Stop Name/s	Area Description	OA Classification		
Trent University (LRT) Huntingdon St (Control)	High density townhouses – city centre neighbourhood	Cosmopolitans		
Beaconsfield Street (N.E.T) Bernard Street (Control)	High density terrace housing – inner city neighbourhood	Multicultural Metropolitans		
Basford (N.E.T) Ring Road (Control)	Medium density semi-detached housing – inner city neighbourhood	Multicultural Metropolitans		
Cinderhill (N.E.T) Gala Way (Control)	Medium density detached housing - suburban neighbourhood	Urbanites/Suburbanites		

Table 3.4 - N.E.T/Control corridor locality characteristics.

The results found that in two out of the four localities compared, the control area significantly outperformed the tram corridor on nearly all of the pertification indicators measured (Table 3.5). The control area stops within the inner city seemed to have greater competitive position over the tram with nearly all of the gentrification indicators showing greater levels of positive change. Comparisons in more residential suburban areas of the city (i.e. Basford and Cinderhill) it was observed that the two corridors seemed to have similar levels of competitive growth across the measured gentrification indicators. The score for each stop has been highlighted in the final column. The results further highlight how the existence of the tram has a limited influence on encouraging positive socio-economic changes associated with the urban entrification process.

	Average Price Paid	Property Turnover Rate	Educational Attainment (L4)	Higher Level Occupations	Lower Managerial Occupations	Self- Owned Housing	
Trent University (N.E.T)	trial	-66%	+4.6%	-0.5%	-2.4%	+2%	1
Huntingdon Street (Control)	78.2%	-5.6%	+8.5%	-1.0%	-1.9%	+5.5%	5
Beaconsfield Street (N.E.T)	95.2%	-70%	-0.3%	+0.1%	-1.3%	-2.2%	0
Bernard Street (Control)	107.8%	-39%	+2%	+2.4%	+2.6%	+1%	6
Basford (N.E.T)	92%	-60%	+4.4%	+2.3%	-0.1%	-2.4%	3
Ring Road (Control)	70%	-42%	+1.8%	+1.4%	0.5%	+5%	3
Cinderhill (N.E.T)	66%	-50%	+5.7%	+2.6%	+2.7%	+1%	3
Gala Way (Control)	53%	-58%	+6.7%	+2.7%	+1.6%	+3%	3

Table 3.5 - Change in Gentrification Indicators by locality