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ABSTRACT

This thesis will explore the history of housing policy in the United States as it relates to Weinland Park and Italian Village, two changing urban neighborhoods in Columbus, Ohio. It will examine the history and definitions of gentrification and mixed-income housing, two policies aimed at redeveloping and improving the architecture and quality of life in dilapidated urban areas. Gentrification and mixed-income housing are often thought to be two distinct regimes of redevelopment, where mixed-income is the solution for the problems of gentrification – mainly displacement and unfair treatment to pre-redevelopment residents. This thesis will argue that the strategies and motives behind these two forms of redevelopment as well as the results, have more in common than was originally thought.
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Introduction

Over the past six years, I have lived, worked, and studied on the border between the Columbus neighborhoods of Weinland Park and Italian Village. The neighborhoods are bounded by High Street on the west, East 11th Avenue on the North, Grant Street and the train tracks on the East, and Interstate 670 on the South. My research has focused on these neighborhoods and the line of factories that extends south to Interstate 670. Throughout the first two years that I lived here, I was struck by the changes I saw occurring in the Short North: The factories had all permanently closed in the 1990s, leaving most residents out of work and living below the poverty line. The homes were in disarray and garbage clogged the gutters of many of the streets. When I moved to the neighborhoods in 1998, people of color (predominately African-Americans) made up over 85% of the counted population. In the hot summer of my arrival, young men uniformed completely in bright red or bright blue outfits collected in groups outside of convenience stores. I often saw women socializing on their porches, watching as children played in water-filled trashcans or splashed around in illegally-opened
fire hydrants. The neighborhood had an unusually high amount of violent crime - rape, gang and drug related murder, arson, and domestic violence made local and at times national news. A notorious gang, the Short North Posse, had been 'taken down' on charges of racketeering and weapon/drug distribution in early 1995, in the one of the largest gang busts in American History. At Huckleberry House, a homeless shelter for teens where I worked as the Activities Director, young people, even those from other 'ghetto' neighborhoods, often feared leaving the house to walk to the bus stop or carryout, because, they said, the Short North was the most dangerous place in Columbus. They boasted of family members and friends who had been mugged, beaten-up, or killed in the neighborhood. It seemed that I wasn't the only one who thought that this area was an extraordinarily rough place to live.

Working at Huckleberry House, located in the heart of Weinland Park, meant that although I lived on the relatively quiet edge of the neighborhood, I routinely encountered the violence associated with the center. Walking to work, I was often harassed by the groups of young men on street corners, who greeted me with catcalls and occasionally threw bottles and other trash at me while I passed. The Section 8 apartment complexes surrounding Huckleberry House were regularly stormed by SWAT officers who raided apartments in search of criminals, weapons, and drugs. One winter evening, the young people and I watched as over 300 weapons and a small truckload of crack-cocaine were removed from an adjacent apartment building. Since the arrest of most of the
members of the Short North Posse three years earlier, the police had waged a
campaign to create a visible presence and to engage in more effective surveillance
measures. Officers, on foot, horseback, bicycle, and in cars patrolled vigilantly,
but their presence did little to prevent violent crime. Between 1990 and 2000,
assault, battery, and murder rates remained steady, at least twice that of other
Columbus neighborhoods.¹ At Huckleberry House, I witnessed two gun murders,
one that occurred less than fifteen feet from where I stood. Several of my
colleagues were nearly shot when they were caught in the crossfire of a gunfight,
and we got used to dropping to the sound of nearby gunfire, even when we were
'safe' behind the bulletproof glass that covered the windows of the shelter. When
I left my job in 2001, young people were no longer permitted to go outside after a
number of incidents in which the teenagers at the shelter had dangerous
encounters with neighborhood youth.

So far, I have portrayed the Short North as something like a mid-west
version of South Central Los Angeles - and it's important to note that aspects of
the popular imagination of areas like this are real. The Short North was, and in
some ways continues to be a place of frequent and explicit incidents of violence.
In 2003, seven murders occurred in the area, including the murder of an infant and
his mother.² And it is significant that police, policy-makers, city officials, and
even some residents characterize the neighborhood by its reputation for being a
crime-ridden, physically decaying, poor, urban center. But, as I have discovered,

¹ Technical Memo #4 (5)
² Hupman 18
the Short North - it's people, it's history, it's landscape - cannot be understood by focusing only on the violence and poverty that are part of the Short North that I know. The dominant story with its emphasis on poverty, violence, and urban decay, is so far, the only official story of the neighborhood.

It would be easy to expose readers to the beauty and complexity of this neighborhood. I could talk about the living remnants of community fruit orchards that spanned the Western edge of the factory line and were a gathering place for working men’s wives. I could describe the Native American burial grounds, many of which have never been unearthed by archaeologists' hands, or the numerous Underground Railroad stops that dot the neighborhood. And I could talk about the amazing people I've met and interviewed, like the ninety-two year old African American lesbian who is the great-great granddaughter of Confederate General Lee and has lived in the Short North for the past sixty years; or Mike Hayes, who is the last employee of the Jeffrey Mining Corporation, and refers to himself proudly and sadly as 'the last man standing.' I could tell the story of the glory days of a historical black church in the neighborhood, once visited by Martin Luther King Jr. But these stories on their own, like dominant narratives of poverty and crime do little to explain the place that I have come to know. The story I tell, while still only a partial and fragmented glimpse at the Short North, will pay attention the ways that decay and rejuvenation have been framed in relation to these neighborhoods.

I began taking photographs several years ago, in an attempt to document
the changing landscapes of the Short North. I followed processes of
redevelopment through pictures - documenting the purchase of dilapidated homes
and apartments as they were bought by land speculators and then renovated and
made into middle-class, Victorian-style residences. I took pictures of the
evictions and property set-outs, which left everything from food to furniture to
clothing, heaped unceremoniously in front yards and side alleys. I documented
the 'hidden' history of the neighborhood, marked by old signs nailed to the side of
homes and long-abandoned businesses. I took pictures of the hundreds of barrels
of bio-hazardous chemicals that littered the outside of the now-closed factories,
leaking and mixing with rainwater or running into the cracks in the cemented
loading lot. I photographed businesses, streets, broken windows, fires, police
raids, pets, and occasionally people, emphasizing through my lens what others so
easily took for granted as they drove down North Fourth St. or Summit Street on
their way home from work.

Last summer, I was given the opportunity to display my photography at a
local gallery. I developed, matted, and hung twenty-five pictures that I hoped
would lead viewers to see the neighborhoods differently. I chose to display
mostly insignificant objects because I felt then, as now, that perhaps the
seemingly unimportant and overlooked fragments of the neighborhood could tell
stories and histories that have been silenced or forgotten. For example, one
photograph showed a charred piece of wood jutting out of a rusted metal drum.
When I took the picture, I wondered who had burned the log. Did this person
burn it to stay warm or to cook food? Was this evidence of another homeless community (quite prevalent in the area)? Did the person who burned the log live in the abandoned factory? These questions may seem silly, but the factory was partially destroyed by a massive fire the week before my show. The local news media implied that the fire had probably been started by a careless homeless person, but rumors flew through the neighborhood that the city had purposefully lit the building on fire in order to avoid lawsuits when it was discovered that toxic chemicals were literally spilling into the streets and lawns of neighborhood residents. I have no answers, but I use this example to demonstrate the diversity of questions that may surround an object as simple as a burnt log in a rusted barrel.

After hanging my last picture in the gallery, I moved to the center of the large room to admire my work. I was struck with disappointment when I realized that while for me, each picture represented a complex and fascinating story and set of questions, that those seeing the pictures would not understand them as I did. I felt the death of the amateur photographer as friends and family gazed politely at each photograph, reminding me and each other that "this is just like when she had that drawing up at the Kroger Kids Art show in second grade!" Instead of making a critical statement about the way dominant culture imagines the ghetto, I had been reduced to a well-meaning girl doing art. And while I was able to convey frozen bits of the history of the Short North, without words, these were images that could have been taken in any poor, urban neighborhood. I do not want to tell
the story of a theoretical urban neighborhood. That is not to say that the story of
the Short North doesn't have implications for thinking about widespread processes
of urban redevelopment that are transforming similar neighborhoods across the
country.

In fact, the mixed-income redevelopment plan being carried out by Capital
Housing Corporation, now called Community Properties of Ohio, in Weinland
Park is the largest mixed-income redevelopment of its kind, and planners and
policy-makers hope that it will serve as a model for mixed-income redevelopment
in other places.

As I write today, the Short North is several years into large-scale
redevelopment. Over 550 residents have been relocated to other neighborhoods
so that condemned Section 8 properties can be repaired and refurbished. Homes
and businesses along High Street have been demolished to make way for the
South Campus Gateway Complex, "an urban mixed-use project that blends
entertainment, retail, rental housing, offices...and a 1,200-space parking garage"
which is set to be completed in autumn of 2005.\footnote{\textit{Campus Partners Revitalization Plan Statement 23}} Land Speculators, most notably
Joseph Armeni and his ReMax City Center and SalesOne Realty have bought and
restored hundreds of inexpensive properties. Their actions alone have drastically
altered the demographics of the neighborhood. Rental prices have skyrocketed;
three-bedroom homes that three years ago rented for $400 are now being leased
for up to $1,500. The local elementary school has been destroyed in order to make way for a new community center and charter school; neighborhood children are now being bused to Hudson Avenue Elementary school. The police have started a 'hot spot' program, which establishes their constant presence in front of bars, convenience stores, and other sites where teenagers have typically gathered. The Ohio State Department of Human Ecology and OSU Extension have set up a community development house, where students and faculty monitor and facilitate changes and run a service-learning program for Ohio State students. City officials have inspected every property in the Short North, issuing citations for everything from indoor furniture on porches to un-kept lawns to broken fences. Community Properties of Ohio, an offshoot of parent company Campus Partners and a non-profit redevelopment agency has enacted strict rules to ensure that only those on leases are living in the rented properties.

Preventing the "appearance of disarray" has been a driving factor for those involved in the redevelopment processes. One broken window, argue Wilson and Kelling, signals that 'no one cares,' and if it is left unrepaired, all of the other windows will eventually be broken. Untended human behavior is the same. If vagrants and prostitutes are not 'taken-care-of,' the breakdown of community control can happen within a period of a few months to a few years. A once-stable neighborhood, where residents care for their homes, watch each other's children, and "frown on unwanted intruders" can quickly change into an "inhospitable and

---

4 www.SalesOneRealty.com/rent/iv
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frightening jungle."\(^6\)

Along these lines, 'cleaning-up' major roadways, that are traversed frequently by downtown workers, OSU students, and people attending sporting and cultural events on campus, has been a primary focus of redevelopment and the most visible changes can be seen on these roadways. Within a year, both East 11th Avenue and Chittenden will be turned into two-way neighborhood "showcase" streets in anticipation of heavy traffic traveling to and from the South Campus Gateway. Less-traveled places, such as the Eastern side of the neighborhood, with its railroad tracks and abandoned factories, have been slower to change and many residents who used to live in other parts of the Short North have relocated here, where there is less surveillance and code enforcement. If redevelopment continues as planned, in less than five years the Short North will be a virtually crime-free series of urban villages, where residents will be safe to take an evening walk to the Gap or one of the other high-end stores that will be part of the campus gateway.

Today the Short North is not the same place that I came to over six years ago. And in five years, it will be barely recognizable as the impoverished, decaying, crime-invested neighborhood that it became famous as. I have learned about this place from my complicated subject position as resident, gentrifier, activist, photographer, ethnographer, friend, and neighbor. Initially, I planned to examine the stories and histories of neighborhood insiders (those who lived here

---

\(^6\) Wilson and Kelling 270
pre-redevelopment) as opposed to the viewpoints of outsiders (those who impose policies and reforms on the residents and properties of the Short North). This division is problematic, not least because it is far too simplistic. Each person I have interviewed, whether insider or outsider, has different interests in the future of the Short North. This division would also, I am afraid, lead me to demonize the outsiders as well-intentioned colonizers, and romanticize the insiders as many Davids, fighting bravely against the Goliath of violent imposition into the insiders' lives.

*   *   *   *   *

In March of 1994, Stephanie Hummer, a freshman at The Ohio State University, was abducted a half-block from campus between three and four in the morning. The white, middle-class honor student was raped and killed by a blow to the back of her head before her body was dumped in a field beside the Olentangy River, three miles from where she had been abducted. Her tragic death brought unwanted local and national media attention to the South Campus neighborhoods that caused Ohio State, as one local reporter stated, “a full-fledged public relations crisis.”\(^7\) The neighborhoods located to the east and south of Campus had been deteriorating for two decades, but their condition had been largely ignored by the University, who had been reluctant to intervene in the condition of spaces that were not University property. But with Hummer’s death

\(^7\) Turnbull 2
came the recognition by the City of Columbus and Ohio State that the area had become an enormous financial liability.

Concerned parents had begun to publicly complain about the conditions of the neighborhoods in which their children were living. One mother, who began following crime statistics for the area voiced her dismay, “Parents would be shocked if they saw the crime statistics for where their children are living...Parents deserve to know about crime before they send their kids there.”

The University’s fears about the increasing ‘poor image’ of the area were not unfounded; application and enrollment at Ohio State began to fall almost immediately after Hummer’s murder. Then-President Gordon Gee wasted no time, working with the Mayor and other City and University officials to develop a comprehensive plan of action. By January 1995, Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment, a 501(c)(3) non-profit redevelopment corporation was formed with funds from the Ohio State Board of Trustees and the City of Columbus. They immediately hired EDAW, a San Francisco-based urban planning firm, to develop a comprehensive revitalization plan for the University Neighborhoods.

Planners and policy makers from OSU and the city worked together to identify areas targeted for redevelopment. Surprisingly, planners and city officials mostly ignored the University District neighborhoods, and instead advocated the redevelopment of census tracts 16 and 17, collectively known as

---
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Weinland Park, an area neighboring the University District to the South, home to over 550 publicly-subsidized rental units and a population composed of sixty- to eighty-percent African-Americans. Stephanie Hummer was neither abducted from Weinland Park, nor was her body found there. Few people bothered to ask why Weinland Park, known for its high concentration of poor residents, became the target of the largest redevelopment of its kind in US history.

At the time of Stephanie’s murder, another neighborhood was undergoing a different kind of redevelopment. Italian Village, which bordered the southern boundary of Weinland Park, had been redistricted in the mid-1970s as one of Columbus’ Heritage Communities. A former working-class neighborhood, Italian Village remained mostly unchanged until the early 1990s, when real-estate speculators began purchasing, renovating, and reselling dilapidated and/or abandoned properties. While the adjacent neighborhood, Victorian Village, with its grand, turn-of-the-century architecture and highly desirable housing stock had undergone gentrification during the 1970s, Italian Village’s smaller, simply-designed homes did not initially attract middle-class gentrifiers. Additionally, Italian Village had nearly fifty subsidized housing units—far fewer than Weinland Park, but enough to deter potential middle-class ‘urban pioneers.’ But as house prices soared in Victorian Village and the arts district that ran between the two neighborhoods became increasingly popular, middle-class residents started to trickle in to rent and purchase homes in Victorian Village’s less-flashy sister neighborhood.
In 1994, the inward migration of gentrifiers seemed insignificant. Many people were unwilling to risk moving to a neighborhood that may or may not succeed as a hip, urban village. When Joe Armeni, husband of a prominent Republican City Council member, opened The New Victorians in 1995, it seemed like just another independent rental agency. Within less than a decade, Joe Armeni’s The New Victorians and its offshoot, ReMax City Center, would be largely responsible for the tide of redevelopment that swept through Italian Village. These events would change the neighborhood from a racially-diverse enclave community, rooted in a manufacturing economy, to a glowing example of a homogenous, middle-class urban village in the 21st century service economy.

* * * * *

The goal of this thesis is to examine the changing landscapes of these two neighborhoods, whose histories are being relentlessly pulled into the hegemonic ocean of dominant narratives of progress and redevelopment. In chapter one, I will partially reconstruct the history of the impact of US housing policies on Weinland Park and Italian Village. These policies have been the decisive force behind virtually every place that has included, excluded, removed, and policed poor people in the United States. The history of US housing policy reveals some of the mechanisms that have helped to create racialized, isolated, enclave neighborhoods of poverty like the Short North Neighborhoods. In their study of the resurgence of gentrification, Wyly and Hammel argue that “transformations in
the national system of housing finance and housing policy have become closely intertwined with the market-driven revival of inner-city neighborhoods.\footnote{Wyly and Hammel 715}

To understand my assertion that the processes of isolation and subsequent redevelopment in Weinland Park and Italian Village are related to each other, it is necessary to examine the social and economic policies that have constructed and deconstructed these two communities in particular ways. I will follow the history of Weinland Park and Italian Village, paying particular attention to the influence of US housing policy and the moral assumptions and ideologies that have permeated housing policy since its inception. I will also scrutinize the development discourses that have masked the reality of displacement of the poor in these redeveloping neighborhoods, specifically the ideologies of historic preservation, gentrification, and mixed-income redevelopment. Although I do not attempt to search for root causes of displacement, I will argue that public housing policies play a crucial role in redevelopment and coerced (and sometimes forced) migrations of poor people.

Along with the acknowledgement that “the primary structuring elements of class occur outside the gentrified neighborhood or prior to the gentrified process,” I will examine the histories of Italian Village and Weinland Park, and their relations to one another and to the city of Columbus\footnote{Smith and Williams 238}. Using primary and secondary source historical documents, as well as interviews with long-term area residents, I will attempt to partially explain the local historical contingencies that
have led to the present series of ongoing redevelopment processes in Weinland Park and Italian Village. My wish here is to unsettle the comfortable narratives of progress and development that encourage the unlodging of history from space.

I became one of the first gentrifying residents in the area in 1998 when I moved to the border between Weinland Park and Italian Village. Since then, I have lived, worked, and studied in both neighborhoods. My own subject position (as a low-income gentrifier) was initially what interested me in this course of study. But over the past seven years, I have found that my position in relation to neighborhood revitalization efforts has become markedly less significant. Today, I am surrounded by a fairly homogenous community of mostly-white, middle-income gentrifiers. I have become one among the many other brave ‘urban pioneers’ to settle on this reterritorialized land. Soon, however, I too, will have to move from this neighborhood. Rent prices have tripled and federally-subsidized homeownership programs mean that most housing stock is no longer for rent, only sale. But these neighborhoods will continue to capture my attention long after I have moved out of the community.

Columbus itself is a fascinating place in which to do this sort of research – mostly because of its ordinariness. It is “representative of a broad range of metropolitan areas” and is “located within the traditional core manufacturing region of the Midwest and Northeast.”11 Sometimes called ‘test-market USA,’ the social and demographic makeup of Columbus closely represents that of the

11 Halloway 236
Unites States as a whole. The ‘average’ makeup, size, and characteristics of Columbus mean that studies on redevelopment in this city may have implications for those studying redevelopment and displacement in other like cities around the country.

The neighborhoods of Weinland Park and Italian Village are uniquely situated between the city center and the second-largest university in the country. Therefore, the factors leading to redevelopment and gentrification may be different than those of other areas. Whereas the Italian Village revitalization closely resembles processes and outcomes ‘traditionally’ identified by urban studies scholars, the changes in Weinland Park are inextricably tied to the University and the private, multi-million dollar corporation created by Ohio State. Weinland Park exemplifies the kind of public-private ‘partnership’ model advocated by the public housing policy-makers of today. I have included the Italian Village in this study partly because its relationship with Weinland Park facilitates questions about how scholars and policy-makers categorize and differentiate between types of redevelopment, and partly because the resulting distinctions affect outcomes for the displaced and evicted, as well as the gentrifiers themselves. Finally, the relationship between Weinland Park and Italian Village makes visible the ways that the investment of capital alters the landscapes. Following Neil Smith’s discussion of gentrification, I will argue that redevelopment in Weinland Park and Italian Village is linked to capital expansion.
"The ideology of gentrification often describes it as a process of spatial expansion – notably, as settlement on an urban ‘frontier.’ But the changes in the use of downtown space that result from corporate investment really illustrate capital expansion. In our time, capital expansion has no new territory left to explore, so it redevelops, or internally differentiates. Just as the frontier thesis in US history legitimized an economic push through ‘uncivilized’ lands, so the urban frontier thesis legitimizes the corporate reclamation of the inner city from racial ghettos and marginal business uses."^{12}

However, this does not mean that geography is irrelevant to urban redevelopment. In fact, urban revitalization processes are “inherently geographic in [their] manifestations."^{13} In chapter two, after following national and local histories of housing policy and urban change, I will examine the “urban morphology” of these neighborhoods in terms of economic and cultural analysis.^{14} This kind of analysis presents significant difficulties because of the complexities inherent in modern redevelopment processes. Smith and Williams point out that while it is tempting to describe a two-class model in which speculator-developers are pitted-against inner urban residents, we must consider that gentrification is about something beyond economic class position. On one hand, this means that actors hold “multiple (and often contradictory) class locations.”^{15} While gentrification is assumed to be an economic process, this is

---

^{12} Zukin 141
^{13} Wyly and Hammel 716
^{14} Zukin 131
^{15} Smith and Williams 243
simplistic because often highly-educated people with a low economic status are among the first gentrifiers in an area. Also, early in the gentrification process, "working-class home owners may engage in petit-bourgeois renting of their properties." On the other, it means the primary structuring element of gentrification revolves around higher education, or a "gentrification aesthetic in terms of 'good taste' through a middle-class background and/or middle-class (higher) education." 

In chapter two, I will examine the strategies and models of gentrification that have been carried-out in Weinland Park and Italian Village over the past decade. I will attempt to show that the problems associated with gentrification are also present in mixed-income redevelopment. I will argue that mixed-income neighborhood redevelopment is no more humane or egalitarian than its predecessor, gentrification. This is because, among other reasons, the success of mixed-income redevelopment is dependent on the displacement of the same individuals which it claims to protect. Much of my information comes from anonymous informants from area agencies and from on-the-street conversations with my pre-gentrification neighbors. Therefore, this is not intended to be a conclusive, quantitative analysis. Rather, using information from documents, newsletters, planning material, and first-hand sources, I will draw an partial conclusion about the relationship between mixed-income housing and gentrification.

16 Smith and Williams 238
17 Smith and Williams 242
A significant challenge in describing these processes is due to the lack of terms to describe the diverse and distinct processes that contribute to urban redevelopment. This difficulty happens on a number of levels. First, the dominant discourse of urban redevelopment substitutes words like ‘displacement’ with words such as ‘revival,’ ‘revitalization,’ ‘renaissance,’ and ‘redevelopment.’ Critical urban scholars have been forced to adopt this language while at the same time arguing that it does not reflect the reality of changing urban landscapes. When I use the terms ‘redevelopment’ and ‘revitalization’ I am using them to mean *processes carried-out in the name of redevelopment and revitalization.* Likewise, when I use the term ‘gentrification,’ I mean systemic transformations of urban space that result in 1. “in-migration of middle-class suburbanites” and 2. The institutional displacement of no-, low-, and moderate-income residents.\(^{18}\) Under this definition, gentrification can happen even when it is not the sole process guiding neighborhood or citywide transformation. For example, displacement and reterritorialization of this kind can occur in conjunction with mixed-income redevelopment projects.

I agree with John Powell’s assertion that “gentrification and concentrated poverty are closely related...in that they both tend to isolate low-income people and racial minorities from opportunity.”\(^{19}\) However, unlike Powell, I do not see mixed-income redevelopment as a potentially positive alternative to or middle-ground between the poles of isolated poverty and gentrification. I have come to

\(^{18}\) Wyly and Hammel 716

\(^{19}\) Powell 73
believe that displacement of poor residents followed by an inflow of gentrifying residents is central to both gentrification and mixed-income redevelopment.\textsuperscript{20}

Although I will not attempt to quantitatively ‘prove’ this claim, I will offer supporting information from anonymous residents and employees of local development agencies.

While strategies of gentrification and mixed-income housing may differ in the kinds and numbers of residents they displace, they share the same ideology of poverty and a reliance on free-market investment.

* * * * *

In 1899, three decades before the start of federal public-housing policy and a full fifty years before the Civil rights movement emerged in the United States, W.E.B. DuBois made a sociological intervention that has since been unparalleled. Living in a black ghetto in Philadelphia at the height of the settlement house movement, the college-educated DuBois wrote a series of essays that for the first time in US history, articulated the devastating effects of racialized special practices that isolated minorities into enclave communities. He lays out the multiple and relentless manifestations of “color prejudice” including the limited employment opportunities open to African-Americans, unequal pay for the same work, the brutal slurs and stereotypes that confront blacks in every social

\textsuperscript{20} Powell 73
situation, the fact that “the negro must pay more house-rent for worse houses than most white people pay,” and the discrimination faced by black young people.\textsuperscript{21}

“All one of these things happening now and then would not be remarkable or call for especial comment; but when one group of people suffer all these little differences of treatment and discriminations and insults continually, the result is either discouragement, or bitterness, or over-sensitiveness, or recklessness. And people feeling thus cannot do their best” (DuBois 124).

Reading these pieces brings forth important questions for thinking about racialized, spatial isolation and the tendency today to equate redevelopment with the removal of impoverished minorities. DuBois was unquestionably ahead of his time, and is maybe ahead of ours as well. Critical scholars and social justice activists of today are still haunted by his words.

“living men can remember when a Negro could not sit in a street car or walk many streets in peace. These times have passed however, and many imagine discrimination against the Negro has passed with them. Careful inquiry will convince any such one of his error. To be sure a colored man today can walk the streets of Philadelphia without personal insult; he can go to theaters, parks and some places of amusement without meeting more than stares and discourtesy; he can be accommodated at most hotels and restaurants, although his treatment in some would not be pleasant. All this is a vast advance and

\footnote{DuBois 122}
augurs much for the future. And yet all that has been said of the remaining
discrimination is but too true.  

It is easy, when analyzing redevelopment and displacement, to give
mention to the racist patterns associated with such processes. But if DuBois
should be remembered in such an analysis, it should be to remind us, over and
over again, that the United States history of persistent, systematic racism and
white supremacist ideology has been central to the changes in urban shape and
composition that happen in the present.

---
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Chapter 1

Weinland Park, Italian Village, and US Public Housing Policy

1899 - 2005

W.E.B. DuBois wrote *The Philadelphia Negro* in 1899, beginning a tradition of scholarship that has focused on race and ethnic relations and inequality in urban settings. Horace R. Cayton, Kenneth Clark, St. Clair Drake, E. Franklin Frazier, and William Julius Wilson are just a few of the people who have followed in DuBois's footsteps. Other theorists, also influenced by DuBois, developed a cultural studies approach to urban studies which has become one of the most provocative lenses through which to understand urban space. David Harvey, Edward Soja, Sharon Zukin, and Mike Davis have written from a cultural studies approach. Other approaches to the city include the study of urban society that was started by the Chicago School, and the study of urban politics and governance that includes both pluralist scholars like Edward Banfield and Marxist political theorists like Henri Lefebvre.23

---

23 LeGates 14.
None of these sub-fields of urban studies have been unaffected by the problems and policies approach to urban studies. For this reason, I will discuss the histories of Weinland Park and Italian Village in relation to public housing policy in the United States. The problems and policy approach has its origins in mid-nineteenth century reformers attempts to solve the problems of the slums, which were considered a “malevolent environment that threatened the safety, health, and morals of the poor who inhabited them.”24 Concerned with “poverty, overcrowding, congestion, diseases, crime, vice,” and other urban problems, it has dominated the mainstream discourse for over a century and a half.25

In 1822, High Street, the main artery of Columbus, was extended north out of downtown.26 Until 1900, the neighborhoods were divided into six tracts of land, each with a separate owner. In 1870, the Ohio State University was founded and the land directly to the east of the University was re-named as the “University District.”27 The railroads that still line the eastern edge of Weinland Park and Italian Village were constructed in the 1880s. By 1900, the factories had been built and working-class housing developments followed, to thousands of new factory workers.28 1889 marked the establishment of the Godman Guild, a social services agency that is still in operation on Fifth Street in Weinland Park. In 1926, the Weinland Park (park area) was named in honor of the city councilman who was responsible for the annexation of Weinland Park to the City of
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Columbus a year earlier. For the next three decades, the neighborhoods would be home to a diverse population of African-Americans, first and second-generation immigrants from Ireland, Germany, and Italy, and working-class Anglo-Americans.

It wasn't until the 1930s, under Roosevelt's New Deal programs, that the housing division of the Public Works Administration was formed to deal with the "disease, delinquency, and crime" associated with the slum districts. This marked the beginning of US public housing policy. Housing reformers, critical social theorists, and government policy makers all agreed that the elimination of the slums would cure the spreading urban pathology that accompanied industrialization in rapidly-growing cities. Columbus did experience industrial expansion and a growing urban center, but on a smaller scale than cities like Philadelphia and Chicago, which gained the most attention for their massive slum areas. Several residents that I have spoken with distinguish this time in Columbus from the same period in larger cities. They identified Columbus as a place where the American Dream was still believed to be possible - for anyone who was willing to work hard, have a positive attitude, and avoid the 'vices' of the urban setting.

From its inception, public housing was supposed to deconcentrate poverty with the hope that an "ideal or improved residential environment would better the
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behavior as well as the condition” of poor urban-dwellers.\textsuperscript{30} But after WWII, as blacks migrated into cities and whites ‘fled’ the central cities for the suburbs, business opportunities left cities with the whites. As powell states, “concurrent migrations of white and African-Americans forever racialized urban space.”\textsuperscript{31} Subsidized ‘white flight’ combined with the disinvestment in urban areas occurred as part of the “geographic and municipal sorting of people” throughout the 1950s.\textsuperscript{32} This happened on an institutional and institutionally-enforced individual level, leading to practices like ‘block-busting’ and ‘redlining.’ The FHA and Home Owners Loan Corporation, from the 1930s onward, placed neighborhoods on a four-level hierarchy to determine neighborhood desirability. Places with racial minorities were always placed on the lowest tier, regardless of other aspects of the neighborhood. These places were identified with red lines and those within the boundaries were largely unable to get mortgages because ‘red-lined’ places were seen as too risky to loaners.\textsuperscript{33}

Since the Housing Act of 1949 had declared a “war on the slum” complete with provisions for slum clearance and funding for new construction, public housing has always been marked as different from normal housing.\textsuperscript{34} In the middle of the twentieth century, “three-fourths of all American families lived in single-family houses.”\textsuperscript{35} Public housing, constructed as large, apartment-style
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complexes, were both physically isolated and visually distinct from mainstream housing. As slums were cleared, publicly-subsidized complexes were built in the same physical spaces. During the 1950s, the association of slums with the inner-city, poverty, crime, and race shifted to a similar association between public-housing and urban pathology. And because suburbanization led to systematic outmigration (of whites), disinvestment, and neglect of central cities, the urban ghetto became more isolated than before.

In 1952, the year that Weinland Park Elementary School was built on the corner of East 8th Avenue and Summit Street, the neighborhood was nearly a decade into suburbanization-induced decline. In 1959, the City of Columbus created a new zoning category, known as “AR-4” which covered most of the areas around the University Campus. Weinland Park and Italian Village were both left out of the new zoning. This meant that while the housing stock surrounding Ohio State was quickly converted from single-family homes to rooming houses and apartments, the homes in Weinland Park and Italian Village were left mostly intact during the 1950s. This new zoning also led to an exodus of working-class people from the new University neighborhoods to Weinland Park and Italian Village.36

In 1961, the University Community Association, designed to ‘improve’ the neighborhoods around Campus was reactivated as a voluntary civic association by residents of the University neighborhoods. This same year,

---

36 Campus Partners timeline 1.
Columbus Coated Fabrics became the first of the area factories to announce layoffs of part of its 6,000-person workforce. The transition from industrial to service economy saw effects almost immediately in Weinland Park and Italian Village.\textsuperscript{37} In 1962, ‘Fly-Town’ a working-class neighborhood about a mile west of Italian Village became a victim of early ‘slum-clearance’ programs. ‘Fly Town,’ which was a historically African-American working-class neighborhood housing over ten-thousand people, was systematically demolished over a five-year period. While many of its residents migrated north to Detroit to find work, it is estimated that three to five-thousand of these residents moved to the Italian Village and Weinland Park area, closer to the factories. But layoffs had already begun, so many of these residents found themselves out of work and unable to afford to leave the city to look for work elsewhere.

In 1964, an English sociologist invented the term “gentrification” to “describe the movement of middle-class people into low-income areas of London.”\textsuperscript{38} In Fly Town, stylish ‘town-home’ style apartment complexes replaced the homes that had been destroyed in the name of ‘slum-clearance.’ As the economy changed, these apartments attracted early gentrifiers, “who found the niche they could afford in urban housing.”\textsuperscript{39} These early ‘urban pioneers’ were followed in the late 1960s and early 1970s by developers, who purchased and renovated homes in Victorian Village, which were then sold to better-off, mostly
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white residents of Italian Village and Weinland Park, who were now eager to escape the disinvestment and decline of their previous communities. In 1970, the Southwest corner of Italian Village saw the construction of high-rise project housing complexes, which like others of their kind, were justified because they were seen as cheaper to build and manage. What developers soon realized however, was that high-rise housing was impractical, uncomfortable to live-in, and that it led to increased outmigration from the area to "cheap, single-family homes in the suburbs."^{40} That same year, public housing, which had begun to "project an image of disaster" nationwide, was famously referred-to by Lee Rainwater as "human disaster areas."^{41}

Within the next couple of years, policy makers and developers in Weinland Park and Italian Village recognized that the high-rise, 'project'-style housing must be replaced with a new kind of federally-subsidized assistance. The 'old' style of public housing "could not solve social problems, integrate society, or usher in a new, high-rise urbanism."^{42} The problem, as reformers described it, was that the federal government had been "warehousing the very poor in very large developments."^{43} In 1973, President Nixon issued a moratorium on federal funding for all housing programs until a solution could be found. Just a year later, Section 8 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 seemed an ideal solution to the problem of concentrated poverty.
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The Section 8 approach was based on dispersing the concentrated poor population throughout the city through "tenant-based subsidies." The idea was to "disperse the poor throughout the metropolitan region by providing them with rental vouchers to use in privately-owned housing." Tenants were permitted to live in any neighborhood, as long as the landlord accepted vouchers. In addition, each census tract was required to have a certain number of available Section 8 units. The two census tracts of Weinland Park were given a disproportionate share of these required units: 550 in all. Italian Village, in contrast, was allotted a required 87 units. The same year, the City of Columbus adopted Plan 38, which gave funds to the newly-established Citizens Crime Reporting Program. The City also consolidated housing, zoning, and building code enforcement in the neighborhoods surrounding Ohio State.

In 1975, Italian Village was rezoned as a "Heritage District" by the City of Columbus. This distinction allowed the City to take Eminent Domain over dilapidated properties and to prevent the destruction of "historic" sites in the neighborhood. Importantly, Weinland Park was neither designated a Heritage District nor was it grouped-in with the other University neighborhoods. Because of Weinland Park’s high number of Section 8 units, both the University ‘community’ and the Italian Village neighborhood (busy trying to mimic the success of the Victorian Village gentrification) likely wanted to avoid association
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with a high-poverty neighborhood. In fact, 5th Avenue was officially recognized the border between Italian Village and Weinland Park only after the redistricting of Italian Village. Even in the mid-1970s, the economic success of Italian Village and the University neighborhoods depended on their disassociation from Weinland Park.

In the 1980s, under the Reagan administration, tenant-based housing vouchers became the sole approach for adding to federal housing assistance.47 The Section 8 program was promoted as a way to house the poorest people “that would avoid spending public monies on construction of low-income housing.”48 Reagan cut federal spending by almost half, so that “community development corporations and other nonprofit groups emerged as leading developers of subsidized, low-income housing.”49 In Columbus, like in so many other Midwest cities during the 1980s, neighborhoods like Weinland Park and Italian Village say systematic disinvestment as jobs moved overseas and residents were increasingly denied “access to economic, educational, and social opportunity structures.”50 The expansion of the low-income population that began in the 1970s, continued to escalate throughout the 1980s. “In 1970, there were one million more affordable apartments nationwide than families who needed them.”51 By 1990, “due to widespread demolition and the explosion of the low-income population, of the
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fifteen million households that qualified for federal housing assistance, only about 4.5 million received assistance.”\textsuperscript{52}

Until the 1994 death of Stephanie Hummer, Weinland Park and Italian Village remained isolated from the surrounding neighborhoods, University, and downtown business core. Shortly after the 1995 creation of Campus Partners, the US Attorney’s office and the Columbus Police worked together to arrest and prosecute forty of the most dangerous members of the Short North Posse, a gang associated with Weinland Park, but with roots in the Italian Village area.\textsuperscript{53} In November of 1995, Ohio State’s Board of Trustees authorized the use of 28 million dollars to implement the Campus Partners Plan over the next five years. These changes correlated with National Policy implementations headed by the Clinton Administration.

In 1994, the “Moving to Opportunity” program provided additional housing vouchers in Boston, Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City with the intent of studying the success of the Section 8 program.\textsuperscript{54} The idea of mixed-income housing, developed in the 1970s, began to catch the attention of policy-makers who were still committed to integrating the poor with working-class and middle-class people. The mid-1990s saw “accelerated movement from the spatial isolation of publicly-owned and operated housing developments to semi-privatized and integrated redevelopment plans, along with the dispersal of
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vouchers and certificates.\textsuperscript{55} In 1995, HOPE VI provided an incentive to housers to replace federally-subsidized housing projects with "innovative and creative strategies to leverage federal funds through partnerships with local governments and private developers."\textsuperscript{56} In addition, these strategies must integrate redevelopment with support services that "emphasize the principles of work, self-sufficiency, and personal responsibility."\textsuperscript{57} HOPE VI was intended to deconcentrate poverty and revitalize distressed urban areas, but it quickly became associated with gentrification.\textsuperscript{58} Unlike previous policies, HOPE VI meant that 'do-gooder' investors could invest in private non-profit redevelopment corporations like Campus Partners. If the redevelopment was successful, these investors would make money. Gentrification proved one of the quickest and easiest roads towards 'success' as defined by HOPE VI.

In Italian Village, with a lower percentage of Section 8 housing and an ideal location relative to downtown and the Short North shopping district on High Street, redevelopment was largely driven by private-market investment. But Weinland Park, which by the early 1990s was a racially segregated, economically depleted enclave with a mandatory 550 Section 8 units, redevelopment would present some unique challenges. In 2000, Community Properties of Ohio, an offshoot of Campus Partners, purchased all 550 Section 8 properties in Weinland Park. Up until 2000, the properties were managed by Broad Street Management.
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a company who was notorious for cheating the federal government and mismanaging and neglecting its properties. None of the 550 units passed code enforcement inspection in 1999. Under Broad Street, multiple families could live in one unit with no fear of repercussion; felony convicts could live with partners or spouses without being detected by the management; Broad Street Management had no security team and referred all complaints to the Columbus Police.

After the purchase, renters of these Section 8 properties were relocated for up to two years while their properties were renovated. After relocation, tenants were forced to reapply for tenancy. Under the new management, each tenant was subject to criminal and credit record inspection. In addition, tenants were required to disclose everyone who would enter the property at any time. If any of these people had a previous felony conviction, the tenant’s lease would not be renewed. Those who owned pets (elderly people made up the majority of this group) had to get rid of the pet or loose their tenancy. Under the new rules, management could enter any property at any time to inspect for illegal activity or un-documented residents. In the first month after turnover, Community Properties of Ohio served over 400 non-compliance eviction notices to tenants in Weinland Park. Seventy-six of these tenants were actually evicted. In the second month, eighty-four more tenants were permanently evicted.59

In 2001, Community Properties of Ohio brought CPTED on board. CPTED, or “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design” specialized in
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“design that eliminates or reduces criminal behavior and at the same time encourages people to keep an eye out for each other.”\textsuperscript{60} They utilize a number of strategies to prevent crime through architecture and design. The first, natural surveillance, aims to prevent crime by keeping criminals easily observable by lighting the areas around buildings. Territorial reinforcement uses gateways, fences, and landscaping to distinguish public space from private space. Natural access control involves the construction of streets and sidewalks that discourage people from leaving the areas that are designated for public transportation. Finally, target hardening means using bolt locks for doors, enforced window locks, and specially-designed door hinges to make break-ins more difficult. These measures have been central to the architectural design principles used to redevelop Weinland Park.

In 2003, following the fire that killed five students on East 17\textsuperscript{th} Avenue (not in Weinland Park), Weinland Park became a ‘hot spot,’ and an additional seventy-two full-time officers were assigned to the area.\textsuperscript{61} This was part of a grant from the city that provided Community Properties with a Section 8 police force, a mobile sub-unit to increase visible police presence, and other “concentrated resources directed at reducing crime associated with Section 8 properties.”\textsuperscript{62}
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In addition, the University won the fight to declare Weinland Park to be an ‘Empowerment Zone.’ This redistricted Weinland Park as part of the University District, giving Community Properties of Ohio, and the University full power over the changes in the neighborhood. Because in 2003, despite efforts to deconcentrate Section 8 housing and fight crime, “the public image in Weinland Park was one of an area with a high rate of violent crime...the murder of seven people in Weinland Park in 2003, including a baby and a triple homicide [of a college student and her two friends] did nothing to dispel this image.”63

The South Campus Gateway, the crowning achievement of Campus Partners and affiliates, was set to be completed in autumn 2005. Over thirty separate properties had been taken through Eminent Domain to make way for the Gateway project. The architecture had been carefully thought out by planners, who knew that the Gateway sat on the edge of what was historically one of the most dangerous parts of Weinland Park. The outside of the complex was created to be a “prickly space – designed to be uncomfortable to occupy, particularly by the homeless. Components include sprinkler systems, lack of protection from the sun, an absence of public toilets or water, ‘bag-lady’ proof enclosures around restaurant dumpsters, and ‘bum-proof benches’ on which it is impossible to lie down.”64 The Gateway complex is nearing completion, but investors are worried that retailers will not be willing to risk placing businesses in a dangerous area.
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In 2003, two ‘grey-field’ spots in Italian Village had been purchased by private developers. The first of these covered the over fifteen acres where the only high-rise low-income buildings in the area had once sat. The 1,800 residents of Taylor Towers had been evicted or relocated in the late 1990s prior to the demolition of the towers in 2000. The other ‘grey-field,’ Jeffrey Place sat on the forty-one acres on the Southeast corner of the area. This land had been home to the Jeffrey manufacturing company and twenty-eight buildings had been destroyed in the late 1990s to turn Jeffrey into a grey-field (see chapter 2). Both sites are undergoing redevelopment. The Taylor Towers site was completed in November of 2004 and boasts single-family homes and condominiums starting around 200,000 dollars. Construction began on the Jeffrey Place site this year and when completed, will constitute a ‘village within a village,’ with its own security, retail strip, and even its own park.

This chapter has primarily focused on the institutions, agencies, and private corporations that have historically had a role in changing these two neighborhoods. In the last decade, the redevelopment in Italian Village has occurred differently than the redevelopment in Weinland Park. While Italian Village has undergone gentrification, Weinland Park has changed through mixed-income housing policy.
Chapter 2

Gentrification vs. Mixed-Income Housing

What makes redevelopment in Italian Village so different from redevelopment in Weinland Park? Both neighborhoods are connected by the train tracks and the line of factories that extends from East 11th Avenue all the way to Interstate 670. Before the 1970s, these neighborhoods, along with Victorian Village, were collectively known as ‘The Short North,’ and even after Italian Village was redistricted as a ‘Heritage District,’ most residents still referred to the area as a collection of neighborhoods. I have already traced some of the historical factors that have led to these neighborhoods being distinguished from one another. Now I will turn to the more recent past, to examine the differences between Italian Village redevelopment (recognized as gentrification) and the revitalization of Weinland Park (carried out in the name of mixed-income redevelopment). I will ask, ‘how different are these two processes from one another,’ in terms of motivations, strategies, and outcomes.
Virtually all public-housing strategies are based in the assumption of environmental determinism, "a belief that an ideal or improved residential environment will better the behavior as well as the condition of its inhabitants." From its inception, public housing was intended to provide shelter for the working-poor and very poor. Importantly, it was not intended to eradicate poverty. Giovanna Proacci points back to the nineteenth century, to the emergence of the discourse of pauperism, which he argues has been central to all of the policies and laws that affect the poor.

This discourse defines the morality of people by their behaviors, and equates morality with socio-political order. The pauper does live in poverty, but does not become the despised object of a new set of sciences because of her economic status. Poverty is natural, expected, and even considered an integral part of industrialized societies. In the discourse of pauperism, poverty is not a plague in urgent need of a remedy. Rather, that which must be eliminated is the unhappy poor person - the pauper. Proacci defines the pauper as "poverty intensified to the level of social danger." It is symbolized by the "urban mob" and is identified by a "set of physical and moral habits." The pauper is indigent, insubordinate, anti-social, and "hyper-natural" or primitive.

The pauper represents a threat to industrial-capitalist development because of what he represents. Seen as promiscuous, illegitimate, and indecipherable, the
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pauper refuses to be made legible, legal, or contracted.\textsuperscript{70} The pauper appears to be "ignorant of duty and its usefulness" and it is this ignorance that is presumed to lie "at the origin of his/her challenge to political power."\textsuperscript{71} She refuses "to be blackmailed by the future" and insists on living in the immediate moment.\textsuperscript{72} The strategies employed by those in power to combat pauperism are strikingly similar to the tactics used by urban developers and policy-makers to revitalize distressed neighborhoods. Then, as now, social welfare, monitored assistance, and the collection of statistics were techniques that power-holders hoped would reform the pauper. In addition, a number of "rules for hygiene" were enacted, which were intended to police the home and workplace, and paupers were coerced into institutions of family and marriage so that they could be more effectively monitored and controlled (165). Finally, the children of paupers were mandated to attend public schools where they were educated in dominant values and prevented from engaging in 'vice' in the streets.

Like the paupers, the 'street element' in urban neighborhoods can be identified by his behaviors, cultural expressions, and resistance to and refusal of the dominant codes and rules of expression. In the nineteenth century, and now in the twenty-first, the goal is to identify the "unhappy poor" and to reform them, educate them, study them, and ultimately to annihilate the unhappiness while preserving poverty. What is central to the work taken up from here, is that neither
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pauperism nor the category of 'street' describes the "lived realities of poor people's
existences"(163).

One of the problems that leads to urban 'vice' has been, according to
gentrifiers and urban scholars alike, the concentration of the poor into
impoverished areas. The "isolation of the poor from middle- and working-class
institutions and role models," according to William Julius Wilson, "encourages
and reinforces nonmainstream behavioral characteristics such as a weak labor
force participation and results in an 'underclass' subculture."\(^{73}\) The assumption
then, is that "reversing the process of concentration by mixing incomes will
produce better outcomes"\(^{74}\). In the 1970s, two approaches were used to achieve
these ends. Section 8 vouchers, also known as "tenant-based subsidies," became
the largest form of federal housing assistance by the 1980s. The idea behind
Section 8, was and remains to disperse concentrations of poor people by giving
them vouchers which can be used in any part of the city, provided that the
landlord is willing to accept them. The hope was that, by giving low-income
families vouchers to use in the private market, they would be "dispersed
throughout the metropolitan region" instead of concentrated into isolated project
housing.\(^{75}\)

The other deconcentration strategy was to provide incentives to businesses
to invest capital into decaying urban centers which would, planners hoped,
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encourage middle-class people to move into the poor areas, deconcentrating poverty and in essence, creating mixed-income communities. But the private market did not prove to be hospitable to this kind of change and gentrification usually resulted. Wyly and Hammel explain the varied consequences that can ensue when capital is re-invested into an urban area

"Changes in the built environment often provide a valuable guide to describe the process, but actually incidental to the place-based class transformation itself. Gentrification may involve ‘lofing’ or condominium conversion in a warehouse district; it may entail a slow turnover of a neighborhood of attractive Victorian houses; or it may take the form of new luxury condominium towers on an abandoned waterfront site. The consequences of this class shift, therefore, can also take different forms: When it involves ‘invasion-succession’ displacement, the process sometimes leads to open conflicts among old and new residents. New construction or ‘gray-field’ redevelopment avoids these conflicts but is also usually bound up with comprehensive schemes to privatize public space and exclude the city’s poor from areas now reserved for affluent residents, white-collar workers, and patrons of upscale retail and entertainment facilities."\(^{76}\)

What happened in Italian Village is a combination of all of these outcomes. Its proximity to the local gallery district, the availability of attractive housing stock, the aging population of its existing residents, and the lack of a unified community action group all contributed to the kinds of redevelopment that were possible. The Italian Village Commission and its partner organization, the Italian Village Resident Group, were both formed by incoming residents in the
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early 1980s, who instead of fighting gentrification acted as the “vanguard of the bourgeois” working to “impose social and cultural homogeneity.”  

The early gentrifiers are both low and middle income people who may be single mothers, students, artists, and others who need access to the downtown area “find the niche they can afford in urban housing markets.” What many of these residents share is the ideology of historic preservation coupled with a fear of or distaste for existing residents. These work in conjunction with private investment to remove the pre-gentrification population, “especially those residents whose modernization of their homes is incongruous with the spirit of authenticity in the gentrifiers’ own restorations.” Gentrifying residents, supported by private investors and the government, form organizations that provide them with power to determine the future of the neighborhood. In the absence of existing community action groups, the gentrifiers’ groups receive “cultural validation” from shared “activism on behalf of historic property.” Within less than a decade, property taxes go up, poor residents are displaced further from the central city, and individual landlords quit accepting Section 8 vouchers in favor of leasing to tenants who are able to pay market-rate rents. Poor residents become the targets of discrimination by real estate agents, sellers, and public and private landlords.

In Italian Village, all of these things have happened. The most expensive redevelopment projects (Jeffrey Place, 1st Avenue Site) have been subsidized by
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the state under the Ohio Brownfield Program, which provides monies to corporations who rebuild on old factory sites and other demolished places. The condominiums in these developments are priced between 200,000 dollars and over 1 million dollars. Although this kind of development is seen as a way for a city to grow without displacing residents, Smith and Williams argue otherwise. “I would expand the definition of gentrification to include the development of vacant land, the former use of which provided employment or housing to the working class, involving a change of land to serve middle-class needs.”

Remember, Jeffrey Place is being constructed in place of the Jeffrey Manufacturing Company, which employed thousands of workers and the 1st Avenue development was built where the high-rise projects that housed thousands of low-income residents, once sat.

The gentrification of Italian Village was made possible and has been largely understudied partly because of the lack of a cohesive resident coalition. Italian Village has always been considered the ‘safer’ side in relation to Weinland Park which may be one reason why residents did not come together sooner. The idea that the one side is safer than the other comes from the perceptions of pre-gentrification residents, who often discuss Weinland Park as the ‘gang-banging’ side of the Short North. This assumption may have something to do with the fact that Italian Village has never had a disproportionate share of project-based Section 8 units. It is unclear why one side of the neighborhood got more Section
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8 housing than the other, but the result may be that fear of crime is less of a
deterrent for potential gentrifiers in Italian Village.

In contrast, Weinland Park was not already bordered by a gallery district.
The businesses on the Western edge of Weinland Park were a gas station, several
convenience stores, a plasma center, a grocery store, a laundry-mat, two fast-food
restaurants, and a chain of campus bars. Also, the high concentration of poverty-
level households and condemned properties meant that the area would not likely
be targeted by land speculators, who choose neighborhoods that already have the
potential to be “full of vitality.” In 2001, one reporter described the neighborhood
as a prototypical ‘hood. He comments, “Right here in America, many kids skirt
the turf of local toughs on their way from a ramshackle home to a failing school
before returning home to play among drug dealers, eat dinner (maybe) with an
unemployed parent, and finish the day playing a violent video game to the sound
of gunfire on the next block.”

This description, while not reflecting the reality of life in Weinland Park,
does nicely sum up the public’s understanding of the neighborhood. Take into
consideration the gang history, the prevalence of Section 8 housing, and the lack
of a discernable neighborhood ‘character,’ and Weinland Park would seem too
risky to most potential investors. Also crucial to the unique strategies of
redevelopment in Weinland Park was the long-time existence of citizens’ action
groups, who were linked to respected organizations such as the Godman Guild.
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These residents demanded inclusion in redevelopment and used community
groups to voice their concerns. In a neighborhood planning workshop in 2003,
these residents voiced their concerns about their neighborhood.

They recognized the problems of Weinland Park as stemming from
educational constraints and lack of quality education for young people and adults
and "an economy in which manufacturing jobs have been in decline for a
generation," as well and the "dispersal of jobs to suburban locations."84
Specific barriers they cited included lack of support services for single mothers,
poor public transportation, people's backgrounds preventing them from getting
jobs, local employers being unresponsive to applicants from the neighborhood, no
living-wage jobs, not enough job training, inadequate equipment for online job
applications, and not enough child care in general. And they also mentioned a
number of secondary problems such as crime, too many carry-outs and liquor
stores, trash collection problems, intergenerational gang activity, lack of a bicycle
route, and no safe places for children and teens.85

And residents' groups were unequivocal in their stance on gentrification.
They did not want the community to endure a net loss of subsidized housing.
Rather, they hoped to attract working- and middle-class people to the
neighborhood, with the hope that the higher-class residents would bring money
with them, which could lead to positive changes like the construction of a bank, a
drug store, an improved bus line, park land, a recreation center, and a better
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What residents' groups wanted was a truly mixed-income neighborhood, in which the needs of the poor were not sacrificed in the name of redevelopment.

Mixed-income housing policy became popular in the 1990s, as housing reformers saw that "market-driven revival of inner-city neighborhoods" most often resulted in almost total displacement of pre-gentrification residents. Reformers recognized that pre-gentrification residents who were "likely to have consumption patterns of a lower social class, constitute a different racial or ethnic community, and were of an older age group" were driven-out as gentrifiers moved-in. Reformers recognized that gentrification does not "counteract the economic and racial polarization of most urban populations." They also acknowledged a tension between "wanting to provide housing for those in need and, on the other hand, wanting the stability that working families bring."

Initially, mixed-income housing, based on the premise that children should have the opportunity to live among working- and middle-class role models. The Role Model Argument says that "children benefit from living near people who are not poor" and that working families "work to support themselves, pursue education, maintain family structures, and support community institutions." To solve the problems of the poor, mixed-income advocates argued, policy needs to
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attach their needs to “those of a more influential population.”92 This idea fit in neatly with the federal government’s emphasis on personal responsibility and upward mobility. And federal funding cuts meant that more responsibility must lie with the private sector. The private sector, comprised of real estate speculators, small businesses, and large corporations saw mixed-income as potentially profitable, or at least more so than isolated, enclave ‘slum’ neighborhoods. Mixed-income redevelopment seemed like the solution that all stakeholders could live-with. But from the outset, mixed-income as a policy was plagued by conflicting interests.

Whereas the residents’ groups in Weinland Park wanted more educational opportunities, better access to jobs, and a higher quality of life for existing residents, investors were concerned primarily with new residents and businesses. Investors identified a very different set of concerns and objectives than pre-redevelopment residents. Investors pointed to contaminated gray-field sites (that had to be decontaminated before redevelopment could occur), the “broken windows syndrome,” and the “current apathy and cynicism among residents” as primary barriers to neighborhood improvement.93 Among their early strategies were code enforcement, movement away from rental units to homeownership, the investment of over 150 million dollars for the Campus Gateway, and “the deconcentration and dispersal of subsidized residential units.”94 At the same time,
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developers and planners assured residents that the neighborhood plan would
"discourage any and all actions likely to displace current residents contributing to
or capable of contributing to the well-being of the neighborhood." 95

For Weinland Park’s redevelopment to constitute gentrification, planners
argued, three things would have to happen. First, existing residents would have to
be involuntarily displaced. Second, there would have to be physical improvement
to the neighborhood. Third, the character of the neighborhood would have to
change. The authors of the Weinland Park Work Program elaborate:
“Gentrification is not necessarily occurring simply when new, higher-income
residents move into the neighborhood...Moreover, the fact that tenants leave
rental units does not in itself mean gentrification is occurring because tenants
move out for a variety of reasons...revitalization and economic development
activity in itself does not always mean gentrification will occur...gentrification
does not seem very likely in the near or medium terms.” 96

In addition, planners and developers often substituted ‘mixed-income’ for
‘mixed-use.’ These terms can easily be conflated, but the difference between
them holds radical implications for redevelopment. Whereas mixed-income
implies certain protections for some subsidized families, mixed-use merely means
that an area will combine residential properties with businesses. The core values
and objectives statement of Campus Partners and Community Properties reflect
the interests of campus partners. They include the preservation of “architectural
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quality and character,” strict law enforcement to make the area “safe and secure 24 hours per day,” by-the-books code enforcement of every property, and the creation of new investment and leadership “partnerships between city, state, university, community, and individual investors.” These values sound vague, and it isn’t until the detailed descriptions of each one that the conflicting interests of Campus Partners and community members become apparent. Most troubling is the explanation of land use and zoning, in which developers plan to “examine downsizing certain neighborhoods to reflect overlay and density standards, encourage mixed-use areas that focus activity and new development, and create a strategy for identifying, prioritizing, and removing non-permitted properties... campus partners... should acquire the worst single family properties and facilitate their rehabilitation to single-family homes if appropriate or complete removal.”

In the over 200 pages of planning documents for Weinland Park, there are a number of statements that specify that when rehabilitation is “not feasible,” there should be “demolition and creation of new communities.” What is striking, however, is that there are no guidelines to determine the characteristics of a non-permitted or one that is unable to be rehabilitated. We can only assume that it is left to personal judgments by private investors. The lack of guidelines was demonstrated in 2004 when a multi-family apartment complex on East 8th

97 Summary of University District document 9.
98 Summary of University District document 10.
99 Tech Memo 2, 16.
Avenue was demolished because, Campus Partners asserted, “the structure of the building makes it difficult to manage well.”

Planners also stress that a multi-prong strategy is needed to turn Weinland Park into the ‘Campus Gateway to the Near North,’ a mixed-income “city within a city.” Section 8 management must fall into the hands of the redevelopers themselves who will rehabilitate properties and more carefully select tenants; Density must be decreased by turning multi-family duplexes into single-family homes; New residents, with higher incomes, must be provided with incentives to move to the neighborhood. (Target populations include graduate students, staff, and OSU faculty, double-income childless households, and artists); through ‘hot spot’ programs, defensible space initiatives, and increased policing by the public and private sector, the reality and perception of crime must be reduced.

One of the main complaints about Weinland Park is the high residential density of poor residents. To reduce this density, duplexes will be converted into single-family homes, Section 8 housing will be ‘deconcentrated’ and ‘dispersed,’ and homeownership will be promoted over renting. One must wonder how these plans can move forward without displacing existing residents. To be sure, residents’ associations have made an impact on the redevelopment process. Weinland Park Elementary, which was destroyed in the spring of 2005 will be rebuilt and renamed. A 5.5 million dollar child center, paid-for by Campus Partners, will serve 150 children and will be a ‘laboratory for child
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development. And the city and Ohio State have both agreed to fund increased job-training and educational programs for area residents. But it has become increasingly clear that this is an uneven social contest – When residents’ associations have tried to fight developers, they have not been on equal footing with the other ‘stakeholders.’ And instead of fighting one or more actors, they have been up against “a whole set of economic and social processes that underlie development.” And this is not the only criticism of mixed-income housing plans. Because mixed-income housing policy is relatively new, there are a limited number of case studies to point to. But the criticisms of mixed-income housing in these studies are useful to studying the present and future of Weinland Park.

In a case study of the Gautreaux project in Chicago, Susan Popkin points to a range of negative outcomes of mixed-income housing. The poorest public housing tenants, who are often affected by social problems such as disability, mental illness, depression, substance abuse, and domestic violence, “less likely to survive the kinds of screening that new or newly renovated mixed-income developments.” Also, private housing authorities like Community Properties of Ohio are more likely to strictly enforce rules and regulations. As in Weinland Park, this often means that households with members who have a criminal record are banned. In a mixed income project in Charlotte, North Carolina, she says, “only 44 of the original 367 households were able to move back into their
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development after it was revitalized, and most of those were elderly.” In Washington, D.C., half of the “previous public housing residents who applied for a unit in the new, mixed-income townhomes on Capitol Hill did not meet the application requirements.” ¹⁰⁵

Popkin’s study of mixed-income housing results in a chilling conclusion. She fears that the outcome of mixed-income housing policy will be the clustering of “troubled, very poor families in poor communities outside of public housing. Those whose problems are most severe may lose their assistance and end up underhoused in private-marked slums – or even homeless.” ¹⁰⁶

The terms surrounding mixed-income housing – personal responsibility, private ownership, upward mobility, and the role model argument – also lead to questions about the effects of mixed income housing on the very poor. For example, the motto of one Chicago-based mixed-income development is “The cost of opportunity is responsibility.” ¹⁰⁷ The emphasis on personal responsibility, history has shown, excludes those with disabilities. In addition, mixed-income housing is incapable of working with the “segment of the population that’s continually engaged in anti-social behavior, such as gang activity, drug-dealing, and other crime.” ¹⁰⁸ This leads to the assumption that has permeated public housing policy since its inception: that people in public housing are being relocated and/or displaced because of ‘poor lifestyle choices.’ Public housing
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tenants, treated like bad children need “supervision, training, etc. before they can be allowed to make their own choices.”

This assumption underlies the most common complaint made by pre-redevelopment residents of Weinland Park – that moderate- and middle-income incoming residents receive preferential treatment over subsidized residents. Because redevelopment relies on the presence of middle-class residents, their needs, complaints, and requests are more likely to be met by private and public power-holders. In contrast, the public housing tenants are ‘allowed’ to stay in the neighborhood only as long as they ‘behave’ according to the rules and norms set down by the developers. Public housing tenants in Weinland Park are fully aware that there is a three-year waiting list in Columbus to be placed in subsidized housing, and that they are replaceable, or worse, that their presence in the neighborhood is tolerated only with hostility from middle-class residents.

Mixed-income housing projects mean that under watchful eyes of police, social workers, and privatized housing authorities, households, and even individual residents, can be scrutinized and judged to be fit or unfit to live in the developing neighborhood. So that unlike gentrification such as that which is occurring in Italian Village, mixed-income projects do not necessarily or automatically discriminate or displace on the basis of race and class. Instead, residents are put in a position to ‘prove’ their commitment to individual responsibility and the work ethic and their willingness to be reformed by powerful
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institutions. Those who resist redevelopment, engage in illegal or ‘immoral’ behavior, or fail to assimilate to the new norms of the renovated ‘Campus Gateway to the Near North,’ are removed in the name of progress. Under regimes of mixed-income housing, it “becomes necessary to destroy at least part of the neighborhood in order to save it.”110 Here, a formal imposition of sameness is combined with the exclusion of “those whose rhythms and movements do not accord with dominant representations and uses of such space.”111

Various reasons underlie the move away from the gentrification/isolated poverty model towards a model of community planning and mixed-income housing. Not least of these are the complaints of housing reformers that planners and policy-makers have, in the past, inhumanely displaced huge numbers of people from their homes simply because their properties have been located within an area targeted for redevelopment. Today, there is spreading recognition that there are people and structures within even the most decayed neighborhoods that are ‘worth saving.’ The goal of mixed-income housing is much the same as the nineteenth century goal associated with pauperism. Like paupers, the ‘unworthy’ poor can and must be identified by their behaviors, cultural expressions, and resistance to and refusal of the newly-imposed dominant community norms. The ‘success’ of the mixed-income neighborhood relies on the ability of institutions to identify, reform, educate, study, and categorize the existing residents, rooting out the most desperate and those who are least able or likely to assimilate into
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dominant, middle-class, 'village' life. Mixed-income, unlike gentrification, does
not necessarily need to eliminate the poverty from the 'village' or 'district.'
Therefore, this strategy is able to eradicate dissatisfaction, desperation, and rage
associated with extreme poverty while not affecting, in any measurable way, the
condition of poverty itself. Mixed-income is successful precisely because it
removes all 'blame' (for poverty, racism, classism, segregation) from the
redevelopers. The emphasis on personal responsibility, private investment, self-
sufficiency, and work places the blame on residents who 'choose to fail' even
with the 'support' of social workers, educational and work programs, and police.
Conclusion

In 2000, the median household income was $15,381 in Weinland Park, $19,422 in Italian Village, and $38,042 in the City of Columbus as a whole.\textsuperscript{112} Fifty percent of Weinland Park residents and thirty-nine percent of Italian Village residents lived below the poverty level opposed to fifteen percent of Columbus resident who lived below the poverty level.\textsuperscript{113} People still referred to the two neighborhoods collectively as the Short North. They called Campus Gateway to the Near North by its old name, Weinland Park. In Italian Village, it was still possible to rent a three-bedroom house for about $500 and usually with no credit-check. Crime, poverty, and physical decay of Short North properties were still common.

But as promised by the City and the University, change washed over Italian Village and Weinland Park like the floodwaters that used to collect around the garbage-clogged gutters. The “Eliminate the Elements” crime program and Community Properties have been responsible for the acquisition and destruction.
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of more than fifteen publicly-subsidized apartment buildings and homes.\textsuperscript{114} Renovated single-family homes in Weinland Park sell for an average of $190,000 and for $270,000 in Italian Village. The 250,000 square foot Gateway complex is almost complete – it will boast the largest Barnes and Noble bookstore in the world, dozens of dining and shopping establishments, offices, and loft-style apartments for graduate students, faculty, and Ohio State staff. On the southern end of the two neighborhoods, all of the eighty homes and condominiums at the First Avenue site have been bought for no less than $210,000 per unit. The Jeffrey Place site is midway through construction – the next-door police station is already open for business. The homeless camp that used to border the traintracks was burnt-down in a mysterious fire. The state has reinstated their policy of claiming the property of any Medicaid recipient when he or she passes away. Joe Armeni, in an arrangement with the City of Columbus, is given the first opportunity to buy these houses at bargain basement prices.\textsuperscript{115}

When I started studying these neighborhoods in 1998, I was hopeful that Weinland Park would be different than Italian Village. I planned to engage in a comparative case study of these places, which were and are undergoing two different kinds of redevelopment. I have come to believe that mixed-income housing policy, while it does use a distinct set of strategies, has many of the same effects and outcomes for which gentrification has been criticized. I also believe

\textsuperscript{114} Community Properties Celebration from Campus Partners News 2004. "Eliminate the Elements" is the city and University-sponsored program that initiated the "Hot Spots" program among others.

\textsuperscript{115} This is only a rumor, but other developers are talking about filing a suit against the city for selling these properties to Joe Armeni as part of a secret agreement.
that the ideologies underlying mixed-income are almost identical to those that are associated with gentrification. If anything, mixed-income is not so much a new kind of policy as it is an intervention into the free-market tendencies of gentrification. But this intervention, like the residents' groups who fight for jobs, better schools, and childcare, has little power in the face of partnerships between the government and the private sector. Though public-housing advocates and residents groups have always been up against private and public partnerships, the formalizing of this relationship in terms of redevelopment has created a united force. I hope that I have demonstrated that the interests of the public-private stakeholders do not reflect those of the residents themselves. Mixed-income housing does little to fight poverty and may actually create new areas of concentrated poverty.

Finally, I have told the histories of decay and redevelopment in Weinland Park and Italian Village as they are in reality—bound-together but being torn-apart by new narratives of redevelopment. As territory is reclaimed and redeveloped; as new maps are drawn and boundaries are defined; as people and places are destroyed, removed, and erased, I believe that mixed-income redevelopment is little more than a mask for gentrification. I fear that pre-gentrification residents suffer under both redevelopment regimes in equally devastating ways.

Since I moved here in 1998, all of my neighbors have left the area. My homeless friends are either in jail or have been told by the police that they must
look for a new place to live. I have moved five times in the past six years, no more than two blocks from my original house on East 4th Avenue. Each time, I have fled the construction and chaos that accompanies redevelopment in search of a place where work had not yet begun. Every time this has happened, neighborhood revitalization followed me. I have memorized the order of things: First, land speculators drive and walk by the homes on a particular block. They take notes on the condition of each property and leave flyers in the mailboxes, offering to pay cash up front to the homeowner if he or she decides to sell. About a month later, code enforcement officials cruise the block, searching for problems and issuing citations. This usually happens around the same time that the police become hyper-visible. Before the speculators visit, police vehicles might drive by once or twice per day; after the redevelopers come, they will drive by many times during the day and night. They may park on the corner and enforce stop signs and speed limits for the first time in recent memory.

Because residents on the chosen block begin to get arrested and are sometimes unable to meet the code standards, evictions follow within a few weeks. It is painful to see the belongings of someone you know, strewn about a front lawn. The first day of a property set-out, a number of residents gather at the site, sorting through the debris in search of potentially valuable or useful items. By the end of this day, there is usually little more than a few pieces of skeletal furniture, open packages of food, and trampled clothing. If the evicted resident does not return to gather these things, the city will arrive within a couple of days.
to remove the garbage. After this is done, the interested redeveloper will take control of the property and begin renovation.

Redevelopment of a single property most often takes less than one or two months. Sometimes, the redevelopers simply re-carpet and paint; other times, they must repair and rebuild certain parts of the property. The house or apartment goes on sale as soon as the property is acquired by the redeveloper. By the time the finishing touches are put on the outside of the dwelling, the house has been sold to a gentrifier. One thing you will always notice is that the pre-gentrification residents move out of their property either carrying their belongings or packing them into the back of a beat-up pick-up truck or van. The gentrifier, on the other hand, almost never shows up until after the hired movers have unpacked the new resident’s belongings from an enormous moving-van.

After several properties have been renovated on any block, differences are immediately apparent. New residents add flood lights to the outsides of their homes, so that the block seems brightly lit, even in the middle of the night. A street that was completely deserted a few months earlier will now be packed with stylish cars and sports utility vehicles. And people socialize across porches, over wine and candle-lit patios. At this point, I am ready to move away. Because I am plagued by the fading memories of what was there before. I am unable to erase the shadows of what these places were before redevelopment re-staked its claims. Through this project, I hoped that I would be able to preserve, even if only in
writing, the memories that are being promptly destroyed by those with the power to re-create a place as well as a history.
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