

“Hope. Effort. Family.” The Benny Farm Community Then ... and Now?

Erin Silver

e_silv@alcor.concordia.ca

I grew up on Benny Farm (50-60's)... many fond memories. We considered our apartment home, not a rent. I remember my mother scrubbing the front stoop down to the next landing and so on. We had pride, and it showed. – bkzmeridian, Citynoise.org¹

In a recent email exchange with my great-aunt Rosemary Gray-Snelgrove, a tenant of Benny Farm as a teenager in the 1950s, Gray-Snelgrove wrote to me of “the enthusiasm that tenants had for their community. The post-war mood was one of hope, based on community and care for kids and building toward the future. Perfect example of what the late forties and fifties were about. Hope. Effort. Family.”²

It is from this email exchange that I take the title of my paper, as the sentiment expressed by Gray-Snelgrove is one that I would like to examine in association with the structural, architectural, and social evolution—and perhaps de-evolution—of the Benny Farm housing project in Montreal’s Notre-Dame-de-Grâce neighbourhood. Originally built in 1947 to house veterans and their families, the fate of Benny Farm has been in upheaval since 1991, when the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) made public its intention to sell the site to developers; though this particular fate was ultimately abandoned and Benny Farm has since been given a second life which continues to face various transformations, I wonder if, throughout these transformations, it is possible to preserve a social environment that would reflect that which flourished so organically during Benny Farm’s original run. Of course, the needs of the community have changed, but are the needs of the community being taken into account in the redevelopment of Benny Farm? Whose interests should be prioritized in the

redevelopment of Benny Farm—the original tenants and purpose of the project in an effort to preserve the project’s heritage, or the potential tenants and corporate stakeholders its redevelopment might benefit? Can both be integrated into a harmonious living situation that would accommodate both current tenants and those being targeted for future tenancy, all the while preserving that which once made Benny Farm such an appealing place to reside? Are developers working with the best interests of the Benny Farm community in mind, or has Benny Farm gone the way of gentrification and speculation, removing from the site the community environment that once made this social housing project so unique and beloved?

Outlining the social and architectural history of Benny Farm in relation to the belief in place-making as the combined effort of site and social involvement, as well as the role of collective memory and action in securing the built environment, I will provide a history of Benny Farm, from its auspicious beginnings to its current fragmented state, detailing its structural and social transformations, its environmental and economic aspirations, and the political controversies that have resulted from the conversion of this public housing project to a corporate entity. In researching the history and redevelopment of Benny Farm, I have used a diverse range of materials that include documents provided by the City of Montreal, the housing corporations involved in site allocation and development, the architectural firms hired to design and redesign the new and existing Benny Farm units and property, the community members and organizations involved in deciding the future uses of Benny Farm, and the current tenants who live, on a daily basis, within the parameters of the project that has been and is currently being developed. My intention is to present a picture of the current state of Benny Farm that serves not to

problematize Benny Farm's redevelopment, but to point to the ways in which Benny Farm's redevelopment both adheres to and neglects the tenets that comprised the original Benny Farm mandate and vision.

Benny Farm stands as one of the oldest social housing projects in Montreal and still serves the needs of a few of its original tenants. The implementation of collective models of social housing projects began in Montreal shortly after the Second World War, and was intended to benefit veterans and their burgeoning families.³ Social housing architecture of the time was witness as much to a desire to confront social and urban dilemmas as it was to put in place a new professional approach to ensure that the working class who did not live in social housing units did not feel slighted in their access to resources. Bounded by Monkland Avenue to the north, Sherbrooke Street to the south, Benny Avenue to the east, and Cavendish Boulevard to the west, Benny Farm was named after Scottish manufacturer Walter Benny, who purchased the property in 1838 and whose descendants owned the land until 1944, when it was purchased by Housing Enterprises Limited.⁴ Designed by Harold James Doran and built in 1946 and 1947, Benny Farm reflected the garden city style conceived of just a half a century earlier—one of the few remaining examples of garden city in the North American context. The garden city, introduced by Ebenezer Howard in 1898 in his book *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, was intended to gradually reconfigure existing cities into decentralized but networked cities through a commitment to land owned in public trust, a maximum population of thirty thousand for each city, a greenbelt to surround the city, and a mixture of land use.⁵ This model is evident in miniature form in Benny Farm, especially in Doran's intention in his design of Benny Farm to emphasize the green and open spaces.

Doran's original plan comprised 384 units in groups of three-storey sixplexes, which, though initially resisted by members of the surrounding neighbourhood, who felt them to be unsightly and incompatible with the existing architecture of the neighbourhood, was accepted by municipal authorities due to the post-war housing shortage.⁶ The original Benny Farm buildings, like other social housing projects such as Les Habitations Jeanne Mance, Habitat 67, and the Îlots Saint-Martin Petite Bourgogne neighbourhood, all built between 1960 and 1968, followed the European and American models developed for social housing and were low-rise, adhering to a Modernist aesthetic by which a "modesty of expression and an economy of means" were employed in order to emphasize a minimalist and functionalist approach to building.⁷ Red brick comprised the façade of the 16 groupings of the single loaded walk-up blocks set around two large land parcels that resulted in courtyards facing onto surrounding streets or back into the Benny Farm buildings. The crisp, linear Art Deco design of the buildings' exteriors and their serpentine layout challenged "historic urban form" and took advantage of Canada's abundance of land.⁸ The Farm was purchased in 1947 by the CMHC and gave priority to veterans' families. Soon, young families began to flood the Farm, resulting in a unique community that ran its own associations, committees, and sporting and recreational activities.

Considerable attention has been paid to the social aspect of Benny Farm, and for good reason. Talja Blokland asks

How does place-making become a shared endeavor? Places are always articulations of social relations. Place is, then, no longer an essentialist concept with one particular, fixed meaning. Places have to be made in social interactions; places are 'particular moments in such intersecting social

relations, nets of which have over time been constructed, laid down, interacted with another, decayed and renewed.⁹

As Benny Farm served as dwelling for returning veterans and their families at the beginning of the Baby Boom and on the cusp of the idealism of the 1950s, it is no wonder, in some respects, that Benny Farm was perceived not merely as lodging for poor families, but as a place in which “beginnings” took root and aspirations could grow and flourish—not a dead end, but a starting point for many individuals and their families, as much a “way of life as a place to live.”¹⁰

According to Maurice Halbwachs, the city functions as a visceral interpretation of collective memory. Dianne Chisholm elaborates that “[r]elationships between individuals and between individuals and groups, are established in relation to the things and designs of the city as part of the process of habitation.”¹¹ Anecdotal accounts from former tenants of Benny Farm emphasize that Benny Farm functioned not merely as the grounds on which memories and identities were formed, but that Benny Farm itself was embedded in the memories and identities themselves. In Halbwachs’s opinion, the relationship between the construction of the individual and the city is inextricable and, in the probable event that the inorganic materials of the city outlive the inhabitants of the city, it is left to the collective memory of the society who claims the city and its structures as its home to restore and preserve the physicality of the city.¹² Chisholm states that, “the most enduring image city dwellers possess is that of the ‘stones of the city’ itself. When a neighborhood suffers demolition or decay, the individual inhabitant feels that ‘a whole part of himself is dying.’”¹³ The tradition of conservation and restoration, Halbwachs argues, is one that is relegated to the urban elite, the “longtime old aristocratic families and longstanding urban

patriarchs.”¹⁴ The collective memory that contributes to the construction and preservation of the city, then, is one of privileged individuals who form the privileged collective.

The recent "advances" in urban planning often ignore the greatest achievement of every city: Its soul. – EvilGentleman, Citynoise¹⁵

Halbwachs’s claim still seems to ring true and is a potentially dangerous notion when considering the low-income demographic of the Benny Farm redevelopment plan. In 1998, Pierre Bourque’s administration gave the CMHC permission to demolish the site in order to erect condos, high-rent units, family townhouses, and seniors’ residences. The effort was delayed, half-executed (resulting in what Michael Fish argued in 1998 to be “the worst demolition in the city in the last 10 years”¹⁶), and ultimately abandoned as a result of the efforts of various stakeholders, from architectural firms to community members, to spare the Farm an untimely death. Rather than demolish the site, the CMHC announced plans to redevelop Benny Farm in order to house veterans and other tenants in more accessible units, hoping to have the project financed by the private sector. Strong reactions from the community resulted from the proposed project’s density (1200 units), the height of the buildings (six storeys), the demolition of some of the postwar buildings, and the loss of the site’s social role.¹⁷ Zoning was changed in 1994 and 1998 to accommodate the CMHC project and the first two new veterans’ units were constructed in 1997. In 1999, Canada Lands Company (CLC) acquired the land and developed Phase I and Phase II (two more veterans’ buildings, bringing the total number of units up to 247).¹⁸

The new buildings, designed by Saia Barbarese / Laverdière, Giguère and completed in September 2000, maintain much of the architectural character of the

original units and have been hailed for their contemporary nod to Modernist architecture.¹⁹ Forming two new six-storey blocks for veterans, the new buildings fill in the south-facing crescent and the extension of Prince Of Wales Street to the south creates a succession of private yards and semi-public courts. Clad in orange clay brick, the exteriors of the new buildings blend in with the architectural exteriors of the neighbourhood, and are also intended to convey a sense of security, an aspect deemed by Mario Saia to be “of central concern” and embodied by “exterior elevations [that] are a kind of shield all around, a shield of bricks with relatively small punched windows.”²⁰ The outer façades emphasize verticality, an effect that is achieved with vertical aluminum panels and the stacking of staggered balconies, some of which jut out to create a more animated façade. Façades facing into the private courtyards are made of anthracite, and the balconies are adorned with silk-screened yellow polka dots. The interiors, most with two bedrooms, are modest but kept as open as possible by accentuating views to the outdoors. Breaking with the Modernist housing tendency to neglect the ground plane, the new buildings are defined by courtyards and pedestrian lanes designed by Claude Cormier. The yards combine smaller and larger open areas broken up by a series of mounds of tall grass and trees in circular formations, while the lanes comprise lines of trees and low bushes. Infusing the contemporary urban landscape with Modernist design, the new buildings were intended to act as a design template for future development on the site.

Concurrent to the new building construction, CLC undertook discussions with local organizations grouped together in the Benny Farm Round Table to discuss community projects for the site. In April 2001, the Fond Foncier Communautaire Benny

Farm (FFCBF) signed a protocol agreement with CLC for six months to acquire the site, and proposed residential and social development based on a community and land trust model, presenting, in September 2001, a plan to district council proposing to keep all of the original buildings.²¹ However, in October 2001, CLC opted not to extend the FFCBF agreement and instead put forward a new development plan by which they would act as the principal developer.²² In July 2002, a Task Force was put in place, made up of ten individuals representing various points of view being voiced in the community (but including only one Benny Farm resident). Saia Barbarese Topouzanov architects were hired to draw up the redevelopment plan, revising the original plan to take into account the Task Force recommendations.²³ The plan was presented to the Task Force in January 2003, submitted to the Borough of CDN/NDG on February 24, 2003, and presented to the residents of Benny Farm between February and April 2003. The Task Force validated the final version of the plan on September 10, 2003, and the plan was subsequently submitted to City Council for public consultation.²⁴

At its first meeting, the Task Force adopted a set of principles that would guide its decisions at every stage of the process for preparing the plan. These included emphases on integrated and inclusive community, social balance reflecting the diversity of the community, housing diversity and building quality, providing services that met the residents' needs, and preserving the symbolic value of Benny Farm. The Task Force confirmed that Benny Farm would continue to be used predominantly for residential purposes. Low and middle-income groups would take up three quarters of the site and a quarter of the site would be reserved for the NDG/Montreal West CLSC, recreation and

community centre, and daycare services. There would be 500 to 550 residential units, two-thirds for rental and one third for home ownership.

The Task Force also agreed to a series of recommendations for the development plan, which included locating seniors' housing next to veterans' apartments to ensure a quiet zone for elderly residents, concentrating community-service facilities facing Benny Park to allow for public access to these facilities, respecting the size of the buildings on neighbouring streets by limiting the height of the new buildings facing Benny, Walkley, and Monkland Avenue to three storeys, preserving the existing community garden and clearing distinguishing public and private spaces. In addition to implementing a seemingly democratic participatory process, the Benny Farm redevelopment also envisioned a building and renovation project that would incorporate environmental sustainability into its design. Daniel Pearl, architect and L'Office de l'eclectisme urbain et fonctionnel (L'OEUF) were hired to develop Benny Farm's green development, which was intended to first benefit Coop Chez Soi, The Cooperative d'habitation Benny Farm, and The Zone of Opportunity (Z.O.O.), three non-profit housing organizations. Z.O.O. and engineering firm Martin Roy et Associés oversaw the renovation of 30 units and the construction of 16 new four-storey units, and a green energy plan was implemented on these units in 2005. The environmental objectives for this new plan were: to utilize low-embodied energy building materials; to reduce construction waste; to reuse demolition materials where technically and economically feasible; to improve the use of interior space, increase natural lighting and improve air quality; and to maximize thermal efficiency.²⁵ Several demolition materials were incorporated into the renovated and new units: hardwood flooring from the demolished units was used to repair floors in the

renovated units, glass blocks were salvaged and used for the new entry foyers, cast-iron radiators were salvaged and used to repair the damaged units in the renovated buildings, and brick from the demolished buildings were used in both the renovated and new buildings. Asbestos was removed from both the renovated and demolished buildings. In order to upgrade the exterior walls of the buildings, the brick cladding was removed in order to make the necessary upgrades and then reinstalled, permitting the application of sprayed polyurethane foam insulation and continuous air barrier, all of which was forecast to considerably reduce annual heating costs. All of the water fixtures were replaced with low-flow heads and taps, and additional plumbing was installed to fill new low-flow toilets with on-site-treated grey water or filtered drain water. Windows in the renovated units were replaced with insulating glass units. In the new construction, the roof structure was designed to accommodate a green roof, and energy reduction was implemented with motion detectors and radiant in-floor heating. Energy-reduction plans included the conversion to geothermal or solar-electric energy systems.

In regard to the environmental mandate of the Benny Farm redevelopment project, though Daniel Pearl, architect, and L'OEUF won the Gold Holcim Award in 2005 for their project Greening the Infrastructure at Benny Farm, much controversy has arisen from the project's actual outcome. As of September 2007, many of the proposed plans, such as the reuse of drain water, had yet to be implemented, and several other plans have proven to be faulty: the geothermal wells were improperly sealed and resulted in the flooding of a storage locker, causing a mould problem that has had adverse effects on tenants' health (and that potentially contributed to one tenant's death²⁶), while rooftop solar panels overheated and caused antifreeze leaks. Gas boilers, meant as back up to the

geothermal and solar energy systems, broke down, resulting in units without heat or hot water, while radiant flooring proved difficult to balance, resulting in overheated units or unheated units that required electric space heaters. L'OEUF attributed these problems to their attempt to both maintain the original buildings in their redevelopment and to be environmentally innovative despite being constrained by the limited funding available for social housing projects. Responding to criticisms over Benny Farm's innovative—but faulty—new design, L'OEUF architect Mark Poddubiuk stated, “we’re working within the structures of social housing, which require us to work with the lowest bidder. In the low-bid process, there is absolutely no incentive for a contractor to do a good job. All that there is is [incentive] to do it for as little money as possible.”²⁷

Although Benny Farm has been touted for its environmental initiative and innovative attempts at sustainability, the structural pitfalls that have jeopardized its tenants' safety and wellbeing point to a continued lack of practical consideration for the needs of low-income tenants. The question of the tenant's, as well as the public's role in the Benny Farm redevelopment plan is paramount, considering Benny Farm's identity not only a social housing project, but also as a social housing community. An emphasis by CLC on its participatory process would suggest their acknowledgment of the importance of the public's voice in the redevelopment of the site, an acknowledgment with roots in twentieth century urban planning theory. Social housing advocates as early as the 1930s, such as Catherine Bauer, were asking question such as

How does the decision-making process occur? Who should make value judgments about individual needs, preferences, family and community functions, group relations and the whole pattern of civic life? Who are the ‘experts’? How do you transfer decision-making responsibility to citizens?

How do you get people to consider the full range of possibilities available to them?²⁸

Although CLC went to great lengths to present their Task Force as one that sufficiently represented the Benny Farm community (hiring Convergence to facilitate discussions), a participatory Task Force that almost completely excluded actual Benny Farm tenants from its makeup and a lack of adherence to its guiding principles proved the plan to be an ill-conceived one. In a letter to the *Sécretaire Général*, *office de consultation publique*, Montréal, dated November 26, 2003, architect Joseph Baker voiced his concern with the supposed participatory process employed by CLC. He criticized the way in which CLC revoked its prototype agreement with the FFCBF and opted to redevelop its plans with a Task Force selected not by community organizations but by CLC's consultants. The selected architectural plan envisioned the demolition of sixty percent of the existing buildings that, according to Baker, made "all reference to sustainable development in CLC proposal ring hollow."²⁹ Baker argued that the cost of renovating the existing units would be lower than demolishing and replacing them, and that, as of 2003, the demolition of any recoverable housing should be unacceptable, as said housing could have been worked on and made available to families in need. Baker argued that recreational facilities should not occupy any space that it could occupy offsite while housing units were urgently needed, and also argued against the choice to maintain what were perceived of as "the more important buildings."³⁰ He points to Doran's original architectural vision and Benny Farm's employment of the Garden City format as one of the few existing examples of such in North America, writing

In this tradition it was a brave vision that offered the returning servicemen, a healthy spacious environment in which to raise their families ... Admittedly, in appearance and design the buildings of Benny Farm are modest in nature but it is equally true that they reflect the rational standards that motivated twentieth century planners ... The heritage value of this ensemble should not be easily dismissed. Ideas on what constitute Heritage have significantly evolved and as Jean Claude Marsan ancien doyen de la faculté d'aménagement, l'U de M, has pointed out, "*qu'est considéré comme culturel, donc digne de conservation non pas uniquement les monuments exceptionnels mais ce qu'est approprié par les gens, à savoir ce qui sert de support à leur genre de vie.*"³¹

[what is considered cultural, and thus, worthy of conservation is not unique to extraordinary monuments, but what is important to the people, that is, what supports their way of life.]

Baker accused CLC's conservation plan of practicing façadism, and that the buildings of Doran's original plan are "the carriers of true memory and worthy of greater respect than token gestures."³² Baker asked of CLC that it consider three proposals: to revert to an architectural approach—either that proposed by the FFCBF or that proposed by Pearl and Poddubiuk architects, both of whose plans maintained a maximum number of buildings and which actually garnered the most public support; to assure the long term affordability of all housing by establishing structures for long term community control; and to ensure that Benny Farm never become a site of speculation. In concluding, Baker writes, "Affordable housing is not a slogan, it is not only a technical solution, it is a right for all citizens."³³

Over the years, many people have contributed—in their own way and with great passion—to shape the project being put forward today; they include veterans, residents, members of community organizations and interest groups, politicians, representatives of municipal service departments, and professionals from various fields. CLC extends its sincere gratitude to all of them and hopes the future Benny Farm site reflects the qualities and values they have advocated. – Benny Farm Redevelopment³⁴

Baker was not the only individual acting on behalf of the Benny Farm community to voice an opinion to the Office de consultation publique: In December 2003, Sam Boskey, who has been actively involved in various committees dealing with the fate of Benny Farm, further unraveled the shortcomings of the Benny Farm redevelopment plan in his Presentation to the Office de consultation publique. Boskey's main criticism of the Benny Farm redevelopment plan follows Baker's concerns over the so-called democratic approach to decision-making, one in which CLC silenced the voice of the Benny Farm community by cutting ties with the FFCBF and by assembling their own Task Force without consulting concerned members of the community. Additionally, the City's planning priorities did not form the basis of the Task Force's discussions, nor were the proposed planning solutions as developed by the City and CLC divulged to the Task Force members. After inviting four architectural firms to participate in the redevelopment plan—the disparities of their visions pointing to the lack of consensus among members of the Task Force—it became evident that this invitation was, in fact, a competition, and its winner was chosen not by the public, but by CLC.

Boskey notes how several of the issues raised by the Benny Farm project have proceeded unfavorably, from the “massacre” of Doran's original garden city plan, to the use of the site for purposes other than housing (such as the allocation of property to the NDG/Montreal West CLSC), limiting access to housing for those with no other resources, to the demolition, rather than renovation of the remaining units, to the privatization of much of the site.³⁵ Boskey's criticisms all point to the ways in which many of the guiding principles as developed by the Task Force were disregarded, and

how the Benny Farm redevelopment project had quickly lost its transparency and accessibility to affected members of the community.

However, this is not to say that community activism would have alleviated Benny Farm of all of its strife. It must be kept in mind that Benny Farm, though it now predominantly serves as social housing for low-income individuals, was originally intended to provide affordable lodging to veterans' and their families, few of whom remain on the site. Gray-Snelgrove expressed to me the sentiment of her longtime friend, long-standing Benny Farm resident Joyce (Dolan) Leach, who, in regard to the current efforts to conserve and redevelop Benny Farm, is critical of "what she saw as their efforts to block better housing for senior veterans. 'They' of course were people concerned to have that prime property developed partly to benefit the poorly housed and needy," which, Leach argued, wasted a lot of time in ensuring Benny Farm's survival.³⁶ Boskey describes how CMHC attempted to use the issue of patriotism and veterans' rights as a strategy that would cause public opinion to favour the privatization and demolition of the old buildings. He notes how "a 'consultation' of the veterans indicated that a very high proportion of them [looked] favourably on new housing."³⁷ However, Boskey then clarifies that the veterans were not actually presented with any alternatives in regard to how the existing buildings could better serve their needs. As a result of this missing information, attempts by community associations to relay said information to the attention of the veterans "were met with hostile reactions, tantamount to saying that anyone who was interested in conservation or renovation was anti-veteran, trying to prevent them from getting what the government was offering them."³⁸

The issue of veterans' housing illustrates the lack of clarity regarding what of the original Benny Farm to preserve and what to demolish—and why. If not for the original tenants of Benny Farm, who decry priorities that threaten their access to appropriate resources in favor of preserving buildings in the name of heritage, then for whom are community activists advocating? Advocates such as Baker and Boskey encourage an approach to the Benny Farm redevelopment plan that would find a balance between heritage preservation and affordable and appropriate housing, arguing that said balance could be achieved if only developers were interested in relinquishing their total control over the project and allowing affected members of the community more than a token and innocuous voice in the decision-making process. However, the priorities of those individuals advocating on behalf of tenants and future tenants of Benny Farm, and the actual residents of Benny Farm reveal a conflict between the sometimes over-idyllic notion of heritage preservation and the sometimes-destructive nature of sacrificing form in the name of preserving function.

In their presentations to the Office de consultation publique, both Baker and Boskey criticize the City of Montreal and the housing corporations responsible for what Baker and Boskey regard as neglectful consideration for the tenants *and* tenants of the Benny Farm housing project. During the consultation publique of 2003, Phyllis Lambert presented her comments on the proposed redevelopment of Benny Farm, expressing concern for the future of the social context of the Benny Farm project. She argued that

Benny Farm as originally constituted by the CMHC had a social purpose. This rare commodity—social responsiveness, is of the greatest importance to the well being of all Montrealers ... the initial population drew on need—the need of veterans. The present approach should target the need, the need of those Montrealers who do not have a choice—or very little choice—of where they

can live.³⁹

Lambert's comment provides a possible answer to the question of whose needs should be prioritized in the redevelopment of Benny Farm, as well as the question of whether or not it might be possible to maintain the site's heritage while providing resources to Montreal's current low-income demographic. The social context might have changed, but to continue to emphasize the concept of need would continue to promote the mandate that resulted in the construction of Benny Farm in the first place.

And what of the voice of the Benny Farm tenants? As Helen Guy, a resident of Benny Farm, reminded the Office de consultation publique, the Benny Farm Charter, as granted on May 22, 1954, reads

To promote, support and protect the common interests of the tenants of the housing development known as Benny Farm Gardens in the Notre Dame de Grace ward of the City of Montreal and the general welfare and well being of all residents of the said housing development,⁴⁰

Which, it could be argued, should continue to be honored in the present day. The physical structures that comprise the Benny Farm social housing project provide an example of the inorganic materials of the city *not* outliving their inhabitants, and thus, collective memory *and* collective action are important here: the physical structures that comprise Benny Farm do not stand as testament to the lives lived on its grounds; rather, architects, heritage activists, tenants, and community members and their fierce defense of the unique project that was—and could continue to be—Benny Farm stand testament to their beloved community in its fragile present and uncertain future in honor of its hopeful past. Benny Farm will secure the social environment and aspirations that were once so central

to its existence as long as there remains a willingness to preserve Benny Farm's original vision.

¹ Bkzmeridian, "The Benny Farm Condemned Housing Projects," *Citynoise.org*, 11 Dec. 2006, 29 Mar. 2008, <http://www.citynoise.org/article/4408>.

² Rosemary Gray-Snelgrove, E-mail to E. Silver, 2 Mar. 2008.

³ Laboratoire d'étude de l'architecture potentielle, "2nd Concours L.E.A.P. Competition, Montreal: Brief history of the architecture of social housing in Montreal," 2007, 30 Mar. 2008, <http://www.leap.umontreal.ca/en/projets/logement2007/goals2007.htm>.

⁴ Canada Lands Company, "Benny Farm: A Project for the Community," 22 Sept. 2003, 15 Mar. 2008, <http://www.bennyfarm.org/en/pdf/Presentation.pdf>.

⁵ Stephen V. Ward, ed, *The Garden City: Past, Present and Future* (London: Routledge, 1992): 2.

⁶ Laboratoire d'étude de l'architecture potentielle.

⁷ Laboratoire d'étude de l'architecture potentielle.

⁸ Rhys Phillips, "Modern Living: Housing for veterans in Montreal continues the Modernist ideal of rationally planned, airy, brightly-lit housing," *Canadian Architect*, Mar. 2001, 30 Mar. 2008, http://www.canadianarchitect.com/issues/ISarticle.asp?id=70616&story_id=CA108942&issue=03012001&PC=.

⁹ Talja Blokland, "Bricks, Mortar, Memories: Neighbourhood and Networks in Collective Acts of Remembering," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Volume 25.2 (June 2001): 270.

¹⁰ McKenzie Porti, "Benny's Happy Family," *Macleans*, Nov. 1952, 24 Apr. 2008, <http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/14f.pdf>.

¹¹ Dianne Chisholm, "The City of Collective Memory," in *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 7.2 (2001): 195.

¹² Chisholm 196 .

¹³ Chisholm 196.

¹⁴ Chisholm 196.

¹⁵ EvilGentleman, "The Benny Farm Condemned Housing Projects," *Citynoise.org*, 11 Dec. 2006, 29 Mar. 2008, <http://www.citynoise.org/article/4408>.

¹⁶ Wayne Hiltz, "Wrecking ball stops in mid-swing: Benny Farm complex gets a reprieve, even though demolition has already begun," *The Mirror*, Montreal, 12 Mar. 1998, 4 Apr 2008, <http://www.montrealmirror.com/ARCHIVES/1998/120398/news5.html>.

¹⁷ Canada Lands Company.

¹⁸ Canada Lands Company.

¹⁹ Phillips.

²⁰ Phillips.

²¹ Canada Lands Company.

²² Canada Lands Company.

-
- ²³ Canada Lands Company.
- ²⁴ Canada Lands Company.
- ²⁵ Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, “Innovative Buildings: Benny Farm Redevelopment, Montreal,” 15 Mar. 2008, <http://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/en/inpr/bude/himu/inbu/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=119486>.
- ²⁶ Kazi Stastna, “Death prompts action on mould,” *The Gazette*, Montreal, Tuesday 4 Sept. 2007, 4 Apr. 2008, <http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=d89078f4-6da7-4471-89b6-0f331eb5d43e>.
- ²⁷ Kazi Stastna, “Harsh reality of a green plan,” *The Gazette*, Montreal, Tuesday 4 Sept. 2007, 4 Apr. 2008, <http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=6e84a31f-5e3d-4f1f-8600-93f15ca5666e>.
- ²⁸ Eugenie Ladner Birch, “An Urban View: Catherine Bauer’s Five Questions,” *Journal of Planning Literature*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Summer 1989): 252.
- ²⁹ Joseph Baker, letter to the Secrétaire Général, Office de consultation publique de Montréal, 26 Nov. 2003, *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*, 2 December 2003, 10 Apr. 2008, <http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/15b.pdf>.
- ³⁰ Baker.
- ³¹ Baker.
- ³² Baker.
- ³³ Baker.
- ³⁴ Canada Lands Company.
- ³⁵ Sam Boskey, “Presentation to the Office de consultation publique: Benny Farm Consultations, December 2003,” *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*, 2 Dec. 2003, 10 Apr. 2008, <http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/15c.pdf>.
- ³⁶ Gray-Snelgrove.
- ³⁷ Boskey.
- ³⁸ Boskey.
- ³⁹ Phyllis Lambert, “Comments by Phyllis Lambert on the Proposed Master plan for Benny Farm of 26 September 2003,” *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*, 1 Dec. 2003, 10 Apr. 2008, <http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/14d.pdf>.
- ⁴⁰ Helen Guy, “Benny Farm Tenants Association, 20th November, 2003,” *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*, 1 Dec. 2003, 10 Apr. 2008, <http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/14f.pdf>.

References

- Affleck, Gavin. “Renewing the Urban Fabric: Social Housing in Montreal.” *Canadian Architect*. 14 Apr. 2008.
http://www.cdnarchitect.com/issues/ISarticle.asp?id=153389&story_id=25948105952&issue=07012004&PC=.
- Baker, Joseph. Letter to the Secrétaire Général, Office de consultation publique de Montréal, 26 November 2003. *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*. 2

-
- Dec. 2003. 10 Apr. 2008.
<http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/15b.pdf>.
- Birch, Eugenie Ladner. "An Urban View: Catherine Bauer's Five Questions." *Journal of Planning Literature*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Summer 1989): pp 239-58.
- Bkzmeridian. "The Benny Farm Condemned Housing Projects." *Citynoise.org*. 11 Dec. 2006. 29 Mar. 2008. <http://www.citynoise.org/article/4408>.
- Blokland, Talja. "Bricks, Mortar, Memories: Neighbourhood and Networks in Collective Acts of Remembering." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Volume 25.2 (June 2001): pp 268-83.
- Boskey, Sam. "Presentation to the Office de consultation publique: Benny Farm Consultations, December 2003." *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*. 2 Dec. 2003. 10 Apr. 2008.
<http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/15c.pdf>.
- Canada Lands Company. "Benny Farm: A Project for the Community." 22 Sept. 2003. 15 Mar. 2008. <http://www.bennyfarm.org/en/pdf/Presentation.pdf>.
- . "Community Consultation: The Benny Farm Experience." *Réaménagement Benny Farm/Benny Farm Redevelopment, Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Montréal, Québec*. 4 Apr. 2008. <http://www.clc.ca/en/nr/speeches/pdf/2004/pres02182004.pdf>.
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. "Innovative Buildings: Benny Farm Redevelopment, Montreal." 15 Mar. 2008. <http://www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/en/inpr/bude/himu/inbu/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=119486>.
- Chisholm, Dianne. "The City of Collective Memory." in *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 7.2 (2001): pp 195-243.
- Développements McGill. "Square Benny: Hybrid Condominiums." *Square Benny*. 10 Apr. 2008. <http://www.habiter.com/squarebenny/en/>.
- EvilGentleman. "The Benny Farm Condemned Housing Projects." *Citynoise.org*. 11 Dec. 2006. 29 Mar. 2008. <http://www.citynoise.org/article/4408>.
- Fish, Michael. "Save the Benny Farm!" *The Mirror*, Montreal. 30 Oct. 1997. 15 Mar. 2008. <http://www.montrealmirror.com/ARCHIVES/1997/103097/letters.html>.
- Gray-Snelgrove, Rosemary. E-mail to Erin Silver, 2 March 2008.
- Guy, Helen. "Benny Farm Tenants Association, 20th November, 2003." *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*. 1 Dec. 2003. 10 Apr. 2008.
<http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/14f.pdf>.
- Hiltz, Wayne. "Wrecking ball stops in mid-swing: Benny Farm complex gets a reprieve, even though demolition has already begun." *The Mirror*, Montreal. 12 Mar. 1998. 4 Apr. 2008.
<http://www.montrealmirror.com/ARCHIVES/1998/120398/news5.html>.

-
- Holcim Awards for Sustainable Construction. "Holcim Awards 2005 – North America – Gold: Greening the Infrastructure at Benny Farm, Montreal, Quebec, Canada." 14 Apr. 2008. <http://www.holcimfoundation.org/T327/Gold-BennyFarm.htm>.
- Kelly, Stephanie B. *Community Planning: How to Solve Urban and Environmental Problems*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004.
- Laboratoire d'étude de l'architecture potentielle. "2nd Concours L.E.A.P. Competition, Montreal: Brief history of the architecture of social housing in Montreal." 2007. 14 Apr. 2008. <http://www.leap.umontreal.ca/en/projets/logement2007/goals2007.htm>.
- Lambert, Phyllis. "Comments by Phyllis Lambert on the Proposed Master plan for Benny Farm of 26 September 2003." *Office de consultation publique de Montréal*. 1 Dec. 2003. 10 Apr. 2008. <http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ocpm/pdf/P05/14d.pdf>.
- Office de consultation publique de Montréal. "Arrondissement de Côte-des-Neiges/Notre-Dame-de-Grâce: projet métropolitain." 4 Apr. 2008. <http://www2.ville.montreal.qc.ca/ldvdm/jsp/ocpm/ocpm.jsp?laPage=projet5.jsp>.
- Phillips, Rhys. "Modern Living: Housing for veterans in Montreal continues the Modernist ideal of rationally planned, airy, brightly-lit housing." *Canadian Architect*. Mar. 2001. 30 Mar. 2008. http://www.canadianarchitect.com/issues/ISarticle.asp?id=70616&story_id=CA108942&issue=03012001&PC=.
- Popovich, Nadja. "Green architect talks of challenges to sustainable housing." *The McGill Daily*, Volume 97, Number 29. Thursday 17 Jan. 2008. 24 Apr. 2008. <http://www.mcgilldaily.com/view.php?aid=6873>.
- Stastna, Kazi. "Death prompts action on mould." *The Gazette*, Montreal. Tuesday 4 Sept. 2007. 4 Apr. 2008. <http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=d89078f4-6da7-4471-89b6-0f331eb5d43e>.
- . "Harsh reality of a green plan." *The Gazette*, Montreal. Tuesday 4 Sept. 2007. 4 Apr. 2008. <http://www.canada.com/components/print.aspx?id=6e84a31f-5e3d-4f1f-8600-93f15ca5666e>.
- Ward, Stephen V. ed, *The Garden City: Past, Present and Future*. London: Routledge, 1992: p 2.