HARRISON WEST:
A CASE STUDY OF GENTRIFICATION AND ECONOMIC AND RACIAL INTEGRATION

A Thesis
Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Master of City and Regional Planning in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By
Sierk Hendrik Braam, B.A.

*****

The Ohio State University
1996

Master’s Examination Committee:
Dr. Hazel Morrow-Jones, Adviser
Dr. Dale F. Bertsch

Approved by

Department of City and Regional Planning
Harrison West has felt the forces of gentrification through the concerted effort of a single large scale developer. Through community pressure and a law suit, the developer was forced to maintain some subsidized housing, housing for the elderly, and low-income housing. This thesis examines the theoretical benefits for those not displaced, and, whether this neighborhood, 20 years later, is an economically and racially integrated neighborhood even though it has been gentrified.
Dedicated to Carla Van Sittard
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my adviser Dr. Hazel Morrow-Jones for her enthusiasm and intellectually stimulating seminars, not to mention her patience in correcting errors in this thesis.

I am grateful for the support and listening ear of my dear friend Clare Ross who has been an inspiration to me for years and was a fantastic help in finding material for my literature review.
VITA

1991.................B.A. Sculpture, University of Oregon.
1994-present........Graduate Research Associate, The Ohio State University. Intern at the Clintonville Area Commission.

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: City and Regional Planning
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract......................................................................... ii
Dedication....................................................................... iii
Acknowledgments.............................................................. iv
Vita.................................................................................. v
List of Tables.................................................................... viii
List of Figures.................................................................... ix

Chapters:  

1. Introduction................................................................. 1
2. Literature Review......................................................... 5
   2.1 Effects of Gentrification on Incumbent Residents........... 5
   2.2 The Poverty Spiral.................................................... 10
   2.3 The Potential Benefits of Gentrification on Racial and Economic Integration........... 13
   2.4 Gentrification and the Incumbent Poor......................... 20
   2.5 The Hurdles of Gentrification With Regard to Integration.................................... 23
3. Harrison West............................................................... 26
   3.1 Harrison West’s History and Gentrification............... 26
   3.2 Data Analysis......................................................... 38
3.3 Description and Discussion of Harrison West

4. Possibilities for Policy Making

5. Conclusion

Appendix

Tables one through three

Tables four through eight

Bibliography
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Educational Attainment 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Labor Force Characteristics 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Income and Poverty 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Year Housing Unit Was Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Year Household Moved Into Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gross Rent as % of Household Income 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Median House Values 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Median House Values for 1980 and 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Map of Harrison West and surrounding neighborhoods</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Map of Harrison West Census Tracts</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Victorian style house on Neil Avenue</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Typical OMC infill housing</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subsidized housing for the elderly</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Typical OMC infill housing</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Market rate rental housing</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Map of poverty and subsidized housing concentration</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Graph of 1990 educational characteristics</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Graph of 1980 labor force characteristics</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Graph of 1990 labor force characteristics</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Graph of 1990 labor force characteristics for Harrison West and Franklin county</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Graph of 1990 poverty characteristics for Harrison West and Franklin county</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Graph of 1990 female headed household characteristics in Harrison West</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Graph of black population in 1980 and 1990</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Graph of median house values in 1990</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Map of median house values in 1990</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Subsidized housing</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Market rate housing</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Recently built subsidized housing</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Typical infill housing built by OMC</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Map of 1990 black population concentrations</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Map of 1990 median household income</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Affordable housing in Harrison West</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Affordable housing in Harrison West</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Affordable housing in Harrison West</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Affordable housing in Harrison West</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>House undergoing renovation</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Recently renovated house</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Harrison West is a neighborhood in Columbus, Ohio which in the last fifteen years has seen tremendous changes. Through the concerted effort of a large scale developer the neighborhood has been transformed from a poor dilapidated white Appalachian neighborhood into a neighborhood of professors, professionals, and other affluent and well educated people. Harrison West has been gentrified.

Though many people have been displaced by the forces of gentrification, the neighborhood has retained some low-income and subsidized housing. A study of related literature will determine whether there are any benefits to be derived from gentrification for poor and working class residents of a neighborhood. Race, income and education are all determinants of a neighborhood’s tolerance of diversity. Though Harrison West has retained some poor and low income
residents, these are not necessarily incumbent residents; they may have moved from other parts of the city. The intent of this study is not to disprove the displacement which occurred in Harrison West. This study is interested in finding out the extent of the racial and economic integration of Harrison West. This thesis will determine what types of people are willing to invest in a gentrifying neighborhood which retains some low-income and subsidized housing. The study will determine the types of jobs the gentrifiers hold, their income, and their level of education. When studied in light of relevant literature this may indicate the level of tolerance the gentrifiers have for a racially and economically mixed neighborhood and the benefits the less fortunate may derive from a gentrified neighborhood.

The policy ramifications of this study could be very useful to many American cities. The study of Harrison West will reveal a level of diversity in income and race which does not hinder investment by the more affluent in a neighborhood. In the future, a city which sees its neighborhoods gentrify and people displaced will have figures which can help in controlling the displacement and gentrification to the benefit of all.
Gentrification has been a powerful force in many American cities since the 1950’s. Many poor and minority groups have been displaced by the process. This thesis attempts to answer the question of whether gentrification can occur while the neighborhood retains its less affluent population. The results of the case study will reveal the proportions with regard to the racial and economic make up of a gentrifying neighborhood and the effect this has on the continuation of the gentrification process. Harrison West shows us to what extent the gentrifiers will tolerate differences in income and race and continue to invest in a neighborhood. The results of the study have important implications for policy regarding urban renewal, gentrification, and racial and economic integration.

A review of literature on the subject defines what constitutes an integrated neighborhood, and poses some arguments as to why economic and racial integration may be desirable. There are many elements which lead to a diverse and integrated neighborhood and the benefits which are derived from such a neighborhood. This paper will illustrate those as they relate to the subject.

One cannot discuss gentrification without addressing issues of race, poverty, and displacement. In this thesis I will
highlight the social and psychological benefits of integrating the poor into economically stable mixed income neighborhoods. Since poor and low-income families are already present in gentrifying neighborhoods, integration should not need to involve moving them from elsewhere. The analysis involves examining census data at the tract and the block group level. A comparison of income, education, race, and housing characteristics to standards set by the literature will help illustrate the level to which the study area is economically and racially integrated. The results, when compared to national figures and when compared to the local county level statistics, will also determine whether it is indeed racially and economically diverse. Census data will be examined in light of studies which discuss education, income, and race with regard to integration. Studies have also shown that labor force characteristics can be used to determine tolerance of racial and economic diversity (Galster and Killen 1995; Fossett and Kielcolt 1989; Wilson 1994). Finally the thesis concludes with a discussion of the policy implications of the results.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 EFFECTS OF GENTRIFICATION ON INCUMBENT RESIDENTS

The popular press has perceived gentrification as a hot topic and has commonly misrepresented those affected by displacement as primarily poor African Americans. Such assertions bring the issue of race into the discussion in a volatile way by making gentrification look like one more way in which the white population oppresses the black population. In fact, studies show that when displacement occurs through gentrification it is usually in predominantly white neighborhoods and that, in fact, gentrification proportionally displaces more whites than blacks (LeGates and Hartman 1986). The gentrifiers usually move from another location in the city, not from the suburbs as the “back to the city” movement and “urban-homesteading” movement imply (LeGates and Hartman 1995; Lang 1982). The gentrifiers have been described as “suburban-oriented young people who have chosen
to establish households in an urban setting” (Lang 1982:7). Often, the gentrifiers are people who may have moved to the city for education and have decided to stay in the city after graduation (Lang 1982).

Much of the popular and academic literature on gentrification fails to establish a clear working definition of the term. In the literature that does define gentrification there seems to be a great deal of inconsistency and disunity (Smith 1986; Beauregard 1986; Lang 1982; Cameron 1992). Since there is disagreement about the term, I will use a working definition of gentrification posed by Neil Smith and Peter Williams: “the rehabilitation of working-class and derelict housing and the consequent transformation of an area into a middle-class neighborhood” (Smith 1986:1).

There have been studies about which types of neighborhoods tend to gentrify, what types of people tend to be the ones responsible for the gentrification, where the gentrifiers come from and whether it causes displacement of the incumbent residents. Many people argue that gentrification causes displacement and inflicts hardships on the poor or working-class (already living in the neighborhood) and
generally benefits the in-moving middle-class (Beauregard 1986; LeGates and Hartman 1986; Cameron 1992). The hardships faced by those displaced through gentrification have been in the forefront of discussions concerning gentrification often enough that in 1979 HUD released a report with recommendations concerning gentrification. They proposed limits on how federal dollars could be used in revitalization projects where people might be displaced and encouraged local governments to ask HUD for technical support concerning such efforts (Lang 1982).

There are many components of gentrification which cause displacement of the poor and working-class residents of a neighborhood. The most important is the increased cost of housing. This can take the form of increased rent, or increases in property values making it more difficult to pay property taxes and more difficult to keep or buy a house. Often in gentrifying neighborhoods subdivided houses that had contained several low rent units, are converted back to their original one or two unit form. The restored larger units command higher prices and diminish the number of rental units available. The scarcity thus created compounds the rent problem because the resulting increased competition
for a diminishing number of rental units drives the rents up.

Michael Lang describes gentrification as "private-capital-induced development in formerly lower income areas that results in a pattern of higher rents and land and house values" (Lang 1982:8). These higher rents and land values obviously cause some to be displaced, however the resulting move often occurs within the original neighborhood (LeGates and Harman 1995). Often as gentrification proceeds, people are displaced several times as the higher rents and land values force them closer to the fringes of the gentrifying neighborhood or area.

LeGates and Hartman found that the people displaced by gentrification are usually blue-collar workers or low level clerical workers and that a large number are also unemployed or on welfare. They were surprised to discover that middle-class professionals were among those being displaced (LeGates and Hartman 1995:189). Studies by LeGates and Hartman also revealed that there is a misconception that those who are displaced are forced to relocate far from their original neighborhood.
There have also been numerous studies of how displacement contributes to a destruction of the social fabric and how this does incredible psychological harm to those displaced (Abramson 1995). The loss of community weakens the built-in safety net which provides social structure and support among poor residents (Abramson 1995). This leads to my primary argument for racial, social, and economic integration along with gentrification. Gentrification may actually be able to spur increased integration into the economic and social mainstream. The benefits of such integration can be significant for the poor and working class who remain in gentrifying neighborhoods.
2.2 THE POVERTY SPIRAL

Gentrification often occurs in dilapidated ethnic neighborhoods of the working-class and the poor. These neighborhoods are often isolated by their poverty and this type of isolation and segregation of the poor leads to many social problems. The neighborhoods often have high (school) drop out rates and they may face crime and drug problems. High unemployment and the lack of positive adult role models can subvert the best home training. These reinforce images of negative self-worth and perpetuate the downward spiral into indefinite poverty (Abramson 1995; Galster and Mikelsons 1995; Rosenbaum 1995; Galster and Hill 1992; Handy 1993; McNight 1989; Wilson 1994; Leigh and Mitchell 1988). Racial and economic segregation often further isolates the poor from the non-poor causing increased misunderstanding, friction and contempt (Henderson 1995). Deterioration in infrastructure and concentrations of poverty and racial minorities lead to problems including those related to social and economic isolation. An integrated neighborhood can provide a positive environment in which social norms are more easily transferred and the healthier environment provides benefits to the residents (Galster and Killen 1995; Vidal 1995; Rosenbaum 1995; Wilson 1994). If such
integration can be promoted during gentrification it may create a win-win situation. Gentrified neighborhoods could then act as neighborhood role models encouraging more integration in all parts of a metropolitan area.

Galster and Killen note that the risk of young people dropping out of school and getting into trouble increases when a neighborhood lacks professional and managerial workers. In their analysis, the risk increases for black and white teens when the percentage of middle-class residents drops below 3.5 percent. According to Galster and Killen’s definition, neighborhoods tend to be detrimental for youth when the high school drop-out rate for students is higher than 40%, when more than 40% of the households in a neighborhood are headed by single mothers, and when 10% or less of the people with jobs are professionals or managers. ‘Good’ neighborhoods, according to Galster and Killen are those where fewer than 10% of the households are headed by single mothers, at least 40% of the employed population of the neighborhood work in professional or managerial fields and there is a 10% or less drop out rate. Their study went on to say that youth growing up in ‘good’ neighborhoods were 52% less likely to drop out of high school and that the mean years of education would be increased by 6% in these ‘good’
neighborhoods (Galster and Killen 1995:31). If
gentrification can help equalize opportunity by bringing in
positive role models and improving the overall level of
education and income of a neighborhood, then gentrification
brings benefits to those who are not displaced. The extent
to which this balances the damage to those who are displaced
remains open to question.
2.3 THE POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF GENTRIFICATION AND RACIAL AND ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

Though displacement causes hardship to those affected, to those who remain in a gentrifying neighborhoods there may be significant benefits. Gentrifiers can provide access to job information and thus create a social information network based in the community. Increased economic stability can provide a positive environment where the poor may thrive.

Gentrification can provide positive role models the disenfranchised and for poor youth. The benefits of a more solid economic base can sustain more resources for the neighborhood and thus the remaining poor. This implies that contrary to all the arguments posed about the negative effects of gentrification on the poor, there may be some benefit derived from gentrification for the poor if we can maintain a mix of subsidized and low-income housing in gentrifying neighborhoods. Vidal and Abramson argue that programs should in fact attract the non-poor into poor neighborhoods through community redevelopment programs, essentially sponsoring gentrification. (Vidal 1995; Abramson 1995; Ostberg 1996:1).
One of the benefits which the remaining poor receive in a
gentrified or economically integrated neighborhood is an
improvement of services. Vidal speaks of a study done by
Bendick and Egan in 1991:

One symptom of economically distressed inner-city
areas is a dearth of retail and service business,
particularly stores such as chain supermarkets.
Minority shopping areas, in particular, generally
have fewer and more limited variety of stores than
nonminority neighborhoods, and these stores are
more often marginal establishments offering a
limited range of goods, lower quality goods,
higher prices, less customer service, less
attractive shopping environments, and higher
credit costs. (p. 7) (Vidal 1995; 206)

There have been many studies on the higher cost of foods in
inner-city super markets as compared to suburban
supermarkets. The reason often given by supermarket chains
is that inner-city leases and land costs are higher,
delivery costs are higher and costs of goods have to be
higher to cover increased theft. Supermarkets also often
claim that people in the inner city make multiple trips, the
result for the supermarket is increased labor cost because
people make multiple small cost purchases. However, the
increased density of the city and the multiple small trips
might actually result in more total sales. Though an inner-
city neighborhood may be comprised largely of the poor and
working-class, the sheer density of city neighborhoods is
such that their aggregate purchasing power is substantial.
During the gentrification of Victorian Village and Harrison West, the local supermarket was completely rebuilt. I shopped at this supermarket before and after the rebuilding. Not only did the prices of goods come down and the selection increase, the new store also employs more people, thus providing more jobs. You would think that an increase in hiring costs because of more employees would have increased the costs of goods. It did not. The store now has many more loyal customers from the surrounding neighborhood; people who used to drive elsewhere to do their shopping now shop at the new supermarket. Low-income people have benefited from the improved services and lower prices and according to the New York City Department of City Planning, the medium sized inner-city supermarkets have no harmful effect of any note on existing ‘mom and pop’ shops (Vidal 1995). A study by the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs found that middle class and affluent zip code areas in Manhattan had 43% more supermarkets for every thousand people than poor neighborhoods (Vidal 1995;207). As Harrison West and Victorian Village became more affluent, the supermarket was improved and the incumbent residents received the benefit of this.

Vidal goes on to say that the:
...development of both housing and strategically selected neighborhood convenience shopping facilities can have an important stabilizing influence on neighborhoods, anchoring the community and, in extreme cases, helping to reestablish functioning housing and commercial markets. (Vidal 1995:222)

In the case of Harrison West, gentrification has indeed contributed to a better housing stock and better services as we will see in the empirical analysis. As long as the neighborhood remains somewhat economically diverse, the poor and low-income people who remain in the neighborhood benefit from the improved services and a more stable community.

An influx of money from community development corporations and city government may help neighborhoods attract the middle-class. The increased diversity (if low-income people remain) will create a stable network and connections to the labor force (Vidal 1995:224). Encouraging people with moderate and higher incomes to move into a neighborhood, to ‘gentrify’ may help provide an atmosphere conducive to positive social change and a system of role models. These ideas have been discussed by Rosenbaum, the participants of the Gautreaux program, William Julius Wilson, and many others.
Before turning to this literature, it is important to note that discussions of integration often limit themselves to issues of race, specifically black poverty. Though many lessons can be learned from these it must be kept in mind that poor whites are also often socially isolated and stigmatized, thus, when I discuss issues of poverty, race and integration as it relates to the black condition, much of the discussion also applies to integration of the non-black poor. (Though whites don’t carry the automatic marker which causes immediate differential treatment.)

In the Gautreaux program housing vouchers were given to people wanting to move out of the “Projects’ in Chicago. It came about through a 1976 lawsuit against HUD with regard to the placement and density of its public housing projects in Chicago. Those on waiting lists for public housing since 1981 are given Section 8 housing vouchers allowing them to move to the suburbs, which are predominantly white, or to other inner-city working-class Chicago neighborhoods. The program is a lottery system of sorts, and the people have no choice in whether they go to the suburbs or remain in the city, if they are not happy with their assignment they go to the bottom of the list and wait for better luck the next
time their case comes up. As can be imagined, few take this risk as the waiting time is extremely long (Rosenbaum 1995).

The program provided an interesting opportunity for a study of racial and economic integration. Those moving out of the projects were moved to locations with much more stable middle-class social networks and established norms. The move out of the projects provided the participants with better access to jobs, education and neighborhoods not riddled with crime, drugs and desperation. The program attempted to avoid moving people out by themselves in complete isolation, instead it tried to move several households to the same neighborhood to provide participants in the program with support in the transition. The program also attempted to avoid saturating a neighborhood with too many participants of the program so as not to tip the balance of stability and cause clashes between incumbent residents and the newcomers (Rosenbaum 1995).

The Gautreaux program has produced some very interesting results. Though not all of the results of the study are relevant to my particular topic, there are some interesting side effects of having the very poor integrate themselves into middle-class and working-class neighborhoods, whether
urban or suburban. Many of the adults interviewed in the
Gautreaux program spoke of being more motivated to find work
and keep it when they were surrounded by the positive role
models of their neighbors, all of whom had jobs. “Gautreaux
adults reported that they felt that they too could have
jobs, and they wanted to try” (Rosenbaum 1995;239). This
implies that similar results could be achieved in a
neighborhood which gentrifies without total displacement.
Gentrification could actually have positive effects for
those poor who remain in the neighborhood in well integrated
subsidized or low-income housing. The best balance of
middle class and poor remains an open question, but the
literature on Gautreaux certainly provides potential
solutions to the cycle of the poverty problem.
2.4 GENTRIFICATION AND THE INCUMBENT POOR

As we have seen, there are many reasons to help the poor remain in gentrifying neighborhoods (Galster and Killen 1995; Galster and Hill 1992; Wilson 1994). Integrating the poor into a more mainstream middle class environment may help alleviate the pessimism of the poor created by their hopeless environments. Role models and improved services may motivate the poor to find better housing conditions and jobs. Often, in poor dilapidated environments, where society has given up its responsibilities to human dignity, only the government has stepped in with its impersonal and sterile solutions. There is a kind of dependence and passivity on the part of recipients when the government has acted as an intermediary in their lives. Because many recipients of government housing and welfare have never searched for housing on their own, they may be unwilling or unable to go out and look for better accommodation in the private housing market. Many end up dropping out of the various programs (Leigh and Mitchell 1988). An improved positive integrated environment may help people find solutions to their housing and economic problems without having to rely too heavily on the government and its impersonal solutions.
Often, Section 8 housing and public housing are in areas where it is difficult for people to get to jobs and transportation, in addition to problems with goods and services. Section 8 housing becomes concentrated in such areas because communities receiving Section 8 and public housing are often neighborhoods which already contain low cost units eligible for Section 8 housing. This is because politicians want to avoid the political battles involved with moving low-income households them into more affluent (not necessarily rich) neighborhoods.

Leigh and Mitchell point out that the Congressional mandate of the CDBG program is to promote and increase the diversity of neighborhoods, to reduce isolation of income groups, to deconcentrate low-income housing, to encourage the revitalization of neighborhoods and to attract higher income residents into poor neighborhoods (Leigh and Mitchell 1988;124). Even though the federal government has stated that one of its goals is to deconcentrate low-income housing and to promote integration, this is seldom achieved in reality. The fact that public housing has been located in places which already have such units increases the segregation and concentration of race and poverty. Often
when people become tenants of public housing they are moved from more to less integrated neighborhoods (Leigh and Mitchell 1988).

In the case of Harrison West, there was quite a bit of low-income and subsidized housing present which made it easier to replace and maintain additional subsidized units in the neighborhood. Many of these have remained, even after gentrification, and contribute to an economically and racially integrated neighborhood.

Integration of gentrifying neighborhoods can help ease the stigma of poverty. Instead of having the poor live in segregated isolated communities or in the utilitarian and often obvious architecture of public housing, they can live in a mixed income neighborhood. This makes it more difficult for the public at large to lump the poor together in an amorphous blob which can be ignored because of its impersonal identity, or derided because of its poor housing and bad neighborhoods.
2.5 THE HURDLES OF GENTRIFICATION WITH REGARD TO INTEGRATION

In trying to put too many local and federal regulations on gentrification, we may in fact stunt the process of gentrification and the benefits it can bring a neighborhood and a city. With many cities across the country facing a declining inner-city population and an accompanied decline in revenue and a concentration of poverty, the cities are losing political clout which further exacerbates the problem. Rebuilding the inner-city with private and public funds through gentrification may be one of the few ways we can slow or maybe even halt the decline. One of the hurdles we face is preconceived notions about the gentrifiers. Will they invest in a neighborhood which is racially and economically integrated? Will they invest in a neighborhood which will remain economically and racially integrated (Fossett and Kielcolt 1989)? Will the gentrifiers continue to invest in a neighborhood if there is subsidized housing in it? Will they buy a house across the street from Section 8 or low-income housing?

The middle-class has been influenced in many ways by the popular press. This influence has caused many to abandon
the inner-city for the homogeneity of the suburbs. This perception of the inner city as a ‘ghetto’ to be avoided at all costs only accelerates the outflow of capital and increases the isolation and stigmatization of those who cannot afford to leave for lack of transportation, money or jobs.

The press has also had a role in changing images of public housing. In the 1960’s the perception of public housing started to change, until then it had been viewed as a spring board for those with bad luck to move into mainstream society, but that started to change and public housing began to be viewed as high-rise drug infested african american ghettos housing the permanently lazy. The press started portraying negative images of public housing projects, especially the large high-rise projects of the 1950’s.

This image--projects overrun by African-American children--became a dominant motif in the public imagination, though overlooked and unremarked was the fact that residential suburbs also teemed with children, except they were neither poor nor African-American.....A contemporary housing scholar, Lawrence Friedman, noted this general trend, arguing that ‘most of the noisy criticism’ was ‘directed at the big urban projects’ and that ‘small-town and suburban projects’ did not ‘deserve to be tarred with the same brush.’ The periodical press, however, neither reported nor heeded Friedman’s advice (Henderson 1995; p.36,37).
Unfortunately this tainted image of anything even remotely resembling subsidized housing still remains with us today and often makes integration of the disadvantaged difficult because they are perceived as a threat to the more affluent. An article written in the *US News and World Report* in 1971 captioned a photograph of “three African American teenagers with a statement by President Nixon: ‘Public housing will not be imposed on any community.’” (Henderson 1995; p.41) The perception that public housing is only for African Americans and that it is always overrun by teenage criminals has not improved since 1971.
CHAPTER 3

HARRISON WEST

3.1 HARRISON WEST’S HISTORY AND GENTRIFICATION

Harrison West is an old city neighborhood in Columbus, Ohio. It is located approximately one-half mile north of the CBD and about one-half mile south of The Ohio State University campus (see fig. 1). It is bounded on the west by the Olentangy River, on the north by the Fifth King neighborhood (also know as the Circles neighborhood), on the east by Victorian Village, and on the south by Thurber Village, which was originally known as the “Flytown” area (Thompson 1981).

The Harrison West Society defines its boundaries as follows: The northern boundary is West Fifth Avenue, its eastern boundary is Harrison Street, its southern boundary is West First Avenue, and its western boundary is the Olentangy River. These are official boundaries subject to the political divisions of the city. I believe that the
Figure 1: A map showing the area and neighborhoods which surround Harrison West.
neighborhood is more accurately described as extending one block further east to Neil Avenue and a block south to Buttles. The reason is that Neil Avenue is a major North-South street and such an artery usually defines a neighborhood more accurately because it takes a physical boundary into account; Fifth and Buttles Avenues are also physical boundaries, and the Olentangy River is certainly a physical boundary. The reason the block-width stretch between Harrison Avenue and Neil Avenue is not technically part of Harrison West is that this street contains some significant pieces of Victorian Architecture and has therefore been officially absorbed by Victorian Village (see Fig. 3). This is done purely on an architectural basis and has little to do with the way neighborhood boundaries would function with regard to neighborhood interaction and the use of facilities. The stretch in question suffered the same decline after the 1930’s and the same forces of gentrification affecting Harrison West as a whole. The houses fronting Neil Avenue are only one lot deep, therefore everything which is not directly on Neil Avenue is a part of the Harrison West Neighborhood in my opinion. In my definition, Buttles street is the boundary at the southern end, separating the local supermarket and a retirement community from Harrison West (see fig. 2). It is actually
the supermarket and its parking lot which create a physical boundary, and therefore the southern edge of Harrison West. The boundaries of neighborhoods, with regard to their sense of community and social networks can never be as strict as politically drawn boundaries.

Figure 2: Harrison West tract map.

Under the argument stated above, roughly 80% of Harrison west falls within one census tract (tract 20). Harrison West is comprised of five census block groups. Four of these (B, C, D, and E) fall into Census Tract 20 and one of these (A) falls into Census Tract 18.2 (see fig. 2). I have included
one block group to the east and one block group to the south, these are block groups four and three respectively of census tract 20. These block groups have also improved along the same demographic lines as Harrison West. Though the census tries to design its tracts to cover neighborhoods the block group provides a much more accurate way to look at it.

Figure 3: A Victorian house on Neil Avenue, block group D.

Harrison West was developed primarily in the late 1800’s providing housing for the middle and working class employees of the industries which cropped up during that same period along the Olentangy River south of Third Avenue. Many who were employed by the railroads also lived in the area
Demand for middle-class housing in the area started to decline with the advent of the mass produced automobile of the 1920’s. People now had mobility to move away from the noise and pollution of the manufacturing plants which employed them. The area started to decline in the 1930’s with a property value drop of over 100% (Thompson 1981). There was an in-migration of poor minorities (primarily rural Appalachian) and single-family houses were converted to higher density multiple-family units (Thompson 1981).

In the early 1960’s, Battelle Memorial Institute, a privately established research organization, started acquiring vast amounts of property in Harrison West for future expansion. Properties were torn down and others were rented very cheaply. The properties were poorly maintained and in substandard condition. The low rents attracted low-income people into the neighborhood and this in effect depressed property values and made it a less desirable place to live. Battelle was block-busting for its future expansion (Rose 1982). Many home-owners were forced to put their properties on the market, at low prices, as they found the neighborhood becoming intolerable to live in. These lower property values, in turn, made it cheaper for Battelle
to acquire them. By the late 1970’s Battelle owned 60% of the property in a 28 block area of 100 acres. It had acquired 328 structures and 114 vacant lots (Rose 1982).

Battelle had acquired the property in anticipation of expansion, however, in 1974 Ohio’s Attorney General filed a lawsuit in the Court of Common Pleas of Franklin County halting Battelle’s plans. The suit alleged that Battelle was not conducting its business within the guidelines stipulated in the will of Gordon Battelle under which the Battelle Memorial Institute was established. Under the guidelines of the will, a certain percentage of Battelle’s profits were to go to philanthropic organizations promoting education and creative scientific research. To ensure that the institute complied with the intent of the will of Gordon Battelle, a Public Interest Test was set up. Under the conditions of the Public Interest Test, it was determined that Battelle was not complying with the will of Gordon Battelle because they were acquiring monetary gain from rental properties and landlordism. Having failed the Public Interest Test Battelle had to liquidate its land holdings, and therefore no longer had the capital nor the land for its planned expansion. The institution was stuck with large amounts of property it could no longer use. Under pressure
to relieve itself of the properties, Battelle decided to start a redevelopment corporation called Olentangy Management Company (OMC), Headed by Barry Humphries. This company was to rehabilitate properties and return them for a substantial profit to the market. The strategy was to gentrify the neighborhood surrounding Battelle.

The project was started in the late 1970’s and problems soon arose for the Olentangy Management Company. The redevelopment required the realignment of certain streets and other infrastructure improvements, this meant that they needed city funds in the redevelopment. In 1978 HUD awarded the city of Columbus two million dollars in Innovative Grant money. Much of this money was to be used in redeveloping Harrison West in conjunction with the Olentangy Management Company. However, later in the year, Washington ordered a stop on the release of the HUD funds pending an investigation as to how the funds were being used (Rose 1982). New HUD regulations stipulated that when federal funds were being used for community development, displaced residents would have to be relocated at a large expense to the developer. Residents had complained about the displacement caused by Olentangy Management Company and discrepancies in how OMC chose its tenants.
It was at this point that OMC made concessions for low-income housing, Section 8 housing, and tenant purchase plans. In 1979 HUD released funds for tenant assistance, but with continuing questionable behavior on the part of OMC it was not until late 1980 that HUD released the remaining capital improvement funds. This was only after OMC followed the federal regulations concerning relocation of those being displaced, including reimbursement for the costs of moving and finding an adequate place to live (Rose 1982). The plan called for a tenant purchase program, almost 80 houses for low- and moderate-income households and 33 units for elderly poor (see fig. 5). It encouraged the development of subsidized housing and offered to give relocation payments to those who were displaced (Bertsch 1984:56).

Robert Rose claims that between 1960 and 1970 the proportion of rental units increased from 63.7% to 73.8% (Rose 1982). Since the gentrification of Harrison West, that number has gone down to 59% of the total housing units. This can be viewed as a positive change, since Americans associate homeownership with neighborhood stability. However, a decrease in rental housing also means that the poor and low-income residents have less choice of housing.
Figure 4: Typical infill housing built by OMC, block group A.

An indication of the gentrification in Harrison West is the change in the median value of owner occupied housing. In the 1980 census, the median value of houses was 45% below the median for Franklin county as a whole. In 1990, the median housing value in Harrison West was roughly 5% higher than the median value for Franklin county. The median house value in Harrison West increased roughly 151% between 1980 and 1990, while the median house value in Franklin county increased only 56% in the same period (see appendix table
This is a strong indicator that Harrison West was being gentrified. Census data also indicates that the vast majority of people moved into the neighborhood after 1980.

Figure 5: Subsidized housing for the elderly. Block group B.

Figure 6: Typical infill housing built in Harrison West by OMC. The house on the far right is an old structure. These are all directly across the street from the subsidized housing for the elderly in figure 5. Block group A.
Figure 7: Market rate rental housing built by OMC, Block group A.
3.2 DATA ANALYSIS

I have collected census data on Harrison West concerning housing, labor force characteristics, poverty, and social characteristics. The variables were chosen to analyze and illustrate the level to which Harrison West is integrated racially and economically. Variables describing the make-up of the labor force and female headed households were used to compare to data in the literature. These variables describe the potential for integration.

This data was used to compare the individual block groups which comprise Harrison West. Harrison West is technically composed of two block groups in census tract 20, block groups five and six and one block group from census tract 18.2, block group five. As I explained earlier, I will also include block groups three and four. I do not include block groups one and two because these are east of Neil Avenue, the physical boundary I discussed previously. To the north of block group five in tract 20, is the neighborhoods fifth block group, a part of census tract 18.20. This block group lies south of West Fifth Avenue and I consider it part of the Harrison West Neighborhood. I will thus be using data from five different block groups.
For ease of discussion, I will refer to the block groups by capital letters. I will refer to block group five of census tract 18.2 as block group A. Block groups five and six, of census tract 20 will be referred to as block groups B and C respectively. Block groups three and four of the same tract will be referred to as block groups E and D respectively. I have lettered them roughly from north to south with block group A being the northernmost block group, E being the southernmost block group, and the exception of D which is an eastern block group running north-south (see fig. 2).

I examined 1990 and some 1980 census data to determine whether the neighborhood of Harrison West is a racially and economically integrated neighborhood. The results are considered in light of other studies on the determinants and benefits of racial and economic integration.

My definition of integration will be based on numbers given by Mark A. Fossett of Texas A&M University and Jill Kielcolt of Indiana University (Fosset and Kielcolt 1989). They have examined the racial make up of neighborhoods with regard to white resistance to blacks. Their studies show different levels of tolerance with regard to racial integration.
These levels of tolerance differ by gender, age, income and education of whites. These results will help illustrate the nature of the racial integration of Harrison west (Fossett and Kielcolt 1989). This will shed light on the nature of the racial, economic, and educational make up of Harrison west and whether the characteristics of Harrison West are conducive to integration and whether the poor and working-class derive any benefits from gentrification (Galster and Killen 1995). These studies will all be discussed in the context of arguments made by William Julius Wilson and Galster and Hill with regard to the possible benefits which the poor and working-class may derive from gentrification, from the influx of money, education and social structure conducive to survival in the context of American culture (Wilson 1994; Galster and Hill 1992).

To illustrate the integration, or lack there of, Harrison West will be compared to Franklin county as a whole and the country as a whole. The range of income within Harrison West, the poverty levels and the percent of subsidized households of Harrison West are also compared to county and national levels.
Data was collected for Harrison West, several nearby census tracts, Franklin county and the nation. I have selected census data on income and poverty, educational attainment, labor force characteristics, house values, racial make-up, the number of children in private schools, the number of female heads of households, and the years in which housing units were built. Most of the data I have used from the census is sample data. Though sample data can weaken the usefulness of analysis on the block group level, it was the only data available and is a reasonable description of the neighborhood. Significance tests and confidence intervals were not calculated as they would not have a significant impact on the results of this study. The only 100% count data distributed by the census which was useful in this analysis was the data on house values, rents, and the data on female headed households (Myers 1992:44).

As I have already discussed, Harrison West does not fall neatly into neighborhood political boundaries, nor does it fall neatly into one tract. In calculating figures for Harrison West, I looked at selected block groups only. In some situations I took averages of the block groups and in some situations I took median values. The choice was determined by what best described the overall character of
Harrison West and how it could be compared to the county and national level. In some situations I compare it to the overall data from the whole of Tract 20, but most of the time this comparison is irrelevant. In the analysis which follows it will be indicated whether the value given is an average (mean) or a median value.

Education has been determined to be an important factor in racial tolerance, not to mention the obvious benefits education provides. The level of education in Harrison West compares very favorably to the level of education in the county as a whole. The number of people with high school diplomas for Harrison West as a whole is 80%, this is only slightly lower than the figure for Franklin County which stands at 81%. The range within Harrison West is interesting to note though: block groups range from 60.3% to 89%. Block group B with only 60.3% high school graduates also happens to be the tract in which most of the subsidized housing is located, not an unexpected result (see Fig. 8). This same block group (Block group B) also has a lower median household income than all other block groups in Harrison West. Block group A with the highest level of high school education (89%) lies directly to the north of block
group B. This part of Harrison West has large Victorian style houses and high-end rental town houses (see fig. 9).

Figure 8: Concentration of poverty and subsidized housing in Harrison West.

Though the percentage of high school graduates for Harrison West was slightly lower than for the county as a whole, I was surprised to find that the percent of college educated people was much higher in Harrison West than in the county as a whole. Roughly 44% of the residents (over 25 years old) in Harrison West have a college education or higher (see Fig. 9). This is much higher than the percentage for Franklin County which is 26.6%, and much higher than the
national percentage which is 20.3%. I found it interesting that even the poorest and least educated block group was only slightly lower than the national average. The range in Harrison West is from roughly 19.3% in block group B (the poorest block group) to 69.2% in block group E in the southern end of the study area. The northern most block group A, which is the richest block group, has a college educated public running at 67%; this is in stark contrast to block group B, which lies directly to the south (19.3%). It is also interesting to note that block group E, which has the highest percentage of highly educated people has the lowest median family income level (not to be mistaken with median household income). Because of the proximity of these block groups to each other, these numbers become strong indicators of the level of integration in Harrison West.
It is interesting to compare education to labor force characteristics and income statistics. To illustrate the level of integration and diversity, block group B has the highest percentage of executives, administrators and managers living there (27%) even though is has the lowest level of college educated people. It also has the highest number of both households receiving public assistance (36%) and families below the poverty level (36%). The average number of executives, administrators, and managers for Harrison West is 17% compared to 15% for Franklin county (see Fig. 11 and 12). The range (of the percentage of employed persons over 16 working as executives,
administrators or managers) is from 11% in block group E, to 27% in block group B (the poorest least educated block group). Professional specialty occupations range from 32% in block group A and block group E, to 12% in block group C where most of the smaller and more affordable housing is located (see Figs. 23-28). Twenty one percent of the work force over 16 years old in block group B are in professional specialty occupations. The average for Harrison West (25%) is considerably higher than that for the Franklin County (16%). Unemployment in Harrison West ranges from 0% in block group E to 7% in block group C and D. This is interesting because block group D has some of the most expensive housing and neither block groups have the highest concentration of subsidized housing. The average unemployment rate for Harrison West is 5% which is the same as the unemployment rate for Franklin County. Note the changes in the labor make-up of Harrison West from 1980 to 1990 (see Fig. 10 and 11). This change can be taken as a strong indication that the neighborhood has gentrified since 1980.
Figure 10: Labor force characteristics for Harrison West in 1980.

Figure 11: Labor force characteristics for Harrison West in 1990.
Figure 12: Labor force characteristics.

Figure 13: A comparison of poverty characteristics between Harrison West and Franklin County.
Twelve percent of the families in Harrison West live below the poverty level, compared to 9% for Franklin County as a whole (see Fig. 13). The concentrations of poverty come as no surprise with regard to their location. They are in the block group with the most subsidized housing and the block group with the least expensive housing, block groups B and C respectively. Thirteen percent of the households in Harrison West receive public assistance compared to 7% for Franklin County. Most of this is also concentrated in block groups B and C.

The current political trends in the nation blame crime and poverty on the breakdown of the traditional two parent household. There has been a lot of blame put on poor single mothers with regard to evils of drugs and crime and a run-away welfare system. In Harrison West, Seventeen percent of the households are headed by single women with children under the age of eighteen (see Fig. 14). Thirteen percent of the these live below the poverty level and 23% of those below poverty have children under the age of eighteen. Though this doesn’t bode well in the eyes of the public, they live in a diverse, racially and economically integrated
neighborhood with many positive role models and good social services close by.

![Bar chart: Female Headed Households 1990](image)

**Figure 14:** Characteristics of female headed households in Harrison West.

Unfortunately, poverty is often associated not only with single motherhood, but also with the black population and lack of education. In Harrison West, the highest concentrations of single mothers, blacks and households receiving public assistance are concentrated in block group B. This block group also has the lowest levels of high school education. According to the 1990 census, the percentage of the black population of Harrison West overall is 14.1% (see
Fig. 15). The range is from 3.6% in block group E to 26.2% in block group B. Tract 20 as a whole has a 12.9% black population, Franklin County has a 15.9% black population and the nation has a 12% black population. According to these figures, Harrison West is more racially diverse than the nation as a whole, it is more racially diverse than Tract 20 as a whole and it is approaching the level of integration Franklin County as a whole has. It should be remembered that the figure for Franklin County includes block groups and tracts with 0% black populations and block groups and tracts with 100% black populations. When seen in that light, Harrison West is particularly well integrated regarding race, however, this is only true when one is looking at the numbers for Harrison West as a whole. When seen at the block group level, the level of racial integration actually declined in every block group except in block group B which jumped from 1.5% black population in 1980 to 26.2% black population in 1990 (see Fig. 15).

The decrease in all the tracts except block group B amounts to a 14.1% decline in the black population. Some of these people may have been displaced during gentrification and moved into the subsidized housing in block group B, however, that explanation does not completely account for
the 24.7% increase in the black population of that block group. It is interesting to note that much of the gentrification of Harrison West took place in the 1980’s and since then the overall racial integration of Harrison West has improved. In 1980, Franklin County had a 15% black population and Harrison West had a 12% black population. According to these figures the black population in Harrison West has increased at more than double the rate of Franklin County as a whole (jumping 2.1% in the 10 year period where the county as a whole only saw a 0.9% increase in the black population over the same period). In many American cities, the black population might be growing as a percentage in urban neighborhoods, however, this is often due to white flight, and a concentration of the poor. It is nice to find that in Harrison West, it is happening along with gentrification although it may not be increasing racial diversity broadly in the neighborhood.

Almost 28% of renters in Harrison West pay more than 35% of their household income in rent (see appendix table 6). The heaviest concentration is in block group C where almost 45% of the renters pay more than 35% of their income in rent. Roughly 37% of renters in Harrison West pay less than 20% of
Figure 15: Distribution of the black population according to block groups from 1980-1990, and the total percentage in Harrison West from 1980-1990.

Figure 16: Median house values in Harrison West and Franklin county.
their income to rent, this is the largest group in Harrison West being 297 out of 809 households. About 46% of the home owners in Harrison West pay less than 20% of their income on associated costs. Only 14% pay more than 35% of their income on associated costs.

Most of the housing in Harrison West was built before 1939 (see appendix table 4). This older housing is what made it ideal for gentrification; old solid brick houses which could be had cheaply and remodeled. Seventy two percent of the housing stock was built before 1939. Roughly 13% was built between 1940 and 1959, roughly 3% was built between 1960 and 1979, and then there was a jump again with roughly 12% of the housing having been built since 1980, almost 100% of that between 1980 and 1984. The median value of the houses ranges from $48,200 in block group C to $85,200 in block group D. The median for Harrison West is $81,500 which is considerably higher than that for Franklin county which has a median house value of $73,300 (see Fig. 16 and appendix table 7).

According to my definition of the boundaries of Harrison West, roughly 59% of the occupied housing units are rentals and roughly 30% of the housing units are owner occupied. According to the political boundaries of Harrison West, 56%
of occupied housing units are rentals and 32% of the occupied units are owner occupied. I have included the figures according to the political boundaries so that they can be compared to the figures given by Norman Robert Rose for 1970 when he states that 73.8% of the housing units were rental units.
3.3 DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION OF HARRISON WEST

When determining the level of racial and economic integration of Harrison West from census data, one must look at the data from several vantage points. There are different scales at which the data tells different stories. On the micro scale, the block group level, one can see that there is indeed segregation in some ways, yet at the larger scale of the neighborhood as a whole, Harrison West is quite integrated. This will become more obvious in the following discussion. It must be remembered that on the macro scale, figures for Franklin County do not reflect individual neighborhoods which may be segregated, neighborhoods which may be 100% black, 100% white, 100% poor etc. The numbers are averages for all neighborhoods combined and my arguments will be made in light of those discrepancies.

By my definitions, a neighborhood is integrated when it matches the numbers of the county and the nation closely, when it doesn’t show higher figures of poor, uneducated and minority populations, when it is not 100% white, 100% minority, 100% poor or 100% middle class. This implies a neighborhood which reflects the numbers of the population as a whole as opposed to a neighborhood which reflects a
disproportionate number of a specific type of person. Though the numbers don’t match exactly, I believe the reader will find the matches to be reasonably similar and thereby reflecting a balanced proportion of the different variables which contribute to our overall population make-up.

Harrison West is not perfect, a neighborhood can be broken up into smaller parts which do show concentrations of poverty, education and income. However, because a neighborhood is a fairly small unit I feel that at the overall neighborhood scale the different groups do interact. In fact, the groups cannot help but interact in one way or another when they live across the street from each other, shop at the same stores, and send their children to the same schools. In illustrating the integration of Harrison West, at the larger scale of neighborhood, one can see the overall integration of Harrison West. At the smaller block group level scale one can see different concentrations of different variables. This is interesting because popular notions would hold that people would not invest in a house which might be directly across the street from subsidized housing, popular belief would hold that this would be an unwise investment. What Harrison West illustrates, is that this popular notion can be contradicted in gentrified neighborhoods and enhance neighborhood integration.
Figure 17: Median house values for Harrison West in 1990.

As discussed earlier, block group D, the eastern end of Harrison West, has a large number of houses of significant Victorian architecture. Neil Avenue is a tree lined street and is a prestigious place to live. This block group has the highest median house values (see Fig. 17). What is interesting is that the median values only run about $4,000 dollars more than the median house values in block groups A and B. The median house value of block group B, located in the middle of Harrison West, is $81,500. This is $8,200 more than Franklin County as a whole and this block group
also has the highest concentration of subsidized Housing and families below poverty (see Fig. 8, 18, 19 and 20).

Note that the median house value in this block group B is higher than the median house value of the block group just to the north of it (block group A), which has a smaller percentage of subsidized housing, blacks, and female headed households with children. It is interesting to see that contrary to what one might expect from the poorer block group with the higher housing costs, block group B has a higher (33% vs. 26%) percentage of owner occupied housing than block group A even though it has a lower median family income. It also has a higher concentration of subsidized housing and the highest percentage of families below poverty and households receiving public assistance.
Figure 18: Looking south from block group A (see fig. 19). The housing in the background is subsidized.

Figure 19: Looking north from block group B to block group A (see fig. 18). The view is from the subsidized housing.
Block group A, to the north of block group B (which has the highest levels of poverty and minority concentration, not to mention education) has a lower median house value, however, it has the highest median family income and the highest median household income in Harrison West. It also has the highest level of education with 89% of the people over 25 years old having high school educations and 67% of them having a college degree or higher. The figures for Franklin county are 81% high school graduates and only 26.6% with college degrees. This is significant because studies by Fossett and Kielcolt suggest that higher levels of education contribute to significantly more support for (racial) integration (Fosset and Kielcolt 1989:826).

Concentrations of unemployment, poverty, and low education create a lack of positive role models in a neighborhood. The lack of communication and access to information on jobs and services reinforces images of negative self worth and compound the struggle for a better existence (Abramson 1995; Galster and Mikelsons 1995; Rosenbaum 1995; Galster and Hill 1992; Handy 1993; McNight 1989; Wilson 1994; Leigh and Mitchell 1988). Concentrations of poor education, high unemployment rates and poverty often segregate and isolate the poor causing increased friction and misunderstanding
between the poor and the non-poor (Henderson 1995). A neighborhood which gentrifies but maintains some of its incumbent poor can provide a positive environment and provide benefits to those less fortunate (but only to those that are able to remain). Such benefits include access to job information, positive social norms and better services and infrastructure (Galster and Killen 1995; Vidal 1995; Rosenbaum 1995; Wilson 1994). When a neighborhood lacks professional and managerial workers as role models, the risk of dropping out of high school among black and white teens increases (Galster and Killen).

Galster and Killen claim that ‘bad’ neighborhoods, ones which spiral down into hopeless crime ridden ghettos are those in which 40% of the households with children are headed by single women. The overall data for Harrison West shows that only 17% of the households with children under 18 are headed by single women, though 23% of the households headed by single women live below poverty. The area in Harrison West with the highest number of subsidized housing and the highest level of poverty has 35% of the households headed by single women with children under 18, 55% of those living below poverty. Though there are ‘bad’ blocks according to the Galster and Killen model, the number for
the neighborhood as a whole (17%) falls well below the 40% which Galster and Killen claim make a ‘bad’ neighborhood.

Galster and Killen also believe that neighborhoods in which less than 10% of the population have professional or managerial jobs are ‘bad’ neighborhoods. The average for Harrison West is 42%, well above the 10% cut off, and 2% above Galster and Killen’s 40% definition of a ‘good’ neighborhood. In fact, the area with the highest concentration of subsidized housing and poverty, and also the highest black population, has 48% of the population in professional occupations, well above the 40% threshold.

Galster and Killen also claim that a neighborhood with a 40% high school drop out rate constitutes a ‘bad’ neighborhood. When 80% of the population of Harrison West have high school diplomas and 44% of them have college degrees, 69% in some block groups, it is unlikely that Harrison West would have a 40% high school drop out rate. A ‘good’ neighborhood was defined as one in which the high school drop out rate is less than 10%, I don’t have drop out rate figures for Harrison West, however, with the high level of education in the neighborhood, and the abundance of positive role models,
Figure 20: Subsidized housing across from owner occupied housing in following picture (fig. 21), block group B.

Figure 21: The house on the left is newer infill housing built by OMC, block group B.
I doubt that the drop out rate is higher than that of the county as a whole. Their study went on to say that youth growing up in 'good' neighborhoods were 52% less likely to drop out of high school.

Fosset and Keilcolt found that many factors contribute to tolerance of racial integration. In studies they conducted they found that people in cities tend to be more tolerant of racial integration. Within this context, they also found that income levels, age and gender influence tolerance for integration. The block group in Harrison West which lies directly north of the highest concentrations of blacks in Harrison West, has a median family income well above the median for Franklin County (see Fig. 22 and 23). This supports the findings of Fossett and Kielcolt that higher income groups tend to be more tolerant of racial integration. Harrison west also has a large young population with a median age around 30. According to Fossett and Kielcolt, older people tend to be less tolerant of integration and younger people more tolerant. Gender also contributes to racial tolerance, women being more tolerant than men (Fosset and Kielcolt 1989:826). Harrison West does not have a disproportionate number of men, though there are more men than women in every part of Harrison West.
Figure 22: Concentration of the Black population, 1990.

Figure 23: Median household income, 1990.
except where the highest concentration of subsidized housing is found. Harrison West also has a large gay population. All of these factors contribute to the possibility for a racially integrated neighborhood.

It is also possible to see the level of integration within Harrison West by looking at the range of the many variables. Median family income levels of the block groups range from $49,375 down to $20,625, individual households vary even more. This means that the block groups with the richest family households earn almost two and a half times what the poorest block groups, all within one neighborhood. Households receiving public assistance range from 0% most block groups to 32% in one block group. Unemployment ranges form 0% to 7% (this range doesn’t correlate with the poorest block group either). The level of high school education ranges from 60.3% to 89%, and college education ranges from 19.3% to 69.2%. The racial make-up of Harrison West ranges from some areas with a 26.2% black population to areas with only a 3.6% black population. Median house values range from $48,200 to $85,200, the most expensive block group median being almost 77% higher than the lowest. The range of such numbers illustrates the level of integration within one neighborhood, the lack of homogeneity usually found in
suburban neighborhoods which are much less tolerant of integration on any level (Downs 1994).

Figure 24: Affordable housing in block group C.

Figure 25: Affordable housing block group C.
Figure 26: Affordable housing, block group C.

Figure 27: Single story affordable housing in block group C.
Figure 28: House undergoing renovation in block group C.

Figure 29: Renovated house in block group C.
CHAPTER 4

POSSIBILITIES FOR POLICY MAKING

...most residents desire the form of their housing to be symbolic not only of their current attainments but also of their social aspirations. The form of their houses must not only satisfy their current lifestyle needs but also relate to houses occupied by higher income groups. The housing must be a stage set for the enactment of dreams and the realization of aspirations” (Newman 1980;53).

This would seem to contradict finding higher income groups in mixed neighborhoods. However, it does explain the possible desire for poorer income groups to want to remain in an integrated neighborhood and the benefits which they can derive from economic integration. To understand the desire of higher income groups for living in an integrated neighborhood would require extensive profile studies of gentrifiers not covered in the scope of this case study. Such studies have been done by scholars such as Legates and Hartman and I have briefly discussed the characteristics of in-movers earlier.
Oscar Newman’s study of the psychology involved with housing choice and aspirations is not limited to individual structures only, it can be applied to a neighborhood as a whole. An integrated neighborhood provides a place for everyone, it maintains the identity of the individuals living there and it fulfills their needs and aspirations. This should encourage the integration of low-income households into a gentrifying community where they may have the chance at housing which doesn’t stigmatize them and which incorporates their lives into that of the community.

Vidal and Abramson both argue that community redevelopment programs should attract the non-poor into poor neighborhoods (Vidal 1995; Abramson 1995). Their idea is that by bringing in higher income groups such programs can minimize high concentrations of poverty and provide the benefits of positive role models. These outcomes are shown to have a positive effect in the Gautreaux program. Though in that case the poor were moved into non-poor neighborhoods and reported being more motivated to find work when surrounded by people who had jobs and unsubsidized incomes.

Often when people become tenants of public housing they are moved from more to less integrated neighborhoods (Leigh and
Mitchell 1988). In the case of Harrison West, the poor are actually in a very integrated community. Granted there is no public housing, but there is quite a bit of very low-income subsidized housing. Harrison West provides a unique opportunity to learn about the possible benefits of gentrification. Many of the poor were able to remain in the neighborhood, they were not all displaced by the gentrification process. What is also interesting is that the redevelopment in Harrison West did in fact attract non-poor to the neighborhood, creating an economically healthier environment and creating more diversity in income and race.

In the case of Harrison West, there was already quite a bit of low-income and subsidized housing present which made it easier replace and maintain additional subsidized units in the neighborhood. Many of these have remained, even after gentrification, and contribute to an economically and racially integrated neighborhood. One must keep in mind that a large portion of the racial integration comes from the HUD mandate that OMC build subsidized housing.

There are several possible policy lessons we might be able to learn from the study of Harrison West. One of those involves the federal policy which requires that displacement
be minimized. The costs of relocation can be prohibitive for developers and this helps alleviate displacement pressures on the poor when a large scale developer revitalizes a neighborhood with the intent of gentrifying it. Though large scale developers are not always the ones who gentrify a neighborhood, they are often the impetus. Currently there are two developers in Columbus Ohio who could have a significant impact on poor neighborhoods. These include Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment and a developer intent on building luxury apartments on the west bank of the Olentangy river in downtown in an area called the Bottoms. Campus Partners is a joint venture between the city of Columbus and Ohio State University. They plan to clean up and revitalize the University district which houses quite a number of low-income people at its northern and southern ends. This venture was until recently headed by the same developer who headed OMC. The development in downtown will start with the conversion of an old high school to house the local science and industry museum, this will be followed by high-end retail and housing. Currently the Bottoms have lots of subsidized and low-income housing and many of these people might be displaced.
Gentrification also happens at a slower pace by private individuals, people not subject to some of the federal regulations regarding revitalization. These individuals can slowly force poorer incumbent residents out of a neighborhood as property taxes and rents increase. If we look at the numbers discussed in this paper, we can suggest threshold standards to control displacement through private gentrification forces.

The numbers for Harrison West suggest that low-income housing does not necessarily devalue the surrounding owner-occupied housing. If the concentrations of poverty are not extreme, investment by non-poor can continue. Poverty, racial make-up, and low levels of education among the population do not necessarily discourage gentrification. Harrison West shows that gentrification continued even after the HUD mandate required low-income, elderly, and subsidized housing to remain in the neighborhood (see Fig. 8). Another component critical to a mix of income is a mix of the housing stock. Harrison West has large houses to attract higher income brackets but also has a sufficient supply of smaller affordable houses for low- and moderate-income households.
The area provides an opportunity to study the figures and see if we can get close to rough estimates of certain variables at which gentrification might stop. There are several reasons why this is of interest. Gentrification happens in many older inner city neighborhoods and looks to be continuing at the same rate it has since the 1970’s in many different cities. The problem with this, as has been stated, is that it often forces out the poor. There are however benefits. Gentrification enhances the political power of city voters who are often powerless against the votes of outlying suburbs where higher levels of education and income tend to turn out more voters. Such increased political power can improve overall services and infrastructure. Gentrification, which causes higher property taxes as buildings are rehabilitated and increase in value, also contributes to a larger tax base for the city. This can contribute to more funding for schools and improve the quality of education. Gentrification also often brings with it better services such as fire, police, garbage removal, and response time by utility companies. It may also encourage banks to provide better services, something often unavailable in poor neighborhoods.
Gentrification lowers the concentrations of poverty and can increase the diversity of an area. The effect could be seen as dispersing the poor, eliminating the concentration and segregation often associated with poverty. This is where the numbers for Harrison West become important, they can give us percentages of subsidized housing, and in turn tell us how much low-income and subsidized housing an inner-city neighborhood can sustain without jeopardizing the gentrification process.

The legal mandate imposed on OMC by HUD required that they OMC provide subsidized housing for the poor and the elderly poor and that they set up a tenant purchase program for low- and moderate-income people. The subsidized housing amounted to approximately 8% of the total housing in Harrison West. There is also a fairly large supply of low- and moderate-income housing in the southern end of Harrison West where the median house values are the lowest (see Fig. 16).

Under the federal low-income tax credit program, a rental unit cannot rent for more than 60% of the median rent for the SMSA, and a house cannot be sold for more than 80% of the median value of the SMSA. I use those figures as the standard for what I consider to be affordable housing in
Harrison West. Median house values in the southern part of Harrison West are about 66% of the median value for Franklin county and 59% of the median value for Harrison West as a whole. If we consider only the units below the median in the southern part of Harrison West (the ones costing less than 59% of the median for the whole neighborhood) then a very conservative estimate would be that about 14% of the housing in the southern part of Harrison West is affordable. Keep in mind that this counts only housing well below the 80% limits imposed by the federal government’s low-income tax credit program. When we combine this very conservative estimate of affordable housing with the 8% provided by OMC, we have low- and moderate-income housing representing 22% of the housing in Harrison West (see figs. 23-28).

What these figures give us is a potential to control the amount and extent of gentrification in neighborhoods. Policy could be implemented to avoid total displacement of the incumbent poor in gentrifying neighborhoods and help to alleviate the concentrations of poverty in neighborhoods. Low-income housing cooperatives, non-profit developers and metropolitan housing authorities can use these figures to control some of the housing stock in gentrifying neighborhoods. It is also critical that non-HUD agencies
get involved and look at the numbers in a way which combines idealism with capitalist market realities. The new Republican congress voted into office in 1995 has imposed severe budget cuts on the Federal government. HUD is being forced out of the public housing business and the city of Columbus (due to lack of HUD support) is not renewing many property specific Section 8 contracts, instead, it will offer Section 8 Vouchers. This could endanger much of the subsidized housing in Harrison West, as these might in the near future be turned over to market rate rental units. At this time, with federal government cutbacks, the city of Columbus is not planning to renew Section 8 contracts on housing and will instead be handing out Section 8 housing vouchers. This may force many people to look outside of Harrison West for affordable housing.

We now know that highly educated gentrifiers will tolerate living near from subsidized housing and that they will tolerate mixed income and mixed race neighborhoods where the racial mix is close to the numbers for the metropolitan region as a whole. They will continue to gentrify a neighborhood in which roughly 20% of the housing is affordable to low-income people. With strategic planning on the part of advocacy organizations, housing could be bought
and set aside for the incumbent poor, and they would benefit from the positive influences of gentrification I have mentioned throughout this paper.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This paper has illustrated that Harrison West is an integrated neighborhood after having been significantly gentrified. It has also determined that some poor and low-income residents have benefited from the gentrification. Benefit to the poor and low-income households was defined by implication (through the literature review and improved services and infrastructure). No interviews were conducted to determine benefits to individual households and how benefits were perceived by the poor and low-income households.

It was also not possible to determine whether the beneficiaries of these improvements were incumbent residents or poor and low-income residents who moved into Harrison West after the redevelopment. Many residents were displaced
(Rose 1982). We cannot determine whether they were displaced within the neighborhood, or whether they were displaced to a different neighborhood. A hint can be taken from the racial make-up of Harrison West in 1980 as compared to 1990 (see fig. 14). Unfortunately, every block group in Harrison West except block group B lost black population from 1980 to 1990. This actually made Harrison West less racially integrated on the block group level. However, for Harrison West as a whole, the black population did increase. All of this increase occurred in one block group. The increase in this block group was larger than the loss of all other block groups combined. This could imply that those who were displaced in the other block groups were actually displaced within the neighborhood. It also illustrates that other blacks moved into the neighborhood, though it does not necessarily imply that those were poor or low-income people.

What this paper has been able to determine is that Harrison West, 20 years after the redevelopment effort and the gentrification began, is as a whole, an economically and racially integrated neighborhood. There is quite a bit of diversity in education, income, housing, and overall racial make-up. This paper has shown that it is possible to gentrify a neighborhood without causing total displacement.
Strategic planning would allow low-income residents to remain in the neighborhood, if not in the exact unit, even with significant gentrification. This paper has shown that in the case of Harrison West, the rough estimate for tolerance by gentrifiers of economic integration is a neighborhood with roughly 15%-20% low-income and subsidized housing. It also showed that in the case of an inner city neighborhood which gentrifies, the rough proportion of the black population can be at least slightly higher than the make-up of the region or SMSA.

Harrison West has become a neighborhood which supports many different income levels and many different life styles and family make-ups. It is a clean neighborhood with regular trash pick-up, reliable police and fire protection, attentive service by utility companies and a variety of establishments serving a variety of tastes. Whether it will remain so will be determined in a large part by the length of the Section 8 contracts and whether they will be renewed. This could easily be done if the buildings were bought by the Metropolitan Housing Authority or other non-profit low-income development and real-estate companies. At least 8% of the low-income housing is likely to stay as it was placed
through the HUD mandate on OMC and is run by a non-profit organizations.

The purpose of the research was to mitigate the negative press usually given to gentrification by scholars. In a free market system such as the one we have in the United States of America, gentrification is likely to continue. This thesis illustrated that it is possible to derive some real benefits from gentrification, not just for gentrifiers, but also for incumbent residents of gentrifying neighborhoods.

It is not the intent of this thesis to be idealistic, rather it illustrated what can be done within the confines of a greedy capitalist system. We do not live in a class-less society in the United States, though many would like to believe so. The poor and other minorities are often isolated and segregated, forced to the fringes of society and denied its luxuries. We have a history of ignoring those who can least afford to be ignored. This compounds our social ills and the resulting social costs of this intolerance are prohibitive. America has a phobia for ‘social democracy’, equating it with communism and anti-Christian values. Faced with this unfortunate perception of
social equity, we must rely on the extreme self interest generated by a capitalist free market system to help the less fortunate and socially isolated. Self interest is a poor tool for creating opportunities for others. The unfortunate result is a thesis which tries to combine the whims of the rich with the needs of the less fortunate. In America’s struggle for equality and integration, I have shown that gentrification can be a tool in reaching some of those goals. It must however be done with some guidance from local governments and advocacy groups.

Integration through gentrification can provide our society as a whole some benefits. It can alleviate the isolation and segregation of the poor and minority groups. It can create trust on the part of the disenfranchised (who were not displaced) and it can create understanding and tolerance on the part of the more fortunate. It might enhance the social awareness of higher income groups and motivate them to vote in socially responsible ways. For the fortunate poor it enhances their living environment, takes them out of social isolation and provides some of the basic amenities a just society should provide. Increased services and access to information through neighborly social networks can improve the opportunities for jobs and provide a chance for
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the disenfranchised to become proud productive members of society. It can provide the poor an opportunity to become active participants in society as opposed to passive bystanders at the mercy of an uncaring greedy system.
APPENDIX
### Table 1
**Education 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tract 18.2 Block Group 5 (A)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 5 (B)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 6 (C)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 4 (D)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 3 (E)</th>
<th>Average for Harrison West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School or Higher</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or Higher</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
**Labor Characteristics 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tract 18.2 Block Group 5 (A)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 5 (B)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 6 (C)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 4 (D)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 3 (E)</th>
<th>Average for Harrison West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executives, Administrative, and</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Specialty Occupations</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3
**Income and Poverty 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tract 18.2 Block Group 5 (A)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 5 (B)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 6 (C)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 4 (D)</th>
<th>Tract 20 Block Group 3 (E)</th>
<th>Average for Harrison West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$30,375</td>
<td>$18,125</td>
<td>$21,713</td>
<td>$27,866</td>
<td>$21,923</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$49,375</td>
<td>$26,023</td>
<td>$27,059</td>
<td>$28,693</td>
<td>$20,625</td>
<td>$30,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Receiving Public Assistance</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families Below Poverty</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
**Year Housing Unit Was Built**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18.2 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>Total for Harrison West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 and Older</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
**Year Household Moved In**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18.2 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>Total for Harrison West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1990</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1988</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1984</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1959</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6
**Gross Rent as % of Household Income in 1989**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18.2 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>Total for Harrison West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied Units</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%-24%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%-39%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%-34%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% or more</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Computed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7
**Median House Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18.2 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>Median for Franklin County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td>Block Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>$79,500</td>
<td>$81,500</td>
<td>$48,200</td>
<td>$85,200</td>
<td>$84,600</td>
<td>$81,500 $73,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8
**Median House Values for 1980 and 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20 Tract</th>
<th>Harrison West</th>
<th>Franklin County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$47,100</td>
<td>$47,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$76,900</td>
<td>$81,500</td>
<td>$73,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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