’s (1982) Broken Windows criminology, buildings looking unkept (12.6%) and litter or trash accumulated (9.0%) have low response rates. Similarly, transportation related responses are low, with traffic as a determinant of safety at 16.2% and insufficient access to public transit at 7.8%. The high concentration of participants in the downtown area, where car traffic is slower and there a fair amount of transit access, is likely a strong factor in the lack of responses.

The factors that got the lowest responses are insufficient signage (6.6%); too many people around (6.6%); and unclear where shared spaces and private property start and end (4.8%). The low response around too many people around is attributable to the emphasis put on the importance of not being isolated in public spaces emphasized by participants. Insufficient signage and unclear territoriality are strongly emphasized as problematic in CPTED literature (Crowe, 2013). Although not many participants cite signage and territoriality as a priority, it does not necessarily mean that they should be ignored. However it does call into question how effective these strategies may be at curbing perceived unsafety in urban spaces as they are not readily noticed.

Participants have strongly conflicting opinions on the usage of video cameras and panic buttons in all focus groups. The Fred Victor and Open Call focus group participants want twenty-four hour security around their housing, along with fences and cameras, whereas the House of Constantine and Marvelous Grounds focus group participants both express feeling very uncomfortable around fences, cameras and security. There was some disagreement around whether or not to use cameras in public spaces as a safety mechanism within the Fred Victor group. Participants say that the feel less safe around the cameras, and that they are afraid that they will be murdered in public one day and the footage of their murder will end up being watched by millions of people in the internet. Crowe (2013) writes that in a digitally interconnected world, it is very difficult to control how footage will be used once it is put online, a fact that makes participants feel uncomfortable. The mixture of opinions importantly demarcates the contradictions within LGBTQ2+ communities.
The results drawn from the focus groups affirm and challenge safety planning and CPTED principles. Lighting, isolation, and sightline are notably marked as issues that affect perceptions of safety in various spaces. Although territoriality, residential design and signage were not emphasized as being overall important to participants, there is something to be said for these factors being important to at least a few respondents. Participants offer small design intervention ideas on how to make spaces like public transit feel a little bit safer. Safer cities should not be designed and planned with only a few in mind, but also must not ignore minority voices and experiences. The experiences of sex workers and people of colour in the focus groups complicates the tendency to either ignore or actively design out the needs of these communities in planning.

Social Planning Interventions

Focus group participants speak to a variety of programming and other social planning intervention ideas that would help LGBTQ2+ people feel safer in the city. Much of the social interventions participants suggest exist at the systemic level. Several participants across all focus groups say that they imagine a safer city without judgment, with respect, and that prioritizes equality and equity education. Participants also say they want a world without racism, sexism, homophobia, gay bashing, transphobia, violence and jails. They want better wages, no student loans or credit limits, and legalized sex work and marijuana. Decolonization is mentioned in the Fred Victor focus group as a goal, and returning to pre-colonial world as an ideal. They mention wanting more community engagement, more community outdoor parties and more community gardens, all of which exist within the realm of conventional social planning tactics (Crowe, 2013). Participants generally want love, peace, happiness, and warmth in their safer cities. Although these factors are outside the scope of planning, law enforcement and public transit commissions, as overarching frameworks to work within they are helpful for all of these professions.

As for more concrete actionable recommendations, participants want community gardens, inclusion poster campaigns, better reporting systems, better relationships with authority figures, more LGBTQ2+ programming, and anti-oppression training for everyone. Participants give additional feedback on public transit and safety as well. These interventions are suggested within the messiness of lateral violence, exclusion, and interlocking stakes in identity.
The police are most frequently mentioned as an institution needing reform by participants. Disarming police, creating better relationships with the police and dismantling the police are all mentioned in the brainstorming sessions and throughout the focus group conversations. There is a prevailing sense that the police forces, as they are designed and operating today, are unwelcome in the conceptualization of a safer city.
The police are not the only group of people participants speak to excluding in order to create a safer city. In the Fred Victor focus group, participants also want to “keep the drunks out” of their spaces (Fred Victor, 2015b). In the House of Constantine focus group, participants want to abolish crack use and create spaces that do not revolve around sex and alcohol. Exclusion is a complex way to render safety, especially when in all cases those marginalized by addiction are unwelcome.

A participant in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group talks about exclusion from a broader perspective. They say they would like to see a demographic flip in the world where it would be “90% queer people of colour, 10% scum” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). Creating groups for marginalized people, and excluding those outside of those groups in order to create safer spaces, was brought up in Toronto in March of 2015, four months before the focus groups were conducted. The controversy began when two White Ryerson journalism students were turned away from a meeting held by the Ryerson Students’ Collective because they are not people of colour. Outraged, the two students wrote an article in response to this exclusion in the school newspaper. There was a lot of backlash to their article on social media and in other newspapers. One journalist, Aeman Ansari, who is a Ryerson journalism student and woman of colour, writes in response to the claims that excluding White people is a form of reverse racism. She writes that: “Marginalized groups have a right to claim spaces in the public realm where they can share stories about the discrimination they have faced without judgment and intrusion from anyone else” (Ansari, 2015). The right to claim space is especially pertinent when marginalized groups in the focus groups express feeling unsafe and excluded from many spaces throughout the city.

Participants are prompted to provide feedback on the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) can improve safety and inclusivity. Participants in the focus groups identify the Request Stop Program, which allows all customers to travelling alone between 9pm and 5am the option of being let off between stops on any TTC bus, as a great existing program. The Request Stop Program used to cater to women only, but since 2011 has expanded to all TTC customers regardless of identity (TTC, n.d.). Participants in the House of Constantine focus group said that it can be harder to request a stop on the streetcar, but that the stops are often closer together when on the streetcar anyway. The TTC webpage says that they do not offer the Request Stop Program on streetcars because they “travel in the middle of the roadway too far from the sidewalk to let customers exit safely at unmarked stops” (TTC, n.d.). Participants from the affiliated Marvelous Grounds focus group said that TTC drivers often do not stop when they request, claiming that they were not given enough notice. Although it is a great program, it would be beneficial to revisit where it can be ironed out and further improved.

Participants from the House of Constantine focus group said that the TTC needs more night buses, especially after subway trains stops running. They emphasize that more buses are needed on the weekend when people are out partying downtown. Participants will take a cab
sometimes when the bus will not be coming very often to get home faster, but brought up that it is very expensive to take cabs often.

Participants say that they are frustrated because they are paying for inhospitable transit service. A participant from the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group calls out the TTC for constantly announcing the amount of money they reportedly lose due to fare evasion. The participant says “for me, that money doesn’t exist, don’t act like it does” (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b). The campaign around fare evasion tries to get TTC passengers to police each other. During the House of Constantine focus group, participants are hesitant to have people police each other’s behaviour. A participant says “asking others to police each can reiterate other social inequalities … It’s just going to be a bunch of old people saying there’s a bunch of Black kids on the bus” (House of Constantine, 2015). Recommending changes that are inclusive of everyone involves a difficult balance of conflicting concepts of safety that are laden in racism, sexism and other systemic forces.

A participant from the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group rides their bike everywhere to avoid transphobic and racist harassment on the TTC. Another participant in the Fred Victor focus group says they take the taxi to avoid harassment, stares and other microaggressions on public transit. There was some dissension around whether a taxi or the TTC is safer for trans people, with other participants saying that taxi drivers have asked them sexual favours and have exhibited other unsafe behaviour. Some prefer the TTC over taxis because the TTC at least has cameras to document incidents of harassment. Many participants bring a ‘carry bag’ with them when they go out with their feminine clothing inside the bag, and dress more masculine on the TTC to avoid harassment. The TTC should address the discrimination that occurs on their system.

Many focus group participants are interested in creating a LGBTQ2+ inclusive poster campaign to create safer spaces on the TTC. The participants from Fred Victor want to see posters on trans-inclusivity and ending violence against trans people. Trans inclusivity poster campaign have been incredibly successful in other jurisdictions, including a poster campaign by the Vancouver Park Board around gender inclusive change rooms and bathrooms in their facilities (Friesen, 2014; On the Coast, 2015). They also suggest buying advertising space on TTC apps like NextBus and Rocket Man, which have lots of people using them for public transit schedules and updates on delays to promote messages of inclusivity.

Many participants provide suggestions on what they want to see in a inclusivity poster campaign. The members of House of Constantine have slogan ideas like ‘Mind your Business’. The participants in the Open Call focus group have a lot of poster ideas. Slogan include ‘common sense - please use it’, ‘treat others how you would like to be treated’, ‘ride along, get along’, ‘mind your own business’, ‘don’t bother them’, and ‘don’t hit on people’. Poster ideas include a poster that reads ‘White, Black, Old, Young, Fat, Slim, Gay, Straight, Trans, Bi’ and at
the bottom in bigger font ‘HUMAN’. Another person said they would like to see a poster with a
close-up shot of two hands holding each other with the caption ‘would this bother you if you
knew one of these people is trans?’ Another participant wanted to see a poster with someone
with their headphones on with the caption ‘they don’t want to talk to you’. All of the poster ideas
assert a need to respect personal space and boundaries on public transit.

The Open Call focus group participants mention that the TTC should create skits in
various stations to promote safer space. A skit could be shown on the TV screens on the station
platform. They also say that auditory messages on safety could be broadcast on transit. The
Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group participants’ reference anti-sexual harassment
campaigns in New York City which utilize the station’s loud speakers to broadcast their
campaign message. Participants cite campaign trying to raise awareness around the amount of
space men take on public transit by spreading their legs and say they felt like the campaign led to
the over-policing of men of colour. The House of Constantine participant are also weary of
campaigns that target harassers, since they see that young people of colour are constantly
positioned as the instigators of harassment when in fact, they get harassed by older White people.

The limitations of a poster campaign are brought up by the Open Call focus group
participants. One participant says that posters will not be enough to challenge someone’s
homophobia or transphobia. Other participants disagree and points out that if it even changes the
opinion of one person, it is worth it. One participant says that a poster campaign helps show
people what the norm is for treating others on the TTC, which perhaps will not change their
opinions on queer and trans people, but at least will show them that they do not have the right to
harass queer and trans people. Although posters are but one possible intervention to be used in
the face of discrimination and harassment in public spaces and semi-public transit, they can have
a positive effect and help stop the normalization of harassment and assault.

Green spaces are important to participants. Focus group participants over all four sessions
agree on the need for more clean air, open public spaces and greenery around the city. Although
open spaces are conceptualized as a site of harassment, there is by no means a call to rid the city
of them. On the same note, greenery can create sites of entrapment or hide spots for crime, but
on the other hand, participants’ note that trees and grass make them feel welcomed, safer and
more likely to utilize public spaces. The House of Constantine participants specifically mention
that they want community gardens in the city to help access greenery in a programmed setting.

Community gardens are quite popular in planning, but they are only effective if properly
programmed. Crowe (2013) writes that programs and services fall through when there is an
inadequate assessment of a problem or possible problems, undiagnosed organization needs to run
the program, and the implementation of solutions that do not fix the problem. Critics have
noticed that community gardens in particular are often evoked and implemented as a catch-all
solution to food systems, crime, community building and an appropriate apolitical use of the
urban commons (Markham, 2014; McGurik, 2015). The problem of properly implementing a program is both beyond just community gardens and inherent to all community garden projects. The programming needs around the community garden also demonstrate that the separation between the physical needs of a city from social planning in these subsections is done more for organizational purposes. In practicality, there is always some of the social in the physical, and some of the physical in the social.

Sensitivity training for TTC staff, as well as police officers and security guards, is mentioned in all four focus groups. Notably, the Toronto Gay Patrol was already petitioning for anti-homophobia training for the police in the 1970s, which has not been effectively actualized in the opinion of the participants (Toronto Gay Patrol, 1981). Due to the prompts participants speak to the TTC in particular, but the details on what this training should involve should still apply to law enforcement. The Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group want TTC constables and TTC drivers to get training on de-escalation and respecting passengers. They find that at this point TTC staff are too aggressive. During the Open Call focus group, a participant said they would like TTC staff to have training around transgender identity and gender more broadly. A participant from the House of Constantine focus group says TTC drivers need to learn to stop and wait for women running to catch the bus at night. The participant points out that a woman running for the bus could also be running away from someone else, and that by not stopping, the driver might be putting her at risk. The participants in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group says that sensitivity training could help TTC staff not be condescending or rude to women asking for directions or other simple questions. Participants also mention that TTC drivers should learn to be more patient with people who speak English as their second or third language.

Participants in the House of Constantine focus group pointed out the limitations of sensitivity training. Drivers may resent being forced to take such training, or the materials may not stick with them. One participant also points out that TTC staff are not the only people who are rude, and that passengers also need to learn how to behave. As one participant aptly says “what about sensitivity training for the world?” (House of Constantine, 2015). One way to make the training stick would be to make its materials part of the promotional structure of the TTC. If a driver or constable wants to be eligible to be promoted to a higher ranking position, they should be mandated to have completed some sort of sensitivity training and be able to recite its content in an interview. Transgressing the sensitivity training in one’s conduct should also reflect badly on the records of the TTC staff. These implementation methods apply to law enforcement as well.

Reporting incidents of assault is reimagined by participants. Participants in the Fred Victor and House of Constantine focus groups propose creating a texting service or app to allow passengers to discreetly request help on the TTC. At this point in time, if the emergency stop bar is pulled on the subway, the police are called to the situation. Not only does this unnecessarily
escalate a situation, but it also creates barriers for those who cannot or will not deal with the police. Some reporting mechanism that is not as extreme as stopping the subway and calling the police is needed. The proposed app could connect people with a reporting service or alert the driver or nearby TTC security that help is needed. The app could be piloted on the TTC with a potential for future expansion.

Participants in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated focus group call for more transparency around reporting incidents of harassment on the TTC. Participants point out that TTC staff never step in to help people getting harassed on public transit. One participant says:

I’ve intervened for a stranger, putting myself at risk, [but the driver doesn’t] … even say anything. So when a woman is being harassed, or when something racist is happening, doesn’t matter because the TTC does absolutely nothing. [They] sit in their seat and stare ahead until it is over. (Marvelous Grounds, 2015b).

Participants describe needing to get off a subway train to get away from a harasser, or wait for another bus. The way the TTC distributes transfers is problematic for this reason. If someone decides to get away from someone by getting off the TTC, they cannot get on the next bus or streetcar without paying again in most cases. The TTC should implement a timed transfer, as opposed to a transfer that is based on where you have to switch between different lines to get to your destination.

Participants in the Open Call focus group mention that the TTC should hire more diverse staff to help mitigate feeling unsafe and underrepresented on transit. Participants in the Marvelous Grounds affiliated group emphasize needing to tone down the behaviour of the authoritative security guards that make them feel unsafe and uncomfortable using the TTC.

A participant from the House of Constantine focus group describes the complications of attempting to make the TTC safer. They say, “I feel like there’s nothing we can do on the TTC beside beef up security, and if we beef up security we will have other issues that come along with that. You can put up as many posters as you want and things like that, but it really is about human code and treating others with respect” (House of Constantine, 2015). Although as participants in all the focus groups point out, posters are better than nothing and they have the potential to make an albeit minimal impact, the risk of further marginalizing people by increasing security or installing cameras is noteworthy.

The problems described by participants reflect systemic racism, classism, homophobia, transphobia, femmephobia, transmisogyny, ableism and other oppressive social constructions. Some participants see their safer city as a place where unsafe embodiments are excluded. Exclusion is a fraught concept, but is also pervasive in the urban form and often works to the
detriment of society’s most marginalized. Community gardens, upgrading transit safety and inclusion, sensitivity training, and improved reporting mechanisms are among the interventions participants suggest within the realm of social planning and issues. When presented with the problem of implementing safety campaigns and interventions on the TTC, participants offer solutions involving awareness campaigns and more accountability from TTC staff. There is recognition by participants that these interventions are not enough, but are a good start to addressing the problem of safety on public transit and beyond.

**Conclusion**

Ehrenfeucht (2013) writes on the gentrifying redesign of West Hollywood, which excluded vulnerable street users, including many transgender sex workers, while privileging the wellbeing of middle to upper class gay and lesbian populations, and their straight counterparts, that gender nonconforming populations are excluded from planning and design because “planning interventions respond to community feedback and envision desirable outcomes, and thus the interests of influential populations dominate” (Ehrenfeucht, 2013, p. 60). Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, crime prevention planning, and all other planning and design methodology and praxis must take this fundamental conundrum into account. Whose city is being planned, and who is excluded from it?

When we look at the safety needs of LGBTQ2+ communities, some aspects of CPTED, such as the importance of street lighting and community programming, do apply, but they are not enough to ensure safety. We must recognize that some segments of CPTED, like increasing police presence or having lots of people around, has the opposite effect for many queer and trans communities. A more nuanced approach that is aware of the complicated interplay of power and privilege is needed to bring in the recommended sensitivity training, poster campaigns and safer community spaces, as well as the accessible well-lit infrastructure called upon by participants.

Planning as a profession has its limitations in its scope of influence. It predominantly a field that influences public spaces owned by government, as well as regulating the use of private infrastructure and usage. Although cultural planning does have a bearing on the social characteristics of spaces, the lack of jurisdiction it has on how privately owned businesses are specifically programmed, as well as having virtually no direct power on the exclusively private domestic sphere where a lot of violence is happening, planning cannot effectively address all safety concerns of all people all the time on its own. Allies are needed in other professional fields, as well as within the community to work towards safer cities. Some considerations are made in Table 2 on how law enforcement, transit commissions and other policy makers can be involved. Even though this thesis is written from a planning perspective, its recommendations have implications beyond the scope of planning.
Chapter 8 - Conclusion

The thesis has attempted to make a strong case for a number of recommendations that would help plan for, instead of against, the needs of LGBTQ2+ communities. Research participant experiences make demands on the heterosexist frameworks used by feminist safety planners. Urban planning and design for safer spaces that treat women as victims and men as perpetrators in a heteronormative context, is not a culturally appropriate conception of harassment or of safety experienced by queer and trans communities. LGBTQ2+ communities consist of diverse experience and positionalities, meaning that not all people in queer and trans communities are impacted by safety concerns in the same way. Community members who are racialized, trans and/or sex workers have acute challenges and needs. It is also notable that class, ability and geographic location impact safety as well. Special attention must be paid to the unique barriers faced by the most marginalized members of queer and trans communities.

Participants would also like to see better reporting services to go to after incidents of hate crimes, assault, harassment, microaggressions or behaviour that makes them feel unsafe. Participants feel uneasy going to the police to report incidents due to fears that they will not be taken seriously, or will be blamed for an altercation that was not their face, or be confronted with feeling re-traumatized. An independent reporting service that is not affiliated with the Toronto Police would help get more accurate account of perceived and experienced safety, and would offer a reporting mechanism for incidents that may not seem appropriate to bring to the attention of the police (e.g. glances and stares, or institutional neglect).

Participants generally do not respond to feeling unsafe due to a lack of territorial demarcation between private and public spaces, but do feel as though being familiar with a neighbourhood greatly impacts their feeling of safety. They also do mention insufficient lighting extensively, especially in parks and on the street. They also dislike entrapment areas, especially on public transit, as well as some other design interventions done around isolation on streetcars and buses. The determinants of safety least affecting feelings of safety are insufficient signage, lack of maintenance of residential property and having too many people around, despite its prevalence in CPTED and ‘Broken Windows’ theories.

Public bathrooms are a site of discomfort and feeling unsafe by participants who identify as trans and/or non-binary. Retrofitting bathrooms in public and private venues to be fully gender inclusive through the use of single stalls and appropriate signage is a goal strongly emphasized by participants. The emphasis put on making the semi-private space of a public bathroom stall safer for LGBTQ2+ communities also demonstrates the slippery divide between
The private and public spaces that make up urbanized life. The thesis at hand is limited by its focus on public space exclusively, as public and private is an inseparable continuum.

The criminalization of participants, particularly participants of colour, participants who use illegal substances, and/or sex workers, further marginalizes them. Participants call for the decriminalization of marijuana and sex work. They also call for dismantling, disarming and simply creating better relationships with the police. They are collectively weary of cameras and security, but want better security around their own homes and communities that look out for their interests. The Toronto Police is currently undertaking a trans education and outreach project this coming year, and it will be interesting to see what impact this has on Toronto’s various communities (Intelligence Services, Hate Crime Unit, 2014).

Poster campaigns and sensitivity training are strongly recommended by participants. Although participants were asked specifically on the value of a poster campaign on public transit, interviewees in particular mention safer space stickers and posters in schools, organizations and community centres as being an effective visibility tool (Egale, 2015; Kulanu, 2015; Rainbow Health Ontario, 2015). Sensitivity training is also mentioned in the context of policing and public transit staff needing to be more aware of LGBTQ2+ issues, anti-racism and conflict resolution, and as one focus group participants says, we need sensitivity training for the entire world.

Organizations seeking to make safer cities already exist in health care, education, local government, policing, housing, and other institutions. It is clear through the thesis results that these institutions have a ways to go around becoming holistically inclusive of LGBTQ2+ communities. Participants encourage organizations to actively promote inclusivity and invite queer and trans communities explicitly to the table when making decisions. Organizations are also encouraged to engage with communities socially by coming to their neighbourhoods and actively building relationships with them.

Systemic barriers impact participants, and so they call upon systemic change. Participants want a world without homophobia, racism, sexism, gay bashing, violence and jails. They do want better access to inclusive health care, employment, better wages, no student loans or lines of credit, love, peace and happiness. Participants in the Fred Victor focus group conceptualize their version of a safer city as being framed by an ideal, returning to a world before colonization, and a goal, which is the decolonization of our institutions and practices.

If everywhere is potentially unsafe for LGBTQ2+ individuals in cities, the iterative utopian ideal to be worked towards is a world where every space is a little bit queer. In Hanhardt’s (2013) Safe Space, she ends the book with a chapter centered on the work done by the contemporary New York City queer people of colour activist group FIERCE. FIERCE members drew up their version of what they wanted the Christopher Pier, a gentrifying area in New York, to look like on their terms. Handhardt (2013) writes that FIERCE’s mapped ‘Dream
City’ “makes distinctively gay spaces more inclusive and, in fact, imagines spaces everywhere as potentially queer, both by loosening the status of gayness as unique – and exclusive – commodity (as Gay Index proponents would have it) and by making numerous peoples and places marginalized by heteronormativity central to broad queer political imagining” (p. 215). A safe city for queer and trans people is a city that is not just tolerant of LGBTQ2+ communities, or commodifying a facet of their inclusivity, but instead must be a city where queerness is actively integrated into its very fabric. A safer city then, as envisioned in this thesis, must iterate through a series of goals to make a city safer with the ideal safe city always in mind.

There’s still much work to be done.

Reflections for Future Research

The original research question proposed for the Master’s thesis was at once both too narrow and too broad. The researcher initially proposed a thesis on LGBTQ2+ experiences of public safety within the scope of mobility and disability. The proposed topic is too narrow due to the specificities of the communities that needed to be contacted. It is too broad due to the breadth of existing literature on public safety, gender, sexuality, mobility, and disability that would have to be researched and brought into conversation with each other. The difficulty of determining appropriate scope, particularly in a Master’s thesis which is significantly shorter than a dissertation, was a clear challenge faced in the completion of this work. More often than not in research there is always something more to say. On topics of queer and trans planning in particular, the field is open to new texts and considerations.

Future considerations for research on the topic of planning LGBTQ2+ inclusive cities would have to fundamentally further and more explicitly ask what aspects of queer and trans communities are being included and on whose terms would this be occurring. In particular the silence of certain members of the LGBTQ2+ community in Toronto on anti-Black racism and police brutality, a proposed ‘LGBT-inclusive sports and recreation facility’ to be imposed upon Moss Park without adequate community consultation, and the politics of the corporatization of Pride Toronto speak to the need for communities to consider who is getting left behind in the current creation of mainstream queer spaces (Seitz, 2015; Watson, 2014, 2015a).

The division between private and public is slippery, and further considerations should be made, beyond this thesis, dismantling dichotomous propriety-based ways of thinking of space. The data on violence demonstrates the importance of considering domestic violence, and the ways in which violence in private spaces can strongly influence public life (Koskela & Pain, 2000; Sweet & Ortiz Escalante, 2010). Queer and trans communities inhabit private and public spaces through a negotiation of survival tactics such as code switching and community care in the data collected for this thesis. Further research should be done on how queer and trans communities use spaces differently and employ distinct signifiers of safety and inclusion.
Finally, follow-up investigations should be done on the state on safety in Toronto. Progress on the Toronto police trans inclusion policy should hopefully be forthcoming, as well as developments around the current Black Lives Matter tent city in downtown Toronto and the upcoming deadline to fully implement the Accessibility for Ontario with Disabilities (AODA) in businesses, speak to a demand for future needs assessments and evaluation of progress on safety, inclusivity, and LGBTQ2+ communities from an intersectional lens (Media Suite, 2016; Parris, 2016).
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Appendices

Appendix 1.1 - Interview Questions

1. What communities do you and/or your organization represent? Is it a part of the LGBTQ2+ community? Other communities?

2. How do you think experiences of safety differ amongst LGBTQ2+ identified people (e.g. how is safety in cities experienced by someone who identifies as lesbian, compared to someone who identifies as trans? Someone who identifies as both?)?

3. What other factors do you think influences perceptions of safety and threat?

4. What form of harassment do your clients/communities experience in public space? (e.g., graffiti, verbal comments, written comments, physical assault, glances, etc…)

5. Have you noticed that these types of harassment happen in certain areas/spaces?

6. How could these areas/spaces be made safer for LGBTQ2+ communities? What social and physical changes need to be made to these spaces?

7. Do you find that your client/communities report instances of harassment to the police? Why or why not?

8. Where do your clients/communities go for resources and help after encountering harassment in public spaces?

9. Who do you not see accessing services? Why might some individuals not feel safe accessing certain services?

10. How does frequency, location and accessibility of services differ when harassment occurs in the workplace? In community spaces? Personal/intimate spaces?

11. Are there other important facets of this issues that we did not cover?
Appendix 1.2 - Focus Group Schedule with Questions

Safety, Safety Audit and LGBTQ2+

Focus group Schedule

1. Sticky Note Activity (Before Start)

**ACTIVITY 1: Sticky Note Activity**

- Give everyone 3 sticky notes as they walk in
- Tell them to write 3 things they feel is important to making a space safer (ie. City, home, etc).
- Put all the sticky notes on a board to be discussed at end of session

2. Introduction/Objectives (10 min)

- Who we are? Why are we here?

**About METRAC**

- Not-for-profit organization founded in 1984
- Works to change ideas, actions and policies with goal of ending violence against women and youth
- Works across Toronto, Ontario and Canada
- Program and Services include:
  - Safety promotion and Safety Audits
  - Youth Outreach and Education
  - Access to Justice and Legal Information

**About Jen**

- Discuss research and work at METRAC for summer

**Objectives**
• To assess the safety needs of LGBTQ2+ community and how can make METRAC’s safety audit more inclusive

Introductions

• To assess the safety needs of LGBTQ2+ community and how can make METRAC’s safety audit more inclusive

3. Consent Forms/Confidentiality (10 minutes)

Consent Forms/Confidentiality

• Read over and have participants all sign
• Discuss consent for recording
• No names will be written or identifying info

Triggering

• Free to leave and ask for assistance

4. Info about METRAC’s Safety Audit (10 minutes)

METRAC’s Safety Audit Process

• What is METRAC’s Safety Audit?
  o METRAC’s Safety Audit was created in 1989
  o First developed to address the reality of women’s safety concerns.
  o Used internationally to evaluate the safety of many environments
• Our audit has evolved to include diverse communities and to:
  o Evaluate the safety of many environments (neighbourhoods, hospitals, parks, transit systems, universities and colleges, parking garages)
  o Collectively identify risks or problems in physical spaces, policies and practices, and social dynamics
  o Contribute to a common understanding of safety, leading to comprehensive recommendations for change.
  o METRAC’s safety audit had been identified by UN-Habitat as a ‘best practice’ for creating safe environments.

• Practical community based action tool used to evaluate the safety of an area by:
  o Identifying safety concerns
- Discussing solutions
- Developing an action plan to create safer neighbourhoods.

- **Everyone is an expert on their own sense of safety**
- **Steps in a Community Safety Audit**
  1. Attend METRAC Training
  2. Form a Safety Audit Group in Neighbourhood
  3. Choose the date, place and time for Audit
  4. Conduct the Safety Audit
  5. Collect and send Audit results to METRAC
  6. Implement plan of action using Report Card

- What info is collected?
  - General Impressions
  - Social Environment
  - Physical Environment

- **General**
  - Gut impressions/how feel in area

- **Social**
  - People’s attitudes, behaviours, actions
  - Comfort safety in a space
  - Services in area

- **Physical**
  - Lighting
  - Signs/Maps
  - Sightlines/Visibility
  - Entrapment Sites
  - Isolated Areas
  - Maintenance
  - Accessibility
  - Security/Police
  - Public Transit

5. Questions (1 hour)

1. How do you experience safety as a member of the LGBTQ2+ community in Toronto?

2. What other factors influences your perceptions of safety and threat of violence?
3. What form of harassment do you experience? (e.g., graffiti, verbal comments, written comments, physical assault, glances, etc…)

4. Have you noticed that these types of harassment happen in certain areas/spaces?

5. What changes can be made to make the TTC feel safer?

6. Do you find that you or other members of your community report instances of harassment to the police? Why or why not?

7. Where do you or your friends go for resources and help after encountering harassment in public spaces?

8. What services do you access after incidents of harassment?

9. How can we make the safety audit inclusive of your experiences?

10. What can be done to make the safety audit training inclusive of your experiences?

6. Safe City Activity (25 minutes)

ACTIVITY 2: Safe City Brainstorm

- Facilitators write down answers on chart paper
- Ask group to imagine a safe city, where they could fully express themselves and not fear violence. What would that city look like?
- Questions
  - What physical changes in the City would create a safer city?
  - What social changes in the City would create a safer city?
- Facilitators write/draw out answers and stick them on sticky notes on a chart paper.
- After add the sticky notes from the beginning of the session when people walked in.

Question

- Are there any other important items/issues that we did not cover?

7. Wrap-up/Honourariums (5 minutes)

- Thank participants for attending session
- Ask participants to fill in honourarium forms and give out honourarium and tokens
Appendix 1.3 - Consent Forms

Jen Robertson
Master's Student
School of Community and Regional Planning, UBC

Safety and Embodied Mobility
Consent for Participation in Research – Interviews and Focus Groups

You volunteer to participate in a research project conducted by Jennifer Robertson from the School of Community and Regional Planning at the University of British Columbia. You understand that the project is designed to gather information on LGBTQ2+ identities and communities as it relates to safety in an urban setting. You will be one of approximately 10 research participants.

1. Your participation in this project is voluntary. You may withdraw and discontinue participation at any time without penalty. If you decline to participate or withdraw from the study, no one will be told. You understand that you cannot withdraw your participation after November 2015.

2. You understand that most participants will find the discussion interesting and thought-provoking. The data collected also hopes to inform future planning and design interventions in an urban context. If, however, you feel uncomfortable in any way during the interview session, you have the right to decline to answer any question or to leave the session.

3. Once you agree to participate in the study, you will be interviewed by Jennifer Robertson from University of British Columbia. Each session will last approximately one hour. Notes will be written during the session. An audio recording and subsequent dialogue will be made.

4. You understand that the researcher will not identify you by name in any reports using information obtained from this interview, and that your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain as secure as possible. Upon request, your organization will not be named in the final report. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions, and will not be destroyed after the study has concluded, unless requested by research participant.

5. The Primary Investigator and Co-Investigator are the only people from our campus who will be present at the interview and are the only people who will have access to raw notes or transcripts. This precaution will prevent your individual comments from having any negative repercussions.

6. You have been given a copy of this consent form. You have read and understand the explanation provided to you. You have had all your questions answered to your satisfaction, and you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

7. You understand that the data will be used by the researcher to analyze a non-profit’s safety audit kit, as well as informing the research’s master’s thesis. The data collected will be published publicly in a Master’s thesis at the University of British Columbia, with the potential of being accepted to a peer-reviewed academic journal.

8. You understand that a Canada Graduate Scholarships under the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council has been secured by the student for their Master’s thesis project.

9. You understand that you can contact Jennifer Robertson if you have further questions after the session. You can also withdraw from the study by contacting her.

Version 2.0, April 14, 2015 1 of 2
10. If you have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, contact the Research Participant Complaint Line in the UBC Office of Research Ethics at 604-822-8598 or if long distance e-mail RSIL@ors.ubc.ca or call toll free 1-877-822-8598.

Study Team:

Jennifer Roberton  
Co-Investigator  
Thesis Researcher and METRAC intern  
Master of Arts in Planning Student  
School of Community and Regional Planning  
University of British Columbia  
Phone: [redacted]  
Email: [redacted]

Leonora C. Angeles  
Principal Investigator  
Faculty Advisor  
Associate Professor of Community and Regional Planning and  
Women’s and Gender Studies  
University of British Columbia  
Phone: [redacted]  
Email: [redacted]

Your signature indicates that you consent to participate in this study:

________________________________________
Participant Signature   Date

(or Parent or Guardian Signature)

________________________________________
Printed Name of the Participant (or Parent or Guardian) signing above
Appendix 1.4 - Online Survey

LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto

1. Pre-Survey Consent

Safety and Embodied Mobility: Consent for Participation in Research - Online Survey

You volunteer to participate in a research project conducted by Jennifer Roberton from the School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP) at the University of British Columbia (UBC). You understand that the project is designed to gather information on the interaction of LGBTQ2+ identities and public safety in the City of Toronto. You understand that the data will be used by the researcher to inform the researcher’s master’s thesis. The data collected will be published publicly in a Master’s thesis at the University of British Columbia, with the potential of being accepted to a peer-reviewed academic journal. You will be one of approximately 80-100 research participants.

You understand that your participation in this project is voluntary. Due to the lengths that have been taken to protect the anonymity of participants, you cannot withdraw from the study once your survey has been submitted. You understand that the researcher will not use any personal information collected in the final thesis or any subsequent reports or articles, and that your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain as secure as possible.

If you feel uncomfortable answering any of the survey questions, you have the right to select ‘no response’ to a question, leave a comment field blank or to not submit the survey.

You understand that the survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

You understand that the data is encrypted on Survey Monkey’s website to protect the survey responses, and that IP tracking has been disabled for your privacy. Survey Monkey stores its data in secure servers located in the United States and Luxembourg. Survey Monkey content is subject to the laws of both countries. The data will only be accessed by the Primary investigator and Co-investigator in Canada. The security and privacy policy for Survey Monkey can be found at the following link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/policy/security/.

You understand that you can contact Jennifer Roberton if you have further questions. You can also withdraw from the study by contacting her. If you have any concerns or complaints about your rights as a research participant and/or your experiences while participating in this study, contact the Research Participant Complaint Line in the UBC Office of Research Ethics at 604-822-8698 or if long-distance e-mail RREL@ors.ubc.ca or call toll free 1-877-622-8698.

You have read and understand the explanation provided to you. You have had all your questions answered to your satisfaction, and you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Study Team:
* 1. Do you agree to the above terms? By clicking Yes, you consent that you are willing to answer the questions in this survey.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Version 3.0, June 10, 2015
The following survey will cover these topics and will include a total of 51 questions:

- Qualification Criteria - pg. 3-4
- Self-Identity pg. 5-7
- Neighbourhood Safety pg. 8-15
- Other Public Spaces pg. 16-17
- Police pg. 18
- Conclusion pg. 19-21
LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto

3. Qualification Criteria

This question determines your eligibility to participate in the survey.

* 2. Do you identify under the LGBTQ2+ Umbrella?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No
  ○ No response
LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto

4. Qualification Criteria

This question determines your eligibility to participate in the survey.

* 3. Do you live in the City of Toronto? (including the former city of Etobicoke, York, East York, North York, Scarborough, and Old Toronto)
   - Yes
   - No
   - No response

* 4. What are the first three digits of your postal code? (e.g. M6G or M1H)
5. Self-Identity

* 5. What is your Gender Identity? (Feel free to choose more than one)

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female
- [ ] Transgender
- [ ] Cisgender
- [ ] Genderqueer
- [ ] Intersex
- [ ] Transsexual
- [ ] Cross-dresser
- [ ] Other (please specify)

* 6. What is your Sexual Orientation? (Feel free to choose more than one)

- [ ] Lesbian
- [ ] Gay
- [ ] Bisexual
- [ ] Queer
- [ ] Straight
- [ ] Asexual
- [ ] Pansexual
- [ ] Questioning
- [ ] Demisexual
- [ ] Androsexual
- [ ] Gynosexual
- [ ] Skolossexual
- [ ] No response

Other (Please specify)
6. Self-Identify

7. What's your Age?
   - 18 and under
   - 19 - 24
   - 20 - 29
   - 30 - 39
   - 40 - 49
   - 50 - 59
   - 60+
   - No response

8. Do you identify with any of the following religions? (Please select all that apply)
   - Christianity
   - Judaism
   - Atheist
   - Islam
   - Buddhism
   - Hinduism
   - Indigenous spirituality
   - Paganism
   - Other (please specify)

9. What's your racial identity? (Please select all that apply)
   - Latino/Latina/Latin@
   - Black
   - Brown
   - Indigenous/Metis/First Nation/Inuit
   - South Asian
   - Other

   - East Asian
   - Arab
   - White
   - Mixed
   - No response
10. Do you identify as disabled, crip, hard of hearing, deaf or differently abled? (including intellectual, physical, invisible, sensory, mental and developmental disabilities)

☐ Yes

☐ No, I am able-bodied

☐ No response

☐ Other (please specify)
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7. Self-Identity

11. What’s your yearly income?
   - $0 - $14,999
   - $15,000 - $29,999
   - $30,000 - $39,999
   - $40,000 - $49,999
   - $50,000 - $59,999
   - $60,000 - $69,999
   - $70,000 - $79,999
   - $80,000 - $89,999
   - $90,000 - $99,999
   - $100,000 - $149,999
   - $150,000 or more
   - No response

12. What is your occupation? (Please select all that apply)
   - Employed, working full-time
   - Employed, working part-time
   - Student
   - Parent
   - Caregiver
   - Volunteer
   - Not employed, attending school
   - Not employed, looking for work
   - Not able to work
   - Retired
   - No response
   - Other (please specify)

13. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?
   - Less than high school degree
   - High school degree or equivalent
   - Some college/university but no degree
   - College diploma
   - Associate degree
   - Bachelor degree
   - Graduate degree

14. Do you rent or own the place where you live?
   - Own
   - Rent
   - No response
   - Neither (please specify)
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8. Neighbourhood Safety

15. What neighbourhood do you live in?

16. What is the closest major intersection to your house?

17. About how long have you lived in your neighbourhood?
   Years
   Months

18. How many of your neighbours do you know?
   ○ All of them
   ○ Most of them
   ○ About half of them
   ○ A few of them
   ○ None of them
   ○ No response

19. How strong is the sense of community in your neighbourhood?
   ○ Extremely strong
   ○ Very strong
   ○ Moderately strong
   ○ Slightly strong
   ○ Not at all strong
   ○ No response

Comments
LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto

9. Neighbourhood Safety

20. How safe do you feel walking alone in the shared areas around your residence (e.g. hallways, porch, front yard, lobby)?
   - Extremely safe
   - Very safe
   - Moderately safe
   - Slightly safe
   - Not at all safe
   - No response

   Comments

21. Do you feel safer alone or in a group in your neighbourhood during the day?
   - Alone
   - In a group
   - Doesn’t matter
   - No response

   Comments

22. Do you feel safer alone or in a group in your neighbourhood after dark?
   - Alone
   - In a group
   - Doesn’t matter
   - No response

   Comments
23. Overall, how safe do you feel in your neighbourhood?

- [ ] Extremely safe
- [ ] Very safe
- [ ] Moderately safe
- [ ] Slightly safe
- [ ] Not at all safe
- [ ] No response

Comments


24. Do you feel uncomfortable entering any of the following spaces in your neighbourhood? (Please select all that apply)

- Parks
- Yard, hallway or other shared space around my place of residence
- Restaurants
- Schools
- Public Transit
- Nightclubs
- Ears
- Stores
- On the street
- Workplace
- I feel safe in all these spaces at all times
- No response

Other

25. If you answered yes to any of the above locations, can you describe what makes you feel unsafe in these spaces? (Including if there are physical features of the space that make you feel unsafe, or if feelings of safety change depending on the time of day)
LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto

11. Neighbourhood Safety

26. Do you feel comfortable being a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community in your neighbourhood?
   ○ Yes, I have no problems being visible in my neighbourhood
   ○ Yes, but only if I’m not alone
   ○ It depends (please specify in the comments)
   ○ No, I do not feel comfortable
   ○ No response

   Comments: ________________________________________________________________________

27. If applicable, do you feel safe being a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community and a racialized community in your neighbourhood?
   ○ Yes, I have no problem being both a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community and racialized in my neighbourhood
   ○ I am not a visible member of a racialized community
   ○ No response
   ○ Yes, I have no problem being both a visible member of a racialized community in my neighbourhood, as long as the people in my neighbourhood don’t know I’m also a part of the LGBTQ2+ community
   ○ No, I do not feel safe being a visible member of a racialized community, nor a member of LGBTQ2+ community in my neighbourhood

   Comments: ________________________________________________________________________
28. If applicable, do you feel safe being a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community and a religious community in your neighbourhood?

☐ Yes, I have no problem being both a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community and a religious community in my neighbourhood

☐ I am not a visible member of a religious community

☐ No response

☐ Yes, I have no problem being both a visible member of a religious community in my neighbourhood, as long as the people in my neighbourhood don’t know I’m also a part of the LGBTQ2+ community

☐ No, I do not feel safe being a visible member of a religious community, nor a member of LGBTQ2+ community in my neighbourhood

Comments
29. Does ability and accessibility have any bearing on your feeling of safety in your neighbourhood? (If yes, please specify in comments)

- Yes
- No
- No response

Comments
30. Does your age have any bearing on your safety in your neighbourhood? (If yes, please specify in the comments)

- Yes
- No
- No response

Comments
**LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto**

**13. Neighbourhood Safety**

31. Which of the following affect your feeling of safety around your neighbourhood?

- [ ] Poor lighting on the streets
- [ ] Poor lighting in parks
- [ ] Poor lighting inside residential hallways, lobby or outside main entrance and/or porch
- [ ] Time of day (before dark)
- [ ] Time of day (after dark)
- [ ] Season (e.g. less foliage on trees and less people outside in the winter months)
- [ ] Not lots of people around
- [ ] Lack of LGBTQ2+ visibility
- [ ] Lack of visibility of other community I'm a part of (please specify in the "other" box)
- [ ] Too many people around
- [ ] Hedge, trees or other landscaping blocking your view/that people can hide behind
- [ ] Lots of police
- [ ] Not enough police
- [ ] Unclear where shared spaces and private property start and end
- [ ] Narrow or single access into a path, laneway, street or residential complex
- [ ] Litter/Trash accumulated
- [ ] Insufficient signage, wayfinding or maps
- [ ] Insufficient access to public transit
- [ ] Traffic (e.g. too many cars going too fast)
- [ ] Buildings look unkempt
LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto

14. Neighbourhood Safety

32. Have you ever encountered discrimination in your neighbourhood?

(Note: Discrimination as an action, behaviour or decision that treats a person or a group unfairly based on a group they're part of.

The Canadian Human Rights Code protects against discrimination due to race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, disability and conviction for an offence for which a pardon has been granted or in respect of which a record suspension has been ordered)

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ No response

If you answered "No" to the previous question, please skip questions 33 - 39

33. What aspect of your identity was the target of discrimination? (Please select all that apply)

☐ Age
☐ Disability
☐ National or Ethnic Origin
☐ Colour
☐ Speaking with an accent
☐ Gender
☐ Sex
☐ Immigration status
☐ Race/ethnicity
☐ Religion
☐ Sexual Orientation
☐ Economic Status
☐ Marital Status
☐ Familial Status
☐ A Conviction for which a pardon has been granted or a record suspended
☐ No response

34. How many discriminatory incidents have you encountered in your neighbourhood?

☐ It only happened once
☐ It has happened twice
☐ It has happened three or more times
☐ No response
35. How long ago did the discriminatory incident(s) occur?
☐ Within the past 12 months
☐ Within the last 2 years
☐ Within the last five years
☐ Over five years ago
☐ No response

36. How was the discrimination expressed? (Please select all that apply)
☐ Physical assault
☐ Sexual assault
☐ Anonymous phone calls
☐ Being chased or followed
☐ Being spit on
☐ Having rocks thrown at you
☐ Glances or staring
☐ Ignoring
☐ Written threats or slurs (E.g. in publications and/or graffiti)
☐ Verbal threats or slurs
☐ Other verbal comments (e.g. catcalling)
☐ Not having access to services or locations (E.g. inaccessible buildings, discriminated against trying to acquire a job, etc...)
☐ Over social media (e.g. texts, facebook, email, etc...)
☐ No response
☐ Other (please specify)

37. Where did the discriminatory incident(s) occur? (Please select all that apply)
☐ Parks
☐ Yard, hallway or other shared space around my place of residence
☐ Restaurants
☐ Schools
☐ Public Transit
☐ Nightclubs
☐ Bars
☐ Stores
☐ On the street
☐ Workplace
☐ I feel safe in all these spaces
☐ No response
☐ Other
38. Who or where did you go to for support after the discriminatory incident(s)? (Please select all that apply)

☐ Police
☐ Community Health Centre
☐ LGBTQ+ Community Centre
☐ Other Community Centre
☐ Faith-based Organization
☐ Family Members
☐ Friends
☐ Partner
☐ Other (please specify)

☐ Mental Health Services
☐ Lawyer/Legal Aid
☐ Social Media (facebook, twitter, email, etc.)
☐ Local business
☐ Not reaching for support, or not communicating to anybody the incident
☐ No support
☐ No response

39. To your level of comfort, please provide more detail on the incident(s) of discrimination (e.g. time of day, whether you were alone, etc..)
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15. Neighbourhood Safety

40. Have you been harassed, assaulted or encountered an unsafe situation in your neighbourhood for reasons other than discrimination?
   - Yes
   - No
   - No response

41. If you answered yes to the previous question, and if you are comfortable doing so, describe what happened:
42. Do you engage in cruising and/or some form of public sex? (If yes, and if you're comfortable doing so, please specify whereabouts and your feeling of safety while doing so in the comments)

- Yes
- No
- No response

Comments
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17. Other Public Spaces

43. Do you frequent any other public spaces outside of your neighbourhood? If yes, specify your experiences of public safety in these areas (including parks, streets, transit, and civic buildings)
## 18. Police

44. Have you ever reported an incident of harassment, discrimination or assault to the police

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No response

If yes, what was the experience like? If no, why not?
LGBTQ2+ Public Safety in the City of Toronto

19. Conclusion

45. What neighbourhoods do you feel safest in? Why?


46. What neighbourhoods do you feel unsafe in? Why?


47. How do your feelings of safety differ in private spaces compared to public spaces? (Private spaces include inside a residence, the workplace, and businesses. Public spaces include roads, parks, and sidewalks)


48. Overall, do you feel safer and more comfortable in neighbourhoods with reputation as being queer and trans inclusive (e.g. Queer West, the Village, etc.)?
   ○ Yes, I feel safer in areas known to be queer and trans inclusive
   ○ Sometimes, some areas known to be queer and trans inclusive feel safer than others
   ○ No, I do not feel safer in areas known to be queer and trans inclusive
   ○ No response

Comment:


49. Have you ever encountered discrimination, harassment or were made to feel uncomfortable in a space or neighbourhood that advertizes itself as being queer and trans inclusive?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ No response

50. If you answered "Yes" to the previous question, please explain why or what happened. Please include as many details as you feel comfortable disclosing.
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20. Conclusion

51. How does your gender and/or sexual identity influence your feeling of public safety in Toronto?
21. Conclusion

52. Any last comments or something that the survey missed?
## Appendix 1.5 - Online Survey Results

### Table 3 – Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Dresser</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Spirit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersex</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses Inputted by participants in the ‘Other’ Field:

1. AFAB/Genderqueer/Whatever
2. Androgynous / gender fluid
3. Cisgender, but questioning
4. Femme
5. femme
6. genderfluid
7. Genderfluid
8. genderfluid
9. i am female but i think gender is an oppressive construct
10. non binary
11. Non-binary  
12. Non-binary male

Table 4: Pairing of Multiple Gender Identities by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identities</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female &amp; Cisgender</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &amp; Cisgender</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female &amp; Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &amp; Genderqueer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female &amp; Genderqueer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Genderqueer &amp; Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender &amp; Genderqueer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer &amp; Agender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &amp; Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &amp; FTM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male &amp; other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Transgender &amp; FTM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Transsexual, FTM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Cisgender, &amp; Bigender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Transgender, FTM, &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Transgender, Transsexual, FTM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Cisgender, Genderqueer, &amp; Cross-Dresser</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male, Transgender, Genderqueer, &amp; Two-Spirit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female &amp; Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female &amp; Agender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Transgender, &amp;MTF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Cisgender, &amp; Genderqueer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Cross-Dresser &amp; Bigender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Cisgender &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Transgender, Transsexual, &amp; MTF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female, Transgender, Transsexual, MTF, &amp; Bigender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer &amp; Transsexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer &amp; Two-Spirit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender, Agender &amp; FTM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5– Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queer</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demisexual</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skoliosexual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asexual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androsexual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gynosexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses Inputted by participants in the ‘Other’ Field:

1. Dyke
2. Likes people.
3. Mostly date guys
4. oh my god, demisexual isn't a sexual orientation, it's a descriptor of attraction, your survey is already terrible
5. Polyamorous
6. same gender loving
Table 6 - Pairing of Multiple Sexual Orientations by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientations</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queer &amp; Gay</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer &amp; Bisexual</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer &amp; Pansexual</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Bisexual &amp; Pansexual</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Bisexual &amp; Lesbian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer &amp; Lesbian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Gay &amp; Lesbian</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer &amp; Skoliosexual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual &amp; Pansexual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer &amp; Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual &amp; Demisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual &amp; Androsexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual &amp; Demisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian &amp; Gay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual, Pansexual &amp; Demisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pansexual, Androsexual, Skoliosexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer &amp; Demisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Bisexual &amp; Gay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Bisexual &amp; Demisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Bisexual &amp; Questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Pansexual, &amp; Demisexual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Bisexual &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queer, Bisexual, Straight &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your Age?

Table 7 - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 and under</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your Religion?

Table 8 - Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paganism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/Non-denominational</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous spirituality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taoism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucianism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shinto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses Inputted by participants in the ‘Other’ Field:

1. Athiest
2. Christian-informed
3. Esoteric Christianity (Greek Gospels without later Acts and Epistles)
4. Jewish heritage. Identifies as culturally jewish but not judaic religion
5. my own
6. non-practicing
7. Practice spirituality
8. syncretic family spirituality

Table 9 - Pairing of Multiple Religions by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic &amp; No Religion</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist &amp; No Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity &amp; Agnostic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion &amp; Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paganism &amp; Agnostic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Taoism, &amp; Atheist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paganism, Agnostic &amp; No Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity, Atheist, Agnostic, &amp; No Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism &amp; Agnostic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist &amp; Hinduism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism &amp; Agnostic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism &amp; Inter/Non-denominational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism &amp; Taoism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity &amp; Paganism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism, Atheist &amp; Agnostic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism &amp; Agnostic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism &amp; Inter/Non-denominational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist, Agnostic &amp; No Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism, Agnostic, &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism, Indigenous spirituality, Paganism, Inter/Non-denominational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What’s your racial identity?

Table 10 - Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Latina/Latin@</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous/Metis/First Nation/Inuit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses Inputted by participants in the ‘Other’ Field:

1. Canadian
2. European
3. French Canadian
4. Irish Inuit
5. Jewish
6. Jewish
7. Jewish/E. European
8. Middle Eastern
9. Pacific Islander
10. Southeast Asian
Table 11 - Pairing of Multiple Racial Identities by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin@ &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous/Metis/First Nation/Inuit, White &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian &amp; East Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; Indigenous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous/Metis/First Nation/Inuit &amp; White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin@ &amp; White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; South Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous/Metis/First Nation/Inuit &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin@, White and Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, White &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian, White &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian, Mixed &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin@, Black, White and Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Indigenous, East Asian, White &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian, Arab, White &amp; Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you identify as disabled, crip, hard of hearing, deaf or differently abled? (including intellectual, physical, invisible, sensory, mental and developmental disabilities)

Table 12 - Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Able-bodied</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I am able-bodied</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses Inputted by participants in the ‘Other’ Field:

1. able bodied with some medical health concerns
2. ADD
3. ADHD
4. HIV
5. I have extrasensory perceptive abilities; or, I'm delusional.
6. Learning disabled
7. long term chronic manageable illness/HIV is often categorized as an episodic disability
8. mental health--anxiety, ptsd, depression
9. mental illness but I am still able to function normally
10. Mild developmental disorder but do not publicly identify
11. PTSD, Depression, anxiety. makes cycling tricky sometimes
12. Yes, i have an anxiety disorder and am on meds for it but i'm highly functional and don't think i should really be classed as disabled in comparison to what some ppl go through
What’s your yearly income?

Table 13 - Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Bracket</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $14,999</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $29,999</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $39,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $69,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 - $79,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 - $89,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is your occupation?

**Table 14 - Occupation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full Time</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, working part-time</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, looking for work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, attending school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not able to work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed, not looking for work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 - Pairing of Multiple Occupations by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed, Working Part-Time &amp; Student</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time &amp; Volunteer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student &amp; Not Employed, Looking for Work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, Working Part-Time, Volunteer &amp; Student</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, Working Part-Time, Volunteer, Caregiver &amp; Student</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time &amp; Part-Time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time, Caregiver &amp; Volunteer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student &amp; Volunteer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time &amp; Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, Not Employed, Attending School, &amp; Not Employed, Looking for Work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time &amp; Parent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Able to Work &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Employed, Attending School &amp; Not Employed, Looking for Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time, Volunteer &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time, Working Part-Time &amp; Student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, Working Part-Time &amp; Volunteer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed, Working Part-Time, Student &amp; Parent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, Not employed, Looking for Work &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time, Working Part-Time, Volunteer &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, Volunteer, &amp; Not Employed, Looking for Work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Full-Time, Working Part-Time, Student, Not Employed, Looking for Work &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Highest Level of Education?

Table 16 - Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school degree or equivalent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/university but no degree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College diploma</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you rent or own the place where you live?

Table 17 – Housing Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Status</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses Inputted by participants in the ‘Neither’ Field:

1. I live with an artistic patron.
2. im a freeloader and i live in my mom's friend's mansion for $0
3. Live at home
4. Live at parents
5. Live with boyfriend who owns
6. Live with family
7. Live with family.
8. Live with parents
9. live with parents
10. live with parents
11. Live with parents
12. live with parents
13. live with parents
14. living with parent
15. Living with parent who is the owner of the house, but not paying rent
16. Living with Parents
17. Parentally owned property paying monthly costs and taxes
18. Parent's house
19. temporarily living in family owned house
20. With parents
21. With parents

What neighbourhood do you live in?

1. Agincourt
2. Alexandra Park
3. annex
4. Annex
5. Annex
6. Annex
7. Annex
8. Beaches
9. Between the Church-Wellesley neighbourhood and St. Jamestown
10. Blake-Jones
11. Bloor West
12. Bloor West
13. bloorcourt
14. Bloorcourt
15. Bloordale
16. bloordale
17. Bloordale
18. Bloorwest village
20. Cabbagetown
21. Cabbagetown
22. Carleton Village
23. Chinatown
24. Christie Pits
25. Christie Pitts
26. Church & Wellesley
27. Church and Wellesley aka the gayyyyy village
28. Church/Wellesley - The Village
29. Church-Wellesley
30. Cliffside
31. Corktown
32. Danforth Area
33. Danforth/Greektown
34. Danforth-East York
35. Davenport
36. Davenport and Dovercourt - Does it have a neighbourhood name?
37. davisville
38. Deer Park
39. Don Mills
40. Don't understand question
41. Dorset park
42. dovercourt park
43. Downsview
44. Downtown
45. Downtown/Yorkville
46. East York
47. East York
48. east york
49. entertainment district
50. Entertainment District
51. Esplanade
52. Etobicoke
53. Forest Hill
54. garden district
55. gay village
56. Gayyyyy village
57. Grange Park
58. Harbourfront
59. High park
60. high park
61. High park
62. High Park-Pardale
63. Hillcrest
64. Hillcrest Village
65. Islington City Center West
66. Junction
67. Junction Triangle
68. Junction Triangle
69. Junction triangle
70. Keele and Eglinton
71. Kensington market
72. King W.
73. Kipling
74. Leaside
75. Leaside
76. Leslieville
77. Leslieville
78. Leslieville
79. Little India
80. Little Italy
81. Little Italy
82. Little Italy
83. Little Italy
84. Little Italy
85. Little Italy
86. Little Italy.
87. Little Italy.
88. Little Portugal
89. Little Portugal
90. Longbranch Village
91. Mid Town
92. Midtown
93. Mimico
94. north york
95. North York
96. North York
97. Oakwood Village
98. Ossington
99. Parkdale
100. Parkdale
101. Parkdale
102. Parkdale
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neighborhood/Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>Parkdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>Parkdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>Parkdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Pelham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>Port Union Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>Queen West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Queen West/Parkdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Reagent Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Regal Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>Regal Heights / Corso Italia / ambiguous undefined neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Regent park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Regent Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Regent Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Regent Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>riverdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Riverdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>Roncesvalles Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Scarborough Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Scarborough, Woburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Sherbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>South Rosedale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>St james town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>St Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>St. Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>The Annex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>The Annex / Koreatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>The Beaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>The Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>The Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>the Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>The Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>The Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>The Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>wallace emerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>Wallace-Emerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>west bloor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eighteen participants did not respond to this question.

What is the closest major intersection to your house?

1. Bathurst & College
2. Bathurst & St Clair
3. Bathurst and DuPont
4. Bathurst and Eglinton
5. Bathurst and Steeles
6. Bathurst/Bloor
7. Bayview and laird
8. Bayview/Steeles
9. bayview/steeles
10. Birchmount and ellesmere
11. Bloor & Lansdowne
12. Bloor and Bathurst
13. Bloor and duffern
14. Bloor and Dundas
15. Bloor and Jarvis
16. Bloor and keele
17. Bloor and Ossington
18. Bloor and Ossington
19. Bloor and Ossington
20. bloor/spadina
21. Bloor/Yonge
22. Bloor-Sherbourne
23. Broad view and Dundas
24. Broadview & Gerrard
25. Christie and Bloor
26. Christie and St. Clair
27. Church & Jarvis
28. Church and Carlton
29. Church and carlton
30. Church and Mutual
31. Church and Wellesley
32. College and bathurst
33. Coxwell & Danforth
34. Coxwell and Danforth
35. coxwell and Gerrard
36. Danforth and Greenwood
37. Danforth Ave/Pape Ave
38. Davenport and Lansdowne
39. Davenport and Symington
40. Don Mills and Lawrence
41. Don Mills and York Mills
42. Dovercourt and Bloor
43. Dufferin & Landsdowne
44. Dufferin and Davenport
45. Dufferin and Dupont
46. Dufferin and Sheppard
47. Dufferin/Davenport
48. Dufferin/King
49. Dundas and Bathurst
50. Dundas and Beverley
51. Dundas and Bloor
52. Dundas and Dufferin
53. Dundas and jarvis
54. Dundas and Ossington
55. Dundas and Parliament
56. Dundas and Roncesvalles
57. Dundas spadina
58. Dundas West and Bloor St West
59. DuPont and ossington
60. Gerrard & Parliament
61. Gerrard Street East/Parliament Street
62. Gerrard/Church
63. Greenwood and Danforth
64. Harbord and Ossington
65. high park and Bloor
66. I'm not comfortable saying
67. Jane bloor
68. Jarvis & Bloor
69. Jarvis & Front Streets
70. Jarvis/Wellesley
71. Keele
72. Keele and Eglinton
73. King and Bathurst
74. King and Dufferin
75. King/ Dufferin
76. Kipling and Dundas
77. Kipling and Dundas
78. Kipling and Lakeshore
79. Kipling Dundas
80. Laird and Eglinton
81. Lansdowne & Bloor
82. Lansdowne and dundas
83. Lansdowne and Dupont
84. Lansdowne and Dupont
85. lansdowne and dupont
86. Lansdowne Ave. & College St. W.
87. Lansdowne-Dupont
88. lower simco and bremner
89. Markham and Eglinton
90. Markham and Lawrence
91. Midland and Sheppard
92. Midland ave and Kingston Rd
93. Mt. Pleasant and Eglinton
94. Oakwood and St.Clair
95. Oakwood and Vaughan
96. ossington and bloor
97. Ossington and Bloor.
98. Ossington and Davenport
99. ossington and dupont
100. ossington and dupont
101. Ossington and Dupont
102. Ossington college
103. ossington/dupont
104. Pape & Danforth
105. Pape and Queen St East
106. pape/danforth
107. Port Union and Lawrence
108. Quebec ave and bloor St west
109. Queen and Bathurst
110. queen and dufferin
111. Queen and Dufferin
112. Queen and Dufferin
113. Queen and parliament
114. queen/Carlaw
115. Queen/Jones
116. Queen/Roncesvalles
117. Royal York and lakeshore
118. Scarborough Golf Club Road and Lawrence
119. Sherbourne and Bloor
120. Sherbourne and Carlton
121. Sherbourne and Esplanade
122. Sherbourne and Richmond
123. sherbourne and Wellesley
124. Sorauren & Dundas
125. Spadina and Bloor
126. Spadina and College
127. Spadina Rd. and Bloor St.
128. Spadina x Bloor
129. St. Clair W Ave and Dufferin
130. Wellesley
131. Wellesley & Parliament
132. Wellesley/parliament
133. Woodbine and Gerrard
134. Woodbine Ave. and Kingston Rd.
135. Yonge & Carlton
136. yonge & davisville
137. Yonge & St Clair
138. Yonge and Bloor
139. yonge and carlton
140. Yonge and Eglinton
141. yonge and wellesley
142. Yonge and Wellesley
143. Yonge King
144. yonge/finch
145. York and Bremner
146. York and Queens Quay
147. yorkville and avenue
148. Young Dundas

Seventeen participants did not answer this question
About how long have you lived in your neighbourhood?

Table 18 – Amount of Time Living in Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Living in Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 months</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over a year</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over two years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over three years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over four years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over five years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over six years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over ten years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over twenty years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many of your neighbours do you know?

Table 19 - Neighbours Known by Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbours Known</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All of them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About half of them</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few of them</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How strong is the sense of community in your neighbourhood?

Table 20 – Sense of Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sense of Community</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely strong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately strong</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly strong</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all strong</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on sense of community:

1. Community in the larger sense, not the community who live in the same building.
2. Definitely a changing and gentrifying area. There are many people who have owned their homes intergenerationally, so the older Italian families definitely have a sense of community. That said, the area is very expensive, so there are lots of rental units for young people as well as professionals moving in. We have a few neighbours that are friendly, and a lot of people sit out in their front or backyard and will say hi - great street for that. However, some homes you rarely see any action.
3. I don't know how to answer this question. Whose community? There are queers moving into the area that seem connected to each other. There is an older Portuguese population that seems connected to each other. Community all together? I don't know.
4. I don't know that I am part of that community and I don't know how much of a unified community there is, exactly. But many people seem to know each other or are friendly to one another.
5. I don't mingle. I get from point A to B
6. I feel sense of community thru my church only; other than that i do not feel any sense of community with the neighbourhood @ large
7. I live in a condo no community atmosphere at all
8. I live in student family housing which is a strong community that I'm not yet a part of. I live near Yonge/Church and Wellesley which is a strong community.
9. I love knowing my neighbors and having regular faces / being a regular face on the street and at various institutions - many of which can also be quite alienating because of
the dynamics of desire that play out there for some bodies and not others. But the more quotidian interactions I have with neighbors of various types are nice.

10. I love my neighbourhood but people seem distant
11. I think living in student housing might prevent engagement with neighbors who have different lifestyle
12. I think the families who own houses here have a strong sense of community but the students who rent (like me) don't really
13. My area (Palmerston between Bloor and Dupont) is inhabited mostly by young families, so I don't really interact with them. I suspect that many of them interact with each other, but I can't comment on that for certain.
14. Recently moved from downtown-Annex to Islington City Center West
15. Small grocery stores and coffee shops nearby have a strong sense of community, but the street itself is ever-changing and largely anonymous
16. strong sense of community but not my community
17. The brown community seems very strong, which is nice to see.
18. The few neighbours I know are ones I knew way before I moved to this area.
19. The sense of community is strong between Italians and Portuguese people, and only if they're of the conventional sexualities and genders.

How safe do you feel walking alone in the shared areas around your residence (e.g. hallways, porch, front yard, lobby)?

Table 21 – Safety Around Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety around Residence</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Safe</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Safe</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Safe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Safe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22 - Feeling of Safety around Residence by Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Safe</th>
<th>Very Safe</th>
<th>Moderately Safe</th>
<th>Slightly Safe</th>
<th>Not at all Safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Dresser</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Spirit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on safety around residence:

1. Condo with security
2. During the day; very safe. At night, any area of Toronto that is largely deserted does not feel safe, and there are at least four wandering, belligerent screaming homeless folk in my neighbourhood that I am aware of. I don't want to say they are necessarily dangerous, as I'll probably be one of them someday; but nevertheless, honestly, I couldn't say passing by them feels safe-- or predictable at any rate.
3. During the daytime I feel very safe walking alone in shared areas but after dark I don't feel as comfortable. At night I often refrain from listening to music and choose to walk on the illuminated side of the street, or the side of the street where cars are not parked, to be more aware of my surroundings.
4. I sometimes worry about skunks
5. I'm mostly afraid of raccoons.
6. I'm slightly afraid to walk around in drag in my area and even in my building, but I do it anyway.
7. Less so at night
8. My street isn't that we'll lit at night and I recently got cat-called way more than I'd expect while walking along Yonge at night (between 8 and 10pm).
9. Sometimes smoking by myself in the back alley makes me nervous because I don't know what people might want from me. I've seen people doing various kinds of hard drug, and people having sex in that alley, which is fine by me, but I don't want to make others feel like I'm a voyeur or be bothered when I'm just having a smoke.

Do you feel safer alone or in a group in your neighbourhood during the day?

Table 23 – Daytime Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Safety</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't Matter</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 - Feeling of safety alone or in a group daytime by gender identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alone</th>
<th>In a group</th>
<th>Doesn't matter</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Dresser</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Spirit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment box entries on daytime safety:

1. As long as I'm not in drag.
2. Day feels much safer.
3. I usually feel safe during the day

Do you feel safer alone or in a group in your neighbourhood at night?

Table 25 – Nighttime Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nighttime Safety</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn't Matter</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 - Feeling of Safety Alone or in a Group nighttime by Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Alone</th>
<th>In group</th>
<th>Doesn't matter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Dresser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Spirit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment box entries on nighttime safety:

1. Being AFAB, it always feels safer to be in a group after dark regardless of location/neighbourhood.
2. but as long as I'm on a bike, alone feels totally fine.
3. Depends on the group I'm with, but if I'm with a bunch of ladies we'll be harassed by douchebros going clubbing (because when do ladies ever hang out if not seeking men to prey on, right?!); if I'm alone I'm more anonymous
4. I always feel unsafe at night.
5. I don't mind being alone at night up until a certain time but I would prefer to be with at least one other person.
6. I generally always feel safer in groups.
7. This has more to do with always being slightly on edge at night if I'm alone...
Overall, how safe do you feel in your neighbourhood?

Table 27 – Overall Neighbourhood Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety around Residence</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Safe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Safe</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Safe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Safe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 28 - Feeling of Safety Overall by Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Extremely Safe</th>
<th>Very Safe</th>
<th>Moderately Safe</th>
<th>Slightly Safe</th>
<th>Not at All Safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transsexual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Dresser</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Spirit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on overall safety in neighbourhood:

1. My daily commute takes me toward parkdale, where my various jobs and partner are, along queen. I make this commute at all times of day and night and when I choose to walk, I am invariably approached/addressed by strangers when travelling alone.

2. One of the downsides to being in a visibly gay neighborhood is that homophobic jerks know where "we" (some of "we") are. Because it's marked I think when drivers or passers-by say shitty things, as they sometimes have to me in yonge or in the parking lot across from Wellesley station, that they're hitting their intended target.

3. Pretty safe

4. there have been a couple abductions and sexual assaults this year that were made public. makes me a little uneasy/happy to be on my bike at night
Do you feel uncomfortable entering any of the following spaces in your neighbourhood? (Please select all that apply)

Table 29 – Discomfort Entering Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncomfortable Spaces</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard, hallway or other shared space around my place of Residence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightclubs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entries in ‘Other’ box:

1. "uncomfortable" is a vague word.
2. (only at night)
3. certain isolated spaces at night
4. churches, community centres
5. depends on who is around

Comment box entries on uncomfortable spaces:

1. Pace of life (having to do things quickly to not feel I'm in the way of others) • apparent disregard of others to their surroundings (walking and texting) • cyclists on sidewalks • too many people walking abreast • loud talking • aggressive pedestrians and drivers • noise from cars • social evaluation anxiety

2. 1) parks: secluded and lots of coverage make me nervous. The park's history of serial sexual assaults puts me on edge 2) nightclubs and on the street: the harassment level is high. Whether you choose to answer, rebuff or question the harassment there's a subconscious fear of violence.
3. a lot of people who live in shelters or the street. drug use connected. many men who make me feel uncomfortable
4. Allen Gardens is just a generally sketchy place with a number of homeless and drug abusers who I feel uncomfortable around -- I generally just want to be left alone and not stared at or talked to by random people.
5. as a woman, one who is often visibly lesbian, of course i feel uncomfortable in any place there are men. i have been yelled at on the street, and i don't want to experience that or anything worse again. there are no gay bars or anything where i live, so i hate going to the straight bars here. i hate assumptions that are made about me, and being looked at, and even just interacting with very heteronormative ppl where i feel invisible.
6. At night there aren't many people around and it's fairly dark, which makes me feel less safe. Most bars are fine but there are a few where I get pointed looks and unwelcoming attitudes from older people due to being visibly queer
7. At night, most people in these spaces for any length of time are club-goers (a group which historically I do not get along with, and which I've been persecuted by members of, on multiple occasions); homeless people (*most of whom* do not deserve to be feared, but some of whom are aggressive, confrontational or loud); or night-workers who love to slow down and catcall. I hate those guys.
8. Bars/clubs have very inappropriate patrons who cat call
9. dark. usually at night
10. Depending on the bar/nightclub, I feel like I do not conform to the strict gender division sometimes enforced socially - like I am not "female enough."
11. Depending on which bar etc. and the people in it or around it outside and this is generally at night. I wouldn't necessarily say I feel unsafe but mostly uncomfortable.
12. depends on a lot of factors... often feel safe but if walking alone at night on the street and it is mostly empty, may feel uncomfortable if catcalled while walking or biking may feel unsafe even if it is daytime unaccessible subway stations force me to rely on randoms to help me carry my kid/stroller down stairs - sometimes feels fine, but if later at night or the station is more empty, can feel really uncomfortable
13. Drinking, people's lack of boundaries when they drink.
14. Drunk, possibly conservative, cis men
15. Dundas streetcar can have sketchy people on it at times. Areas around moss park and Ontario street isn't the safest at night.
16. Everywhere feels unsafe at night if you're queer, but night clubs, public transit,and parks are especially uncomfortable at all times of the day especially at night. People get angry if they find out you're queer sometimes, and in night clubs and in public transit, because it's such a closed space with no queer bathrooms or areas, it's easy to be targeted and hurt.
17. feel judged based on gender presentation; need to hide gender identity
18. Feel unsafe on the street and in parks at night time.
19. Groups of bored / angry men Amped up drunk guys on the street
20. Humber loop if you're waiting for a streetcar late at night is awful. You can be waiting for half an hour or 45 minutes with one or two other people. I've been hassled and I'm scared if anything ever got physical there would be no one to hear screaming.
21. I am afraid of running into someone who was abusive toward me.
22. I feel less safe on public streets ie Queen, based on looks, comments and body language of strangers. At night, the likelihood of intoxication increases stranger aggression and my fear.

23. I feel like my body will be unwillingly touched or men will not take no for an answer after I reject an advance.

24. I generally feel unsafe in places with alcohol (TTC included) because men leering makes me really feel uncomfortable. Thankfully nothing has happened in Toronto.

25. I gravitate towards LGBTQ spaces at night, but walking alone in certain areas at night I'm a little afraid of drunken straight bros in certain areas. While I identify as genderqueer, I can mostly present as a slightly effeminate male. Because of looking mostly male, I do not experience much trouble. I do think about taking self-defence classes just in case as I am slight and look fairly non-threatening. Not sure what to suggest, but maybe urging more gyms and community centres to offer affordable/free self-defence classes that are trans and queer male inclusive.

26. I have had a few people (intoxicated) stare at me at night, presumably when it is not clear what gender I am, and that has made me feel uncomfortable. I generally feel uncomfortable on the street at night when I am walking, but not when I am biking. Part of the discomfort is likely because I grew up in Mexico, where going out at night is always dangerous: even though I know that it is much safer than Mexico, I always feel uncomfortable walking.

27. I occasionally feel unsafe in parks, shared spaces around my place of residence, and on the street when I am alone after dark. I will avoid, whenever possible, travelling through parks or down dark alleys or streets for fear that there could be someone hidden from view that could harm me without witness. If there are other groups of people visible that are travelling through the same park spaces and down the same streets as me, my fear is greatly reduced even after dark. I occasionally feel unsafe on public transit whenever strangers initiate interaction, either with myself or with other people nearby. It is the unpredictability of the situation and the inability to remove myself from the situation (due to train/streetcar/bus being between stops, or very crowded, or exits blocked by other passengers, etc.) that makes me uncomfortable.

28. I only ever feel uncomfortable walking by two or more guys (groups) on the street. but that is not the same as feeling threatened by them. that rarely ever happens.

29. I pass as a straight woman. I feel unsafe in spaces with older men hanging around them at night or during the day. I would also feel less safe for my friends/partner and I if we were deemed queer/trans by people in my neighborhood.

30. I sometimes encounter street harassment on the street or on public transit, which makes me feel unsafe.

31. I try not to enter parks when I'm alone at nighttime, as many of them are not well lit, nor are there many people around.

32. I wouldn't say that I necessarily feel "unsafe" in these spaces but I cannot say that I "feel safe in all these spaces at all times." The streets and public transit of any large city can be intimidating. I certainly feel most vulnerable in those spaces.

33. In part, my mental illnesses is what triggers my anxiety in these spaces, however I do also experience a high amount of street harassment around my building. Also, you often have to navigate around violent behaviour (thankfully, the violence is almost always directed towards objects or through yelling). The security in my building is very lax.
34. In public transit, feeling unsafe when it's night time and there's no one around.
35. I've been accosted on the sidewalk before and still get nervous. That person seemed to be mentally ill. In my experience most mentally ill street involved folks keep to themselves and are non threatening. But i still get nervous. Mentally ill folks need more support. Sometimes I see cops picking them up and that doesn't make me less nervous. Quite the opposite. Clubs and bars can feel unsafe in a different way - the danger of being invisible, undesirable, ignored, viewed with contempt. I feel uncomfortable in those spaces but not necessarily unsafe in a physical sense. But sometimes when alcohol is flowing there can be conflict.
36. Lack of light, not much traffic (pedestrian or cars)
37. Many store fronts close early, leaving a subset of the population vulnerable at night.
38. Most of the above are specifically a feeling of uncomfortable when I am with my same sex partner. Especially on the street, we do not hold hands. We do not eat out in restaurants in our neighbourhood. Public transit can be uncomfortable, especially at night. We only start holding hands once we've crossed into getting closer to Toronto. I would avoid going to a bar/pub in Scarborough. Mostly lower/working class white (cis straight) older men being excited about sports.
39. My gender identity brings on feelings of concern when entering these locations due to the level of privilege of many neighbours and their desire for a uniform and biased social strata within the area.
40. My neighbourhood is a bit removed from bars, restaurants, and other things people do at night, so it tends to be somewhat uninhabited when its dark out. There are lots of small parkettes, industrial buildings and areas, and many poorly lit, but open-ish spaces and walkways. So sometimes people seem to pop out from the dark nowhere, or feel like they are following you because they are the only other people/person around and they are on the same street.
41. Noise sometimes, anxiety if its a space that i read as very heteronormative i get uncomfortable lots of "bros"--a certain performance of cis male masculinity that is hyper aggressive and objectifying of women, also i never know when folks who perform this masculinity will become violent towards folks of colour, people who they (the bros) deem as a threat to strict gender binaries, or openly queer people. never know when i will have to de-escalate (often if i am intervening for a male identified friend) or escalate (more often if i am intervening for a cis-female friend that dude bros are trying to pick up) to end a potentially violent situation on the street-- there's a dude who almost deliberately hit me with his bike last spring, who i've noticed is sometimes around and harassing folks. he's big and i try to be aware of my surroundings to avoid him on the street/bars/public--male gaze certain restaurants and stores-- too expensive, they read me as someone who cant afford their stuff (true) and i feel uneasy. not about my class, but about the assumptions people are making about my class
42. Non-queer, Non-Parkdale crowds
43. Not a lot of lighting, lots of people frequently use alleyways, lane ways, etc at night and sometimes people startle me and I can't fully see them
44. Not a lot of street lamps during the night and the nearby park is completely dark with a lot of huge trees that could completely cover large men from sight.
45. Not sure what to expect. Not trusting that people will respect my boundaries or consent.
46. Occasionally there are rough-looking guys in the neighbourhood, either having come out of a sports bar, or wandering the streets. While I have not been the target of harassment by these individuals, I have often felt their gaze, which I attribute to some part of my outfit or mannerisms. There may have been one or two instances of verbal harassment, though minor, where I could tell they knew I was gay.

47. On the street at nighttime, only in certain pockets (Jameson and King, for example). Mainly because the area is known for being not so nice, and there are often people who yell or catcall if I walk or bike by.

48. On the Street- during the night- because men will follow me home sometimes

49. on the streets only at night, because i am a woman. especially walking home alone at night. im always on the lookout for an attacker even though i trust my neighbourhood enough to be okay with walking home alone

50. Only at night because of lack of light

51. Parks or any public spaces at night that are not well-lit or have a lot of people.

52. past association to crime.

53. Poorly lit and very desolate, empty spaces make me feel afraid. I wonder if I come across as gay (which I think I do) and I wonder whether the gender presentation of friends will make me more, or less of a target. I wonder whether being seen as a straight woman versus a gay woman will make me more or less of a target. Either way I feel like a target, for different kinds of harassment.

54. Primarily afraid of violence from homophobic/racist police; Secondarily afraid of crack/drug addicts

55. Public transit - Often feel uncomfortable, or anxious, taking the subway or streetcar but not necessarily unsafe. Related to feeling other commuters looks towards me at times. Considerably less tense if I'm not travelling at a peak hour. No negative incidents have actually unfolded though. Nightclubs/Bars - Often very stressed about visiting a venue's bathroom (if there's a stall, a stall that locks, if it's empty, etc). I'm just beginning to transition medically, and I'm not recognized as male yet much of the time even when I'm presenting that way, so I often visit places where I can time when the bathroom will be empty, rush and make sure no one else will enter. I often avoid using the bathroom if they're crowded and worry about future experiences in the washroom.

56. Safety is such a complicated word, dependent on so many variable, and, even then, are we ever actually safe as black people? I don't feel safe at night on the Danforth -- there's an intense, toxic, almost unbearable masculinity that exists and is heightened by alcohol, that I don't feel 'safe.'

57. schools- I'm visibly queer and students, especially the highschool ones put me on edge just because of the enviornment of hostility that highschools tend to breed public transit - I'm usually only uncomfortable on transit when there is a large group of men (especially white men). I've had people stare at me for entire subway rides across the city into scarborough and then follow me off the subway. It's a terrifying feeling. also I work late and it scares the crap out of my partner that I take transit so late, which makes me more paranoid. nightclubs/bars - (read cis straight people clubs) I feel as though I'm not welcome in these spaces as a visibly queer person guys give me dirty looks and women avoid me. even with my friends it makes me feel like all eyes are on me.

58. Some of my neighbours make me feel unsafe
59. Some of the bars in my immediate area have less than appealing individuals lurking outside of them at any time of day, making them seem sketchy.

60. Street harassment (lewd comments, being called names, being followed or approached)
- Lack of adequate lighting outside of nightclubs combined with zero surveillance offers more anonymity for potential offenders
- I have been groped, sexually harassed and been subject to indecent exposure on public transit with public onlookers that have done nothing to assist me before, during or after the situation and I don't feel comfortable reporting it to a TTC worker for fear that everyone will complain about being held up, the person responsible may be unstable and attempt to cause me bodily harm or there will be no way to prove that anything inappropriate has happened because even if it has been recorded on camera, some acts of sexual harassment require verbal witness

61. Teenage schoolboys often congregate around these areas. I have been followed, harassed, and verbally assaulted by these boys at different times. This varies depending on time but I feel most unsafe during the day and evening and most safe just after dark, as usually they have gone home by then. These areas are usually deserted except for groups of boys and some passers-by, which makes me feel very unsafe. I feel safer in stores, etc because it is more crowded, and generally while bad behaviour is tolerated to a point in my neighbourhood (ex. if a slur or threat is whispered at me and people see themselves as being able to just ignore it), if it escalates into something unignorable, people will intervene.

62. The crowds of people outside and inside are very aggressive. Rich people lookin down at you and tell in at you from their cars that cost more than the amount of money I've made in my life. I've been followed home countless times.

63. The feeling of safety changes. I feel comfortable in most places during the day but very uncomfortable at night. As a person who identifies as a woman there are certain things I need to be wary of at night especially when I'm by myself which is often.

64. The feelings of safety change during night. During the day I feel safe, but at night I don't feel as safe.

65. The level of discomfort is small but in a subway (and Sherbourne or Castle Frank are my neighbourhood's stations) there is a sense of 'nowhere to go" or of quick escape is something happens.

66. The nightclubs and coffee shops in my area are very hetero and Greek-guy dominated so it's not a cool place to be overtly gay.

67. The people look at me as if I am a stranger with unwelcoming stares. Another store, I feel the owner is just homophobic and doesn't want the kind of client.

68. The street is the only place that I have ever been verbally assaulted or harassed, almost entirely from drivers/passengers in automobiles.

69. The type of crowd that the nightclubs attract make me feel uncomfortable. Sometimes some of the men can be aggressive in their pursuit of women.

70. There are just some areas around here that have a lot of drunks/catcallers which gets kind of scary alone at night.

71. There are queer bars and spaces in my neighbourhood. I'm usually more comfortable in these places because, while I don't always feel a sense so strong as "belonging", I feel like I'm expected to be there and supposed to be there. I avoid most bars that aren't explicitly or known to be queer-friendly because of the feeling I get that I'm not supposed to be there and I can't predict what kind of interactions I'm going to have. I also feel
uncomfortable in some stores and establishments for class reasons as much as gender reasons. I avoid walking through parks at night.

72. There are some bars in the area where the clients are mostly older straight men...kind of feels like their own private club

73. There is a very large older and immigrant population who tend to socialize in groups. I hide my tattoos and try not to draw attention to myself if I have to go into any of the above places.

74. There is an alley behind my building I pass through and I sometimes feel unsafe if somebody has followed me off the bus through that space. Also, I avoid certain bars that have a more male/local feel because I have been (verbally) harassed in that type of space before for looking abnormally gendered.

75. These places feel less safe at night because I am a woman and most public places feel at least a little unsafe at night. Also my first week of living here, 2 people were stabbed across the street.

76. They are occupied by groups of roaming young men who are not respectful to women and if they knew I was trans would be much worse.

77. Time of day, typical patrons of the establishment, too many unlit places at night, an influx of street people that are very "in your face" and violent, comments from people about Trans people

78. Typically at night I feel unsafe in these places. I live in a community where homophobia is still strongly prevalent and so I sometimes feel uncomfortable and vulnerable in these spaces at night, especially when I'm alone.

79. Well, this area is in the middle of a big change with lower class people being pushed out further west of Dufferin and new semi-wealthy people coming in. Since there is a transition happening, there is a mix of these two groups from different social strata and it's just uncomfortable. Particularly at night there are lots of parks around and you'll see the people on the edges of society (literally and figuratively) inhabiting these spaces since the main strip on Queen has been turned into an uber trendy hotspot. There is a palpable tension between people who have lived here for many years versus those who are new to the area which is clear in places like the grocery store where everyone congregates.

80. When it's dark out I feel unsafe in these places as these are places where at night discrimination has occurred. The problem with these places at night is they're too dark, not enough people around, groups of teens looking for trouble seem to be out

81. When it's dark, I just tend to feel unsafe in most parks by myself
Do you feel comfortable being a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community in your neighbourhood?

**Table 30 – Visibility, LGBTQ2+ and Neighbourhood Comfort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have no problems being visible in my neighbourhood</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but only if I'm not alone</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It depends (please specify in the comments)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don't feel comfortable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on visibility and LGBTQ2+ identity:

1. Again, at night I am aware that I am a gay man living in a queer neighbourhood, and I try and stay in well-lit areas with people nearby. Always try and be aware of my surroundings.
2. Because of my slight stature and style/fashion, I am often pegged as LGBT - usually gay - by many members of the public.
3. Depends on the time of year and what's going on in my neighbourhood. During Fifa or other such events where lots of people come into my neighbourhood, it becomes very heteronormative and unsafe for LGBTQ folks.
4. Depends on what you mean as "being visible." Holding hands not so much, wearing stuff for Pride no problem.
5. Depends where I am going.
6. Depends where in my neighbourhood I am. There are queer spaces in my neighbourhood where I feel comfortable as visibly queer.
7. don't feel uncomfortable being visibly queer, but sometimes made to feel unsafe/ experience scrutiny and harassment re gender/femme gender presentation? related i guess!
8. During the day, I don't mind, there's a lot of people out, and families. At night, there's less people, and the few who are out are intoxicated and bored because not too much happens in the neighbourhood at night, and they will likely will call out after you if you give them a reason (being, dressing differently than they are used to, or really being anything).
9. Generally many people in my neighbourhood are older and "stick to themselves", so at most I will get dirty looks. However, even dirty looks can still make me feel very vulnerable, and there are rare instances where I run into someone forward. It depends where I am if I feel safe--I know if I'm in a store where there are many people, I am safe.
because generally no one will act on anything, but if I'm alone I feel more vulnerable (I still have trouble believing it will escalate, though; generally this neighbourhood is very safe)

10. However, I'm not actually sure if I am visible (femme invisibility)
11. I am not really a "visible LGBTQ2+ member. outwardly there isn't any visual cues to suggest that.
12. I do feel comfortable with the idea, though I haven't been visible about it in my neighbourhood yet.
13. I do not feel that I am a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community.
14. I don't know. As far as I know, the impression I give is that I am straight. But I do feel comfortable speaking about it within my neighbourhood.
15. I don't really know how visible as queer I am just by appearance. But I also try to pass to a certain extent, or I am not openly presenting as genderqueer because I definitely feel like that affects my safety, or how much harassment I will face when out in public. There are some ways I am comfortable with my visibility as queer, and others I am more cautious about.
16. I don't think I am particularly "visible" as queer when walking alone because I pass as straight looking.
17. I experience a lot of sexual harassment as a femme. If I am partnered with another femme this sharply increases.
18. I feel more comfortable during the day and on bloor street. at night time or on the residential streets I feel less safe.
19. I feel safe but I feel underrepresented
20. I feel that whether or not I present as queer or am seen with other visible queers, my visibility as a woman puts me at risk first.
21. I have no problem being visible, but in some parts of the city I am concerned about transphobia and homophobia as a visibly queer person
22. I know my area has a lot of LGBTQ people but there have still been some homophobic incidents
23. I live in the village and am relatively gender conforming.
24. I mostly feel comfortable being visible in my community, however if I am doing something that makes me more visible, like walking down the street holding my partner's hand, there's often the thought in the back of my mind that I could be made to feel unsafe, even thought it's unlikely.
25. I never feel completely safe, but I'm out any way and bad things early happen. When they have happens, they have been in surprising contexts, so unless I'm only with my people did feel safe.
26. I often feel, because I am femme presenting, that people in my neighbourhood don't read me as queer.
27. I think when i am not walking with a group of friends i can pass as straight, especially if i present as more femme that day. with friends i think my queer visibility kicks up. in both contexts i for the most part feel safe
28. I would like to know what constitutes as visible? If I had told everyone and they knew then yeah I would feel totally fine and safe in my neighbourhood. I can't say that I get asked about my sexuality a lot so I don't think it is much of a problem, mind you I also don't think its anyones business either. I suppose the only way anyone would know my
orientation would be based on who I am out with, but as a Bi sexual it doesn't help make things abundantly clear.

29. I wouldn't say I am "visible" even though I am queer.

30. I'm not really a visible member of the community because I'm in a straight relationship.

31. I'm not visibly LGBTQ2+

32. I'm usually read as straight.

33. It depends if family sees me with a same sex partner

34. It had led to harassment in the past, so occasionally I feel uncomfortable

35. i've had dyke yelled at me in my neighbourhood, so no. sometimes if i'm with friends and in a good mood i'll forget about it, but i feel like i'm always on guard.

36. I've lived in the east end of Toronto for almost a decade and have been able to walk hand in hand with my a same sex partner and display affection without fear during this time.

37. I've walked around in drag or makeup before, so more of an alternative expression of gender identity situation. I sometimes feel nervous, but I'm also a pretty tall, white, able-bodied cisgender guy, and I think its important to take up space and be in people's faces when I have the privilege to generally feel pretty safe.

38. My neighbourhood is rather straight. As a feminine presenting bisexual woman, I feel my sexuality is often overlooked in any neighbourhood, but especially relatively straight ones. I don't want to change how I present just to be seen, but sometimes I wish that people would read me as queer, you know? I want to increase femme visibility, but am unsure how to do that in my straight neighbourhood.

39. Not entirely sure how "visible" I would be in any case; currently dating the "opposite" gender in what would outwardly appear to be a very straight relationship. If I was dating someone of the same (or another) gender, I might feel mildly uncomfortable being visibly "together," but I would have to test the waters first to get an idea of the temperature of the people in the area.

40. Not many people know how I identify

41. Not many people know me, so its only visible to those who know me personally.

42. Older individuals stare and make me uncomfortable

43. Slight discomfort, but don't feel threatened

44. Some of the rough sports bars make me feel uncomfortable.

45. Sometimes I feel comfortable, but there have been a few instances that make me apprehensive. When a group of 15 teenagers just point and laugh at you it makes you concerned that if something did go wrong no one would call for help. I've had friends who have been assaulted for their gender and sexuality. It's really difficult not to remember the sight of their bruises when you interact with people.

46. There a lots of people with substance abuse around here

47. There are days when I don't care and other days when I rather 'hide', for a lack of a better word.

48. There is a healthy contingent of queer folk here and The Beaver is right down the street.

49. with my partner things have felt uncomfortable before, she is a more visibly clear member of the lgbtq
If applicable, do you feel safe being a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community and a racialized community in your neighbourhood?

Table 31 - Visibility, Race, LGBTQ2+ and Neighbourhood Comfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visibility and Race</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who identify as racialized)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have no problem being both visible member of LGBTQ2+ community and racialized community</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, as long as they don't know I'm LGBTQ2+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don't feel comfortable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm Not a Member of Racialized Community</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on visibility, race and LGBTQ2+ identity:

1. "not feel safe" might be a bit too strong, "uncomfortable" might reflect better of what I would feel if I am a "a visible LGBTQ2+ member".
2. However, my life partner is a member of a racialized community and we occasionally jointly experience negative attitudes/interactions with people opposed to interracial relationships.
3. I am half white so I pass as white most of the time, but I still receive racist comments and threats more often than I receive anything due to my sexuality.
4. I don't experience problems- but I do understand my difference in my neighbourhood.
5. I dont look latino too much , so that helps
6. I want to clarify that I do believe people are racialized as 'white' and that I do believe it's important to recognize my whiteness as a racialized identity marker, but I don't believe that my community (whatever it is) is racialized.
7. N/A
8. The more interesting question, however, is do I feel safe being a racialized community member in the village. The answer would be no...but that would be a much more interesting, revealing question.
If applicable, do you feel safe being a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community and a religious community in your neighbourhood?

Table 32 – Visibility, Religion, LGBTQ2+ and Neighbourhood Comfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visibility and Religion</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who identify as racialized)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes no problem</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have no problem as long as not LGBTQ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t feel comfortable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not visible religious</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on visibility, religion and LGBTQ2+ identity:

1. Although I identify with being a Christian I do not go to church so am not part of a religious community.
2. I have heard antisemitic remarks on public transit in my area.
3. I sometimes where shirts representing the metropolitan community church of Toronto, I always feel a bit hokey like people will think I'm a prude or a holy roller but no one cares.
4. My neighbourhood is predominantly Jewish, I might not feel as safe if this was not the case.
5. N/A
6. While I may be converting to Judaism, I would not be viewed as Jewish to outsiders, and don't feel unsafe.
Does ability and accessibility have any bearing on your feeling of safety in your neighbourhood? (If yes, please specify in comments)

**Table 33 – Ability and Safety**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ability and accessibility</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on ability and accessibility:

1. as i have an anxiety disorder, i'm always gonna be worrying about my safety more than the average person.
2. Depends how 'AIDSy' I look/feel. (It's an HIV thing... "looking" HIV+ as opposed to people who look "healthy").
3. I am able-bodied but currently experience barriers because of using a stroller to get my kid around the city. Definitely feel less safe/comfortable/welcome when I can't get around; it's vulnerable and potentially uncomfortable to have to wait for someone to help you up/down stairs etc
4. I am mentally ill which can influence how safe I feel (I experience paranoia, past trauma due to homo/transphobia, etc), so I may misjudge how unsafe a situation is; I am developmentally disabled and my movement/spatial planning is affected so even though my instinct is often to "run", I am not always able to, which makes me more nervous.
5. I can't speak to that bearing as I only know being able and having accessibility...
6. I do not have any physical accessibility issues.
7. I don't experience ableist barriers in my neighbourhood since I'm able-bodied
8. I have problems with flickering lights giving me stroke like migraines.
9. I have PTSD which increases the stress of being harassed.
10. I request TTC stops late at night if I am unable to move as quickly as I usually can.. Or am injured.
11. I sometimes feel like I would be safer if I had more access to mental health resources in the area.
12. I'm hearing impaired so Noises can play tricks on me. I tend to walk with my good ear directed behind me (if that makes sense)y
13. I'm highly asthmatic but I normally choose to bike rather than take the transit and risk being hassled.
14. Lighting
15. My being able-bodied means I am more able to control being near people who are harassing me or not.
16. My disability is a learning disability. It does not affect my daily experience of safety.
17. My neighbourhood is fairly accessible because there is a retirement home nearby - everything is wheelchair accessible.
18. Only because I am able-bodied. There are many non-accessible areas in my neighbourhood.
19. Sometimes the mental health stuff kicks in and being in public is a bit tricky. Besides that I am okay as far as safety and the neighbourhood.
20. When physical, makes me feel more vulnerable. When mental, amplifies sense of danger and/or reaction to threatening actions/words.

Does your age have any bearing on your safety in your neighbourhood? (If yes, please specify in the comments)

Table 34 – Age and Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Factor</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment box entries on age:

1. appear very young, older neighbourhood
2. Appearing younger than I my age, I always feel I present as a violence against women target.
3. As I've gotten older, I've become more aware.
4. As someone who presents as young and able, I feel less at risk that I might as an elder.
5. being a young woman is terrifying. maybe if i was older i would have a great job, so i would have money, so i could take a taxi home whenever and not feel like i was breaking the bank, so i wouldn't fear walking down that dark street home?
6. Being an older woman, I'm not as fast as when I was younger, always alert to avenues of escape if required
7. I am a small young woman
8. I am a young looking woman with big breasts
9. I am a youngish woman
10. I am and young and able bodied so I have a greater sense of my ability to carry and defend myself.
11. I feel because I look older, I am treated differently.
12. I feel like younger women are more vulnerable to unwanted attention, violence and sexual violence.
13. I feel that as a young man who appears even younger than he is, people feel like I am an easy, non-authoritative target for harassment.
14. I feel that because I am a young woman and people perceive me as such, that I'm more likely to experience street/sexual harassment in my neighbourhood.
15. I guess? as a younger women, I feel more likely to be harassed by men.
16. I sometimes feel vulnerable for being visibly young as that might be taken as I am susceptible to an attack or can't defend myself.
17. I think my youth increases my safety and works to my advantage in public situations. a lot of elderly folks in this neighbourhood have a hard time getting around and do not always seem to have the necessary supports (like someone in the store helping fill their grocery order).
18. I worry about my age/experience/income status and housing situations, because I feel like those go hand-in-hand. Toronto's a precarious enough town for housing, and even though I'm university educated and a good tenant, even well into my 20s my roommate and I are put through the wringer every time we've had to seek out new housing. At 26 we had to have our parents co-sign our lease, and we're both white and otherwise mostly innocuous, so I can't imagine what the process would be like for people of different visible minorities.
19. if i were ten or fifteen years younger, i might encounter problems. and if i were 30 years older. but as a 30 something i feel somewhat safe. knock on wood.
20. I'm in my early 20s and a ciswoman. I get harassed constantly the minute I step out the door of my house because of these things, and it's frustrating. When a person who's bothering me finds out that I'm pansexual, they almost always try harder because they think it means I'm easy. If it doesn't work, they get violent which is why I'd rather be in a group if I'm walking around at night.
21. I'm not as agile pr physically able to defend myself in possible situations.
22. In some regards being a young female can feel unsafe. But once you get very close to schools it becomes safer.
23. It's also beside an elementary school, so there's mostly families here. The safety is good.
24. I've grown up here, so I became exposed to what the neighborhood was like as a very young age, as such you could say I've developed a fairly high tolerance to uncomfortable spaces or areas, additionally: people are always responsive to being able to provide help.
25. just young
26. Mid twenties, sometimes looks like a teen, may seem defenceless (gender is more of a cause over age)
27. No idea.
28. not really 'unsafe', but I do, at times, feel scrutinized as a young femme parent
29. Only because I'm a young looking woman and I experience harassment based on that already
30. Unsure. I feel that if I were older I might not be cat-called as much? No guarantee on that.
Which of the following affect your feeling of safety around your neighbourhood?

Table 35 – Safety Affected by Following Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Determinants</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of day (after dark)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor lighting on the street</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor lighting in parks</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of LGBTQ2+ visibility</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not lots of people around</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow or single access into a path, laneway, street or residential complex</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges, trees or other landscaping blocking your view/that people can hide behind</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Season</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of police</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor lighting inside residential hallways, lobby, or outside main entrance and/or porch</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings look unkept</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter/Trash accumulated</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient access to public transit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Signage</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many people around</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough police</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear where shared spaces and private property start and end</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of day (before dark)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of visibility of other community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have you ever encountered discrimination in your neighbourhood?

(Note: Discrimination as an action, behaviour or decision that treats a person or a group unfairly based on a group they're part of. The Canadian Human Rights Code protects against discrimination due to race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, disability and conviction for an offence for which a pardon has been granted or in respect of which a record suspension has been ordered)

Table 36 – Has Discrimination Been Experienced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What aspect of your identity was the target of discrimination? (Please select all that apply)

Table 37 – Identity Targeted by Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who have experienced discrimination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from ‘Other’ Box:

1. Being a cyclist
2. Queerness
3. Using my status card for tax exemption purposes
4. while in drag
5. Why the hell is gender separate from sex? Can people on the street tell what's in your pants?!
Table 38 - Pairing of Multiple Reasons for Discrimination by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Reasons for Discrimination</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &amp; Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex &amp; Marital Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex &amp; Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation &amp; Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation &amp; No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Status &amp; Marital Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability, Gender, &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability, Race/ethnicity &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin, Race/ethnicity &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, Sex &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation, Marital Status, &amp; Familial Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin, Gender, Sex, Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, Gender, Sex, Sexual Orientation &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin, Colour, Gender, Sex &amp; Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking with an accent, Immigration Status, Race/ethnicity, Economic Status &amp; Familial Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, Gender, Sex, Sexual Orientation, Economic Status &amp; Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin, Gender, Sex, Race/ethnicity, Religion &amp; Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How many discriminatory incidents have you encountered in your neighbourhood?

**Table 39 – Number of Discriminatory Incidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who have experienced discrimination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It only happened once</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has happened twice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has happened three or more times</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How long ago did the discriminatory incident(s) occur?

**Table 40 – How Recent was Discrimination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination Occurred</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who have experienced discrimination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the past 12 months</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the last two years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the last five years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over five years ago</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How was the discrimination expressed? (Please select all that apply)

### Table 41 – Discrimination Expressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination Expressed</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who have experienced discrimination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glances or Staring</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Verbal Comments</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threats or slurs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Chased or Followed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Social Media</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Spit On</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Having Access to Services or Locations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written threats or slurs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous Phone Calls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having Rocks Thrown at You</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of discrimination from ‘Other’ box:

1. another parent stopped their child from playing with mine because my partner is a butch lesbian who is often mistaken for a man. When it was discovered that she was not a man, the restriction was put in place.
2. being bullied at the park
3. Ignorant comments
4. Impeding movement
5. Single out by police
6. Threats of physical violence
7. thrown egg
8. Unwarranted threats from within vehicles (yelling, throwing things, dangerous/threatening driving, excessive honking)
9. was not allowed to rent in many different buildings due to lack of employment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43 – Sexual Assault Rates Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Harassment Experienced</td>
<td>Identity Targeted</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous Phone Calls</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45 – Being Chased or Followed Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being Chased or Followed</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 42
Table 46 – Being Spit On Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being Spit On</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47 – Having Rocks Thrown at You Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having Rocks Thrown at You</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Harassment Experienced</td>
<td>Identity Targeted</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glances or Staring</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Harassment Experienced</td>
<td>Identity Targeted</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Harassment Experienced</td>
<td>Identity Targeted</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written threats or slurs</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 51 – Verbal Threats or Slurs Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threats or slurs</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52 – Other Verbal Comments Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 53 – Not Having Access to Services or Locations Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Having Access to Services or Locations</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Harassment Experienced</td>
<td>Identity Targeted</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Social Media</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form of Harassment Experienced</td>
<td>Identity Targeted</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 56 – Other Discrimination Broken Down by Identity Targeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Harassment Experienced</th>
<th>Identity Targeted</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National or Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking with an accent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familial Status</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conviction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where did the discriminatory incident(s) occur? (Please select all that apply)

**Table 57 – Location of Discrimination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination Occurred</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who have experienced discrimination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard, Hallway or other shared space around residence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightclubs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Street</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in all these spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location of discrimination from ‘Other’ box:

1. Waiting for public transit
2. In front of a pizza place
Who or where did you go to for support after the discriminatory incident(s)? (Please select all that apply)

Table 58 – Support Accessed after Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of participants who have experienced discrimination)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ2+ Community Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Community Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-Based Organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Members</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer/Legal Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reaching for Support</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support from ‘Other’ box:

1. doctor
2. home
To your level of comfort, please provide more detail on the incident(s) of discrimination (e.g. time of day, whether you were alone, etc..)

1. While I have never faced outward discrimination, I get stared at frequently and I would attribute this to my gender expression.
2. When I was a kid the neighborhood children would tease us at the park. We tried playing sports with them but it got to the point of being bullied and picked on because of race. There was also a man with a large dog who would chase and bark at us and the man would just laugh and make racist comments.
3. Was accused of 'sticking my fingers in my partners mouth' while waiting for our pizza. We were not doing anything of the kind. The man continued to yell and scream at us during the early evening with lots of people around and not one did or said anything. He then followed us as we tried to walk away
4. Various catcalling, generally happened when I presented more feminine. I usually ignored this by pretending I couldn't hear it (headphones usually in), but sometimes called them out on it. I'm usually alone when this happens. I've also been followed before, but I don't really remember the details. A few weeks ago while I was riding my bike home at around 4am I had some sort of food item thrown at me from a van by a group of cis white male individuals, who hollered something unintelligible at me. I was also alone at this time. I've also often had things yelled at me from cars (at any time of the day) simply for biking, even though I follow all of the rules of the road, wear a helmet and lights, and stay at the speed limit. Sometimes they'll drive right up behind/beside me and lay on the horn, which can be pretty startling, and has made me almost wipe-out on my bike. I've also been cut-off and revved-at by drivers for no reason. A while back while I (by myself, again) was buying wine at the Wine Rack in Honest Ed's an older woman loudly complained that I was "much too young" to be buying alcohol, and that the drinking age "is way too low!" She expressed astonishment that I was, in fact, years older than the minimum legal drinking age and professed to the entire store that there was "no way" I could be "any older than sixteen!" Her tone was quite combative, and I felt embarrassed and disrespected. I do not believe she meant anything positive by it. There are a lot of douche-bros (ones you would find at the Brunswick House or the Madison, frat-bro-types) who stare at me, yell at me, or try to get my attention when I walk down the street alone after dark, but I generally just ignore them by staring straight ahead and focusing on whatever music I'm listening to. A few months ago I offered my assistance to a woman who was being harassed by an intoxicated middle-aged man on the Spadina streetcar by walking her out of the station, but we were unable to lose him and he followed us to the corner. At this point, he was trying to grab the woman again and convince her to go with him to the Walmer/Bloor Metro (grocery store), and she was unable to shake him. I had to pull him off of her and tell him to "lay off" as we hurried across the street, but he continued to follow us, this time directing his anger at me, yelling things such as "you fucking dyke!" and "I bet you're both fucking dykes, aren't you?! ugh!!" I'm pretty sure he ended up going to Metro anyway, as we didn't see him again after we passed Walmer. I had planned to take the night bus home but ended up walking with this woman until Markham so that we both wouldn't be alone in case this man returned. There are more examples, but I'm having trouble remembering them all in detail. Oh, I checked of "Being spit on" because a canvasser once spit on me for not
taking his Black History Month pamphlet. These guys are actually notorious scam artists and are known to verbally/physically assault people, and are often right outside the St. George subway station, where I pass every day. Honestly, living in my neighbourhood and working-going to school at UofT means I encounter countless canvassers on a daily basis, and many of them can be unrelenting. I would even label some as having committed acts of verbal harassment.

5. Twice while I was on my motorcycle - men were overly aggressive with me. Stopping me. Forcible engaging me in conversations I did not want to be a part of and repeatedly saying I needed to leave. Another time a man tried to jump on my motorcycle. Once I made up a fake husband - saying he wouldn't be happy if I was engaging, and left.

6. This was not a serious issue. It was more insulting than anything else. I am privileged in ways that allowed me to slough off or dismiss the incident.

7. The one that stands out most of all was a woman on a bus on its way to York University, who started insulting my friends (all young, white women of varying sexual orientation) and I. Just general insults, but certainly some in regards to sexual orientation. I stood up to her until she got off the bus, and the bus driver did nothing. We laughed about it afterwards but I was always nervous I'd run into her again on campus, or on the bus. Other incidences have been drive by slurs either alone or with friends, or stares when I'm with a partner in public.

8. Several incidents that have happened at night/when its dark: One time I was taking the bus to my street and a man on the bus was yelling homophobic comments at people. Another time a group of teenagers followed me around the grocery store on my street discussing loudly if I was a guy or girl and what they would do in each case. When I left the store they were outside and started yelling "faggot" at me. Another time, a group of teenagers in the coffee shop were making the same kind of comments about my gender presentation. So its not the physical spaces themselves but who occasionally is in them plus the fact that no one speaks up when these incidents happen. Each of these times I was alone and did not think I was "looking gay or trans".

9. Once I was walking to class, maybe in the early evening, next to a park, when I walked passed a guy who seemed like he was asking for change. I said, no, sorry, and he screamed dyke at me. I have also been yelled at (things like bitch) or had guys make like they were going to grab me in other nearby parts of the city. I'm bad at knowing where neighbourhoods start and end. But generally, on the street, in the evening, usually targeted b/c I am a woman, with the occasional lesbophobia (eg being called a dyke).

10. On several occasions, walking with my partner on the street and having people yell homophobic slurs at us. Other occasions, being catcalled.

11. On a weekly-to-monthly basis, I am harassed with homophobic/hate speech from people in automobiles on the street. This has been exacerbated by being a cyclist; drivers feel that they can verbally assault cyclists as-is, and being a not-particularly-masculine man of small stature who COULD be LGBT is often enough "evidence" to yell "faggot". Recently, I was in a confrontation with a man on the street who, after almost backing into me, yelled "you fucking faggot" out of his window. It being the second time in a week that someone had spat a homophobic slur from me from their vehicle, I stopped my bike and asked them why they thought it was alright to say that to another person. He threatened me physically and continued to use all manner of homophobic slurs. I called the police in his presence and he laughed and drove away; the person on the 911 was
wholly uninterested in my complaint and I had to ask for an officer to be sent down. Being on my way to work, I waited 20 minutes and had to continue on; I called to complain the next day after the police did not even check to see if I was okay via phone and was told an officer was dispatched more than an hour after my call.

12. Often get glances or stares from people when I walk downtown, especially when I'm with my partner (cis female identified). Get looks from customers at my workplace. A man told my partner and I that we were abominations and going to burn in hell after not giving him some change.

13. No thank you.

14. Most of it has just been uncomfortable glares and mock-catcalling by drunken straight guys at night (sometimes during the day) while in drag. Nothing physical. Anything verbal was short, but uncomfortable and said in passing.

15. Men yelling at me make by sexual comments about my body. Harassment online including saying I deserve to be raped.

16. Men in this neighborhood do not treat women well. They're even less positive toward two women walking together.

17. Just called me a faggot...but I'm actually just a bio-female queer who looks like a gay guy

18. It wasn't me specifically but two friends of mine went into a local store and they both felt uncomfortable because the conversations were about killing homosexuals.

19. It was the middle of the day, I was alone (although it was on Yonge so def not the only person around). Some younger guys shouted and threw stuff from their car as they passed.

20. It was later in the night, I was with a few friends and it was outside of a music venue.

21. It was evening and my partner and I were yelled at by men in front of a bar about how we were an interracial relationship.

22. I was not afraid, and it was not a dangerous situation. It was most painful to my children, and the ensuing explanation and conversation made them very angry.

23. I was coming home from Pride and wearing a dress. I was not in drag, but dressed as a guy in a dress and this upset the people of the TTC subway car I was in

24. I was buying a pack of tissues before hopping on the subway and a stranger asked me whether I was a boy or a girl and laughed at how feminine my face is. It was the day time. I was alone.

25. I was alone, waiting at a bus stop

26. I was alone walking down yonge street to the Eaton centre and got cat-called by two men in a group, then called names when I didn't react. I got cat-called once again by a separate man that was alone. On the way home from the Eaton centre I got stared at by a man and then cat-called by another who yelled names at me as I walked away and he continued behind me for a short time. This happened between 8 and 10pm.

27. I have been sexually assaulted by both men and women. Both times after a night out. I have been given date rape drugs by a woman but managed to remove myself from the situation prior to being incapacitated.

28. I had a rainbow flag on my purse, and a man yelled out lewd comments out of the passenger window of his car.

29. Group of men walked by me and, stopped talking while we passed and after said, that guy looks gay as fuck.
30. First incident happened at night, walking alone along Church Street, and a car drove by, and the 4 young men in the car began yelling "faggot" at me. Car slowed down briefly, and then continued on. Second incident happened during the day. While waiting for the subway, a man started calling me a "faggot."

31. Experienced ignorant comments and racism while using my status card for tax exemption purposes

32. During the day, around dusk, whether i'm on my bike or walking, or with a partner or alone. People call out and whistle and say things as they drive by.

33. During the day on the weekends I'll sometimes hear homophobic slurs from drivers on yonge or Wellesley directed at me or others or the neighborhood in general? Once on a Saturday night a guy told me, I bet you're going out to spread AIDS tonight. In all of these incidents I was walking by myself.

34. Catcalling and verbal comments/threats are a fairly regular occurrence no matter which part of the city. One major event was a violent sexual assault, limited memories of it, but what is recalled is being pulled down from behind by my purse straps, a struggle to hang onto my purse, and being groped through crotch area, attacker saying to see if I was a real woman. Regular (sometimes weekly) occurrences of strangers approaching and groping my breasts, "to see if they are real" 

35. alone, day, Sweet Petes Bike Shop, dude made me feel like an idiot for asking questions about my bike alone, day, biking east on bloor, dude wove in front of my bike in traffic on his bike, cut me off, and stuck his leg out to try an get me into an accident group, evening, restaurant, with two other queer women. the staff (male) were visibly uncomfortable with our presence as were other patrons (two women with children, the kids didnt care). group, night, illegal art/band venue, noticed a guy was cornering women in line for the only bathroom and making them feel really uncomfortable. i made a sarcastic joke with the women when he went away about how awesome it is to be forced into conversation with someone. he heard and immediately got very physically close, accusatory, demanding that i explain myself and apologize for making him feel uncomfortable/bad. i didnt apologize, i explained that his behaviour was shitty, and i told him to have a good night with other folks who wanted to talk to him. he was not happy with me and tried repeatedly to approach me as the night went on. i was with friends so was unconcerned group, night, illegal art/band venue, noticed a guy was cornering women in line for the only bathroom and making them feel really uncomfortable. i made a sarcastic joke with the women when he went away about how awesome it is to be forced into conversation with someone. he heard and immediately got very physically close, accusatory, demanding that i explain myself and apologize for making him feel uncomfortable/bad. i didnt apologize, i explained that his behaviour was shitty, and i told him to have a good night with other folks who wanted to talk to him. he was not happy with me and tried repeatedly to approach me as the night went on. i was with friends so was unconcerned evening, restaurant, with two other queer women. the staff (male) were visibly uncomfortable with our presence as were other patrons (two women with children, the kids didnt care). group, night, illegal art/band venue, noticed a guy was cornering women in line for the only bathroom and making them feel really uncomfortable. i made a sarcastic joke with the women when he went away about how awesome it is to be forced into conversation with someone. he heard and immediately got very physically close, accusatory, demanding that i explain myself and apologize for making him feel uncomfortable/bad. i didnt apologize, i explained that his behaviour was shitty, and i told him to have a good night with other folks who wanted to talk to him. he was not happy with me and tried repeatedly to approach me as the night went on. i was with friends so was unconcerned alone, night, cycling home. had a car idle at a four way stop with no indicator light. as i cycled by they pulled out, slowed down beside me, and made comments which i could not hear. the passenger was close enough to make eye contact with. they could have side swiped me for no other purpose than wanting to harass me on my way home. this is all within the last four months

36. All times it has been when holding hands with my partner on the street. Incidents mostly with cis-gender men shouting slurs while driving, or saying derogatory things while walking by

37. All incidents were initiated by white men and women. They would start off initially by discriminating because I'm of a Muslim background, then because of my sexuality. They happened during the night and day, by different people each time, and the violent incidents happened at night by two men who I would not sleep with after they found out I was pansexual because they had thought I was a lesbian. I would also always receive threats at a restaurant I worked at because some women thought that I should not be pan as a Muslim, and one poured her tea on my back when I bent down to pick up her napkin;
she called me a sand nigger who was trying to be white, and that I was a part of ruining the gay community in Toronto.

38. A few examples: - When making large purchases or running errands with my at-the-time partner (us being a straight couple), all questions or discussion of any importance went directly to him. Workers at Telus, after learning his name, addressed me as Mrs. ___. - Playing shows with my band, sound engineers at the venues never, ever speak to me or ask questions of me; any inquiries they have of our setup go to the male members. At times I have forced my way into the conversation and asked what they are discussing without me, only to be told "oh, it's tech garbage". - Many, many people in my neighbourhood talk to me with benevolently reductive language. ("sweetie", "beautiful", "love") - People in my neighbourhood ask if I am looking after children when I am outside during a weekday. When I've told people I do contract work from home, they tend to disregard it and suggest places I could get a job. - Catcalls and street propositions are common in my day-to-day life. - When walking with a new partner (same-sex), store owners I am familiar with have glanced at our hands and asked me "Where is your boyfriend?" (?!? WTF :(.?!?! ) - I've been followed off of transit by someone who persisted on his idea of friendly one-sided conversation (hint: one-sided conversation is almost never friendly, dude)

Have you been harassed, assaulted or encountered an unsafe situation in your neighbourhood for reasons other than discrimination?

Table 59 – Harassment, Assault or Unsafe Situation Other than Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered yes to the previous question, and if you are comfortable doing so, describe what happened:

1. A surly homeless man attempted to throw a brick at myself and a friend uttering homophobic statements
2. A woman accosted me, grabbed me and wouldn't let me go, on the sidewalk about four years ago. She clearly thought I was someone else, as she kept alluding to the person she thought I was. It was scary but I assume she was mentally ill and needed support.
3. Almost ran into someone trying to kick in a store window around midnight - but I backed up and crossed the street to where a couple of other people were walking, and called the police. The person trying to kick in the window must have been out of it or didn't care because they didn't appear to notice me.
4. Attacked by people either on drugs or suffering psychotic episodes. Managed to escape without major injury or violence.
5. Bar brawl, lesbians can be very defensive of their own.
6. cars and me on my bike. have almost been doored, hit, or side swiped multiple times  
7. cat calls from cars, followed home from the gym by a man, homophobic slurs  
8. Cat calls from men while walking my dog, or walking to transit.  
9. Catcalling by men and boys, I think more due to being read as a woman than being read as queer.  
10. Drunk people fighting  
11. Frequent cat calling by construction workers and sports fans  
12. I don't encounter discrimination based on my sexuality, but I frequently encounter street harassment because of my gender. People will shout things at me on the street, and sometimes will follow me around my neighbourhood asking me out. The people harassing me on the street are overwhelmingly men, though I have had a couple of encounters where women have harassed me.  
13. I guess the canvasser thing would be considered non-discriminatory. Also, raccoons don't discriminate against anyone, and I've been chased by a few.  
14. I'm not sure  
15. Jumped in an alleyway by an aggressive dude saying sexually explicit things, pinning me against a wall in a go train tunnel passing under eglinton station. had my phone stolen. followed home a handful of times by people trying to pick me up. shouted homophobic things at.  
16. Once the police were unnecessarily rude, authoritarian and punitive to me on my bike, when I was wearing all black and I probably looked distressed (I was late for something). Sometimes there is a strong police presence in the area but they assert their authority more than make people feel safe. There have also been a number of incidents of violence in the neighbourhood that I have seen, between other residents. I also intervened on a local bus once when someone was being verbally attacked because they looked gay. The driver did nothing but I refocused his attacks away from his target and to me.  
17. One happened at night time, I was walking past a bar filled with mostly older men and one of them began following me, asking me invasive questions, wouldn't stop talking to/following me after the first couple of times I told him to leave me alone. I have also been catcalled a few other times when walking past this bar. Another happened on the subway - a man stared at me for 4 stops and continued to stare as I got up and walked away. The last was walking past a park at night time and being catcalled by a group of young men.  
18. Sometimes drunk guys on the street looking to fight, esp on weekends around bar close  
19. workplace incidents where i've had pain due to broken furniture, flickering lightbulbs not getting fixed for weeks, having to go to physiotherapy before my headset got fixed. men harassing me on the street. men harassing me in the subway, in stores, the subway. patients at work sexually harassing me
Do you engage in cruising and/or some form of public sex? (If yes, and if you're comfortable doing so, please specify whereabouts and your feeling of safety while doing so in the comments)

Table 60 – Public Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Sex</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment on public sex:

1. Used to be a sex trade worker across the province. Felt safe with some clients but not all to some degree.
2. Sex in public bathrooms with my partner (male)
3. Rural areas
4. Queens park it's pretty open and safe
5. Queen's Park and Innis sometimes. I don't get turned on by potentially being caught and that's partly why I don't frequent cruising spaces. I also often don't fit into the look that seems most desired in these spaces.
6. Public washrooms, Queens park. Barsa and bathhouses
7. parks, washrooms, bars, bathhouses, et cetera, forever. i have never been afraid of violence except for that which might come from police or security officers.
8. Parks On the Street at night
9. Parkdale isn't much of hotbed for gay cruising
10. On the Internet!
11. Not in the past four years and not in my neighbourhood.
12. Not comfortable specifying where, but I don't feel completely safe while cruising. Risk factor is part of cruising.
13. Never in my neighbourhood; never seen the opportunity here. Public washrooms -- at York U or the Bay Queen Street.
14. I like to have sex in alleyways and other public spaces with partners
15. I have once had sex in a park near my house at around midnight, but it was with someone I had talked to online for a while.
16. I have had sex in Queen's Park, as well as in bars (is that public?). The only thing I'm afraid of, in my neighbourhood and in the dark at Queen's Park, is the police.
17. I do see used condoms lying around some areas of Trinity Bellwoods when I hang out there, but it doesn't bother me.
18. Have once or twice had sex in a park, with no safety concerns (more concerns about getting caught).
19. Gym Sauna Boardroom Change room Fly 2.0
20. everywhere.

Do you frequent any other public spaces outside of your neighbourhood? If yes, specify your experiences of public safety in these areas (including parks, streets, transit, and civic buildings)

1. Men in Toronto are overwhelmingly horrible to women who dare exist in public who they may find attractive.
2. I've only ever felt unsafe near Bloor and Spadina, walking down Bloor on a Friday night.
3. It depends on where I am in the city. Some places feel safer then others (ex. The village or Christie pits area)
4. im often in the annex and i used to live there. i feel the same level of comfort that i feel in yorkville although i wouldn't walk home as often because i lived on a street that was less residential so i felt less safe/enclosed/neighborly ?? if that makes sense. theres more catcalling
5. I use transit and some park space, as well as walking the streets of my neighbourhood. I encounter very little discrimination aside from the usual staring.
6. I travel by transit all over the city and feel generally safe everywhere.
7. I travel all around Toronto all the time, so this is difficult to answer. I used to live at Dufferin/Eglinton and I can safely say that it feels much less safe up there. There are less people around and there were often reports of gun violence and stabbing-murders in the immediate neighbourhood. I also went to a sports bar near Eglinton West station with a friend once and very quickly got the vibe that I didn't belong (due to assumed gender identity/sexuality). I frequent mostly west-end bars which are pretty safe, as far as I can tell. I avoid the village like the plague, somewhat because I feel like my queer identity isn't really accepted there, strangely enough. I know the 519 community centre is pretty transphobic, so I avoid that as well.
8. I travel all across Canada for business. I have yet to have had anything that would make me feel particularly unsafe. In my experience most people seem to want to keep to themselves. However I can mention a time when I was in Alberta where I witnessed some men passing by in a subway that were harassing a First Nations woman as they walked by, couldn't say if she was LGBTQ2+ but it was a notable experience none the less.
9. I took public transit all the time, I work down town and since I don't have a car I walk pretty much everywhere.
10. I take the TTC often enough, and I love reading and spending time in parks, or at the beach. I also go shopping at malls or streetfront stores.
11. I spent plenty of time in public spaces outside of my neighbourhood, including much of U of T, parks.... Again: the most frightening thing about being downtown in Toronto is the police.
12. I spend time in parks around my neighbourhood. I have never felt unsafe.
13. I often go to bars outside my neighbourhood. If it's a bar with mostly straight people, I do not feel as safe, particularly around the men in those bars. I feel safer in queer bars. I also
often take transit outside of my neighbourhood for work. If it's after dark and there are less people around, I do not feel as safe as I normally would on transit.

14. I often frequent public spaces outside my own neighbourhood. In general my experience in other neighbourhoods is similar to my experience in my own neighbourhood but I do find that if I am more familiar with an area, I am much more comfortable and feel generally safer. As I grew up in Bloor West Village/ High Park area, I have an intimate knowledge of the physical space and the people that occupy that space. Therefore, I am extremely comfortable in the parks and on the streets in these areas (even at after dark or when alone).

15. I have had things yelled at me on the street and in parks. I have been approached and hit on by men on public transit. I generally feel safe in civic buildings.

16. I go to York which has notorious safety issues. I have never felt unsafe on campus but I have also never been on campus at night or alone in isolated areas.

17. I go to many parks with my dog all over the city. I have been harassed in parks. I don't exactly feel totally safe anywhere.

18. I frequent transit and streets during my commute to work or other people's places. I feel reasonably safe on streets and public transit (though I stick to well-lit, major streets at night.)

19. I feel very safe in most places, parks, streets, transits - when its dark I'm more aware.

20. I feel safer in the Village because it's an LGBTQ2+ positive space, but I still receive discrimination because I'm pansexual. I also feel comfortable in Chinatown and near St Lawrence market because there are enough people around that it's hard for someone to do anything to me.

21. I feel safe in most spaces. The times when I feel unsafe are when there people aggressively asking for money or cigarettes in areas that I am unaccustomed to.

22. I feel safe almost everywhere in the city BUT anonymous street situations; transit, school, parks, etcetera.

23. I feel quite safe in most of the city. Major concerns: - gendered street harassment - inadequate or poorly designed bike infrastructure, distracted/inconsiderate drivers - riding my bike allows me to feel way more safe and comfortable getting around the city - inaccessible transit routes - cops (make me feel acutely uncomfortable on my own behalf and out of concern for those communities who are more readily targeted by police harassment and violence than I am)

24. I feel mostly safe on the streets of the downtown neighbourhoods I frequent. With parks it depends on the lighting, business, proximity to the road.

25. I feel less safe in areas like Kensington at night... Which is a shame as I used to feel safe everywhere in Toronto.

26. I feel fairly safe on public transit regardless of time of day/night. I feel safe on u of t campus during the day but not late at night/early morning because it is very deserted and not well-lit.

27. I am often downtown for doctors appointments and occasionally visiting friends. I often walk along the Danforth to reach a variety of stores which I frequent. Public transit is a constant.

28. I have had sexist things yelled at me on the street during multiple times of the day, but that's about it.
29. have had many incidents of homo/transphobia on the streets/on public transit around the gay village area when with friends, especially at night
30. Have experienced some discrimination on the streets, mostly slurs downtown by drunk homeless people.
31. Have definitely been catcalled and/or verbally harassed in other places outside my neighbourhood, mainly: the subway, the streetcar, Sherbourne/Bloor, Moss Park, Dufferin Mall, but mainly King and Yonge area by business bros.
33. Eaton Centre, Yonge & Eglinton, and on subways are all places where I have been approached by men who have made me feel uncomfortable - either through sexist comments or flirting that won't take "no" for an answer. None of these, however, was brought on because I identify as LGBTQ2+ but simply because I am female. In fact, my specific neighbourhood is one of the few places in the city of Toronto that I have not had to deal with intrusive "flirting" (being followed, being asked for phone number and the person immediately trying to verify it is mine by calling me while I am right there, by suggesting I ditch my partner, by taking the answer "no, I don't want to get dinner with you," and replying, "coffee instead then!", etc., generally ignoring my own wishes and pushing their own agenda on me).
34. Downtown Toronto, University of Toronto, Mississauga, Square One. No really concern of public safety.
35. Avid user of public spaces including parks and other green spaces. I feel much more comfortable in these spaces during daylight than at night. I feel more concerned walking home after disembarking from the TTC in this neighbourhood than I did in my previous Leslieville/The Beach address.
36. As an adult I have not encountered any safety issues in public places even with a female partner.
37. Aquatic Centre, Regent Park, Daniels Spectrum.
38. All the time. I work downtown, am frequently in various parts of the city. It is very infrequent that I feel uncomfortable or unsafe as a result of my LGBTQ status. It is mostly when I am in the outskirts of the city, in the suburbs, or occasionally when I cross paths with aggressive people on the street. On a few occasions, I have had homophobic epithets hurled at me from people driving by, or by people asking for change. In general, I feel exceedingly safe throughout Toronto, and am comfortable being alone in most any part of the city (though perhaps not certain buildings in some areas after dark).
Have you ever reported an incident of harassment, discrimination or assault to the police?

Table 61 – Reporting to Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report to Police</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what was the experience like? If no, why not?

1. Yes. I feel less safe in tourist zines and condo Zones where I don't know anyone and there are lots of police
2. Yes. I feel for the most part safe in these areas.
3. Yes. Generally they have more foot traffic and people about at more times of the day, so I feel more safe. The only real exceptions being when walking through groups of men outside of bars.
4. Yes. I find transit to often be extremely shifty. Blue night trips, in my experience, have contained aggressive or leering men much more often than not. Even during the day, it is never a surprising or unusual event to come across someone who openly leers or makes inappropriate remarks; or who harasses the bus driver. North York streets have shown me many streetfights, and I've been approached by pickup artists multiple times in that area. Areas close to strip clubs and sensual massage parlours tend to have people loitering about who address passing women or "provocatively" dressed men as if they are more workers at said establishments. Jane and Finch is every bit as bad as one hears. The parking lots of certain places (i.e. Dufferin Mall) can be pretty frightening. Walking close to a car whose window rolls down so someone can whisper at you is unnerving, especially if no one else is nearby. Civic buildings are awkward if not openly hostile for anyone who isn't dressed like a rich businessperson.
5. Yes, I use lots of the parks in my neighbourhood and feel very safe doing so. They are always full of people, ranging from young to old and including families, so it feels very comfortable to spend time there both alone and in a group
6. Yes, but I feel safe in most of those areas.
7. Yes! High Park is directly adjacent to Parkdale, and I've spent much of my childhood in there.
8. Yes but I generally never feel unsafe unless it is a back alley at night and I am alone.
9. Where I live is very safe because it is an gentrified. So I find most other neighborhoods feel less safe or less clean but if I want to interact with a queer community of any kind, I need to leave it.
10. When using gendered/women's public washrooms in neighbourhoods that are privileged (i.e. Yorkville, Rosedale), I feel somewhat uncomfortable since I look androgynous.
This feeling of discomfort also persists at public washrooms in office towers (i.e. of commerce court, in the PATH). Perhaps this feeling is triggered where gendered uniforms are at play.

11. When traveling alone after dark I'm very aware of my own mortality. The level of street harassment increases exponentially. Unwanted touching and forced interaction on public transportation also increases.

12. UofT

13. Transit to work in the core, public venues throughout the city

14. Transit is where I receive the most sideways looks, as well as some civic buildings where my style and demeanour may seem out of place

15. Transit I feel unsafe at times especially living at the end of the subway line. Taking the subway home alone at night


17. This is a really broad question. yes I leave my neighborhood. I feel less safe on transit outside of the city core.

18. The Fashion District is fine - which is where I work, its always busy enough to feel safe. The homeless can be bothersome but they're not unsafe by any means.

19. The 519 community centre

20. Subways, on campus, the annex, the village, college west, queen west, and downsview. As long as I'm not in drag, I'm okay. I'm usually fine around Downsview (along Sheppard), but there is an energy that something could go wrong (like being hit by a car or hearing a slur hollered out a window).

21. Street harassment happens everywhere.

22. Sometimes I'll hang out on Church so that I feel like a part of the queer community.

23. Similar experiences around the city. Worse on parts of Queen and King at night on weekends.

24. Same as within my neighbourhood

25. Public transit and the Church-Wellesley Village area Typically catcalling, comments, verbal threats and aggressive panhandlers or addicts/street people.

26. Parks, transit, markets, etc

27. Parks around the city, the islands, the waterfront. Anywhere I feel like going really


30. not really. i generally feel safe in public.

31. No

32. no

33. Neighbourhood near work, upper-middle class area, feels heterosexist

34. Museums, libraries.

35. mostly stick to the neighbourhood

36. Mostly hanging out in park spaces in the west end, during the day, like dufferin grove.

37. As described before, the police did not even want to take my complaint - the first thing the 911 operator said to me when I described the threatening behaviour I was experiencing was "verbal assault isn't actually a crime" - and then treated the incident in a completely cavalier way, not even checking to see if I was okay after sending a unit down more than an hour after I made the call. The supervisor that I complained to the next
day was sympathetic but ultimately I was disillusioned and dissatisfied; the police clearly do not consider this an issue of hate speech or LGBT harassment.

38. Because the police force is full of people who would do the same discriminatory act that I'd be reporting.

39. Because there would be no point

40. Completely negative and futile

41. Didn't feel it was worthwhile to go through the effort. My word against theirs doesn't go very far. Also the few people I tried to talk about it with did not believe me so if they didn't it probably meant the police wouldn't be much more receptive

42. Generally, I assume that reporting to the police will just be another interaction which I'd have to tolerate and don't deserve. I don't trust that the cops will do anything useful about the situation.

43. Got chased by a man I assumed was a homeless mental health case. He was screaming obscenities and trying to hit ppl. I saw an unmarked cop car nearby. They did take a description and go off looking for the guy, after asking if my hair was naturally coloured and responded to "hey officer" with "Hay is for horses"

44. Hasn't gone well for the few people I've see try -I've been harassed by police officers and all cops are scary -my shit is complicated enough without bringing cops into it -prisons are gross, i doubt anything good would come of a charge, and it might piss the person/people off even more

45. Haven't had to, never had anything bad enough to report.

46. I didn't feel comfortable doing so.

47. I do not trust cops and do not want to involve them. I think they would do more harm than good

48. I do not trust the police, nor do I believe that they would take the experiences seriously.

49. I don't trust the police and generally, I would rather solve my problems myself.

50. I don't want to interact with the police ever.

51. I haven't found harassment to be of a significant level to warrant contacting police.

52. I haven't reported the incidents to the police because I know that being called faggot is not against the law, and having assisted others who were verbally harassed, unless it is consistently coming from the same person for a period of weeks, they won't do anything. Further, as I did not get the license plate of the car, I did not report it.

53. If it happened what can be done now? ^ the attitude I encountered

54. It didn't seem worth it. I didn't know the people, I had no proof, no harm came to me.

55. I've only ever experienced everyday forms of catcalling and street harassment and I don't think you can report that to the police. In any case I would be hesitant to get police involved because of their violence and discrimination towards woman, people of colour, queer and trans people etc

56. Most of the time I don't consider these incidents to be serious enough to go through the hassle of filing a report.

57. My experience seems to vary from what many have claimed to have encountered... I was listened to, cared for, assured, and treated respectfully (all the work others and myself have done in educating them is making a difference).

58. My friends and I were physically attacked by a man with a hammer. They were very helpful the police but the hospital just saw as another drunk native and didn't provide me any proper health care. I was harassed online from my ex boyfriends jealous girlfriend
she threatened me and my family. I brought the messages to the police and they said they couldn't do anything about that we should resolve it amongst ourselves. Horrible experience with the police then.

59. nothing ever seemed big enough to report to the police. i guess we are socialized to believe that we're just supposed to get over these things, that it would be really outrageous and over the top if we were to report it to the police ("it was just a compliment..." "you are overreacting..." etc)

60. On U of T campus I might have reported an incident... I forget On-campus landscaping workers were harassing me on campus. Several of them. Using their radio communication to further follow me around.

61. Once they have my personal information to the street erasers, the second time they said they was nothing they could do.

62. Police did not know my orientation/gender so they were very courteous and took it seriously. I only told them details I felt they needed to know and left out many of the elements of homo/transphobia.

63. Some kids tried to steal my cell phone near Eaton Centre. It was traumatizing at first and scary.

64. The harassment I've experienced hasn't been physical and the incidents, though upsetting, I don't think are things that need to be brought to the police. I don't think anything would be done. It would probably be another uncomfortable situation going to the police

65. The no relates to my current neighbourhood.

66. The police are the worst. They're super violent and sketchy. Moreover, I'm a white lady in a neighbourhood with mostly people of colour who are already disproportionately likely to be harassed by the police. I'd rather not contribute to the incarceration of people, especially people of colour.

67. The police don't do much when these incidents are occurred they mostly laugh it off

68. The police were helpful, but without the name of the assailant, not much could be done.

69. there hasn't been one

70. they told me that even though I tried to throw my rapist out of the house and endured his assaults due to his threats and strange behaviour, that when I gave consent while he held me down, that this was consent and there was no rape I reported another rape 9 years ago and they just warned the guy but I later found out this was lazy policing. I did not report my other rapes.

71. They were initially dismissive as if it wasn't a big deal.

72. Traumatizing.

73. Two people engaged in a fight on a streetcar. I called police.

What neighbourhoods do you feel safest in? Why?

1. Affluent neighbourhoods, where people don't have to make poor decisions just to get by. Also, paradoxically, in poorer areas with a very strong sense of community where people look out for each other.

2. All except below

3. All of former city of Toronto. I feel its most welcoming and I know it best.

4. All, except Moss Park at night since the amount of drugs and drug dealing I see, plus fights sometimes.
5. Annex - I lived there many years, know the area and there are a lot of people out at night. Parkdale - I know my neighbourhood very well and know that people won't bother me.
6. Any sense I have of personal safety is rarely associate with where I am at any given moment; certainly not in terms of deciding I'm safe "here."
7. Anywhere during the day usually I have the privilege of presenting as a white cisgendered young man.
8. Areas where their are queer/trans or queer/trans friendly bars, business etc. But not necessarily depending on what other businesses are around.
9. Bloor West Village, Swansea, High Park North - I feel safest in these neighbourhoods as I grew up in the area and I know it very well. My parents still live in this area and I am welcome to stay at there house when I choose. I know many of the neighbours and families that live there and I see many of them on the street. I know the streets and public spaces and I can navigate the area with ease even after dark. I am familiar with the transit available in this area, which reduces my anxiety with regards to getting home timely and safely if I am out.
10. Bloor west.
11. Cabbagetown, Church/Wellesley, Leslieville, Riverdale
12. Church and Wellesley Village. For obvious reasons.
13. Church and Wellesley/The Village (well lit, roaming security guards, lots of busy open places to enter if in need of help, minimal cis straight white males) The Danforth (well lit, busy, minimal dark alley ways) I do not feel completely safe anywhere in public.
14. Church is NOT a safe space for cis women. I've actually been harassed by gay men. Campus is a terrible place. All around dt wherever there are nightlife mainstream clubs-terrible. I avoid all of those streets when clubs close- aka "raping hour"
15. Church Street only because there are lots of gays around
16. Davisville, Distillery District. Both are kind of "rich" and I guess it comes through in the crime rates, or something, because I have never been bothered in these places, (though the possible correlation doesn't entirely make sense to me).
17. Daylight hours only, unless traveling with a group, downtown core only.
18. daytime in most places night-time in quieter neighbourhoods or the village
19. Dense downtown neighbourhoods, because diversity is a fact of life, and there are many eyes on the streets.
20. Down town mid town,
21. Downtown
22. Downtown
23. Downtown Less wide open space More other people around Bourgeois
24. Downtown core Sometimes the village, but only during day time. Danforth Liberty Village
25. Downtown since there are always people around, traffic, and lighting.
26. Downtown Toronto because of the higher prevalence of LGBT person and the anonymity associated with being in a large group of people.
27. Downtown Toronto generally feels safer near the village simply because of more representation. Though with the higher amounts of people can feel a little unsafe.
28. East York. I live there and it's pretty quiet
29. Forest Hill, because mostly Jewish The village, the annex, downtown, safer for queer people
30. Generally feel safe everywhere in the downtown area
31. Harbourfront cause there is security around and most people who go there are there to enjoy the lake or an event Church Street cause it's for the LGBTQ community (but gay bashing happens there though the street lights have helped) Kensington Market cause most people are hipsters
32. I feel pretty safe in my neighborhood because there are quite a few queer people around. I guess a feel safer in terms of being with my partner on church street. I feel safer in areas where there are people out on the street during the evening hours.
33. I feel safe in all neighbourhoods in Toronto.
34. I feel safe in general in most of toronto since very few harassment incidents have happened to me because of my queer/trans identity
35. I feel safe in my neighbourhood (the Annex), mainly because of familiarity, and I have yet to experience any negative encounters. I also feel safe in the Queer neighbourhoods (Church x Wellesley) or Queer friendly spaces (i.e. Queen St West aka "Queer West Village"). I feel comfortable in these neighbourhoods because I am surrounded by fairly like-minded people, or at least there may be a higher possibility of being amongst people who may have similar experiences as myself.
36. I feel safe in the majority of Toronto (assuming you are only asking about Toronto).
37. I feel safe on geary lane/north of dupont. streets are quiet, safe for biking. folks who live around those neighbourhoods have never harassed me
38. I feel safest back in Ottawa. So far I have not found a neighbourhood in Toronto that I feel safe in.
39. I feel safest in downtown neighbourhoods (Queen west, bloordale, Parkdale etc.) because I consider them, accurately or not, as young and progressive. I often see others who I believe to be part of the queer community, making me feel safer expressing myself. I feel safe in neighbourhoods where there are lots of people in the streets.
40. I feel safest in my own because its so heavily surveillanced by police and by private security.
41. I feel safest in my own neighbourhood - I always know where to go if I ever needed to escape. We used to live a few streets over on a "very nice" street (Rusholme Road, one of the nicest in the city) but it was always so dark and very few people were out at night. Now that we've moved a bit closer to a main intersection, there's always a lot of people on our street at any time of day, and we're so close to the main street that if I ever felt unsafe walking down our street I could wait for someone to walk with or walk behind.
42. I feel safest in my own neighbourhood and the Church/Wellesley village.
43. I feel safest in neighbourhoods with more people (especially more queer and trans people), well lit streets at night and frequent transit.
44. I feel safest in the gay village because I know that is a space full of people like me or at least people who have a better understanding of me. I can socialize with my girlfriend and have less fear of intimidation. I actually feel noticibly more relaxed in these positive spaces.
45. I like the downtown core (between Sherbourne-Ossington and Bloor to the waterfront) because I know it well.
46. It is very rare I feel unsafe in any neighbourhood.
47. Little Italy, Village, Leslieville
48. Mine - I know it well.
49. Mine and my sister and my mother's because I'm there a lot and I know majority of the people there
50. Mine current neighbourhood. The one I grew up in Little Portugal, Brockton, and of course The Village
51. Mine; around U of T campus; business district. Because these have more adults who are less likely to want to hurt me, fewer people who are drunk/otherwise disinhibited; LGBTQ+ identities are if not tolerated, then accepted, in these areas.
52. Most including my own and my parents (DVP and Lawrence area).
53. Most of the neighbourhoods I've been through I've felt safe in.
54. My mom's house lol.
55. My neighborhood because am use to it
56. My neighborhood the Annex because I see people that I know all the time and I know where I am going.
57. My neighbourhood, its relatively wealthy and quiet.
58. My neighbourhood. The village. Some areas downtown
59. my own - often encounter people I know, knowledge of surroundings, lots of queers
60. My own, the gay village, around university campuses. Familiarity plays a part. My neighborhood, because the large proportion of people sharing my religion is comforting. The village for the same reason, a commonality between most people in the area. and Universtiyy campuses because there is usually a high concentration of students (again, and common attribute) as well as those red poles that allow you to call the police at the push of a button.
61. My own, the village, bloordale.
63. My own. It's well lit, far enough away from downtown that there aren't the usual "criminal" aspects eg. Sex workers, drug dealers and inebriated homeless people.
64. My own; it's very queer and rather friendly. I'm also very familiar with it.
65. Near the village and more areas more heavily populated by lgbtq folks. There's more of a sense of normalisation
66. North York, suburbs
67. Not going outside.
68. Parkdale and the annex because I spend the most time there and know them very well.
69. Parkdale, Queen West, Little Italy, Little Portugal. I know these neighbourhoods the best and have learned what areas of them to avoid
70. probably the annex bc it's where i live and i know it? and there's tons of ppl around. if sometime happened, i'd know what to do, or where to go.
71. Queen West is up there. Kensington, too, feels very safe, even though statistically it may not be as much so as, say, Queen W.-- but the population by and large is made up of people I can relate to, which boosts my feeling of security more than a climate where nobody necessarily means me harm, but who stare at me like I'm an alien or a precocious child.
72. Queen west. Bloor west. Annex. Lots of ppl of around, ppl who I can identify with
73. Queen west. It's full of hipsters
74. Roncesvalles (Upper-Parkdale) - streets are well-lit and quiet, and traffic is local.
75. Roncesvalles, Parkdale (minus a few pocketed areas), The Junction, The Annex, Ossington and Bloor, Trinity Bellwoods -- Mainly because the areas are busy and filled with people are are similar in age, orientation, and economic status.

76. The Annex / Koreatown - Lots of people around, pretty bright, close to home (for escape purposes) Queen West/West Queen West - I've lived/worked/frequented bars in this neighbourhood for years and I've rarely had a problem Little Italy / Little Portugal / Dundas West (west of Trinity Bellwoods) - Same reason as Annex Roncesvalles - It's just too cute to be unsafe / My therapist works here Trinity Bellwoods Park - There are always people around (at least in the summer) and this atmosphere is generally calm.

77. the annex, because nothing exciting or unexpected ever happens there.

78. The Gay Village is probably the safest simply because people are more accepting of transwomen. The financial district is another zone I feel safe in mostly due to other people being far to busy to bother me. Leaside, while having its problems is still somewhere I would consider safe due to a low rate of crime, and a higher degree of education.

79. the neighbourhoods in the downtown core. because of visibility.

80. The ones I know the best.

81. The village, because there it feels safe

82. The Village, due to visible establishments, like bars, community centres

83. The Village, Trinity-Bellwoods, Queen West et. Because they generally have the most eclectic and accepting people

84. There are no neighbourhoods that I don't feel unsafe in.

85. Unsure, to be honest. My childhood area around Lansdowne and davenport, my former apartment around dufferin and queen, and my current residence, because I am familiar with them.

86. Uptown and midtown, some parts of downtown (i.e. the annex). I feel safest there because there are less homeless people.

87. Village and church/yonge corridor. Lots of gays around.

88. Well lit mixed use highly dense spaces. i.e the Annex at night (near U of T campus) More people = more security

89. Yorkville because there are visible queer couples on my street, it has a reasonably neighbourly vibe to it even though i dont actually know any of my neighbours, and i feel like there are always people out and about at night so i feel like they see me and people wouldnt attack me when im walking home alone because there are other people out, seeing me. The annex is like pretty safe as well. The village is so safe. I trust queer people more to be aware of social problems like harassment, rape, etc

What neighbourhoods do you feel unsafe in? Why?

1. my concerns around safety aren't really neighbourhood specific

2. • Most large streets, like 6-lane roads, due to overwhelming traffic and noise • Stadiums and malls, due to heteronormative culture • Wherever police are riding in groups on bikes • crowded areas with fast-moving youth -- physical safety

3. Afterdark walking past George Street at Dundas, or Gerrard. Lots of folks who are in aggressive states, sometimes itching for a confrontation.
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4. any clubbing districts--cat calls, unwanted attention downtown financial district--impossible to bike safely, roncesvalles--soooo much money i feel like an interruption in that neighbourhood, kensington market--lots of tourists, lots of people with money spending leisure time and feeling very entitled to the entire road. cops would probably find me at fault if there was ever an accident. gentrification.

5. Any major arteries where large amounts of motor vehicles congregate.

6. any neighbourhood i haven't been to before, generally, bc i am paranoid and don't know them. also parts of bloor west and queen west.

7. anything outside of the downtown core makes me paranoid and on edge, hypervigilant.

8. Anywhere downtown.

9. Anywhere where there's a line of bars or clubs at night. I haven't experienced any harassment, but i have the feeling that the potential is there. I frequent el convento rico and the feeling is there.

10. Around OCAD because I am afraid of running into a past abusive person.

11. Church-Wellesley if alone or at night, mainly because of the high number of incidents involving trans people, specifically Trans Women.

12. club district (queen st w), parkdale. Too many drunk people.

13. Club district- too many overly intoxicated people behaving badly. Church village- there's just a real bad vibe there at night now. It's hard to explain. Bloor/park dale - rundown, vacant buildings, poorly lit at night.

14. Depends when and what time of the day. Bloor west area cause of all the sexual assaults.

15. Downtown. Lots of sketchy people.

16. dufferin and eglinton, jane and finch etc.

17. Dufferin/Eglinton - I lived here, there were shootings, it's deserted, lots of abandoned storefronts, lots of construction where you have to walk down unlit narrow pathways in order to get to the station. West Parkdale, on Queen (around Triller) - I've just always had bad vibes in this zone. The Village - Just feels like the ultimate in homonormativity, don't feel welcome, have had bad experiences with feeling judged/disrespected here, friends have has terrible experiences, is also a zone for drunk cis straight women to party and try to befriend "the gays" (read: attractive, effeminate, homonormative, cisgendered gay men), and this becomes a zone for creepy cis white men to try to prey on these women, which all-together just creeps me right out. UofT Campus (St. George), especially after dark - Too many young students who do stupid things, too much rape culture all in one spot, too many dimly lit green spaces and dark corners, not enough emergency buttons. Bloor West (west from Christie Pitts Park) - I don't really know, this area just always creeps me out. It just feels like it's not as busy and kind of creepily quiet a lot of the time. Christie Pitts Park (after dark) - No one around. The Entertainment District after dark - Drunk bros, so many fights happening constantly, I feel completely out of place there, and honestly it's one of the only areas in the city that I'd be concerned for my safety due to my perceived gender/sexual identity.

18. East Downtown / Moss Park - streets are large, buildings are unkempt and imposing, heavy police presence. CityPlace/Harbourfront - doesn't foster a very welcoming place to be or to call for help if needed.

19. Every rich or very poor area.

20. Generally I do not feel Scarborough is very safe to be 'out' in.
21. Generally, I feel unsafe in neighborhoods where I am not familiar with the geography or if I look like I don't belong to the neighborhood and people stare at me.
22. Generally, if there are a lot of macho college students in a particular neighborhood than I find that neighborhood to be unsettling for me.
23. I biked through the bridal path once and I felt really terrified that someone was going to come out of a house and question me about what I was doing in the neighborhood. I saw a couple of empty buses go through, which I assumed were there for the nannies, gardeners and maids who work at rich people's houses.
24. I don't feel safe in the entertainment district. Lots of drunk people from outside the get a who are not used to queer people and who are erratic and aggressive. Sometimes I feel the same way on the club strip on Ossington. I don't feel safe in Scarborough with my partner holding hands..
25. I don't like being on the main King Street clubbing district as I feel like a total outsider and my perception is that I'm not welcome in those hetero spaces. In The Village I sometimes feel unsafe because it's demarcated as the locus of LGBTQ community and I get paranoid that someone who wanted to enact a hate crime would seek this area as the most obvious place for victims.
26. I don't visit any neighborhoods that I don't feel safe in.
27. I feel most unsafe in neighborhoods with broken buildings or which are very dirty
28. I feel nervous about walking around areas of town that I don't know, or am not familiar with. I don't like the idea of feeling lost.
29. I feel relatively safe in all areas of Toronto. However, I do feel out of place or in some measure uncomfortable in upscale neighborhoods (i.e. Yorkville/Rosedale/High Park) or the suburbs, where the majority of the population is White.
30. I feel safe in most places that I go; I've lived in Toronto for a few years and Peterborough before that, which, Peterborough is very poorly lit at night but has a vibrant student culture. I'm used to walking late at night. I just walk fast and mind my own business and it has served me well so far. Is that okay? No - I don't think I should have to walk fast to feel safe. But I'm not sure how much it is about my sexuality as it is my gender and the fact that I'm usually walking alone.
31. I feel soooo unsafe near sherbourne station! this area always creeps me out because I've had people approach me for drugs and sexual harassment / catcalling so frequently. There's a lot of drug use in this area near huntley street
32. I feel unsafe around major sporting events when they let out: throngs of drunken, obnoxious men. I used to live in the east end, near Coxwell and Danforth, about 8 years ago, and at the time the Danforth east of Pape would be mostly deserted after 11pm, and that felt unsafe.
33. I feel unsafe in most neighborhoods as I am unfamiliar with them and do not get good feelings from being in them.
34. I feel unsafe in the area north of EGLINTON, it is a poorer neighborhood with more rough areas. Also in some areas of Scarborough
35. I feel unsafe most places when I'm alone especially at night because patriarchy.
36. I feel unsafe when there are few people in the streets and using the public spaces.
37. I generally tend to feel good about most places so long as they are well-lit, and have a good amount of traffic in them. I have come to dislike the Eaton Centre because I have been followed by people wanting to flirt, which has made me feel uncomfortable.
38. I have yet to identify an area of the city where I feel very unsafe, however I only tend to visit certain sections of the city.
39. I sometimes feel unsafe in areas with high concentrations of cultural groups that I know are not LGBT friendly. Parliament street has many Muslims and I have felt unsafe being in some establishments with my partner as we are very obviously derided and given disgusted looks by the people there.
40. Jane & Finch, little Jamaica... Gun violence unrelated to religious affiliation or sexual identity
41. Jane and Finch, Regent Park
42. Jarvis area, in general; Entertainment district, at night
43. King Street East, Landsdowne/Bloor, various places along Finch, Dundas street west of Dufferin.... they are simply the places where I've encountered the most vocal and entitled harassers, and nobody bats an eye or gives a sympathetic glance, so it feels if things were to escalate, nobody would step in to help. Also, at Jane and Finch and King St E I have been followed and grabbed, so that will stick in my mind forever. Luckily, pro-tip: carrying big metal rods to hit people with and acting really scary goes a long way, so I never feel *entirely* unsafe. More like, prepared for a scuffle at any given time.
44. Like I said before I feel safe in the places that I frequent, and in most neighbourhoods. The only time that I might feel a little uneasy would be in a new place, but that would be more of a general anxiety about being somewhere I am unfamiliar with as opposed to feeling like I would be judged or attacked so it is not really a question of safety. I feel as part of the community it is in my interest to not judge a place or people before getting to know them.
45. Lower income housing projects
46. Mine
47. More conservative negohbourhoofs
48. Moss park Parks at night
49. Moss Park, Sherbourne and Bloor... Mainly by reputation but also by the uneasy feelings I get when I go there.
50. Moss Park.
51. Most others; I feel hypervisible and like territory is unfamiliar so I may not know where it is safe to escape to
52. N/A
53. Neighbourhoods with less people, neighbourhoods with a lot of bars that mostly straight people frequent, streets that are not well lit at night time, infrequent transit.
54. none
55. None
56. None in particular, but I have a general feeling of discomfort in most neighbourhoods after dark.
57. None in particular. There are many parts of the city I have never been to.
58. None specifically. I think I feel this way because I don't think I am not noticeably queer.
59. Outside of downtown I'm a bit more wary, I guess?
60. Parkdale - I was physically assaulted in Parkdale (jumped by several intoxicated young men) while walking with two female friends after dark on a side street north of Queen St. Although this event occurred about 4 years ago, I still feel partucky unsafe in the area after dark.
61. Parkdale (lots of loud people hanging out on the street in groups that you have to walk through) all along Yonge from Bloor south to Dundas. The Annex, Old Mill, Castlefrank/Broadview/Sherbourne ravines, Liberty Village, High Park, Trinity Bellwoods, Queen's Park anywhere on the TTC. Most neighbourhoods are unsafe because there are offenders in public. (Ontario's justice system is broken, the victim blaming rape culture is prevalent, and there isn't enough mental health support within our communities). I would never use a community/public washroom for fear of being sexually assaulted.

62. Parkdale because of homeless or crazy ppl on the streets
63. Parkdale, bloorcourt
64. Poor neighbourhoods with little sense of community.
65. Poorly lit, buildings in the park type complexes. Also long stretches of land in between transit stops.
66. Post-war suburbs after dark become desolate, unsafe feeling places. The hardest downtown neighbourhoods in Toronto (Moss Park, Regents Park, St James Town) demand extra vigilance after dark, but it is unrelated to my LGBTQ status.
67. Pretty much any bar district at night outside of the village
68. Queen & Sherbourne (Moss Park?) -- I've never ridden my bike or walked through there without being generally harassed; less about feeling unsafe and more about being on guard. East on Danforth as one leaves the restaurant district; again used to walk that a lot to and from friends' home and was generally harassed routinely.
69. Queen St. East; Dundas/Parliament. It feels unsafe in these places because of the higher incidence of street drug use and homelessness. I also feel unsafe near the Eaton Centre, Yonge-Dundas Square because there are such huge crowds and religious extremists preaching on the street corners.
70. Queen Street West near the Drake - lots of just out of town people go there, get drunk, and look for fights or are homophobic and feel like it's okay to bask. Richmond Street West in the club district on the weekends - fights in and out the bar, lots of heterosexuals drunk and looking for sex (aggressive men), not much protection from random bashing.
71. Regent Park (residents don't make me feel unsafe, however there is a constant, hostile police presence)
72. Regent park, north York, Scarborough
73. Regent Park, St. James Town, Cabbagetown. Because the people there generally are taken aback by someone who is clearly gay in appearance (Snapback hats, strut, clothing etc.) and I feel out of place and stared at often.
74. Rich neighbourhoods. Business and entertainment districts
75. Richmond Street on the weekends - too many drunk guys with something to prove.
76. Scarborough because low income area, reputation for gang activity.
77. The burbs! I feel hyper visible especially as a non driver in Scarborough and etobicoke. The wide open spaces make me feel like drivers could do or say or throw anything at me.
78. The city of Toronto
79. The suburbs and other conservative areas with low LGBTQ visibility.
80. Usually areas where there is a lot of rowdy drunk men. Like Little Italy, and king street west, and parts of the annex. The village is less "dangerous" in terms of harassment, but there is definitely a risk of rude run-ins and tense interactions with other drunk queers. Sometimes fights or almost fights.
81. Usually less affluent neighborhoods, e.g., Regent Park, St. James Town, since there are fewer people in the street. Poor urban planning leading which makes the neighbourhoods unwelcoming and unpleasant to walk through. Additionally, most of the areas are high concentrations of recently landed immigrants who have different beliefs and are less accepting of LGBT people.

82. west end rexdale

How do your feelings of safety differ in private spaces compared to public spaces? (Private spaces include inside a residence, the workplace, and businesses. Public spaces include roads, parks, and sidewalks)

1. a bit, yes. but that distinction is a bit loose. a park is a bit more like a residence than a workplace because you can go with friends and take up space there. but i think that private spaces can be more easily transformed into ones without the threat of danger, whereas public ones just mask other people's hatred. but i guess that's better than feeling like you are gonna be attacked.

2. Depends on the amount of surveillance on the space.

3. Depends on who I'm with. Any private spaces I go to are usually with friends and if I feel uncomfortable, it's usually because of our own personal dynamics. I do occasionally hook up with guys I just met online and am grateful, I haven't met anyone violent.

4. Depends whose private space. Public spaces I am mostly fine. I don't go to public places I know I will feel uncomfortable.

5. Everywhere

6. Familiarity definitely helps with feelings of safety, almost like you can trust places you know very well. Helps in the home environment because we have a really good superintendent who I feel like takes really good care of the space, especially if we ever feel unsafe or if there's inappropriate behaviour going on in the building.

7. Generally safe in both

8. I do not feel like there is a major difference in safety between private and public spaces.

9. I don't like long hallways in buildings, basements, garages, being the only person on the bus or subway car with another person or group.

10. I don't think that public/private is a binary on which my feelings of safety pivot.

11. i feel a lot safer in private places because i usually/more often i can choose which i participate in.

12. I feel fine in private spaces

13. i feel less safe in public spaces because theres often less observers/bystanders. in public spaces like roads, im often all alone, so i would hope there would be others at least on the street watching me and knowing im there.. so that if anyone ever jumped me, at least someone would see it and know about it

14. I feel less safe in public spaces since you do not know who is around. often there may not be other people around to step in when someone is being harrassing.

15. I feel less safe in public spaces though I've had the most violence in private spaces... that's odd

16. I feel more safe in private spaces
17. I feel much safer in private spaces as long as I know the people I'm around. Most workplaces and businesses have security cameras which makes me feel slightly safer. I feel much less safe when I'm alone in public spaces.

18. I feel pretty safe most of the time.

19. I feel safe at work to talk openly about my relationship, but its downtown. Public spaces where there is lots of queer visibility tend to be safe, everywhere else seems like a non-safe zone.

20. I feel safe being in a private space because I feel like I belong in the workplace and I have money to contribute to businesses so I have a reason to be there. I am afraid of wreckless drivers on my street because I feel like there is no control over other ppl's actions.

21. I feel safer generally in private spaces, my home and workplace are both secure and any other business has non-discrimination laws to follow. Public space is less regulated in this way, although to say I feel unsafe in public spaces would be untrue.

22. I feel safer in private spaces - more enclosed so I can see who is there.

23. I feel safer in private spaces, because there is at least a mask of accountability.

24. I feel safer in private spaces since I've often chosen to be in those places and would not knowingly put myself in danger.

25. I feel totally safe in private spaces, whereas the uncertainty of who could be around in public spaces makes me slightly uncomfortable.

26. I generally feel safer in private places but also not too unsafe generally in public places.

27. I much prefer private spaces.

28. I of course feel safer inside of a residence and I would normally know the people and it would be a safe spaces. Indoor spaces might be marginally safer because you could get help if an unsafe situation were to arise.

29. I usually feel a lot safer in private spaces, mainly because the private spaces I frequent are friendly and welcoming to different groups, and have good codes of conduct. I know exactly what to expect from the people in those spaces.

30. I'd generally rather be indoors, outdoors is a lot of exposure to who knows what.

31. If I'm in control of a private space or feel that my community is in control of it then I'm most comfortable there. Least comfortable if it's a private space that queers don't control. Public spaces are just unpredictable.

32. I'm more comfortable in private places but not by much. The determining factor is if its dark/late.

33. In general I feel safer in the private spaces I frequent rather than in the public spaces I frequent. In private residences I take comfort in physical protection (doors, locks, walls) as well as the protection offered by the presence of family and friends. At my work (an office located at University & King St. W.) I feel extremely safe as I know there are laws and company policies to protect against workplace discrimination and abuse.

34. In private spaces it can be less about physically safety and more about security? like, i'd be scared to risk things at work by being too out, not bc i'd be harassed, but bc i don't want to fall out of favour and lose my job. i'm not comfortable in any private space occupied primarily by men.

35. In private spaces, I feel that safety is more regulated. If I am harassed at work, I can talk to co-workers, team leaders, my boss, or HR. In public spaces, I feel that I could be harassed and that no one may stop it.
36. In private spaces, I often know the people who are in these spaces fairly well and have some level of control over what the space looks like and more control over who enters the space. In public settings, I don't feel as much of a sense of control over who is around/not around, what the spaces look like, how they're designed, etc.

37. In private spaces, my feelings of safety is lower as it is harder to escape or walk away from a threatening or uncomfortable encounter. Power relations (i.e. in the workplace) would also play a role in the difficulty of leaving an undesirable situation in private spaces.

38. In public spaces I feel like my physical safety is more likely to be threatened. In private spaces, I feel like my emotional/social safety is more likely to be threatened.

39. In terms of LGBQT status I have no real difference in feelings re safety private versus public.

40. In the homes of my friends I feel safe
41. Inside I do not alter my personality, but outside I will "tone down".
42. Inside I'm just fine.
43. Ironically, I feel much more safe in private spaces because I can control my access to them and the private spaces I choose to spend time in, knowing that the people there are not likely to harass me.

44. It depends entirely on who is within the private space with me. If it is someone I do not know well, it may feel similar in terms of uncertainty and feelings of being on edge as in public spaces where another individual I do not know is nearby. In both cases, if others are with me who I know well and trust, those feelings change to easy-going and trusting.

45. It depends I think.

46. It depends on the space. I was in the Mississauga sports centre last night and a woman in the bathroom was super rude to me because of how I look. Most people are polite when they mistaken my gender and I am back...but when rude doesn't make me feel safe.

47. It simply becomes a matter of awareness. In a private space, you are scrutinized more, assessed more and are usually interacted with on a more regular basis. This can lead to uncomfortable situations where individuals 'clock' or identify me in what they would consider to be a negative light. [This applies primarily to public businesses and workplaces, private residences I will only be in if I know the individual of course.] Within public area's people tend to be more transient, moving to and from the locations quickly and rarely taking the time to try and identify the traits of every single person they come across.

48. It's never safe to be gay in public
49. Less safe in public
50. Less safe in public spaces.
51. Most private spaces are known spaces with known people, there's immediately accountability to what is acceptable behaviour

52. N/A
53. No difference
54. No difference, only safer.
55. No real difference.
56. None
57. Obviously, private spaces have some sort of code (whether real or perceived) on how to behave and act. There's usualy someone else there with you too. That said, I've had my
home broken into before (when I was living in Northern Alberta), and that definitely
shatters your sense of security. I don't think I could ever feel that unsafe again - the
feeling of unsafeness that you get after having your home broken into is the absolute
worst.
58. Parks and sidewalks are the least safe.
59. Pretty much the same.
60. Private space are generally fine if I know people there or have a reason to be there.
61. Private spaces are more safe because they are less open and I am more likely to be
known/seen by witnesses
62. Private spaces are usually better than public spaces.
63. Private spaces feel safer, unless they're made up entirely of police and/or security and I'm
not dressed nicely. (Those people seem to hate a comfortably-dressed woman)
64. Private spaces i usually only choose spaces i know to be queer positive, so it's usually
better. public can be a constant negotiation of whether or not i feel safe.
65. Private spaces mean I'm less likely to encounter comments, catcalling, or verbal threats
66. Private spaces seem much safer even if they may be less comfortable.
67. Public spaces usually feel less safe to me.
68. Public spaces: likely farther from a space that I feel fully safe, but mostly not trapping me
in. Private spaces like work: when unsafe, I feel trapped in them.
69. risk of disassociation, hyper arousal and fight/flight response is significantly reduced
when i am alone. also, when those things do pop up i can take time to address them when
i am alone vs. being in public
70. Safer in public
71. They are fairly similar, it's more dependent on the type of people who are there and how
fancy the private space is
72. They differ greatly because of a sense of control over my environment with door locks,
known fire exits and businesses with one person, private washrooms located in more
public areas).
73. They don't.
74. Visually I can easily pass as "straight" or heteronormative so I rarely confront spaces
where my sexuality causes me to feel unsafe. This is not true with being a woman.
Generally, I feel less safe in public than in private settings.
75. Well one is a controlled environment and the other isn't
76. Well, I definitely feel safe in my only private space.
77. Work in a very inclusive place. I feel safe the vast majority of the time and just avoid
areas or act straight when in areas that I am unsure of. This usually involves areas outside
of downtown Toronto. Overall I feel very safe in public and private places in Toronto.
Overall, do you feel safer and more comfortable in neighbourhoods with reputation as being queer and trans inclusive (e.g. Queer West, the Village, etc..)?

Table 62 – Safety in LGBTQ2+ Inclusive Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety in Queer Inclusive Areas</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on queer inclusive areas:

1. Absolutely - I'm comfortable holding my partner's hand or kissing on our street, but would probably play it up a little bit more if we were in the Village. In addition, I wouldn't dance too closely with her at a bar around us because of the unwanted (usually male) attention, but in the Village? Absolutely!
2. Absolutely. Even though I generally come across as straight, in my experience they are just nicer people who understand oppression, so they're kinder to women in general.
3. Because I don't present outwardly as queer, and I am cis-gendered, I don't feel more of a target on my back as many people in the community. I would fear, however, that perhaps in a neighbourhood that is more queer and trans-inclusive might be at a higher risk for hate-crimes, though I would hope that there would be additional security measures to protect people from such an event.
4. Being bi sexual makes an interesting commentary on this question. I found that if I live in a non-LGBTQ2+ community and I date someone of the opposite gender than I am fine, but if I date someone of the same gender, although not harassed it can draw more stares and the occasional person who has to say something. If I live in an LGBTQ2+ neighbourhood and date someone of the same gender then I am fine, but if I date someone of the opposite gender I will get the same kind of ire that I get from people who are heterosexual. Basically there is no winning here, they both seem to look at bisexuals in the same way. It's a phase, they just do it for attention, they just pretend to be lesbian/gay to pick up opposite gendered people, to name a few of the types of opinions I have encountered. Let it be noted that these were not encountered where I live now, but in a smaller town that I lived in long before. There seems to be a general feeling of mistrust towards bisexual people. I find it hard to get people who only go one way or the other to understand the idea of being sexually attracted to all genders. This is especially true if you are a bisexual and you settle down with someone who is the opposite of your gender, everyone then treats it like some kind of phase regardless of the fact that you still very much have sexual attraction to same gender individuals.
5. However, I have had negative experiences in these neighbourhoods as well. These neighbourhoods are known for being queer and trans inclusive which can make them an easier target for hatred.

6. I don't feel safer in "the village" (Church/Wellsley) because it is right near Yonge Street, which is quite hectic, and as a queer woman I don't feel particularly represented or visible there.

7. I feel more community and comfortable with my own queerness, and definitely less likely to be verbally harassed.

8. I often frequent areas that are Queer positive. I specifically feel safer when spaces have visible indicators (rainbow stickers or explicit Queer inclusion signifiers) that promote inclusion and safe space.

9. I'm often in these spaces at night time and feel safer if I'm in a group as there have been times when I've experienced street harassment from other queer folks, particularly gay men in The Village - however, there are more people around. Queer West, on the other hand, I feel somewhat safer, but the visibly queer spaces can be fewer and further between than in The Village.

10. just as many homo/transphobia incidents have happened in these areas as "non-queer" areas

11. Make all areas queer and Trans inclusive.

12. Most areas that I frequent (downtown Toronto) in Toronto are accepting of LGBT people and I do not feel there is a major difference between these spaces.

13. Queer west is actually better than the village in a lot of ways. I find the village to be heteronormative sometimes- even with queers.

14. Queers can be catty and I'm sensitive.

15. Sometimes. The village for example sometimes is over-policed and the cops can be aggressive. It's also a place where you might feel socially unsafe because you don't want to be seen by your family. There have also been a few instances of homophobic violence there. I feel most safe in bloor west, there's more residences, families, but it's also affordable housing so there's queer people who have similar incomes to me, and it's less built around partying and drinking and clubs.

16. The main factor isn't queer and trans inclusive but rather the reputation of crime (etc. Jane and Finch has a bad reputation).

17. The Village' is also a target for a lot of homophobic and transphobic violence, so it doesn't make me feel any safer.

18. The village is not inclusive. "Queer West" is much more so, and yes, I feel safer there. The village is a terrible place

19. the village, yes. i'm not sure if bloor west being queer and trans inclusive is common belief outside of some parts of those communities.
Have you ever encountered discrimination, harassment or were made to feel uncomfortable in a space or neighbourhood that advertizes itself as being queer and trans inclusive?

Table 63 – Discrimination, Harassment or Discomfort in LGBTQ2+ Inclusive Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination in queer inclusive area</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses (out of 167 participants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on discrimination, harassment or uncomfortable space in queer and trans inclusive area:

1. Drunken & racist bar/club patrons, drunken & racist drag entertainers (Google Daytona Bitch and 'blackface'), drunken & racist club owners....
2. Dunno if it counts, but there is a definite othering that I feel in The Village as a result of the way I present my masculinity. I will avoid The Village since I feel that these spaces are reserved for a certain type of LGBTQ person (read; beautiful, fit, trendy clothes). It's like, you come to Toronto and are jazzed about finding a queer community and yhe most obvious place to look is The Village, but you arrive and are still excluded for being the wrong type of gay that is revered in that area.
3. During Pride about 3 years ago, I was dancing in the 519 Green Space beer garden and a gay man came up behind me and started dancing with me, which I didn't think much of until he grabbed both my breasts. I then elbowed him and told him never to touch me, after which he called me a bitch and tried to justify his actions by saying that he was gay and would never want to sleep with me. Another was also during Pride 2 years ago, I was at the Loblaws at Church and Carleton buying a sandwich. As I was putting my change away at the cash register, the man behind me came up to the cashier and said "just so you know I'm not a big fan of disgusting dykes like her" and pointed at me. I have also been catcalled by gay men in The Village and experienced femmephobia from butch lesbians/women at queer bars.
4. Eggs thrown at me on Church Street
5. Gay men are not nice to visibly trans women. They catcall, yell, and misgender. The village is so make dominated is a horrible place to be visibly trans.
6. General bisexual suspicion and visibility; many queer spaces are suspicious or openly hostile towards bisexuals.
7. Had a car stop once and three young guys get out of the car with hockey sticks yelling they were going to get some fags (it ended well in that they did not pursue us). When I lived in the village it was routine to have eggs thrown at me walking home late. Countless homophobic slurs yelled from cars again when walking in the village; again this would be a decade or more ago.

8. I describe it as the Halloween hate crime - every Halloween someone screams, "Faggot!" at my from the safety of their passing car. This was an annual event until the last two years. So perhaps it won't happen again.

9. I find some Queer spaces can have their own bias. Gentrification in Toronto's Queer neighbourhoods have pushed many Queer identified women out due to a plethora of socioeconomic and cultural barriers.

10. I have been called "sir" many times in the Village which makes me uncomfortable -- despite the fact that I have long hair and generally look reasonably feminine.

11. I live in Queen west and have had homophobic slurs yelled at me.

12. I used to be a hot dog vendor at the corner of gerrard and church. I was harassed each shift.

13. I was just walking around just east of the gay village and some random guy on the street called me a faggot. Nothing else happened, but it was jarring.

14. I was making out with a partner outside her apartment in the village. We had gawkers and people asking if we could kiss them (mostly men). We just told them off/gave them the finger...they moved on

15. I was told that I'm not "really queer" because pansexuals and bisexuals are just confused heterosexuals. I was ignored at the bar and was essentially told to leave.

16. If you're not muscular and masculine and cis and white you can face a lot of banal contempt

17. I'm sometimes misgendered in places like the Village

18. In the gay village it self, at gay bars, some people just ignore me once they learn I am latino, once they learn i have anxiety and depression issues. Also, indirectly, I have heard of people being attacked and called names on church street. And I am close friend of Ryan Boa, who was viciously attacked

19. In the Wesley villlage, I was called a fagot by a very drunk homeless person. Late at night.

20. I've been yelled at walking a block from Church Street by guys in a pick up...likely going to a hockey game. But of course this can happen anywhere

21. most of my responses have been about bloor west.

22. My visible identities are quite privileged and I have never personally experienced discrimination or harassment but I have witnessed it many times (usually racist or transphobic issues).

23. not all spaces are inclusive. some are intended to serve specific communities. there are some spaces carved out by queers of colour and trans folks which are not inclusive of white gay and queer people, such as myself. and that is totally fine. it is important that they have a certain amount of autonomy. so it is fine with me if white and gayqueer andor cis people are exlcuded from certain spaces. but have i felt uncomfortable in such spaces? yes, and that;s fine.

24. Not in Toronto but in London, UK when I was at Pride and in the gay village there. I feel this is relevant because you can encounter harassment even at pride events and more
often there than other places because people who are discriminating against you know they can find you there. This could easily have happened to me at a Toronto pride event.

25. okay, here's something a lot of people don't understand. just bc something is "queer" positive doesn't mean it will be friendly to me as a lesbian. in fact, so many ppl throw around homophobic slurs in LGBTQ spaces without thinking of those of us who have experienced bad things with those words. so yeah, i feel uncomfortable in spaces where people think it's fine to throw around or appropriate slurs and identities, esp ones that have been used to hurt me. also gay men and bi ppl can be pretty awful towards lesbians for being lesbians, just generally saying we're horrible or losers, or trying to convince us to date men. people will disbelieve experiences of discrimination against lesbians. i find this especially when it comes to ppl shitting on gay marriage without understanding how important it is, and was in the past for gay parents, esp lesbians, trying to just have rights to care for their children. also, more and more these days, lgbtq spaces are filled with essentialist ideas of gender. things like, being feminine means you're a girl and being masculine means you're a boy! and critiquing anything related to gender is bad bc it hurts people's feelings. i've seen ppl shut down legit discussions about compulsory femininity bc they don't think it's fair bc some women like make up! it's bullshit. not enough critical thinking.

26. People hurling insults from passing cars.

27. Please read above statement, mind you it needs to be noted again that this was not Toronto.

28. racism

29. Security/Staff at a couple of the bars on Church street.

30. Seriously privileged answer; gay men and women have been kinda shitty when they find out I'm a queer girl with a boyfriend.

31. Sexual harassment.

32. Spaces made by and for whir queer people can be pretty hit or miss. When I was in my undergrad it felt like every gay party had some racist theme like "luau" or "jamaican gaycation" or something. Going out for halloween, people would be dressed as a geisha or an indian or in blackface. Harassment was mostly in the form of micro aggressions.

33. Straight people commenting overtly saying things like "I saw someone who looked really gay the other day"

34. The 519 Community Centre I was screamed at and called a fag repeatedly until I was in tears. There was no one else around at the AIDS memorial so I just sucked it up

35. The village is just generally awful every time I go there. People (and businesses) have openly discriminated against trans friends of mine, the bars and clubs feel less safe, I feel more judged than I ever do at straight bars, and the whole place just feels like it's conventionally attractive cis gay men performing for the enjoyment of other cis gay men and voyeuristic cis straight women, who are in turn being preyed on by creepy cis straight men who are lurking about.

36. This is small, but during Pride there was a booth with buttons that had different sexuality and gender identities on them and they didn't have one for pan. It was just another eye roll moment like "yay pan erasure" and a nod to bi/pan discrimination in both queer and straight circles.

37. This year's AIDS Vigil. A guy shouted "Let's hope look at the freaks!" I confronted him and an argument ensued.
38. Usually multiple comments or verbal threats, particularly being a visible trans woman. We still have a long way to go to be inclusive of our transgender communities.

How does your gender and/or sexual identity influence your feeling of public safety in Toronto?

1. For the most part it does not effect my feeling of safety. I have never had any concern for my safety and the worst experiences are limited to stares from strangers and the odd disrespectful comment.

2. For the most part it doesn't effect my feeling of safety. Not on a day to day basis. But there are episodes of discomfort and harassment. It depends where I am and what time of day.

3. Gender, being female makes me feel less safe in public more than my sexual identity, mainly because my sexual identity is more hidden.

4. Generally, I find Toronto to be a very inclusive city and one of the more safe cities I have found myself in -- it isn't until I leave Toronto and visit a more rural or different city that I start to realize it could be much, much worse.

5. Generally, the way in which I am perceived by another is what affects my feeling of safety. My presentation can switch from more masculine to more feminine and that presentation attracts different responses. So, my feeling of safety is usually greater when I feel more masculine presenting. When I look more feminine, I realize that I am getting looks and more verbal insults and things like that but usually from men. So, where I am is less important than what I appear like and if there are more men present.


7. I always wear steel-toed shoes and constantly look behind when walking. I wear earphones whether listening to music or not (to avoid conversation/conflict) with strangers, especially on the subway.

8. I am a relatively gender conforming, white, cis, man. I believe that contributes greatly to my feelings of safety in most places. My queerness is not too difficult to read which is a source of some felt vulnerability.

9. I am a white male which gives me a good buffer to most forms of discrimination and other issues. I am also in very good physical shape which I think makes me insulated a bit as well. I have seen how my friends who are smaller, visible minorities and/or lesbian are treated and in many cases they are treated better when with me. I know that being a female and/or a minority of the LGBT community would be much more difficult.

10. I am aware of the hatred that exists for my being gay (I live a gay life, although I identify myself as bi I've been in m2m relationships mostly for the past 20 years) and just run a subconscious risk assessment....

11. I am more concerned about my gender identity/presentation than my sexual orientation. My (in)ability to pass and/or the questions my appearance raises seem to be the cause of any discrimination I've experienced. This worries me to the point where I purposely dress in certain ways/go certain places/use certain bathrooms to ensure I am not harrassed for being trans or presenting too feminine.

12. I am not visibly queer so I would say that gender influences my feeling of public safety more. There is a sense of feeling uncomfortable I sometimes get if walking alone or on the subway alone late at night.

13. I am used to constant sexual harassment and a number of sexual assaults.
14. I can a woman or a boy but if I fuck with wearing a dress or women's cloths it's game over
15. I definitely feel a lot less safe as someone who is/identifies as a woman, especially at night time or in public spaces like bars.
16. I definitely feel like interpretations of my gender and sexual identity influence some people's harassment and/or assault, so a lot.
17. I do occasionally feel more on edge when around places where traditional heteronormative culture is on display (e.g. clubbing district, rowdy bars). My lessened sense of safety (and other cultural/preference factors) lead me to avoid those places.
18. I don't know if it influences my personal feeling of public safety because I don't visibly appear to be queer in anyway but if I did I think I would feel unsafe.
19. I don't notice any safety issues
20. I fear sexual harassment as a woman.
21. I feel as though I've already answered this question. - as a woman I experience sexism and street harassment (once every few months). I feel at risk for being assaulted, and like if I went out at night and was assaulted, I would be blamed for it. - I feel more vulnerable to it bc I am visibly gay a lot of the time too, and corrective rape is a thing that still happens to lesbians. (I was the target of corrective sexual assault, but not when I was living in Toronto)
22. I feel fine because I blend in with the "norm" and pass as straight with my male partner. I don't go to clubs and bars anymore and I don't get harassed because of my gender/sexuality by drunk ppl.
23. I feel lucky to live in Toronto. The diversity here helps with being able to walk around as myself and not worry about discrimination for the most part. I get more worried about people from out of town like Brampton who come in and feel all Rob Ford like...like they are entitled to left off steam and will focus much of their inner suburbia frustrations out on people they have been told not to like.
24. I feel safer the more queer I look; I have definitely noticed that presenting as less-female draws less unwanted (sexualized) attention. When I am not on the receiving end of a stranger's leer I tend to feel much more safe than otherwise.
25. I feel that I often pass as straight male, therefore people don't seem to concerned
26. I feel very safe and am very fortunate that I have not been severely harassed (physical, sexual, emotional). My appearance does not necessarily 'label' me as a lesbian therefore I do not have as much discrimination as I could have. I cannot imagine the discrimination that non cis people face.
27. I have always felt safe in this city, but I know that I am lucky in this.
28. I identify as femme and am often read as a straight woman, which allows me to pass which can make me feel safer, although invisible in queer communities
29. I tend to avoid events that are not labelled at lgbtq-friendly, as I wouldn't want myself to be put in a position where I could be discriminated against.
30. I think I generally feel quite safe in Toronto on the whole, but when I do grapple with ideas of personal safety, it is often because of my sexual identity. My gender identity as a male makes me feel like I am more safe than the average female or person who has a non-normative gender identity.
31. I think my privilege as a white gay man has a very large influence on my experience of safety. I don't know that I am what some would describe as 'passing' but I am likely more
that than 'flamboyant' in the majority of my day to day travels. During this time I never worry about my safety. That said, I am a person who does drag/genderfuck/general fuckery and nonsense for fun. This means I am often out in the city in wigs, heels, dresses, blood and glitter, or any mixture of thing. At these times I would say that I still feel safe. Occasionally there is a sense of anxiety but that has more to do with being seen as different than the other people on the bus than it does a fear I will be assaulted or verbally attacked. In fact, at these times I am more empowered to defend myself from such a thing than during my more subdued or 'normal' experiences.

32. I think my sexual identity plays a huge role in my feeling safe or unsafe in Toronto, as does my gender. Being male offers me a greater sense of security.

33. I won't hold hands in public with my partner because I feel that people might stare awkwardly or bash us.

34. I would feel safer as a straight white male, without the potential threat of harassment.

35. I would say that the fact that I'm a man has contributed to my feeling of safety in Toronto.

36. I'm a fairly femme gay guy, but I don't know how to or care to hide it. Downtown is a middle class bubble but that doesn't immure me from shit here as well as in the suburbs.

37. I'm a woman. It factors greatly.

38. I'm fierce and always vigilant.

39. I'm just hyperaware of how people interact with me. every encounter with a stranger means I have to watch what I say and the language I use, and if discrimination comes up I have to gauge my safety further and decide weather it's worth it to respond or to withdraw. every trip it's on my mind.

40. im more scared of being a woman on the streets than i am of being a woman-who-loves-women on the streets. you know? like i dont have a problem with kissing a girlfriend in public because i want so badly to believe that nothing shitty would ever happen because of that. but i definitely feel a constant fear as a woman in general, out on the streets. theres always a threat of rape or harassment. i guess i feel more scared when im alone. like much more so.

41. I'm not readily visibly identifiable as queer. My feeling of safety is purely due to gender - people.generally leave me alone. But I've noticed increaed unwelcome engagement when I'm on or near my motorcycle .. Especially when I'm in my gear or getting ready to ride.

42. I'm not safe. Being a woman in public in the city is awful. Being visibly trans is down right dangerous. In extremely lucky to pass most days and only be subject to the same harassment most other women are subjected to.

43. It causes anxiety whenever I have to go out in public, even though I seem to now have "passing privilege", it still does not feel entirely safe to be seen in public.

44. It does not its all depend on you as a person and your surroundings

45. It doesn't

46. It doesn't have that much of an effect. I guess I feel slightly more wary of other men, because I feel a bit more vulnerable than I assume my straight/cis counterparts do.

47. It doesn't.

48. It doesn't.

49. It makes me feel less safe no matter where I am.

50. it makes me suspicious of those who hold privilege
it works for me in some spaces and against me in others, i just roll with the punches. (no pun intended)

It's a bit more complicated that people just thinking i look quuer or gender non conforming, so that makes me a target of harassment or violence. I think that my experience of gender has affected every aspect of my life (my life trajectory, my self-esteem, my income, my career development) and so all of that combines to affect my safety in public space.

It's doesn't, I'm very comfortable with myself

It's probably my gender that makes me most vulnerable and worries me the most

My being a woman has exposed me to many threats, uncomfortable situations and bigotry that I would not be subjected to were I a man. My sexual identity has made me feel excluded and offended by many things, but I am grateful to say it has not affected my feelings of safety.

My gender has a huge influence on my safety considerations. Especially being a trans male who does not often "pass" in public and who is just beginning to transition hormonally, I often worry how other people will react to me, worry about which bathroom I should use at which place, at what time, worry how other people I don't know well will react if I tell them, or how someone might react if my gender is ambiguous to them. Feel a very distinct sense of unease not being unambiguously taken as male; definitely think my sense of comfort will grow as I continue to transition.

No real problems....

Nope I don't let it influence my feelings

Not much

Only in the village and the entertainment district

sexual identity as a queer femme/soft butch-- i feel like it opens me to a level of harassment that is uniquely based in fetishization on the part of cis men. for straight women i also sometimes encounter discrimination, like me being near them and queer will somehow spread to them so they have to differentiate themselves from me. like i have queer cooties or something. so i feel like me sexual identity is tied to my experiences of low grade discrimination and potentially violent assault gender-- i have experienced rape/intimate partner violence. this previous experience just amplifies all subsequent experiences of gender based violence because sometimes i go into anxiety, disassociation, and flash back stuff. im getting better at calming down, but it just means that sometimes my sense of public safety is totally skewed and very difficult to articulate in relation to the actual presence of threat.

Similar to a previous answer, I feel I have a lot of privilege, which influences how I'm perceived and treated, and I also feel a duty to be visible and brave. I love to be able to be affectionate with my partner in public, and it's very important to me to stand up for other people being harassed or being made to feel unsafe, and I have. So far I suppose I've been lucky nothing bad has come from it, but even if it did I don't think it would change my belief that it's important to be visible and take up space.
67. sorry I don't know how to answer that question
68. The general public doesn't respect the were community.
69. There is somewhat a more general acceptance in Toronto towards the LGBTQ community so I don't feel much unsafe
70. There's a lot of people who stare at me, or blatantly ask me if I'm a guy or a girl...it's no one's business but for the most part it doesn't make me feel unsafe. Just the undereducated public.
71. THIS is the question I was waiting for! My gender PERFORMANCE affects my feelings of safety. I am a tall, white male with masculine body language. It would be surprising for someone to think I am queer without interacting with me, and even then I 'butch it up' when talking to strangers. In fact, other men probably find me intimidating and not an easy target for a bashing or harassment. So I think that, even though it isn't my intention, I probably 'pass' as straight and masculine. In fact, when I was younger (ie 15 years ago or more) I encountered more physical threats from dudes who were threatened by my 'phalic power' than anything else.
72. Toronto is not a safe place for women.
73. Toronto is very progressive in this way, so I rarely feel justifiably unsafe. I put it more to individuals; certain people will be a problem but the attitudes of society as a whole are fine, 8/10
74. Walking at night on public streets can be slightly unnerving due to being a female. I have been followed home twice in my life, but not within the past ten years. I generally feel very safe in Toronto, being a cis-gender feminine-presenting Caucasian woman.
75. When I know that I "stick out" because of my gender/sexual identity, it becomes a lens through which I assume everyone else sees me, interprets me, judges me. I don't actually know that people "see" my identity, but I assume it sticks out... and then I assume that people's behaviour towards me is entirely because of that. So it certainly affects how I feel, though I don't know that it has ever actually made me less safe here.
76. Whenever Im with my boyfriend I am uncomfortable and so is he. but alone I am fine.
77. While I often believe Toronto is a place where LGBT people are welcome and fully accepted, incidents I have experienced are a jarring reminder that no matter how many Pride parades are held - and how many police officers march in them - that there is still a huge swath of the population in this city who believe that it is acceptable to harass LGBT people, and law enforcement simply believes that we should have to put up with it. It is a stark reminder that we can often live in our own "bubbles" of safe people and safe spaces and can be instantly pulled out of them at the whims of the ignorant who would do us harm.

Any last comments or something that the survey missed?

1. Aggressively verbally harassed on the street... While getting ready to get on my motorcycle.
2. Bisexual and pansexual discrimination is real. As a straight passing, pansexual women I've been ignored at local businesses by bar staff, verbally harassed by patrons and verbally assaulted on the street
3. Certain bars in Church street feel cold to me because I'm an awkward, straight-looking girl amidst a ton of flamboyant, confident queers, and I don't feel I am given a chance to
be welcomed. But that's partially my own fault for being shy, I'm sure. Still, I wish I knew the initiation process, if there is one.

4. CHURCH ST- group of gay guys cat calling me in lesbian clubs- i find it to be heternormative- i.e.- you're either butch or femme very constraining gender roles considering it's a "queer club"

5. Cis gay men sexually harassed me

6. Comments about my gender from other patrons when visiting Crews and Tangos, not discriminatory but made assumptions about my gender and didn't let me identify myself to them. Also, horrible bathroom experience there too. Most queer/trans friendly restaurants and bars have gendered washrooms, and I will still be misgendered.

7. Definitely had some of those drive-bys in the Gay Village. Straight men driving by and yelling something along the lines of "faggot." Again, in those instances it's fortunately easy to laugh off because they're obviously cowards, but it's still upsetting.

8. Although I am genderqueer, I am perceived as a man so I don't experience harassment constantly.

9. As a femme, caucasian lesbian, I rarely experience any situations that effect my feeling of safety. When I am with my partner, however, I am much more aware of "looks" and expressions of anger from other people. My partner is a butch lesbian, often assumed to be trans.

10. as a guy it is much easier to walk the streets at night. and as a 30 something guy who is much less femme than ten or fifteen years ago, i have less fear when walking by myself. that said, i grew up in newfoundland in the 90s, which was a different place in term of gender and sexuality than toronto in 2015. but in general, i sense that it is still a lot easier to be a straight guy walking at night than another sort of person...straight woman, gay man, lesbian, trans guy, transwoman, and so on.

11. As a queer woman and because of past experiences, I am often on guard (particularly late at night) and the potential of being made to feel unsafe is often in the back of my mind.

12. As a transwoman I do find that my gender identity does influence my feelings of safety here in Toronto, while many of these concerns are based off of internalized anxieties there are times where comfort and safety because of my gender identity are compromised.

13. As a woman, I feel extremely unsafe. I can hide my sexuality unless I'm with another woman or a transwoman, but otherwise nobody would know of my pansexuality.

14. As I mentioned earlier, I think, for me, it is more about gender (and cisgendered too). I do a lot of work with trans* sex workers, and I don't encounter or experience the city in any way close to how they experience it because of my cisgender and the privilege that comes with that.

15. As I said, I'm not a visible member of the LGBTQ2+ community amd I'm in a straight relationship so I don't think my queerness inherently affects my safety, unless I were to come out to someone who didn't approve (to put it lightly). My gender identity definitely affects my feeling of public safety but I don't think Toronto is necessarily better or worse than anywhere else concerning sexual harassment and assault. The world hates women, and that is only compounded by the intersection of queerness and race, class, etc.

16. As someone who is somewhat visibly queer (esp when holding a partner's hand), I have been the target of homophobic slurs. My gender identity and expression draws attention (ie traditionally feminine), some of which is catcalling and lewd comments.
17. Because I don't often present as queer, it doesn't effect me as much.
18. Being confined in an institution or space with social barriers like gender binarism causes an uncomfortable feeling, especially as an androgynous person.
19. Being female while alone at night, or on public transit at night makes me feel slightly more vulnerable. My sexual orientation is not obvious unless I am with a partner/group of friends, and being with one or more person prevents my feeling vulnerable.
20. Being visibly female can be a challenge at times. I've been assaulted by strangers while waiting for the light to change so I can keep biking... And it seems that people never really understand why it's not okay to have strange men approach you and put their arms around you... I'm grateful to be in a city where people will stop if you are being violently attacked though... While growing up out in BC I was attacked with a friend on a main street by ten.. Maybe fifteen people and no one stopped their cars while they beat us up so badly that we had to go to the hospital...
21. By planning ahead when going out at night. Taking more taxis instead of TTC.
22. For myself, only a little bit more negatively. I am less open about my sexual orientation and keep it to myself largely in Toronto, perhaps because people here seem to all have a far more vocal and possibly aggressive opinion on these things. In the past I was quite open in my hometown about it, hoping to educate others on the fact that it was normal, and to encourage discussion, but here I'm less confident I wouldn't be harassed or followed because of it. On the whole, I would say I have become more private about my sexual identity since coming to Toronto for this reason.
23. el convento rico - Where straight people gawk at trans or drag queens. VERY uncomfortable. never understood how that was identified as queer - friendly.
24. Femme identity should be included.
25. For the most part Toronto feels pretty safe. I do feel like the police could take any form of bashing or fights more seriously. It is intent to harm. But I feel like they still have too much homophobia on the police force and lack of understanding of LGBTQ issues.
26. good survey. i would be curious to know more about how the distinction of public and private is worked out in the study. this seems straightforward for spaces like sidewalks, but groups in public are quite different from individuals in public. good study. happy this research is happening.
27. Great work
28. I answered "no" to most questions of feeling unsafe or been harassed, and I do feel very safe in Toronto overall. However I'm a fairly small guy, I think had I been a larger person I would feel safer, and that, more so than my sexual or racial identity, factor more in my feeling of safety. Thank you very much for having an interest in this!
29. I feel a bit more focus on the failings of our police would not be remiss in a survey such as this. Also, I could not answer with personal experience regarding school systems in Toronto, as I did my schooling elsewhere in Canada, but in case it's significant, the LGBTQ2+ representation was nonexistent, and those who were out were severely punished by their classmates. FWIW.
30. I feel like you overemphasized identity. it doesn't matter how i ~identify~ i am a woman who loves only women, therefore i am a lesbian. can't ~identify~ my way out of that. you will experience oppression based on the facts of who you are regardless of how you identify, and some ppl in positions of privilege use identity to trying and obscure the privilege they have. it's a dangerous rhetoric. also i feel like you missed just how many
parts of the city most ppl frequent? i live in one neighbourhood, yes, but i walk through at least 2/3 on my way to work most days. you also should have asked about, maybe, how many other lgbtq ppl one sees in their area? i see very very few, at least visible ones, very few couples. and that impacts things too, whether i am willing to be visibly by doing something like holding a girl's hand - if there are many of us around and i have seen that it is fine, i'll take the chance. but if i'm surrounded by straight people or men, no way, i'd be too scared.

31. i hope this survey reaches a lot of trans girls, who are definitely getting the brunt of it. it might be useful to know how much people are aware of other people being bashed or harassed because it has consequences too. it might be useful to know how people see themselves or their lives or their behaviour being affected by bashing or harassment.

32. i lived in St. John's, NL for 5 years and encountered more discrimination there than I ever have in Toronto. It's a great city, but I felt a bit less safe there, perhaps because of small town attitudes that prevail. The worst incident was when someone shouted "that's not normal you fuckers" from their truck while I was holding hands with my ex (who is also trans). These things don't happen as much at all in Toronto, based on my own experience.

33. I think that not being an easily identified queer has helped me be safe in all of the places mentioned. I have also lived here my whole life and have adjusted to any feelings of fear because I know my surroundings and identify with the ppl. With a larger male partner I feel protected from harm and harassment.

34. I think that social anxiety is a big issue, I have a friend who is LGBTQ2+ and has a lot of anxiety about going out, about presenting as ones self, about other people, ect. Might have been an interesting avenue to explore.

35. I'm a cisgender white person, but in a relationship with a person-of-colour, and I've dated trans men before, and I consider myself someone who stands in solidarity with racialized and trans communities, and so while it's not my direct experience it's certainly something I'm constantly aware of, which is issues of racial, gender and sexist discrimination within the gay and lesbian community itself. I hope other people have spoken to it, but feeling unsafe in spaces can definitely come from within a community just as easily as from outside of it.

36. In a city like Toronto, I feel that the speed of everyday life reduces people's capacity for empathy. People in a hurry don't care about others.

37. It would be helpful to provide a better working definition of safety (or lack thereof), perhaps in contrast to (dis)comfort.

38. N/A

39. No

40. No, thank you.

41. None that I can think of.. Thank you!

42. Nope - but thanks for doing the work you do. This is important stuff and an important conversation to have at multiple levels of governance.

43. Now that I think about it, I did experience and/or report incidents of assault in the 1990s. I was randomly attacked by someone struggling with mental health in the Annex late at night. They thought i was someone who owed them money. I was punched in the face by a guy at a music festival on The Island when I told him to stop harassing a woman (when it didn't faze me, he ran away). I was mistreated by police in 1999 for participating in a
non-violent protest occupying a park to highlight poverty and homelessness in the city. Still, none of these relate to my queer identity directly.

44. Religion in this survey seems to assume that I publicly practice which is not always the case.

45. Sorry for so much village-hate and gratuitous rambling, it’s getting pretty late. I do stand by my hatred of the village though. It is a dark place.

46. Thank you for taking an interest in these matters.

47. Thank you for taking an interest in this subject and believing that it is an issue of value!

48. Thanks!

49. There needs to be a differentiation or some way to account for differences in experiences between people who are visibly LGBTQ and those who are not.

50. While I think our city can ALWAYS be safer, I think we live in a pretty accepting and safe, world-class city.

51. Your doing an amazing job. Keep up the good work.