



2009

The Redevelopment of Place in the Urban Context: An Evaluation of Non-Housing Economic Change in a Transforming Public Housing Neighborhood

Crystal Jackson
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses



Part of the [Politics and Social Change Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jackson, Crystal, "The Redevelopment of Place in the Urban Context: An Evaluation of Non-Housing Economic Change in a Transforming Public Housing Neighborhood" (2009). *Master's Theses*. 539.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/539

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2009 Crystal Jackson

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

THE REDEVELOPMENT OF PLACE IN THE URBAN CONTEXT:
AN EVALUATION OF NON-HOUSING ECONOMIC CHANGE

IN A

TRANSFORMING PUBLIC HOUSING NEIGHBORHOOD

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

PROGRAM IN SOCIOLOGY

BY

CRYSTAL L. JACKSON

CHICAGO, IL

DECEMBER 2009

Copyright by Crystal L. Jackson, 2009
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is the product of the generous support of several faculty members in the Department of Sociology at Loyola University Chicago including Dr. Philip Nyden and Dr. Japonica Brown-Saracino, whose comprehensive critique promoted a thoughtful consideration of my research questions. I also extend sincere thanks to Dr. Anne Figert whose generous encouragement and concern for my academic and professional development have proven to be invaluable. And lastly, but certainly not least, I am indebted to Dr. David Embrick whose unrelenting support has been instrumental in my growth as a graduate student and as a sociologist.

As in all areas of my life, I remain thankful for my family: my father, Curtis, my mother, Bertha, my stepmother Dougie, my brother and sister, Curtis, Jr. and Clarissa Jackson, and Ronna Jackson, my sister-in-law, whose academic and professional successes continue to motivate me. And finally, I give my sincerest thanks to Gabriel Jackson, Sr., whose friendship and love have sustained me for the last four years.

To Tre and Ruby whose lives I hope to inspire

The goals of HOPE VI are ambitious, seeking to address the physical problems of distressed public housing, while also improving the overall well being of the residents and promoting self-sufficiency. HOPE VI targeted some of the most beleaguered housing in this country—dilapidated public housing developments that had failed to deliver on the promise of decent housing for the poor. The problems HOPE VI seeks to address are among the most complex and difficult to solve.

Susan Popkin, The Urban Institute

Good shelter is a useful good in itself, as shelter. When we try to justify good shelter instead on the pretentious grounds that it will work social or family miracles we fool ourselves.

Jane Jacobs, The Death and Life of Great American Cities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
HOPE VI Public Housing Policy Reform in the City of Chicago	4
Methods	9
Neighborhood Descriptions	14
Grand Boulevard: A Transforming Neighborhood	14
Roseland: An Economically Stagnant Neighborhood	16
Uptown: A Gentrifying Neighborhood	18
Lincoln Park: A Fully Developed Neighborhood	20
CHAPTER TWO: PUBLIC HOUSING AND THE U.S. HOUSING SYSTEM	27
Housing Policy and the Creation of a Two-Tier Housing System	27
CHAPTER THREE: PRODUCTIVE ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT AND URBAN PLACE	39
Race and Place	43
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS	52
Results	52
Discussion	65
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION	69
APPENDIX A: Site Designation Categories for the Chicago Housing Authority's (CHA) Plan for Transformation	73
APPENDIX B: Summary Table of Clothing and Specialty Retail Business Types	75
REFERENCE LIST	77
VITA	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Per Capita Income Reported Across Neighborhoods in 1990 and 2000 In 2009 Dollars	52
2. Net Changes in Income Level Reported Across Neighborhoods 1990 – 2000	53
3. 1990 – 2000 Changes in Rates of Homeownership Across Neighborhoods	55
4. 1990 – 2000 Changes in Median Home Values Across Neighborhoods	55
5. Calculated Business Index Across Neighborhoods 2000 – 2006	56
6. Retail Diversity Across Neighborhood-Types 2000 – 2006	58
7. Calculated Financial Investment Index Across Neighborhoods 2000 – 2004	60
8. Housing Starts Data for the Grand Boulevard and Roseland Neighborhoods 2000 – 2004	63
9. Housing Starts Data for the Uptown and Lincoln Park Neighborhoods 2000 – 2004	64
10. Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) Plan for Transformation Site Designation Categories	74
11. 2000 – 2006 Clothing and Specialty Retail Business Types	76

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	Page
1. Map of Chicago Community Areas	26

ABSTRACT

Housing policy has been a critical element in the evolution of place in American cities. Historic legislation, beginning with the Housing Act of 1934, has fundamentally altered the material context of the urban landscape. Under this policy and its successive iterations, American society has witnessed the emergence of vital cities and communities that have come to define the national standard of living. While the nation has witnessed prolific growth of housing obtained in the private market, social policy directed towards public housing remains a critical necessity for low-income populations.

While the need for public housing remains, criticism of the policy's effectiveness has been growing since the 1970s. Contestation of the policy has more than been supported by demonstrable evidence of untenable living conditions in numerous housing project sites located across the nation. In fact, pervasive unsuitability in living conditions provided within many housing projects exacted calls from the US Congress to address the deplorable conditions emanating from what had come to be considered as severely distressed public housing. By 1993, in response to the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, Congress proposed and approved a National Action Plan called HOPE VI. Under HOPE VI 86,000 units of public housing be razed and replaced with new mixed-income housing or undergo significant rehabilitation.

In the years since the implementation of HOPE VI, the efficacy of the intervention has largely been predicated upon the extent to which qualitative

improvements in living conditions has occurred. The extent to which there has been remediation of negative outcomes historically associated with public housing including high crime and disproportionate incidences of concentrated poverty have also been identified as key indicators of the program's success.

While increasing the habitability of traditional public neighborhoods arguably has been an overarching goal of the HOPE VI intervention, research has not widely considered the extent to which the program may have facilitated the development of non-housing amenities in transforming neighborhoods. As such resources are proposed to be integral to the local health of neighborhoods, demonstrating their growth within the context of public housing reform, may lend support to the program's efficacy.

In an effort to evaluate the development of non-housing economic amenities in a transforming public neighborhood, this study will consider three research hypotheses:

a) The extent to which a transforming neighborhood will experience an increase in household economic capacity as an outcome of public housing policy reform, b) the extent to which a transforming neighborhood will experience an increase in its economic capacity as evidenced by the development of non-housing amenities including grocery and commercial retail stores and c) the extent to which public housing policy reform in a transforming neighborhood will experience commiserate financial investment in housing when compared to the other neighborhoods.

The data indicate that while the transforming public housing neighborhood has experienced moderate increases in household economic capacity, evidence of commiserate changes in the development of non-housing economic amenities remains

weak. When compared to three non-public neighborhoods, the transforming neighborhood continued to experience less development of non-housing economic amenities and less diversity among existing non-housing amenities within the context of public housing reform. While investment in new housing stock has exceeded the historical median home value for the neighborhood, development has not continued at a consistent rate. Moreover, the types of new housing stock that have been added to the material landscape may fail to meet the needs of traditional public housing residents and therefore lead to higher rates of displacement. Implications that the patterns of non-housing development have on the local health of the transforming neighborhood are additionally discussed.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

On March 5, 1962 the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA), in conjunction with the City of Chicago, opened the Robert R. Taylor homes¹. Constructed on ninety-five acres of city land at a cost of \$68 million, the completion of the expansive public housing project was a noteworthy event, not only for Chicago, but also for the nation. Within the boundaries of one site, approximately 4,500 new units of subsidized housing would be provided to the city's low-income residents. The completion of the twenty-eight sixteen-story buildings that comprised the Taylor homes would make it the largest public housing project in the nation.

On that day, the Taylor homes stood largely as a symbol of hope and progress. The expansiveness of the project was matched only by the city's optimism for its future. *Chicago Tribune* columnist Thomas Buck would commemorate the opening of the Robert Taylor homes with the headline, "*Big CHA Project Opens Today*". The article would allow the city its first glimpse into the life that Taylor residents would have. According to Buck, the Taylor homes would offer its residents numerous amenities including 3,500 three and four bedroom apartments, sufficient to house large families, an

¹ Historical reference to the opening of the Robert R. Taylor homes was obtained from the archives of the *Chicago Tribune*

on-site management-maintenance building, a community center, local access to public recreational and educational space run by the Chicago Park District, an on-site health clinic and social rooms for residents to use. Buck's description of the homes conjured up an image of a "city within a city" wherein its residents would have abundant access to resources in addition to adequate housing. Thus, in many ways the opening of Robert Taylor homes imparted a sense of accomplishment. Arguably, the greatest implication that the opening of the homes maintained was that it provided opportunities that the urban slums had prohibited.

Adding to the fanfare, Major Richard J. Daley would be present at the site's inaugural ceremony. With the eyes of the press watching, Daley ceremoniously handed over the keys to Taylor's first tenants. Referring to the significance of the opening of the project, the mayor remarked that, "This is a great thing for the city. It provides decent housing for fine families." His comments were brief but meaningful; not only did they confirm the city's interest in providing public housing but they also reaffirmed a belief that public housing could be an effective strategy in remediating housing disparities. In short, his comments imparted the notion that the homes would be a new beginning for those who would have a residence in the Taylor projects.

The opening of the Taylor homes held meaning for the Office of the Mayor as well. The inauguration of the site marked the first of many steps the city believed to be required to meet the lofty goal of eliminating the worst housing stock in the city.

Beyond all of these factors, the Robert Taylor homes represented the city's response to a national sentiment that was growing increasingly uneasy with inequality.

The Taylor homes would open at the height of an era where a strong national voice was vehemently challenging inequality and racial oppression. Through the site, the CHA and the city provided tangible evidence of a commitment to provide decent and suitable housing to its most economically vulnerable, a population that was disproportionately defined along racial lines. The Robert Taylor homes would be regarded then as both a housing resource and as a tool to aid the promotion of the social mobility of the city's poor. The Taylor homes had become one of the city's newest assets to combat inequality.

Ultimately, the Robert Taylor homes, along with other federally owned housing properties, would become mired in public controversy. Readily apparent building decay and failing building mechanics gave sufficient cause for the public and policy-makers alike to assert that public housing buildings had been poorly constructed. Equally troubling, the community amenities that had been ambitiously integrated into public sites, like Robert Taylor, once lauded by the press, had apparently failed to meet their objectives. Project sites had become troubled enclaves or vertical ghettos that were plagued with pervasive social problems including disproportionate rates of poverty, high incidences of crime, drug abuse, teen pregnancy and single-parent family homes, and low rates of education and job attainment. In the eyes of the public, those residing in the projects were perceived largely as an underclass – an underclass that was growing increasingly isolated from the mainstream society. The *Chicago Tribune*, which had once eagerly reported on the potential of the Robert Taylor homes to remediate inequality, would ultimately characterize the property as “an emblem of failure²”.

² <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/chi-chicagoday-roborttaylor-story,0,4036277.story>

HOPE VI Public Housing Policy Reform in the City of Chicago

By the turn of the twenty-first century, less than forty years after the construction of Robert Taylor and other similar sites, the city of Chicago held the dubious honor of being home to some of the most blighted and maligned public housing sites in the nation. The poor physical condition of the Robert Taylor homes and other public properties contributed to a growing consensus whose position it was that public housing was a grossly ineffective use of federal funds. Public housing projects ambitiously constructed in the 1950s and 1960s, and then touted to be reputable residences for the poor and ill housed had come to be regarded as shameful components of otherwise remarkable urban landscapes. Thousands of families living within the borders of these poorly maintained housing sites were continually called upon to navigate a physical environment that was often rot with unsanitary and unsafe conditions not witnessed in other communities of the city (Popkin, Levy, Harris, Comey, Cunningham & Buron 2002; Brooks, Zugazaga, Wolk & Adams 2005; Finkel, Lennon, Eisenstadt 2000; Zielenbach 2003; Popkin, Levy, Harris, Comey & Cunningham 2004; Smith 2006). The degree to which Chicago and other cities across the nation were experiencing this unsatisfactory trajectory exacted calls from the US Congress to address the deplorable conditions emanating from what had come to be considered as severely distressed public housing. By 1993, in response to the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, Congress had proposed and approved a National Action Plan called HOPE VI. The goals of the HOPE VI program were ambitious. According to federal guidelines, HOPE VI sought to “revitalize distressed and obsolete public housing, usually replacing it with less dense housing

combining a mixture of public and privately owned housing”. Under HOPE VI state and local public housing agencies would be awarded competitive grants in order to rectify recognized conditions of inadequate housing³.

In February 2000, the CHA and the City of Chicago would become one of the nation’s first beneficiaries of the HOPE VI program. In Chicago HOPE VI efforts would be directed under the Plan for Transformation. The plan to transform Chicago’s public housing is the largest reconstruction of public housing in the nation’s history⁴.

While the City of Chicago’s Plan for Transformation has multiple objectives, including increasing the access public housing residents have to job training and programs that increase self-sufficiency, the reconstitution of housing stock ostensibly is the principle focus of the intervention. When fully implemented, the plan will drastically alter the material landscape of the urban communities that served as home to numerous public housing projects. Under the plan, 25,000 family and senior housing units would be rehabbed or slated for demolition. The ten-year plan advanced by the CHA called reconstruction or rehabilitation of 9400 units of housing and 9500 additional units for would be made available for senior housing.

But it is the family housing sites, which largely contained the historic high-rises commonly associated with public housing that would receive the most intensive response.

³ HOPE VI program assessment:
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary/10001162.2003.html>

⁴ Reported on the CHA website http://www.thecha.org/transformplan/plan_summary.html
Please also see Appendix A Table 10 for a detailed description of the publically owned properties targeted under HOPE VI in the city of Chicago

Under federal mandate, fifty-three of the city's high-rise public housing buildings would be demolished. By the end of 2009, the very sites containing the demolished buildings will be replaced with 6100 units of mixed-income housing⁵.

The Robert Taylor Homes is one of the primary targets of the Plan for Transformation. At its height, the Robert Taylor Homes stretched across two miles of Chicago's Grand Boulevard neighborhood. The project included 4300 units of public housing and housed 27,000 people⁶. Under the Plan for Transformation the majority of Robert Taylor Homes would be razed and replaced. Almost 4000 existing family units, contained mostly in the high-rises, would be demolished. The remaining number of family and senior housing units would be scheduled for rehabilitation. The substandard housing scheduled for demolition would be replaced with new mixed-income housing. Ultimately, fewer than 900 of the replacement units would be reserved for public housing residents. A similar pattern of housing replacement would be repeated on a national basis (Smith 2006).

The gross neglect apparent in the physical infrastructure of the Robert Taylor homes and other public housing sites across the nation required that such dramatic attention be paid to remediating the physical environment. Over the last decade, significant attention has been given to understanding the extent to which the HOPE VI policy intervention has actually brought about an improvement in the living conditions of public housing residents. The extent to which changes in the physical infrastructure have

⁵Mixed-income housing is defined as a housing community that integrates middle and high-income families into newly developed residential sites that include poor families receiving public housing.

⁶ Reported in the *Encyclopedia of Chicago, Chicago History Museum*

manifested has arguably been the most critical indicator of the efficacy of the intervention on national and local levels. The degree to which the eradication of existing project sites mediates residents' experiences with varied social dislocations can be regarded as an equally important indicator of the effectiveness of local and national-level interventions.

While the ultimate success of HOPE VI program and Chicago's Plan for Transformation will be dictated by numerous outcomes such as the long-term stability of the mixed-income dynamic, the availability of public homes and the length of time it takes public neighborhoods to return to a point of social equilibrium, the general contention of the intervention is that the reform will make public neighborhoods more habitable places. Toward that end, a more implicit interpretation of the policy may be that the remediation of housing stock will serve as a catalyst for the promotion of a global improvement in the health and stability of traditional public neighborhoods. Another contention may be that housing reform will stimulate the development (or expansion) of non-housing amenities, which historically have been absent from public neighborhoods. Thus, the addition of new housing is proposed to stimulate, at least indirectly, the growth of neighborhoods that have experienced persistent social and economic isolation.

Nearly a decade after the implementation of the HOPE VI program, numerous cities around the nation, Chicago included, have demolished the infamous towers that had come to define public housing in the mind's eye of American society. Within many cities untenable project buildings have been replaced with new mixed-income developments. Understanding the effect that the changes in the housing stock have maintained for areas

historically occupied with public housing has been a central objective for many researchers. However, the affect that the changes in housing stock have maintained for the non-housing amenities that define the larger neighborhood context has not been considered as widely. The pervasive history of disenfranchisement from the mainstream society has, however, played a critical role in dictating the negative trajectory of traditional public neighborhoods, especially as it relates to their non-housing assets and amenities. Therefore, understanding the extent to which changes in housing stock may mediate the development of non-housing amenities within neighborhoods historically associated with public housing may lend insight into the policy's overall effectiveness.

This is a neighborhood-level study that considers the transformation of a public housing neighborhood in Chicago that has been characterized as severely distressed by federal standards instituted under HOPE VI. This study, however, does not consider qualitative changes in the physical structure of public housing sites as an outcome variable predictive of the efficacy of housing policy reform. It also does not seek to investigate how the physical redress associated with public housing reform mediates the experience of social and economic isolation from the mainstream. Instead the study will consider the extent to which the addition of new housing stock correlates with the development of non-housing related amenities in a transforming neighborhood. The study's outcome variable is being interpreted specifically within the context of the current public housing policy reform, whose central objective ostensibly is to make public neighborhoods more habitable. Habitability within this study is defined not only by the development of new housing stock but also by the supplementary development (or

expansion) of non-housing neighborhood amenities. Thus, the study will assess the degree to which the non-housing amenities of the transforming Chicago neighborhood have changed within the context of public housing policy reform. As the HOPE VI initiative also maintains the goal of remediating disproportionate inequities related to place, the study will also compare the changes in housing stock and neighborhood development occurring in the transforming neighborhood to changes in housing stock and neighborhood development occurring in three additional Chicago neighborhoods with varying levels of economic capital.

Methods

The study will compare a transforming public neighborhood in Chicago to three other non-public Chicago neighborhoods defined either as economically stagnant, gentrifying or fully developed. Categorization of the neighborhoods into an economic category was facilitated by a thirteen-year qualitative review of a Chicago-based business newspaper that reports on economic and business development projects across the city⁷. The study will consider three research hypotheses:

1. *The transforming neighborhood will experience an increase in household economic capacity as an outcome of public housing policy reform*

Because the integration of non-public housing into transforming communities has been proposed to be integral to bringing about positive socioeconomic changes in transforming neighborhoods, the study will first consider the extent to which

⁷ A content analysis of Crain's Chicago Business was conducted to gauge development in each of the neighborhoods in the study. The review considered editorials published between January 1996 and June 2009.

newly developed mixed-income housing has increased the household economic capacity of the transforming neighborhood. Through data made available in the 1990 and 2000 censuses, economic capacity will be measured by net changes in household income, rates of homeownership and median home values of the transforming community.

2. *Within the context of public housing policy reform the transforming neighborhood will experience an increase in its economic capacity as evidenced by the development of non-housing amenities including grocery and commercial retail stores.*

Non-housing economic amenities play a substantial role in determining the local health of neighborhoods. They have also been a critical element in determining how places differ historically. As such, the study will also consider how the changes in non-housing amenities occurring in the transforming neighborhood compare to changes in non-housing amenities occurring in the three other neighborhoods. Within each of the study neighborhoods, the presence of grocery stores was used as the first indicator of the development of these amenities. The presence of grocery stores has been used in previous research as an indicator of overall neighborhood physical health of urban communities⁸. This study adopts that measure, however, as a baseline indicator of development non-housing amenities in the study neighborhoods.

⁸ Please see Mari Gallagher's report *Good Food: Examining the Impact of Food Deserts on Public Health in Chicago* located at http://www.marigallagher.com/site_media/dynamic/project_files/Chicago_Food_Desert_Report.pdf

Economic capacity of non-housing amenities will additionally be measured by a business development index. After correcting for population discrepancies, the business development index provides a per capita rate of non-housing economic development within each neighborhood. The index is calculated based upon the average number of businesses opened annually between 2000 and 2006 in each of the neighborhoods⁹.

Diversity, defined by the types of retail stores established over the seven-year period was additionally used as an indicator of the overall health of the local business infrastructure experienced across neighborhoods¹⁰. This portion of the analysis will consider data provided from the County Business Patterns data of the economic census for the years 2000-2006.

3. *Within the context of public housing policy reform the transforming neighborhood will experience commiserate financial investment in housing when compared to the other neighborhoods*

As housing type (i.e., private attained versus publically provided) has been a critical element in determining how places differ historically, the study will also consider the extent to which financial investment in housing in the transforming neighborhood is commiserate with the financial investment in housing in the three other neighborhoods. Financial investment in housing will be measured by a housing development index. After correcting for discrepancies in the median

⁹ Business development index calculation = # of businesses/neighborhood population * 100

¹⁰ Please see Appendix B Table 11 for a detailed description of the types of retail businesses that were included in this portion of the analysis.

home values of each of the neighborhoods, the financial investment index provides a rate of financial investment being made in the new construction housing stock of each neighborhood. The index is calculated based upon the average financial investment made in housing starts in a five year period (i.e., 2000 through 2004) in each of the neighborhoods¹¹. The study will also consider how new construction housing types (i.e., single family homes, multi-unit structures, etc) in the transforming neighborhood compare to new construction housing types in the three other neighborhoods. This portion of the analysis will consider new construction housing starts data from the City of Chicago for each of the neighborhoods occurring between 2000 and 2004.

Four Chicago neighborhoods were selected for the present study: a public neighborhood defined as severely distressed by the National Commission for Severely Distressed Public Housing and was targeted for mixed-income housing under Chicago's Plan for Transformation; an economically stagnant Chicago neighborhood, a gentrifying Chicago neighborhood and a fully-developed Chicago neighborhood.

Chicago's Grand Boulevard neighborhood was selected as the transforming neighborhood because of its prolific history of public housing. Robert Taylor Homes, once the largest public housing site in the nation was located in Chicago's Grand Boulevard neighborhood¹². In 2000, the City of Chicago demolished the majority of the

¹¹ Business development index calculation = # median home value/average investment per housing start * 100

¹² Source: *Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

project's expansive site to build a new mixed-income community. Five mixed-income housing sites replaced the Robert Taylor Homes. Three senior housing sites and one family-housing site – all of which have been rehabilitated under the Plan for Transformation, additionally define the neighborhood¹³.

Chicago's Roseland neighborhood was chosen as the economically stagnant neighborhood based upon the minimal economic development that has occurred in the neighborhood over the last ten years. Roseland residents, who have historically been employed in the manufacturing industry, have experienced increases in unemployment since the late 1970s, coinciding with the deindustrialization of Chicago¹⁴. Persistent unemployment in the neighborhood has significantly decreased the neighborhood's economic capacity.

Lincoln Park, Chicago's most affluent neighborhood, was selected as the fully developed neighborhood based upon the value of its real estate and its prolific business and social infrastructure¹⁵. And lastly Chicago's Uptown neighborhood was chosen as the gentrifying site because it has demonstrated a pattern of increased household income, increases in property values and increases in new housing construction over the last ten years (Nyden, Edlynn & Davis 2006). The selection of Uptown was additionally informed by the neighborhood's rich history of social activism around the provision of

¹³ Source: The Chicago Housing Authority: Plan for Transformation

¹⁴ Source: *Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

¹⁵ The economic standing of Chicago's Lincoln Park neighborhood is supported with data reported by the US Census. The development of its real estate and economic sectors is supported in the qualitative review of *Crain's Chicago Business*

affordable housing¹⁶. Arguably, the extent to which the process of gentrification has been allowed to occur in Uptown has, to some extent, been mediated by the neighborhood's continuing commitment to retain affordable housing for its most vulnerable residents. Thus, the expansion of the neighborhood's economic capacity is being framed within a context of its availability of low-income or subsidized housing. The intersection of the neighborhood's collective identity with its recent patterns of gentrification, therefore, provides a unique examination of housing and non-housing development.

A number of research studies have given significant attention to understanding the nature of change in the social infrastructure of economically transitioning neighborhoods (Vale 2002; Wilson 1987; Massey & Denton 1993; Brown-Saracino 2004; Hines-Rollerson 2007). This present study does not consider changes in the social infrastructure of the transitioning neighborhood, but instead assesses how changes in its non-housing infrastructure occur within the context of a federal housing intervention.

Neighborhood Descriptions

Grand Boulevard: A Transforming Public Neighborhood

Grand Boulevard was incorporated in the city of Chicago in 1889¹⁷. Its desirability as a residential neighborhood for poor and rich residents alike was almost immediate¹⁸. Located only five miles from the city's downtown, some of the wealthiest

¹⁶ Source: *Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

¹⁷ Historical references to each of the study neighborhood's was obtained from the *Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

¹⁸ According to the Northeastern Illinois Planning Committee (<http://www.nipc.org/images/CCAMap3.pdf>), Chicago Community areas are aggregations of census tracts developed as statistical spatial units for the analysis of varying demographic conditions within the City of Chicago. They were originally drawn up nearly 70 years ago with consideration given to the following: a) settlement, growth and history of the

Chicagoans choose to make Grand Boulevard their home. Elegant mansions constructed by these new residents continue to define the neighborhood's main thoroughfare. Not long thereafter multiple-family dwellings reserved for middle and working-class residents would also be incorporated into the community.

The Great Migration of African Americans from the South in the 1920s and 1930s would bring about radical change in the racial groups of the neighborhood. Once known for its white ethnic constituency, the neighborhood's racial demographics would rapidly change to majority black.

The influx of African Americans left an indelible mark on Grand Boulevard. The area would soon become recognized as a center for black culture, art and politics. Popularly embraced as the Black Metropolis or Bronzeville, Grand Boulevard served as home to some of the most well-known and influential African Americans in the nation including jazz musician Louis Armstrong, poet Gwendolyn Brooks and author Richard Wright.

While the stately homes of Grand Boulevard and the history of the Black Metropolis continue to define the neighborhood today, it is the association with public housing that arguably has had the most enduring legacy. Not only would the history of the Grand Boulevard be changed by the tremendous economic decline brought about by

area; b) local identification with the area; c) the local trade area; d) distribution of membership of local institutions; e) natural and artificial barriers, such as the Chicago River, railroad lines, parks and boulevards. However, these areas have historically corresponded with recognized neighborhoods in the city. Grand Boulevard, Roseland, Uptown and Lincoln Park are four of the city-defined Chicago community areas. Consistent with the work of Lawrence Vale, however, the term neighborhood is adopted over community areas. In the current study, the term neighborhood is used to describe a bounded urban place that is defined by social and economic characteristics that are simultaneously independent of and interrelated to other city neighborhoods.

the Great Depression but also by the addition of one of the nation's most notorious public housing projects, the Robert Taylor Homes¹⁹.

For more than a decade, the economic viability of Grand Boulevard has been defined largely by its ability to maintain existing social institutions and community-based organizations, which primarily address the recreation and education needs of the neighborhood²⁰. Little to no economic reinvestment to the neighborhood has come from the private sector. Thus, Grand Boulevard's economic sustainability is strongly tied to charitable donations and eligibility for federal grants.

Roseland: An Economically Stagnant Neighborhood

Located thirteen miles south of the city's downtown, Roseland has a long history of providing employment in various manufacturing industries. White ethnics who called Roseland home at the turn of the twentieth century built stable middle-class homes on tree-lined streets in the insolated neighborhood. By the 1950s and 1960s, downturns in industry and constant threat of black encroachment led to significant outmigration of Roseland's white constituency to nearby suburbs. Factories, social institutions and organizations long committed to the ethnic communities that historically resided in Roseland also eventually followed suit and left Roseland in favor of burgeoning suburban locations.

¹⁹ The Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) classifies the Robert Taylor Home site in the Grand Boulevard community; however, there was a geographical overlap of original project site with the Washington Park community area.

²⁰ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*

As in many south side neighborhoods of Chicago, the turnover of white ethnics in Roseland allowed blacks new residential opportunities. Unlike Grand Boulevard, however, Roseland would not become a site for public housing. While there were city petitions calling for the development of public housing prior to black encroachment, the petitions had been heavily contested by the neighborhood's white constituency. As a consequence, when racial turnover of the neighborhood did occur, the blacks that replaced the white ethnics were remarkably similar in terms of their socioeconomic status. Many of the new black residents were working or middle-class and they maintained very stable employment. Thus, the neighborhood known for its roses soon also became known for its black working and middle-class constituency.

Roseland's economic stability decline significantly after the mid 1970s, however. As jobs in the manufacturing industry began to decline, so too did employment opportunities for Roseland's black residents. Lack of a stable economic participation from its residents and non-existent reinvestment from the private sector stagnated the neighborhood's economic capacity. In fact, no significant economic development plans have been revealed for Roseland in over a decade²¹.

There has been a recent resurgence in the number of community organizations based in Roseland. However, the actions of these organizations have focused mostly upon increasing the social infrastructure of the neighborhood over its economic resources. Roseland is also the home of one of the city's largest black mega-churches, which has

²¹ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*

also proposed plans to stimulate economic development²². The extents to which the church and other non-profit organizations may facilitate the return of resources necessary to combat its social and economic decline remain unknown. Roseland is defined as an economically stagnant neighborhood in the present study because there has been little to no real estate or business reinvestment in over a decade. Investment in the social infrastructure of the neighborhood has also been minimal.

Uptown: A Gentrifying Neighborhood

By the late 1800s, Chicago's Uptown neighborhood had become one of the city's most densely populated areas. Multiple stops along train lines and numerous multifamily housing units made the area desirable to poor immigrants becoming acclimated to American life. Smaller segments of the neighborhood were also reserved for the city's wealthy which further paved the way for economic diversity. Soon the neighborhood would also become a central destination for retail shopping, hotels and live entertainment.

The Great Depression and the city's expansion northward would be impetuses for economic decline in Uptown. By the 1950s the sizable apartments that had come to define the neighborhood had been converted to smaller rooms to accommodate an influx of poor immigrants from countries such as Japan. Patients recently released from mental asylums would also look to Uptown for shelter²³.

The fear that Uptown's growing number of poor and vulnerable residents would be displaced under urban renewal programs served as a rallying call for its established

²² Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*

²³ Source: *Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

residents. The neighborhood became a center for social activism – especially as it related to maintaining fair and affordable housing. Community organizations became loud political voices that demanded that the neighborhood’s poor be protected from patterns of development and expulsion witnessed in other developing north side neighborhoods²⁴. As a large consequence of their political action, Uptown’s population density would continue to increase throughout the twentieth century. So did its ethnic diversity. Immigrants from Africa, Asia and the Middle East continue to make Uptown their first home in America²⁵.

While activism continues to be defining feature of the neighborhood, there has been residential resistance to the advocacy for the poor and the immigrating community. In an effort to distinguish themselves from Uptown’s association with poverty, half of the area was successful at waging secession in the 1980s. A new Chicago neighborhood named Edgewater was established as a consequence²⁶. Edgewater is distinguished from Uptown, in part, by greater wealth and newer housing stock²⁷.

Despite continuing efforts to maintain diversity and housing options for the poor, economic development has been remarkable in Uptown. In fact, the area’s rapid changes in housing stock, business development and increases in its economic capacity provide evidence that the Uptown is quickly gentrifying (Nyden, Edlynn, & Davis 2006). Gentrification has stimulated significant neighborhood reinvestment and even vehement

²⁴ Source: *The Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

²⁵ Source: *The Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

²⁶ Source: *The Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

²⁷ Source: US Census; Chicago Metropolitan Area for Planning (CMAP)

competition for ownership of the historic landmarks. Once thought of as neighborhood eyesores, these properties are becoming well regarded for the great economic and reinvestment potential they are proposed to maintain for Uptown²⁸.

Reinvestment in Uptown has further been facilitated by the Tax Increment Finance district, which has been approved in the neighborhood. The financing has proven to be integral for stimulating multi-million dollar redevelopment projects in Uptown. Additional proposals for business development in the neighborhood continue to be negotiated including plans for the development of national multiplex theater and big box stores²⁹.

Lincoln Park: A Fully Developed Neighborhood

Chicago's Lincoln Park neighborhood garners its name from one of the city's most valued and utilized recreational landmarks in the city. The lakefront neighborhood is situated only three miles north of the city's loop and serves as home to the Lincoln Park Zoo – Chicago's third most visited tourist attraction, cultural institutions including the Chicago History Museum and the Chicago Academy of Sciences and DePaul University, one of the nation's largest Catholic universities.

Since the late 1970s, Lincoln Park's affluence has increased at a disproportionate rate compared to other Chicago neighborhoods. Despite this fact, Lincoln Park has a long

²⁸ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*

²⁹ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*, 5/8/06, vol. 29, Issue 19, p. 25-26; 1/31/05, Vol. 28, Issue 5; 1/19/04, vol. 27, issue 3

history of serving as home to poor immigrants, farmers and factory workers who were employed along the community's western border.

Just as in the other Chicago neighborhoods, the Great Depression marked a turning point in Lincoln Park. Property owners who were unable to adequately maintain large homes often converted them to smaller sized apartments. The neighborhood would linger on the verge of becoming a slum until the 1950s and 1960s when community activists committed to preserving the character and social status of Lincoln Park began vying for private funds and federal monies provided through urban renewal efforts³⁰. The process of renewal combined with the neighborhood action of property owners set Lincoln Park on the path to increasing its economic status. The rapid increases in property values that would result from these actions ultimately exacerbated the displacement of the neighborhood's poor. The displacement would disproportionately affect non-whites especially black and Puerto Rican residents. Their displacement would leave Lincoln Park a primarily white neighborhood³¹.

Lincoln Park stands as a model of a fully developed neighborhood because of the value of its housing stock and its diverse economic and social infrastructure. Evidence of the strength of the real estate market in Lincoln Park is clear. The community has the second highest home selling prices in the city³². Even homes that are surrounded by multi-family dwellings or that lie adjacent to the university – potential deterrents for

³⁰ Source: *The Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

³¹ Source: *The Encyclopedia of Chicago, The Chicago History Museum*

³² Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*, 01496956, 08/03/98, Vol. 21, Issue 31

homebuyers – remain highly valued on the real estate market³³. While the neighborhood has not been insulated from vacillations in the housing market (the number of days homes remain on the market have increased and there are reductions in asking prices), on average, homes in Lincoln Park ultimately fetch 95% of the list price³⁴.

The desire for homes in Lincoln Park by professionals and young singles with high earning potential makes real estate development an ongoing process. Land and property made available by business closures are quickly met with proposals from real estate developers for new condominium developments or single-family home sites³⁵. High real estate equity on new multi-million dollar homes has also had the unintended consequence of waging conflict between those who want to preserve older existing homes and those in favor of building new homes. Homes valued under \$1 million dollars in Lincoln Park have increasingly been sold for the purpose of tearing them down to build new multi-million dollar homes. Opposition to tear downs by historic preservationists has garnered enough support that a small segment of the neighborhood being given landmark status³⁶. Those in favor of the building new homes, however, continue to argue the advantages of having highly valued property in their neighborhood.

³³ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 3/23/2009 Vol. 32 Issue 12, p27-27, 3/5p

³⁴ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*, 01496956, 7/28/2008, Vol. 31, Issue 30; *Crain's Chicago Business*, 01496956, 3/6/2006, Vol. 29, Issue 10

³⁵ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*, 2/23/2009, Vol. 32 Issue 8, p2-2, 1/4p

³⁶ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business*, 01496956, 8/1/2005, Vol. 28, Issue 31; 01496956, 3/14/2005, Vol. 28, Issue 11; 8/1/2005, Vol. 28 Issue 31, p36-36, 1/3p; 01496956, 8/1/2005, Vol. 28, Issue 31

The business infrastructure of Lincoln Park has witnessed similar success. Recently vacated business space have historically experienced quick turnover. The retail activity of the community is defined by independent boutiques and small businesses as well as national retail franchises. In fact, the coexistence of the various business types has been an occasional source of conflict for the community. Fearing that the arrival of national chains would drive up the price of storefront rents and decrease sales, independent boutiques have stood in opposition of their development. Other independent businesses often elect to move to other areas of the city where there is lower rent, easier parking, cheaper real estate and better public transportation³⁷.

The increasing presence of national chains has also prompted calls from community activists who are concerned with the potential they have to interrupt Lincoln Park's distinctive historic character. Even those businesses looking to invest millions of dollars into Lincoln Park have first had to quell complaints made by residents regarding the architectural design of their proposed sites³⁸. The community has also placed limits on how close competing businesses, such as banks, can be to each other³⁹. Resistance has also been leveled at the development of fast food restaurants out of fear that similar restaurants will follow thereby increasing the potential for the neighborhood to lose the

³⁷ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 1/10/2005, Vol. 28 Issue 2, p1-1, 1/6p; 9/13/2004, Vol. 27 Issue 37, p40-40, 1/4p; 01496956, 8/30/2004, Vol. 27, Issue 35; 01496956, 11/22/2004, Vol. 27

³⁸ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* Issue 47; 01496956, 9/1/2003, Vol. 26, Issue 35

³⁹ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 9/13/2004, Vol. 27 Issue 37, p3-52, 2p

uniqueness of its commercial corridors. Criticism has also been leveled at the chain stores for worsening the community's traffic congestion⁴⁰.

In spite of these objections, Lincoln Park is the only city location of some upscale national franchises. Thus, the consumer who is looking for particular products must access it in Lincoln Park⁴¹. Trendy national franchises such as high-end frozen yogurt chains, cosmetics companies, designer jewelry stores, pet "hotels" and a multi-million dollar foreign language school for children are just a few of the retail specialty stores that maintain business in Lincoln Park. Thus, while other neighborhoods struggle to build an economic infrastructure, overdevelopment or the goodness of fit of future development within the neighborhood are bigger concerns in Lincoln Park.

The community's rise to affluence has also influenced the focus of its business infrastructure. Once known for its small industries, Lincoln Park's most viable form of employment has now become retail⁴². Moreover, because of the economic potential inherent in the redevelopment of manufacturing sites in Lincoln Park, there continues to be a push within the neighborhood to transition the remaining small industrial business to retail or real estate. Opponents of these redevelopment plans have argued, however, that

⁴⁰ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 01496956, 01/11/99, Vol. 22, Issue 2

⁴¹ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 7/23/2007, Vol. 30 Issue 30, p3-3, 1/9p; 9/13/2004, Vol. 27 Issue 37, p. 40-40, 1/4p; 01496956, 07/28/97, Vol. 20, Issue 30; 3/27/2006, Vol. 29 Issue 13, p. 3-3, 1/9p

⁴² Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 01496956, 10/05/98, Vol. 21, Issue 40

preserving industry should be a priority as it provides more competitive employment opportunities for city residents⁴³.

Lincoln Park's social, institutional and recreational development is also remarkable. The demographic constitution of the neighborhood allows for social networking ties to be strengthened among its professional constituency⁴⁴. The neighborhood is also home to numerous restaurants, architectural landmarks, social clubs, and elite private schools that are known for providing entry to some of the nation's most prestigious universities⁴⁵.

Significant financial investments allow Lincoln Park to add to its social and cultural amenities. Most recently, taxpayer money has been dedicated to build a \$2 million athletic venue that is available for public use⁴⁶. Expansion plans have also been proposed for DePaul University⁴⁷. The periodic planning of street festivals and art fairs further strengthen the social infrastructure of the neighborhood.

⁴³ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 01496956, 12/18/2006, Vol. 29, Issue 51

⁴⁴ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 01496956, 7/31/2006, Vol. 29, Issue 31

⁴⁵ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 01496956, 5/1/2006, Vol. 29, Issue 18

⁴⁶ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 01496956, 8/18/2008, Vol. 31, Issue 33

⁴⁷ Source: *Crain's Chicago Business* 01496956, 11/22/2004, Vol. 27, Issue 47

CHAPTER TWO
PUBLIC HOUSING AND
THE US HOUSING SYSTEM

The central objective of the Wagner-Steagall Housing Act of 1937 was to insure that “decent, safe and sanitary dwellings” were made available to low-income families unable to attain it in the private market⁴⁸. To ensure that the mandate was met, federally owned housing developments known as projects, would be integrated into the urban landscape of numerous cities across the nation.

While the construction of housing projects adhered to the letter of the law, the extent to which the spirit of the law was ultimately carried out is debatable. Instead of an arbitrary distinction being drawn between housing attained in the private market and publically owned housing, the projects would become differentiated in two critical ways.

Housing Policy and the Creation of a Two-Tier Housing System

Housing policy has been a critical component in the evolution of American cities. Historic legislation, beginning with the Housing Act of 1934, has fundamentally altered the material context of the urban landscape. Under this policy and successive

⁴⁸ According to the website Documents of American History II located at http://tucnak.fsv.cuni.cz/~calda/Documents/1930s/Wagner_1937.html, the Wagner-Steagall Act is defined as follows: “To provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary conditions, for the eradication of slums, for the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low-income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and for other purposes.”

iterations, American society have witnessed the emergence of vital cities and communities that have come to define the national standard of living.

While the Housing Act of 1934 enabled many American families the ability to achieve the dream of homeownership –often in burgeoning suburban communities (Jackson 1985; Lipsitz 2006) – others continued to languish in poorly constructed urban dwellings that failed to meet even the most rudimentary habitation standards. Still others were forced to leverage significant portions of their income to attain viable housing (Marcuse 2006; Dreier 2006).

The need for more and better housing for the poor would ultimately be addressed under the Wagner-Steagall Housing Act of 1937 and again under the Housing Acts of 1949, 1954 and 1974. Under Wagner-Steagall, the federal government gained the legal means to construct and operate housing for those who were unable to attain it in the private market. Public housing would be provided by way of federal monies channeled to states. Urban slums defined by blighted housing would be replaced with decent, safe and sanitary dwellings for the poor.

The Housing Act of 1937 marks the beginning of the long and often contentious debate on the nation's position on the provision of public housing. Over time, plans for public housing would become increasingly subject to ebbs and flows in the political context or ideological shifts emerging between liberal and conservative leadership (Marcuse & Keating 2006). Peaks in the construction of public housing evident in the 1940's and particularly during the era of activism that defined the 1960's would be largely suppressed by the 1980's.

Janet Smith (2006) outlines five critical policy responses that have shaped public housing since the implementation of Wagner-Steagall⁴⁹. According to Smith, each successive response further reduced the potential for public housing policy to effectively mediate the housing needs of the poor. Decreasing efficacy of the policy has been contributed to multiple factors including unmet production goals, slum clearance that culminated mostly in the advancement of city development, high levels of residential displacement, increasing reliance on the private sector for the provision of housing – particularly through the establishment of the Section 8 program (i.e., Housing Choice) and increasing emphasis on the provision of “affordable housing”, which further limited the potential to strictly address the housing needs of the poor.

While federal expenditures for public housing have decreased over the last twenty-five years, tax breaks and federal expenditures earmarked for homeowners in the private sector have continued to garner more political and legislative support. Indirect subsidies, such as mortgage interest and property tax on income tax as well as deferrals on capital gains, have served to fully integrate private housing into the national economy, while public housing expenditures have remained means-tested targets subject to the whims of an apparent unreceptive political context. In 2000, for example, the Federal government allocated approximately \$150 billion dollars in housing subsidies to be distributed among the public and private spheres. Indirect expenditures (i.e., tax expenditures), such as those outlined above, distributed to the private sphere accounted

⁴⁹ In Chapter 2 of *Where are Poor People to Live?: Transforming Public Housing Communities* Smith considers the effects of the Housing Act of 1949, 1954, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, Tax Reform Act of 1986 and the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 as evidence of a “devolution” of the nation’s commitment to public housing.

for seventy-five percent of that amount, leaving only twenty-five percent to be allocated to public housing efforts. Peter Dreier (2006) argues that the decreasing tolerance for public housing reflected in the adverse budgetary allocations has necessitated a focus on maintenance of existing units over the construction of new units – a trend that belies an increasing need for public housing. Dreier writes that:

...In 1976, HUD's budget authority was spent primarily on expanding the inventory of low-income housing through the production of new units, the rehabilitation of substandard units and rental assistance to needy tenants. By 2000, most of HUD's budget authority was spending on maintaining or improving the existing inventory of low-income assisted housing ... rather than adding to the inventory (2006:111).

The integration of federal housing subsidies into the private market has altered the role that housing plays in the national economy. Peter Dreier and Peter Marcuse have asserted that the central role of housing historically has been to bolster labor force participation in the American economy. They note that housing for the purpose of economic stimulation was particularly apparent during the languishing economies that defined the nation prior to the Housing Acts of 1934 and 1937. However, the creation of the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) and favorable mortgage lending tools, coupled with decreasing legislative support for public housing and the implementation of tax policy benefitting non-poor homeowners has created a political-economic environment wherein the role of housing has had a more pervasive effect on the national economy. Not only does the housing industry continue to contribute indirectly to the economic stability of the nation by promoting labor from the construction of homes, the homes themselves now play a pivotal role in the maintenance of the economy itself.

Smith has contrasted the differences in housing provided within the private sphere to that provided within the public sphere. Using Gail Radford's framework she argues that the nation's housing system is the product of policies that were implemented within two divergent ideologies – one reliant upon means-tested legislation and another upon targeted program, facilitated largely by entities such as the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), that enabled property ownership for the middle-class and other non-poor families. Smith writes:

Distributive programs like the FHA, while not directly benefitting the poor, were presumed to help via 'filtering', freeing up older homes as families moved into newer ones. In contrast, poor people directly benefitted from public housing; however, it was considered expensive to taxpayers when compared to filtering, which cost relatively little and generated a lot more taxes than public housing (2006:24).

Increasing discrepancies in the federal distribution of indirect and direct housing expenditures have facilitated the development of a two-tiered system of housing policy⁵⁰. One tier dedicated to public efforts, has historically relied upon federal expenditures to meet its housing objectives. This public tier ostensibly perceives its function to be the provision of housing *in-and-of-itself* – that is, housing for the purposes of subsistence.

Within the second, opposing tier, however, federal expenditures and advantageous tax policies that primarily affect the nation's wealthy has allowed housing to be used as a strategy for building wealth through investment and financial speculation, as well as being utilized for subsistence purposes. As a consequence, housing's private market has

⁵⁰ Janet Smith briefly references this framework offered by Gail Radford In *Modern Housing for America: Policy Struggles in the New Deal Era*

become increasingly less accessible for a growing number of poor and low-income people.

In fact, the non-wealthy only have a limited capacity to pursue housing within the private sector. Moreover, those who can only attain publically owned housing are prohibited from exacting influence on the economic health of the country or to advance their personal wealth through housing investments. On the other hand, over reliance on the investment potential of housing in the private sphere has led to an over privatization of the market, which has a demonstrated capacity to increase its susceptibility for national financial crisis. Thus, the nature of the US housing system has become very complex, while its objectives have become more divergent.

The complexities inherent in the housing system, however, have not diminished its capacity to exact change on the nature of place. Historically, private sector housing has been an integral component in the constitution of place in the United States. Increasing the availability of private housing stock has often coincided with commiserate increases in the overall economic capacity of city and suburban areas (Jackson 1985; Lipsitz 2006). Private sector housing, therefore, has been employed as a tool for promoting additional forms of economic development and participation; it has been instrumental in changing the material context that has come to define place.

The addition of public housing stock has not demonstrated the same positive effects on the material context of publically owned places. In fact, the addition of public housing stock has served only to reduce the overall value of place historically (Hirsch 2000; Wilson 1987; Venkatesh 2000). In this way, the nature of the material context of

place – how it is defined and differentiated – has been affected by vacillations, discontinuities and distinctions emerging in the US housing system. That is, critical differences that have emerged between publically attained housing and housing attained in the private sphere have held profound implications for the nature of place and for understanding how places differ.

In *Reclaiming Public Housing: A Half Century of Struggle in Three Public Neighborhoods* Lawrence Vale (2002) maintains that the projects were “constructed to maximize the distinctiveness of a place beneath private-sector housing (14:2002)”. Thus, the urban form that public housing assumed was a central point of differentiation. Touted as architectural prototypes of a different form of city living, the projects were constructed in expansive “superblocks” that often included hundreds of mid-rise and high-rise homes encased in distinctive concrete facades. The geospatial design of the buildings would further create a purposeful separation from what was perceived as less gratifying elements of city life. Because of the projects’ unique design, many cities would end up with a series of disparate public enclaves – insular housing sites that were readily distinguished from other housing sites in the city. Moreover, the social and economic value of the buildings would also soon come under greater scrutiny as adherence to the maintenance needs dwindled and building decay became more apparent.

More than material differences in structure would distinguish private and public housing, however. The distinctiveness of the projects would become even more pronounced as the standard for robust city living changed. The one-dimensional nature of housing projects would stand in stark contrast to city neighborhoods seeking to define

themselves by abundant street life and diversity in use and structure. Vital city neighborhoods would be defined by the presence of mixed-use buildings and developments (Jacobs 1961). City neighborhoods were being redefined and housing stock was viewed as only one constituent element of productive neighborhoods.

While the geospatial design of the projects did not easily allow for the type of urban vitality other neighborhoods were experiencing, the expansiveness of the superblock design had done far more than simply add to the existing housing stock. They produced an alternate conception of a neighborhood – a neighborhood whose definition ran counter to that emerging in the private sector. In essence, public housing neighborhoods would become remarkable by what was absent. Public neighborhoods were being defined mostly by the presence of project enclaves and the absence of city diversity. Not only were there now two forms of housing, but also there were apparent distinctions being demonstrated on the nature of place. The distinctions between public and non-public places held three distinct implications for the productive engagement of public neighborhoods⁵¹. Perhaps most observable, the lack of diversity affected the neighborhood's potential to contribute to the aggregate economic capacity of the city at large. Secondly, the dearth of diversity affected the capacity of public neighborhoods to

⁵¹ On page 10 of Lawrence Vale's *Reclaiming Public Housing: A Half Century of Struggle in Three Public Neighborhoods* the term productive engagement is used within the context of describing the limitations that public neighborhoods incur because of their public ownership. He maintains that such ownership proves to be prohibitive in promoting the development of essential neighborhood amenities such as libraries or museums. Within the present study the term has been used to describe the limitations that public neighborhoods experience because of their historic inability to demonstrate the type of economic diversity witnessed in neighborhoods that have not been defined by the presence of public housing. The mixed-use diversity present in non-public neighborhoods is proposed as a central point of distinction in the two neighborhood types. The absence of mixed-use buildings and developments is proposed to decrease productive engagement and to be a primary source of economic stagnation in public neighborhoods.

maintain a specific agentic economic identity. The greatest consequence of this limitation is that public neighborhoods lacked the critical non-housing amenities that make urban places habitable. And lastly, the lack of diversity changed the social conception and social valuation of public neighborhoods. Within this context public neighborhoods not only became defined as impoverished as a condition of their housing stock and resident economic status but also because of the dearth of amenities that constituted the neighborhood itself.

In large part, then, the single-function land use projects that defined public housing stood much as an anachronism. Distinctiveness in the projects became not only a function of urban form, but also a consequence of the projects' failure to demonstrate a valued form of diversity. Lack of mixed-use diversity would leave these neighborhoods with little means or opportunity for economic growth. Over time, these bounded places would have little to no economic amenities. Low economic activity led only to greater degrees of economic desolation. As such, public housing was vilified as much for its material form as for its inability to exhibit a highly valued form of urban diversity.

In spite of the critical differences in the diversity of place that have emerged between public neighborhoods and private ones, national debates on the state of public housing have disproportionately focused on rectifying the physical limitations of public neighborhoods. Physical decay, poor maintenance, unsightly property and untenable living conditions have elicited a visceral public response. Public outrage and adherence to political party lines has hastened calls for remediating the substandard building standards associated with public housing.

In fact, addressing the severe distress of thousands of public housing units across the nation is the primary goal of HOPE VI, the latest iteration of public housing policy reform implemented under Congressional action. HOPE VI would set into motion the most substantial revisions to public housing policy in twenty-five years. Under the recommendations of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, 86,000 units of existing public housing would either be razed and replaced with new mixed-income housing sites or undergo significant rehabilitation⁵². Importantly, this reform proposed not only to mark the end of the much maligned, publically contested and physically dilapidated projects, but also to serve as a catalyst to decrease the incidence of concentrated poverty and social distress long associated with public housing.

The eradication of the now infamous housing units also would mark the end of the superblock design. Architectural renderings of new neighborhoods closely mimic picturesque suburbs far more than the concrete and asphalt neighborhoods that have defined the projects. Public housing, as the nation had come to know it, was well on the way to becoming obsolete. While the eradication of the buildings themselves addressed the most objectionable aspect of public housing, it did not directly acknowledge or seek to rectify the historic absence of urban diversity or the limited productive engagement demonstrated by traditional public neighborhoods.

⁵² In response to the declining state of public housing in the United States, Congress established the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing in 1989. The Commission was charged with developing a National Action Plan to improve the condition of severely distressed public housing (Smith 2006). More information on public housing policy reform can be found in the HOPE VI Program Assessment provided by the US Office of Management and Budget and other Federal Offices. Summary of the assessment is publically available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary/10001162.2003.html>

To the extent that the economic infrastructure of transforming neighborhoods has been considered, the focus has been leveled at economic remediation through the development of mixed-income living. Not only is this intervention proposed as a redress for the historic experience of social isolation, but also as a viable strategy for improving the economic capacity of the neighborhood⁵³.

This aspect of the policy intervention may be limited in two ways, however. First, a neighborhood's ability to exact economic change is defined solely by its ability to add to its available private housing stock. However, changes in housing stock may only be an initial indicator of neighborhood or community-level economic change. Moreover, using housing as a strategy for promoting economic stimulation ultimately relies upon a limited stream of economic participation. The economic capacity of a neighborhood becomes an outgrowth of its ties to only one realm of economic participation (i.e., housing) as opposed to multiple streams of economic development. Secondly, the addition of mixed income housing does not adequately respond to the pervasive history of economic detachment experienced by these neighborhoods' inability to demonstrate a sense of a productive engagement that is commiserate with other neighborhoods in urban cities.

By all intents and purposes, then, HOPE VI is a policy intervention aimed at alleviating inadequate public housing stock. Less attention has been given to understanding how the policy demonstrates effects on the projects as an unintentional

⁵³ The notion of social isolation has long been regarded as one of the most negative and pervasive consequences of living in the projects and other chronically poor areas. It is proposed that the experience of concentrated poverty – a poverty that is uninterrupted and has no opportunity for receiving social and economic benefit through interactions with non poor others – disproportionately limits the life chances of those living in the poverty. See William Julius Wilson's, *The Truly Disadvantaged* for an expanded discussion of social isolation.

neighborhood that is defined by more than the quality of its housing stock. While others including Venkatesh (2002) and Wenona Rymond Richmond (forthcoming) have considered the role of individual agency or the significance of “collective activity” in redefining project neighborhoods, they have not directly assessed how the amenities within the material context determine how these neighborhoods become defined as urban places. That is, housing policy has demonstrated effects not only on the way actors ultimately negotiate and interpret place, but also for the nature of the material context itself. Including an assessment of the material context that extends beyond the nature of housing stock, therefore, may provide an alternate understanding of how place is being redefined within the context of public housing reform.

The elimination of the public homes that occupied the superblocks has irrevocably altered the nature of urban place. Their eradication presents an opportunity for additionally addressing the collective material context that has come to define public neighborhoods. The study does not intend to evaluate neighborhood change as a function of changes to housing stock, but instead considers the extent to which the non-housing amenities of a transforming neighborhood have changed within the context of public housing policy reform. Traditional public neighborhoods have been marked by a pervasive experience of economic desolation. Consideration of the development of non-housing amenities of the transforming public housing neighborhood assesses the extent to which a previously economically desolate neighborhood may demonstrate a local, healthy infrastructure.

CHAPTER THREE
PRODUCTIVE ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT
AND URBAN PLACE

According to Logan and Molotch (1987), place is first originated in nature as space; the value ultimately assigned to place, however, is a consequence of ongoing social processes. Place is, as they argue, “not simply *affected* by the institutional maneuvers surrounding them”, but “places *are* those machinations (1987:43)” Thomas Gieryn (2000) has argued similarly. For him, place not only consists of agents – those who perpetuate social processes related to place, but place is itself an “agentic” determinant or as he writes, “a force with detectable and independent effects on social life (32)”. It is through the material and social emergence of place, then, that use value is garnered to things that are nestled within it. That is, place provides a context within which social structural categories, differences and hierarchies gain meaning (Gieryn 2000).

Place is further defined as a “product”, a distinct commodity that cannot be used up and therefore is indispensable (Logan & Molotch 1987). However, its conception and persistence is susceptible to the historical context or as Gieryn maintains, it persists “as a constituent element of social life and historical change (29)”. The social and economic trajectory of urban ghettos, project communities and suburbs serve as cases in point of

the contingency of place upon the historical context – or more specifically, policy intervention occurring within the historical context of place. Referring to the salient impact of history on the production of urban place, Breunlin and Regis (2006) write that, “Urban renewal and slum clearance, discriminatory homeownership programs and segregated public housing, suburbanization and gentrification ... have all fractured, bulldozed, or reconfigured elements of the 19th century city (744).” Similarly, Hirsch (2000) has argued that housing policy implemented in the 1940’s and 1950’s which advocated for slum clearance and urban renewal within the inner city, while simultaneously prohibiting black mobility to areas beyond the boundary of the city have been centrally indicted as causal in disproportionately high concentrated black urban areas and corresponding white dominated suburbs.

George Lipsitz (2006) enumerates several structural processes that solidified the stable presence of emerging white suburbs, arguably the largest constitution of the private realm of housing. Advantageous home lending patterns, institution of indirect housing subsidies, the development of infrastructure to provide essential services such as water and electricity, the expansion of the US highway system all served as carrots of enticement to eligible home owners to flee urban areas. Simultaneous to the exodus of [mostly] white families to the suburbs, corporations were also abandoning the city, bound for new offices lying outside the core of urban cities. Factors, such as these, not only encouraged rapid increases in home values, but also provided an essential foundation for building communities that supported multiple streams of economic growth and participation in the American economy. This basic foundation further supported the

development of a white habitus – a network of social and economic institutions such as schools and churches that more or less reflect a homogenous population.

The contrasting trajectories of place emanating within the public and private spheres supports the notion that place cannot be defined in isolation. Place becomes meaningful only as a mediated social space. It can only be conceived of by its relationship to other socially produced places or as Logan and Molotch write,

...Each place has a particular political or economic standing *vis-à-vis other places* that affects the quality of life and opportunities available to those who live within its boundaries...Neighborhoods organize life chances in the same sense as do the more familiar dimensions of class and caste (P. 19 emphasis added).

Thus, place is not an a priori designation but is determined within the specific context in which it emerges. Janet Kodras (1997) has argued that, “poverty is geographically produced as alterations in the market and the state emanating from the global and national levels are differentially translated into the social order of locales to generate distinctive prospects for affluence or impoverishment”⁵⁴ (67). The nature of place is recursive and its value is contestable over time (Gieryn 2000). The differential valuation of place or the stratification of place (Logan & Molotch 1987) cannot be understood outside of its historical situation.

Multiple factors have facilitated the differentiation of place as it relates to the US housing system. Macro level changes implemented by the government over the last thirty years have facilitated the development of a dual housing system in the United States. Increasing disparities in federal housing expenditures have exacerbated differences

⁵⁴ Kodras (1997) defines a locale as a county geographic region but she conceded that within those locales poverty is confined to certain areas

between publically owned housing and housing attained in the private sphere, including disproportionate increases in the economic value of private sector homes and the corresponding devaluation of public homes that have been shoddily maintained.

Critical differences between publically owned housing and private attained housing also emerge in the local context, however. Differences in the local material context are expressed in two primary ways. First, the rigid and formulaic urban form assumed by public housing is contrasted by variation in use and structure demonstrated in the private sphere.

Differences also emerge in the material contexts that have come to define each form of housing. The geospatial design of public and private neighborhoods is wholly different. Public neighborhoods, disproportionately distinguished by their single-purpose land use design, starkly contrast with non-public city neighborhoods whose material context often reflects diversity in use and structure (Jacobs 1961). The experience of social isolation and economic desolation that has historically defined public neighborhoods is also contrasted by the availability of significantly greater economic and social resources present in housing's private sector (Wilson 1987; Hirsch 2000; Venkatesh 2000; Jackson 1985; Lipsitz 2006).

The differences that emerge between places are not without consequence. Zielenbach (2003) argues that, "An economically vibrant community is able to attract and maintain private investment as well as provide its residents with employment and wealth-building opportunities (628)." The ramifications of the singular purpose of the material context of public neighborhoods then, is not only evident in the limitations inherent in its

physical structure but in the neighborhood's ability to demonstrate a productive economic engagement, wherein multiple economic streams operate to encourage economic growth. The dearth of businesses operating in public neighborhoods has implications for how they, as place, have ultimately been defined and valued within society.

Race and Place

Just lookin' out of the window

Watching the asphalt grow

Thinkin' how it all looks hand-me down ...

- Excerpted theme lyrics from the television sit-com *Good Times*

Differences in public and non-public places have also emerged along racialized lines. The confluence of non-whites to mostly urban areas in the US, or more specifically to public housing neighborhoods, is the result of numerous state imposed actions including legal segregation instituted under Jim Crow and the redlining of black communities that persisted to the mid 1960's. The result of these actions and other covert practices predicated upon racial superiority or racial differentiation, has allowed place to be defined, at least in part, by the race of the people who live within its boundaries.

Speaking directly to the effects of housing policy on the historical persistence of racial segregation in America Arnold Hirsch (2000) has maintained that elemental aspects of housing policy, including urban renewal contributed to the "crea[tion] and sustain[ing] of racially separate neighborhoods even as the civil rights movement gained momentum." Thus, the formation and reformation of place serves as central site for

processes of racialization⁵⁵. Within this context, the disproportionate number of public housing neighborhoods occupied by blacks (and other non-whites) can be conceptualized as racialized geographic locales.

The almost exclusive development of public housing projects in predominantly black communities would prove to have detrimental effects. Urban areas that had for several decades before been dominated by working- and middle-class blacks that arrived to northern and northeastern cities during the Great Migration would become even more tenuously situated in the American economic and social context with the addition of public housing projects. The racialization of black places would be further solidified by the out-migration of blacks of higher classes, persistent patterns of economic disenfranchisement and the devaluation of real estate located in black areas (Wilson 1987; Massy & Denton 1993; Pattillo 2008).

Kay Anderson (1987) maintains that the process of making racial categories is facilitated through place and the actions of the state. For her, place becomes a central element in the establishment of communities that are racially “otherized”. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) has argued similarly using the notion of the habitus. He maintains that it is within the habitus, as a physical context, that differentiation of groups occurs. Just as the habitus exerts effects on groups (their attitudes and beliefs), the differentiation of groups also demonstrates effect on the habitus or place itself. Thus, it is through social

⁵⁵ Race scholar Eduardo Bonilla-Silva defines the US as a racialized social system or a racial social structure whereby race is real in its effects that it demonstrates on ‘racialized’ others – whether they are white or black. This notion counters previous conceptions of race and racism as the products of strict ideological components. For a more comprehensive explanation of Bonilla Silva’s racialized social structure, refer to *Racism without Racist*

action that places are legitimated or devalued. Places, then, are made real through social action. Writing specifically about the emergence of “Chinatown” Anderson writes that, “Chinatown is a social construction with a cultural history and a tradition of imagery and institutional practice that has given it a cognitive and material reality in and for the West (581)”. She further maintains that place is a crucial site in maintaining racial categories.

Within this context, place – just as race – becomes a system of classification that is based upon ideological beliefs. Blackness, for example, is sealed into cultural permanence through processes of racial formation that are facilitated through place. Moreover, place – just as race – remains susceptible to ongoing formations. Places come to be defined through social processes and that definition becomes the basis of differentiation. Thus, it is not that places are organically constituted but that their constitution exacts real social and economic consequences or as Anderson writes of place that:

...is not simply that it has been a representation perceived in certain ways, but that it has been, like race, an idea with remarkable social force and material effect... has shaped and justified the practices of powerful institutions toward it and toward people [who constitute place] ...(581).

The use of the term “the projects,” as a colloquialism, is no misnomer. It is used as detached and anonymous term that has come to define not one particular place but all places that were publically owned. Thus, the term has been used as a way to categorize and identify the housing sites themselves – to ground the material differences that define place. The projects are places of social construction that have gained a specific social meaning in American society. That social meaning is relational – that is, it is not

developed in isolation. It is defined in reference to other places that have also been socially defined. As such, “the projects”, as a housing category, have come to occupy a specific place in the American economic and social hierarchy. The term imparts an understanding of the type of relationships the projects maintain with mainstream society. Thus, the notion of the projects is not simply a socially neutral word. It conjures up a particular image, a particular lifestyle – a particular place in urban America.

The type of place projects are conceived of has important implications for public housing policy reform. Blacks and other non-whites have disproportionately occupied public housing projects since the 1940s. Moreover, the larger communities that contain public properties are also disproportionately black or non-white (Hirsch 2000). Thus, projects are first ostensibly conceived of as black or non-white places. American society’s interpretation of the projects has further been amplified by the material differences emerging between private housing stock and housing stock that was publically owned. Because of the racialized nature of place, the quality of housing and the availability of non-housing amenities also become associated with the groups that inhabit geographic areas. Thus, tied to this aspect of the social identity of “the projects” as a specific urban place, is the notion that the non-housing amenities that these places have are drastically different from the non-housing amenities that non-public places typically have (Vale 2002). This is to say that the social identity and consequent devaluation of project neighborhoods is as attributable to numerous factors including its racial constituency, its poor housing stock and the paucity of economic amenities made

available in public neighborhoods. All three of the aspects promote an understanding of the projects as non-vital places.

This understanding of place has the potential to stigmatize its existence. The ease at which the stigma assigned to public housing remits may hold implications for the ultimate local health that transforming neighborhoods are able to demonstrate. Ultimately, redefining the social identity that has historically been attributed to the projects may be a large part of the existing challenge of remediating the experience of social and economic desolation through policy making. That is, policy must have the effect of facilitating an alternate understanding of place. The effect that policy has on the public conception of transforming neighborhoods may hold predictive value on whether they are ultimately conceived of as socially and economically viable places.

The development of non-housing amenities in project neighborhoods, where historically they have been absent, has the potential to redefine the public perception of black urban places. It also has the potential to alleviate economic differences that manifest along racial lines. The development of these types of amenities also has the capacity to serve as a critical redress for the persistence of economic inequality associated with black and other non-white neighborhoods.

While the social and economic demographics of these communities and the social processes that have rendered them as such have been widely recognized, HOPE VI makes no direct efforts to address the racialized nature of traditional public neighborhoods. Nor has the policy evaluated the potential its implementation may have for perpetuating or alleviating patterns of racial and economic segregation. The fact that the racialization of

public housing has been excluded from policy consideration may support the contention that race remains a central determinant in the degree to which policy intervenes on the behalf of such neighborhoods (Hirsch 2000; Lipsitz 2006). Understanding the impact that the development of non-housing amenities has on these areas provides some insight into how the policy exacts effect on the racialized nature of public places.

Research evaluating the efficacy of the HOPE VI initiative has largely considered the degree factors related to the remediation of the existing project building. For example, studies have compared the new physical context of the replacement housing to the physical context of the demolished buildings; quality of available public housing stock is a critical focus of these studies (Popkin 2006). Differences in place have also been informed by quantitative factors such as the extent to which the numbers of units made available after HOPE VI reform reflect the needs of original public housing residents (Smith 2006b). Or, researchers have evaluated how factors such as displacement and eligibility of tenancy have impacted original public housing residents under the reform measures (Popkin, Katz, Cunningham, Brown, Gustafson & Turner 2004). Researchers engaging differences in neighborhood contexts have additionally assessed factors such as the quality of housing made available to displaced public housing residents or the extent to which social factors such as crime rates have changed within the context of public housing reform. (Zielenbach 2003).

Other researchers have focused largely upon understanding how public housing reform affects specific social processes emanating in the local material context. These studies have particularly considered the implications that integrating the poor with the

non-poor maintain for the home equity of non-poor homeowners. For example, Mary Pattillo (2008) has considered the implications that public housing policy reform has had on the non-poor original residents that move into or remain in transforming neighborhoods. Pattillo's research has also considered how the inclusion of scattered site public housing and mixed-income housing developed within the borders of emerging or historically middle-class neighborhoods changes the nature of place, including "quality of life" factors related to such integration. Other researchers have assessed the consequences that social processes such as gentrification maintain for transforming areas (Nyden et al 2006).

Researchers who have considered how the economic capacities of public neighborhood change have used factors such as the per capita income of residents as an indicator of economic growth. In fact, policy reform efforts informed by this line of research assert that the disadvantageous economic status of project neighborhoods is attributable to the out-migration of higher economic classes – those conferring more social and cultural capital necessary to maintain essential services and institutions – have moved away from these communities, thereby removing essential sources of support⁵⁶. Within this context, economic disinvestment is viewed as an indirect effect of the social out-migration of non-poor residents. Thus increased proximity to non-poor others (i.e., middle- and upper-class newcomers) is purported to have critical social and economic benefits to public housing residents that will begin to address community deficiencies.

⁵⁶ William Julius Wilson discusses the notion of social isolation in *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. He defines social isolation as the lack of contact or of sustained interaction with individuals and institutions that represent mainstream society (60).

Indeed, this contention undergirds the development of mixed-income communities emerging under HOPE VI. In Chicago, for example, mixed-income communities are regarded not only as a viable housing option for original public housing residents but also as a strategy for alleviating historic levels of isolation⁵⁷.

While social integration of this magnitude may demonstrate economic effects on the nature of place, it gives less consideration to the notion of place as an agentic economic determinant of its own, capable of affecting neighborhood economic change. It also does not consider how the nature of place is determined within the larger socio-historical context in which it is situated.

It has been argued that contemporary urban vitality is defined by prolific diversity in use and structure (Jacobs 1961). Historically, public neighborhoods have not demonstrated such a capacity. Their failure to do so has affected the potential the neighborhoods have to contribute to the aggregate economic growth of their respective cities, has affected the capacity of public neighborhoods to maintain a specific agentic economic identity within cities, and has conferred a particular social identity to public places. The demolition of tens of thousands of existing public housing units is regarded as a necessary intervention for developing habitable neighborhoods for publically owned housing. Habitability, however, ultimately encompasses more than those changes associated with the transformation of housing stock.

⁵⁷ Per the CHA's Plan for Transformation information brochure, "Building New Communities; Building New Lives", a central objective is to turn isolated public housing developments into healthy, mixed-income communities by partnering with market-rate and affordable housing developers.

Anne Shlay (1997) has argued that while the focus of public housing policy has shifted over the years, housing (as it relates to the revitalization of place) has historically been situated as a social welfare problem, and not an economic problem onto itself. This is to say that while poverty and inequality have been widely discussed as problematic, it is a discussion that exists within a particular framework. Poverty and inequality are social problems that are disaggregated from the broader economic context in which they are situated. Recent changes in public housing policy provide an opportunity to build upon this assertion and to consider how changes in the material context of public neighborhoods have enabled changes in the non-housing amenities available at the neighborhood level.

Previous research that has considered public housing policy reform, specifically as it relates to HOPE VI, has largely emphasized how changes in the housing structures contribute to the identities of transitioning public housing neighborhoods. While this research has promoted a greater understanding of how the physical and social limitations associated project neighborhoods have (or have not) been remediated, it has not assessed how the non-housing components associated with place may have been altered as a consequence of the intervention. This paper seeks to expand the notion of place-based research to consider how the non-housing amenities of transforming public neighborhoods have changed within the context of recent public housing policy reform.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS

Results

When compared to the other neighborhoods in the study, the Grand Boulevard neighborhood experienced the lowest income per capita income in 1990 and 2000⁵⁸. Per capita income was \$7,788 in 1990 and \$13,063 in 2000, 37% and 52% of the citywide per capita income in 1990 and 2000 respectively. While Grand Boulevard experienced a forty percent increase in per capita income between 1990 and 2000, it continued to have the lowest percentage of city per capita income, when compared to the other neighborhoods. In fact, all three non-public neighborhoods in the study, including Roseland, reported higher income per capita than Grand Boulevard in 1990 and 2000.

Table 1
Per Capita Income Reported Across Neighborhoods in 1990 and 2000
in 2009 Dollars

Neighborhood	Adjusted Neighborhood Per Capita Income 1990	1990 Adjusted Neighborhood Per Capita Income (as percent of Chicago Per Capita Income)*	Adjusted Neighborhood Per Capita Income 2000	2000 Adjusted Neighborhood Per Capita Income (as percent of Chicago Per Capita Income)*
Grand Boulevard	\$7,788	37%	\$13,063	52%
Roseland	\$16,883	79%	\$18,730	74%
Uptown	\$20,472	96%	\$29,541	117%
Lincoln Park	\$63,586	298%	\$80,655	319%

* 1990 Adjusted Chicago per capita income = 21314 ** 2000 Adjusted Chicago per capita income = 25303

⁵⁸ Income results have been adjusted for inflation and reflect 2009-dollar amounts. Actual and adjusted incomes are reported in Table 3

While per capita income remains relatively low, when compared to the other neighborhoods, Grand Boulevard has experienced both an influx of high-income households and an outmigration of low-income households. Grand Boulevard and Lincoln Park are the only two neighborhoods in the study that experienced a loss of low-income households between 1990 and 2000 (-2998 and -597 respectively). Grand Boulevard, as well as Uptown and Lincoln Park, also experienced gains in the number of high-income households between 1990 and 2000.

Increases in low-income households were reported in Roseland and Uptown in the same reporting period, however. Roseland is the only neighborhood in the study to experience a loss of high-income households between 1990 and 2000. Every neighborhood, except Lincoln Park, experienced a gain in moderate-income households between 1990 and 2000.

Table 2
Net Changes in Income Level Reported Across Neighborhoods 1990- 2000

Neighborhood	Net Change in High-Income Households	Net Change in Moderate-Income Households	Net Change in Low-Income Households
Grand Boulevard	+638	+90	-2998
Roseland	-898	+306	+400
Uptown	+2350	+561	+459
Lincoln Park	+2131	-569	-597

*Source: US Census data reported by Chicago Rehab Network

In Grand Boulevard, the rate of homeownership increased by 2.3% between 1990 and 2000. However, in the same year, the median value of a home in Grand Boulevard was 35% lower than the median home value for the city. By 2000 the neighborhood had

made significant gains in the median value of its homes. By 2000, the median home value in Grand Boulevard was 35% higher than the city's median home value. Thus, both median home value and household income in Grand Boulevard have changed greatly with the implementation of HOPE VI efforts.

The increases in per capita income, home values and rates of homeownership coupled with the out-migration of poor families and in-migration of wealthier ones supports the contention that the household economic capacity of Grand Boulevard has changed within the context of public housing reform. Indeed, each of these outcomes may be directly attributable to the eradication of the Robert Taylor homes, which historically provided thousands of low-income households with subsidized rental units. The razing of those units eliminated approximately 4000 units of housing for low-income families. The extents to which those families have been able to remain in the area are highly susceptible to those changes. Moreover, the increases in home values occurring within the context of public housing policy reform may also prove to have a duo effect: It may serve to both constrain the feasibility of low-income families to remain in Grand Boulevard and promote the in-migration of the middle and upper class households.

Table 3
1990-2000 Changes in Rates of Homeownership Across Neighborhoods

Neighborhood	1990 Rate of Homeownership	2000 Rate of Homeownership	Percentage Change
Grand Boulevard	8.2%	10.5%	+2.3%
Roseland	65.6%	62.7%	-2.9%
Uptown	15.4%	26.2%	+10.9%
Lincoln Park	32.6%	41.3%	+8.7%

Source: Chicago Rehab Network

Table 4
1990-2000 Changes in Median Home Values Across Neighborhoods

Neighborhood	1990 Median Home Value	1990 Percentage over/under Chicago Median Home Value*	2000 Median Home Value	2000 Percentage over/under Chicago Median Home Value**
Grand Boulevard	\$49,700	- 35%	\$179,849	+35%
Roseland	\$62,000	-20%	\$89,084	-33%
Uptown	\$137,800	+78%	\$270,300	+104%
Lincoln Park	\$323,900	+144%	\$518,063	+291%

Source: Chicago Rehab Network * 1990 Chicago Median Home Value = \$77,600 ** 2000 Chicago Median Home Value = \$132,400

Variability in the non-housing economic amenities was experienced across neighborhoods. According to Gallagher (2006) two of the study neighborhoods, Roseland and Grand Boulevard are classified as food deserts. In the present study, the paucity of

supermarkets corresponds with a dearth of non-housing amenities in these two areas. In Grand Boulevard, the average number of businesses opened between 2000 and 2006 per person in the population was two. The per capita rate of business openings in Uptown was also two. Roseland experienced the lowest rate of business openings, with one business opening per person in the population between 2000 and 2006. Lincoln Park's business index rate was the highest, with three businesses being opened per person in the population between 2000 and 2006

Table 5 Calculated Business Index Across Neighborhoods 2000-2006

Neighborhood	Pop.	#Bus 2000	#Bus 2001	#Bus 2002	#Bus 2003	#Bus 2004	#Bus 2005	#Bus 2006	Avg # Bus 2000 - 2006	Business Index Avg.
Grand Blvd.	28,006	602	600	618	607	606	610	614	607	2
Roseland	52,723	616	599	627	619	613	624	632	618	1
Uptown	63,551	1032	1033	1090	1110	1136	1160	1170	1104	2
Lincoln Park	64,320	2270	2200	2186	2190	2236	2272	2290	2234	3

While the differences in the calculated business indices across neighborhood are arguably negligible, the commercial diversity of the neighborhoods was more variable. Greater commercial diversity is found in Lincoln Park. Of the four communities considered, Lincoln Park averages approximately five times the number of clothing and specialty stores when compared to both the Roseland and Grand Boulevard neighborhoods. Lincoln Park's commercial development also exceeds Uptown's. Uptown's commercial development is approximately half of that experienced in Lincoln Park. The rate of commercial diversity experienced in Uptown, however, is improved

over that of Grand Boulevard and Roseland. No significant improvement in the commercial diversity is experienced over time in Roseland or Grand Boulevard.

Moreover, the data indicate that rates of commercial retail development are not strictly contingent upon population threshold. Lincoln Park has over twice the number of residents when compared to Grand Boulevard yet only experiences a one-unit increase in business development per person in the population. Uptown, however, also has over twice the number of residents when compared to Grand Boulevard yet only the same per capita rate of business development. Population threshold is also not sensitive to the level of diversity of commercial retail development across neighborhood types. Lincoln Park has twice as many people as Grand Boulevard but experiences three times the overall level of retail development, five times the number of clothing retail development and six times the number of specialty retail development. Disproportionate increases in diversity are also apparent in Uptown. When compared to Grand Boulevard, Uptown experiences 50% more retail development overall, twice the number of specialty stores and 33% in the development of clothing stores. The lack of commercial diversity demonstrated in Grand Boulevard limit its potential to demonstrate a healthy, local business infrastructure. Within the context of public housing reform, the absence of such an infrastructure may have implications for the ultimate stability of the neighborhood.

Table 6
Retail Diversity Across Neighborhood-Types 2000-2006*

Neighborhood	Avg # Businesses*	Avg # of Retail*	Avg # of Clothing Stores*	Avg # of Specialty Stores*
Grand Boulevard	607	102	22	18
Roseland	618	129	18	21
Uptown	1104	155	32	41
Lincoln Park	2234	331	99	108

Source: US Economic Census, County Business Patterns Program

*Numbers reflect the average number of businesses in neighborhoods between 2000 and 2006

Overall, Lincoln Park significantly outperforms the three remaining neighborhoods.

Between 2000 and 2006, an average of 2234 businesses were opened in Lincoln Park.

Grand Boulevard experienced 73% fewer business openings, Roseland had 72% fewer business openings while Uptown experienced approximately 50% fewer business openings, when compared to Lincoln Park.

Patterns of financial investment stimulated through new construction housing development vary greatly between the four neighborhoods. Quantitatively, more Lincoln Park experienced housing starts than did all other neighborhoods. Between 2000 and 2004, Lincoln Park experienced over twice as many new construction housing starts as did Grand Boulevard, five times as many as Uptown and twenty-five times the amount experienced in Roseland.

After correcting for discrepancies in the median home value in each study neighborhood, variance in the amount of financial investment made in new construction housing starts is also experienced. Each year between 2000 and 2004 Grand Boulevard's financial investment in new construction housing starts exceeded the median home values for the area. The average financial investment in new construction housing starts over the

five- year period was 37% over the median home value for the neighborhood. The financial investment in new construction housing starts in Uptown also exceeded the median home value each year between 2000 and 2004. The average financial investment in Uptown in that period exceeded the median home value by 62%. However, the number of housing starts in each of those years was extremely low (n=20). A similar pattern of investment was demonstrated in Roseland. Financial investment in new construction housing starts in Roseland exceeded or equaled 90% the median home value in each of the five years between 2000 and 2004 but fewer than five housing starts were experienced in any single year. The aggregate average number of housing starts experienced across the two remaining neighborhood, Grand Boulevard and Lincoln Park was significantly higher (236 and 499 respectively) than that experienced in Uptown and Roseland.

The median home value in Lincoln Park was between one and five times greater than the median home values in the other neighborhood. However, the financial investment in new construction housing starts was well under the median home value for the area in four out of five years between 2000 and 2004. The average financial investment in new construction housing starts in Lincoln Park between 2000 and 2004 was 13% under the median home value for the area.

Table 7 Calculated Financial Investment Index Across Neighborhoods 2000-2004

Neighborhood	Year	Neighborhood Median Home Value	Average Investment per Housing Start	Financial Index
Grand Boulevard	2000	\$179,849	\$384,608	+54%
	2001	\$187,967	\$197,173	+6%
	2002	\$187,891	\$386,671	+51% ***
	2003	\$192,173	\$286,576	+33%
	2004	\$197,290	\$344,700	+43%
			Avg. Index	+37%
Roseland	2000	\$89,084	\$106,666	+16% ***
	2001	\$91,619	\$919,750	+90% ***
	2002	\$93,067	\$1.5 mil	+94% ***
	2003	\$93,188	\$1.8 mil	+95% ***
	2004	\$97,723	\$60,725	-38% ***
			Avg. Index	+51%
Uptown	2000	\$270,300	\$508,266	+47% ***
	2001	\$277,991	\$687,363	+60% ***
	2002	\$282,387	\$1.5 mil	+82% ***
	2003	\$288,822	\$472,728	+82% ***
	2004	\$296,514	\$1.6 mil	+82% ***
			Avg. Index	+62%***
Lincoln Park	2000	\$518,063	\$322,601	-38%
	2001	\$532,805	\$541,491	+2%
	2002	\$541,228	\$468,940	-13%
	2003	\$553,563	\$535,260	- 3%
	2004	\$568,305	\$499,672	-12%
			Avg. Index	-13%

Source: Chicago Rehab Network and Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

*Adjusted for annual inflation

** Percentage investment made over or under median value

*** Percentage reflects < or = 5 housing starts

*Adjusted for annual inflation

** Percentage investment made over or under median value

***Percentage reflects < or = 5 housing starts

The type of housing that has been added over the last five years further distinguishes the neighborhoods. Between 2000 and 2004, more single-family homes

were constructed in all neighborhoods except for Uptown, which experienced an increase in the construction of multiple-family housing units. Sixty percent of all housing constructed in the reporting period occurred in Lincoln Park compared to 28% in Grand Boulevard, 2% in Roseland and 10% in Uptown.

Single-family homes made up thirty-three percent of new construction occurring in Grand Boulevard. Multiple-family dwellings (i.e., housing containing more than one unit) ranged from 7% of the neighborhood's total housing starts to 20% of its total housing starts. Housing containing eight units or more experienced the second lowest number of housing starts compared to 20% three-unit starts, 8% four-unit starts, and 19% five to seven unit starts. Between 2000 and 2004, only two new construction housing starts (less than one percent) included more than eight units. Only new construction townhomes and starts containing more than eight units (both comprising less than 1% of the neighborhood's housing start totals) were constructed at a lesser rate.

The majority of Uptown's housing starts (78%) were constructed for multiple-family living compared to only 22% for single-family living. Moreover, 79% of Uptown's multiple family units included at least five units (37% five to seven units and 42% eight-unit dwellings).

Multiple family housing comprised 47% of the housing constructed in all four neighborhoods. The Lincoln Park neighborhood experienced the highest percentage of multiple family dwellings (43%). Forty-four percent of Lincoln Park's multiple-family dwellings were three-unit starts compared to 14% of four-unit starts, 21% of five to seven

unit starts, 12% of eight-unit starts and less than one percent of starts containing more than eight units.

The number of housing starts experienced over time has also been variable. Between 2000 and 2004, Lincoln Park maintained the highest average of housing starts (i.e., 100 starts per year) compared to an average of forty-seven for Grand Boulevard, four for Roseland and twenty in Uptown. In four out of five years, the number of housing starts in Lincoln Park exceeded the average for the neighborhood. In 2002, the average number of housing starts was not met, however, the financial investment in housing reflected the annual average over the five-year period.

The number of housing starts exceeded the average, two out of five years in the Grand Boulevard neighborhood. In 2001, however, housing starts were experienced at 70% less than the average rate and 15% less than the average rate in 2003.

The number of housing starts was most consistent in Roseland, however, the neighborhood also experienced the fewest total number of housing starts among all four neighborhoods. Increases in the average number of housing starts were also experienced in Uptown in 2000 and 2002 (33% and 15% increase respectively). In the remaining years the neighborhood experienced a decrease in housing starts ranging between one and thirty-five percent).

Table 8 Housing Starts Data for the Grand Boulevard and Roseland Neighborhoods
2000 – 2004

Neighborhood	Year	Total # Housing Starts	Total Investment (in millions)	Avg. Investment per Start	Single-Family Starts	Townhouse/ Rowhouse Starts	Multi-Unit Starts					
							Duplex	3 Unit	4 Unit	5-7 Unit	8 Unit	Other Multi Unit
Grand Boulevard	2000	73	28	\$384,608	47	0	6	2	5	9	4	0
	2001	14	3	\$197,173	6	0	1	7	0	0	0	0
	2002	47	18	\$386,671	4	0	5	6	7	17	6	2
	2003	40	11	\$286,576	12	2	8	10	2	13	3	0
	2004	62	21	\$344,700	8	2	3	23	6	16	4	0
Aggregate Housing Start Totals by Type – Grand Boulevard					77	4	23	48	20	45	17	2
Roseland	2000	3	320,000*	\$106,666	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2001	4	4	\$919,750	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	2002	4	6	\$1.5 mil	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
	2003	5	9	\$1.8 mil	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
	2004	4	242,900*	\$60,725	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aggregate Housing Start Totals by Type - Roseland					16	0	0	0	0	0	4	0

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

Table 9 Housing Starts Data for the Uptown and Lincoln Park Neighborhoods
2000 – 2004

Neighborhood	Year	Total # Housing Starts		Total Investment (in millions)	Avg. Investment per Start	Single-Family Starts	Townhouse/ Rowhouse Starts	Multi-Unit Starts					
								Duplex	3 Unit	4 Unit	5-7 Unit	8 Unit	Other Multi Unit
Uptown	2000	30	15	\$508,266	3	0	0	4	4	8	11	0	
	2001	13	9	\$687,363	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	0	
	2002	24	36	\$1.5 mil	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
	2003	14	7	\$472,728	5	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	
	2004	19	30	\$1.6 mil	5	0	0	1	2	4	7	0	
Aggregate Housing Starts by Type - Uptown						18	0	0	6	7	23	26	0
Lincoln Park	2000	101	32	\$322,601	54	0	4	21	8	7	7	0	
	2001	116	63	\$541,491	61	0	5	26	7	9	8	0	
	2002	65	30	\$468,940	51	0	1	8	2	2	1	0	
	2003	113	60	\$535,260	91	0	1	10	5	2	2	1	
	2004	105	53	\$499,672	68	5	3	9	2	15	2	1	
Aggregate Housing Starts by Type – Lincoln Park						325	5	14	74	24	35	20	2

Source: Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

Discussion

In 2003 research conducted by Sean Zielenbach found that HOPE VI neighborhoods had experienced several indicators of economic improvement including increases in the per capita income of its residents, gains in level of education of the residents, decreases in poverty and crime rates within transforming areas, and increases in the rates of residential loans made in transforming areas. The present study has found similar evidence of positive gains being made in the economic capacity of the Grand Boulevard constituency. Between 1990 and 2000 per capita income increased by 40% in the neighborhood. The neighborhood also experienced a small increase in the rate of homeownership. Also, Grand Boulevard was one of the two neighborhoods in the study that experienced a decrease in the number of low-income households between 1990-2000. Taken together, the decrease in the number of low-income households and the corresponding increase in moderate and high-income households, further demonstrate how the economic characteristics of residents in Grand Boulevard are changing. These demonstrable changes in the economic capacity of the neighborhood constituency have occurred within the context of public housing policy reform. While a causal relationship cannot be supported, the temporal correlation in these neighborhood changes correlates with the City of Chicago's Plan for Transformation efforts. Thus, the economic capacity of the transforming neighborhoods has been altered within the context of policy reform.

The increasing numbers of moderate and high-income households experienced in Grand Boulevard further supports the contention that the economic capacity of the neighborhood has changed within the context of public housing policy reform. These

household income types contrasts sharply with the pattern emerging in Roseland, where there has been an increase in the number of low-income households in spite of the neighborhood's experience of persistent economic stagnation. Changes in the number of low-income households in both Grand Boulevard and Roseland may support the contention that new clusters of low-income people are moving to other locations in the city as a consequence of public housing policy reform (Turner, Popkin & Cunningham 1999). It may also substantiate the contention that there are some areas in the city that better fit the housing needs of low-income families to a greater degree than do the new housing being developed in transforming neighborhoods.

Grand Boulevard also experienced substantial financial investment in the area through new construction housing starts. Between 2000 and 2004 over \$82 million was dedicated to constructing two hundred and thirty-six homes new homes in Grand Boulevard. While the number of homes constructed and the financial reinvestment being made through housing has decreased each year since 2000, the financial investment made in the area through new construction housing exceeded the median value of housing for the area in each year between 2000 and 2004. The degree to which the financial investment in housing continues to exceed the median home value for the area may have implications for determining its future constituency. That is, the more financial investment made in housing, the less likely it is that affordable housing will remain available in the areas for low-income Chicago residents. A continued pattern of decreases of both the number of homes constructed may support the contention that the demands for such homes have not been supported by potential homebuyers. Both of these factors

may impact the degree to which the neighborhood can continue to use housing as an effective strategy for improving its economic capacity. The changes occurring in housing stock are directly related to public housing policy reform. As such, failure in the marketing of the homes is tantamount to failure in the achievement of one of the central policy objectives.

The demolition of the Robert Taylor homes decreased the neighborhood's low-income housing stock by 4300 units. Quantity of units was one of the defining features of the high-rise units that comprised the Robert Taylor Homes. The razing of the twenty-eight high-rise towers that comprised those projects may have implications for the degree to which the neighborhood can continue to accommodate larger families. The degree to which new construction housing meets the needs of the large families who have traditionally resided in the area is made uncertain by the fact that (a) multiple-family dwellings are being constructed at much lower rates when compared to rates of construction of single-family homes in Grand Boulevard, (b) that between 2000 and 2004, the neighborhood was more likely to add smaller multiple-family dwellings (i.e., less than eight units) than larger ones (i.e., multiple dwellings with more than eight units). Therefore, the number of housing options ultimately offered within the neighborhood will be smaller.

Housing opportunities for original public housing residents may further be impacted by the size of the units (i.e., number of bedrooms, square footage) being constructed. Moreover, while single-family homes were the most frequently constructed in Grand Boulevard, the availability of these homes to low-income or original public housing residents is very low. It is unclear if the number and types of housing stock that

has been added to the Grand Boulevard meet the needs of the original public housing residents. Thus, demand for adequate low-income housing may now exceed supply in numerous ways in Grand Boulevard. The data indicate that low-income residents are moving from Grand Boulevard to a higher degree when compared to all other neighborhoods in the study. The degree to which low-income residents are leaving the neighborhood may be a substantial reflection of the housing stock being made available to its constituency.

While Grand Boulevard has experienced some gains in the economic capacity of its residents and significant changes in its available housing stock, the business infrastructure of the neighborhood has transitioned little. According to research conducted by Mari Gallagher (2006), Grand Boulevard is a food desert. The paucity of grocery stores does, to a certain degree, mirror the nature of the availability of other forms of retail in the neighborhood. In Grand Boulevard one business per capita is available to its residents, however the extent to which those businesses reflect a healthy local business infrastructure is arguable. According to business data, little diversity in business structure exists in Grand Boulevard. Moreover, of all of the neighborhoods in the study, Grand Boulevard experienced the lowest rate of retail openings between 2000 and 2006⁵⁹. Perhaps most importantly, improvements in the diversity of the business infrastructure were not experienced over time. Thus, while significant changes have been made to the housing infrastructure within the context of public housing reform, other economic non-housing amenities that also define place have largely remained absent.

⁵⁹ Negligible differences separated Roseland from Grand Boulevard. Please see Table 7 for exact numbers

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The distinct urban form that public housing projects traditionally assumed made them a readily identifiable component of numerous American cities. Expansive project neighborhoods, often anchored by non-descript high-rise concrete towers, have been sealed in the collective history of urban America. Their inclusion in Americana is contestable, however. Instead of being regarded as assets in the United States housing system, ultimately the projects have largely been mired in notoriety. In this respect, the projects are iconoclastic Americana – an aspect of American life whose existence was contrary to the nation’s values and beliefs.

Addressing the deplorable physical conditions that have subsequently come to define the projects has been a central aim of the HOPE VI program. The program also seeks to address the pervasive experience of economic and social isolation long associated with public neighborhoods. Janet Smith summarizes the goals of the HOPE VI initiative as follows:

...To transform public housing by changing its physical space (i.e., buildings, site plans, scale) ...lessening concentrations of poverty by placing public housing in non-poverty neighborhoods and promoting mixed-income communities, and forging partnerships with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses to leverage support and resources (2006:32).

The implicit assumption of these objectives is that achieving them will improve the habitability of public neighborhoods. Comprehensively assessing habitability, however, requires that consideration be given to the role that non-housing amenities play in defining public neighborhoods. Such an analysis has the potential to facilitate a greater understanding of the extent to which the remediation of the material context that has historically defined public neighborhoods (i.e., economic desolation and the absence of non-housing economic amenities) has been achieved as a consequence of policy reform.

In 1947 Louis Wirth argued that the inequality that emerges between places is defined largely by housing. Comprehensive appraisal of the material context of place, however, must also concede the effect that limited non-housing amenities demonstrate on place. Thus far, evaluation of the efficacy of the HOPE VI program has paid little attention to understanding how non-housing amenities have been shaped within the context of public housing reform. This omission reduces the potential for policy to rectify historic divides that distinguish poor places from non-poor places. This is to say that the success of transforming public neighborhoods rests not only on the remediation of their housing stock and gains in the economic capacity of its constituency, but also in the neighborhood's ability to demonstrate an agentic economic development.

The data in this study indicate that the development of non-housing amenities within a transforming neighborhood has experienced little change, in spite of the eradication of the traditional public housing that has occupied place. Understanding why the development of non-housing amenities is not occurring has crucial implications for the long-term sustainability of transforming communities.

Undeniably, the development of non-housing economic amenities like retail and grocery stores are contingent upon numerous economic indicators and processes – those factors that provide the most predictive power of the financial success of that type of development venture including market demand, economic feasibility of land development, and the economic capacity of a development area. Arguably, the social processes that work to define places also exact an influence; factors such as the social identity and social valuation of place ostensibly contribute to the economic development of place.

The HOPE VI program, with its emphasis on the remediation of housing stock and the simultaneous development of mixed-income housing, however, serves as an artificial impetus for the development of the pervasively stagnated market in traditional public neighborhoods. That is, increases in demands for new markets within neighborhoods are being constructed through policy; policy is providing a context wherein new markets are being created inorganically. The policy arguably serves as an impetus for introducing new forms of economic growth to areas because by its design, it has the ability to produce a new social and economic space that allows for the entry of new forms of economic a context for business development market indicators to change.

These arguments aside, the persistence of slow economic growth of non-housing economic amenities in transforming areas must be a consideration for policy advocates. A central goal of the HOPE VI reform is to increase the habitability of these neighborhoods – in part through the integration of non-poor residents. William Julius Wilson has demonstrated that it is this group of people who maintain the greatest

flexibility in their housing options, however. Therefore, their dissatisfaction with the area's amenities may become a predictive factor determining the permanence of their residence. Potentially then, the availability of non-housing amenities can be a determinant of the effectiveness of the mixed-housing dynamic. Should the new non-poor residents choose to leave their new homes in favor of areas with greater local access to non-housing amenities, the potential for the reemergence of patterns of social and economic isolation remain a real and predictable outcome.

In his discussion of public housing reform, Peter Drier has argued that HUD lacks the power to undertake the task of neighborhood change by itself. He maintains that the effort must include the participation of multiple federal players including the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Labor Department and the Commerce Department. This position intimates that the structural interceding of housing is not enough to address place-based poverty and inequality. While housing remains a basic need that must be satisfied, it cannot shoulder the responsibility for returning poor communities to economic health. Effective policy must recognize the significance of addressing the comprehensive neighborhood context. The pervasive patterns of disenfranchisement and social isolation experienced within traditional public neighborhoods require that such comprehensive action be integrated into housing policy decisions.

APPENDIX A:
SITE DESIGNATION CATEGORIES FOR
THE CHICAGO HOUSING AUTHORITY'S (CHA)
PLAN FOR TRANSFORMATION

Table 10
Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) Plan for Transformation Site Designation Categories

New Mixed Income Housing Developments	Orchard Park
	Mohawk North
	North Town Village
	Renaissance North
	Old Town Square
	Kenwood Oakland
	Hearts United (The Quincy and the Langston)
Family Properties to be Redeveloped/ Mixed Income Communities	Adams, Brooks, Loomis, Abbott (ABLA)
	Cabrini Green
	Henry Horner
	Lakefront Properties
	Rockwell Gardens
	Stateway Gardens
	Robert Taylor
	Ida B. Wells
	Madden Park/Damen
	Raymund Hilliard
Family Properties to be Rehabilitated	Algeld Gardens
	Bridgeport Homes
	Cabrini Extension
	Lake Parc
	Lawndale
	Trumbull
	Frank Lowden
	Wentworth Gardens
Family Properties to be Rehabbed or Redeveloped	Dearborn Homes
	Harold Ickes
	Julia Lathrop
	Lawndale Complex
	LeClaire Courts Extension
	Washington Park
City and State Properties/Project-based Section 8	Harrison Courts
	Lathrop Courts
	LeClaire Courts
	Loomis Courts
	Maplewood Courts
	Ogden Courts
	Prairie Courts

APPENDIX B:
SUMMARY TABLE OF
CLOTHING AND SPECIALTY RETAIL BUSINESS-TYPES

Table 11
2000-2006 Clothing and Specialty Retail Business-Types

Clothing	Specialty
Men's Clothing	Meat markets
Women's Clothing	Fish and Seafood markets
Children and Infant Clothing	Confectionaries
Family Clothing	Other food specialties
Clothing Accessories	Optical goods
Other Clothing	Health food stores
Shoe stores	Other health stores
Jewelry stores	Hobby, toy, game stores
Luggage and leather goods	Sewing, needlework stores
Sporting goods	Musical instrument/supplies
	Bookstores
	Tape, CD and record stores
	Discount department stores
	Department stores
	Warehouse clubs
	Other general merchandise
	Florists
	Office supplies
	Gift novelty
	Used merchandise
	Pet supplies
	Art dealers
	Electronics
	Other direct selling/miscellaneous

REFERENCE LIST

- Anderson, Kay. 1987. "The Idea of Chinatown: The Power of Place and Institutional Practice in the Making of a Racial Category." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 77, No. 4, pgs. 580-598.
- Bratt, Rachel G., Michael E. Stone, & Chester Hartman. 2006. *Why a Right to Housing is Needed and Makes Sense: Editor's Introduction*. In *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda*, Introduction. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Breunlin, Rachel and Helen A. Regis. 2006. "Putting the Ninth Ward on the Map: Race, Place, and Transformation in Desire, New Orleans." *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 108, No. 4, pgs. 744-764.
- Buron, Larry. 2004. "An Improved Living Environment?: Neighborhood Outcomes for HOPE VI Relocates". *Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center, The Urban Institute*, Brief No. 3.
- Clampet-Lundquist, Susan. 2004. "Moving Over or Moving Up: Short-Term Gains and Losses for Relocated HOPE VI Families". *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pg. 57-80.
- Comey, Jennifer. 2004. "An Improved Living Environment?: Housing Quality Outcomes for HOPE VI Relocates". *Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center, The Urban Institute*, Brief No. 3.
- Cummings, Scott L. 2001. "Community Economic Development as Progressive Politics: Toward a Grassroots Movement for Economic Justice". *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 54, No. 3, pg. 399-493.
- Dreier, Peter. 2006. *Federal Housing Subsidies: Who Benefits and Why?* In *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda*, Chapter 5. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Duggan, Lisa. 2003. *The Twilight of Equality: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Epp, Gayle. 1998. *New Directions in Urban Public Policy*. Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey, Chapter 7: Emerging Strategies for Revitalizing Public Housing Communities.
- Feenberg, Andrew. 2005. "Critical Theory of Technology: An Overview". *Tailoring Biotechnologies*, Vol.1, Issue 1, Winter, pages 47-64.
- Gieryn, Thomas F. 2000. "A Space for Place in Sociology". *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 26, pg. 463-496.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hirsch, Arnold R. 2000. "Searching for a 'Sound Negro Policy': A Racial Agenda for the Housing Acts of 1949 and 1954." *Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 11, No. 2, pgs. 393-441.
- Kodras, Janet E. 1997. "The Changing Map of American Poverty in an Era of Economic Restructuring and Political Realignment". *Economic Geography*, Vol. 73, No. 1, pg. 67-93.
- Marcuse, Peter. 1998. *New Directions in Urban Public Policy*. Rutgers: The State University of New Jersey, Chapter 2: Mainstreaming Public Housing: A Proposal for a Comprehensive Approach to Housing Policy.
- Merrifield, Andrew. 1993. "Place and space: Lefebvrian Reconciliation." *Transactions of the British Institute of Geographers*, Vol. 18, pgs. 516-531.
- Merrifield, Andrew. 1993. "The Struggle Over Place: Redeveloping American Can in Southeast Baltimore." *Transactions of the British Institute of Geographers*, Vol. 18, pgs. 102-121.
- Nyden, Philip, Edlynn, Emily and Julie Davis. 2006. "Differential Impact of Gentrification on Communities in Chicago," Executive summary issued to the City of Chicago Commission on Human Relations. January 2006.
- Pattillo, Mary. 2007. *Black on the Block: The Politics of Race and Class in the City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Popkin, Susan J, Diane K. Levy, Laura E. Harris, Jennifer Comey, Mary K. Cunningham & Larry Buron. 2002. "*Hope VI Panel Study: Baseline Report*." Final report. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

- Popkin, Susan, Diane K. Levy, Laura E. Harris, Jennifer Comey, Mary K. Cunningham & Larry Buron. 2004. "The HOPE VI Program: What about the Residents?" *Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 15, Issue 2, pg. 385- 414.
- Popkin, Susan J., Bruce Katz, Mary K. Cunningham, Karen Brown, Jeremy Gustafson and Margery A. Turner. 2004. "A Decade of HOPE VI: Research Findings and Policy Challenges." Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.
- Shlay, Anne B. 1995. "Housing in the Broader Context in the United States". *Housing Policy Debate*, Vol. 6, Issue 3, pg. 695-720.
- Smith, Janet L. 2006 a. *Where are Poor People to Live?* Chapter 1: Public Housing Transformation: Evolving National Policy.
- Smith, Janet L. 2006 b. *Where are Poor People to Live?* Chapter 10: Mixed-Income Communities: Designing out Poverty or Pushing out the Poor.
- Smith, Robin E. 2002. "Housing Choice for HOPE VI Relocatees". The Urban Institute, Final Report.
- Stone, Michael E. 2006. *Pernicious Problems of Housing Finance*. In *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Tilly, Chris 2006. *The Economic Environment of Housing: Income Inequality and Insecurity In A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Vale, Lawrence J. 2002. *Reclaiming Public Housing: A Half Century of Struggle in Three Public Neighborhoods*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wilson, William J. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass and Public Policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Wirth, Louis. 1947. "Housing as a Field of Sociological Research." *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pgs. 137-143.
- Zhang, Yan and Gretchen Weismann. 2006. *Where are Poor People to Live?* Chapter 2: Public Housing's Cinderella: Policy Dynamics of HOPE VI in the Mid-1990

VITA

Crystal Jackson is a native of Louisville, Kentucky. Before attending Loyola University Chicago, she attended the University of Louisville, where she earned a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology. She also attended the University of Detroit Mercy, where she received a Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology.

While at Loyola, Crystal has received a Merit Award from the Department of Sociology and the Graduate School. As a doctoral student, Crystal's areas of interest are Race and Ethnic Studies, Social Policy and Urban Sociology.

THESIS APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Crystal L. Jackson has been read and approved by the following committee:

Philip Nyden, Ph.D., Director
Professor of Sociology
Loyola University Chicago

David G. Embrick, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Sociology
Loyola University Chicago

Japonica Brown-Saracino, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Sociology
Loyola University Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Date

Director's Signature

Crystal L. Jackson

Loyola University Chicago

THE REDEVELOPMENT OF PLACE IN THE URBAN CONTEXT:

AN EVALUATION OF NON-HOUSING ECONOMIC CHANGE

IN A

TRANSFORMING PUBLIC HOUSING NEIGHBORHOOD ABSTRACT

At the turn of the twenty-first century the pervasive unsuitability of living conditions within many public housing projects facilitated the enactment of the HOPE VI program, the most recent reform in public housing policy. While increasing the habitability of traditional public neighborhoods arguably has been an overarching goal of the HOPE VI intervention, research has not widely considered the extent to which the program may have facilitated the development of non-housing amenities in transforming neighborhoods. The goal of this study is to consider the extent to which non-housing economic amenities have been developed in a transforming Chicago neighborhood targeted for HOPE VI intervention. The data indicate that while the transforming public housing neighborhood has experienced moderate increases in household economic capacity, commiserate changes in the development of non-housing economic amenities remain weak. Implications the patterns of non-housing development have for the local health of the transforming neighborhood are additionally discussed.

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

THE REDEVELOPMENT OF PLACE IN THE URBAN CONTEXT:

AN EVALUATION OF NON-HOUSING ECONOMIC CHANGE

IN A

TRANSFORMING PUBLIC HOUSING NEIGHBORHOOD

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

PROGRAM IN SOCIOLOGY

BY

CRYSTAL L. JACKSON

DIRECTOR: PHILIP NYDEN, PH.D.

CHICAGO, IL

DECEMBER 2009