

Reinventing Older Communities Through Mixed-Income Development: What Are We Learning From Chicago's Public Housing Transformation?

Mark L. Joseph, Ph.D.
Case Western Reserve University

Federal Reserve Bank
of Philadelphia
Biennial Conference
March 27, 2008

Mixed-Income Possibilities

1) Impact on people (low-income families)

- Quality of life
- Social Networks
- Social Control
- Behavior and Role Modeling
- Local Power and Influence

2) Impact on place

- Physical revitalization: social costs ↓, tax base ↑
- Win-win: market rate and affordable housing

Mixed-Income Limitations

- Dramatic loss of affordable units; Public housing can be well-run (Vale)
- Focus on attracting middle-class; deficit perspective of families in poverty (Pattillo)
- Potential downsides of mixed-income developments: relative deprivation, stigma, loss of local power (Briggs)
- Does not address macrostructural causes of urban poverty, including structural racism (Turner)
- Market-driven approach; public sector relinquishing responsibility to house the poor (Fraser)

HOPE VI Background

- Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere
- 1992 - 10 yr/\$5 billion
- As of 2006, 236 HOPE VI grants in 127 cities
 - 149,000 units demolished
 - 49,000 units to be developed
- Challenges: loss of units, delays, low return rates
- Impacts: revitalization, relocatee's quality of life
- House bill H.R. 3524 approved January 2008

National experience thus far

- Very complex to finance and operationalize
- Mixed-income developments can be successfully marketed to higher-income residents
- Relatively high levels of overall resident satisfaction
- Some social friction, levels of social interaction are low

My Research Questions

- 1) What is the process of creating and sustaining a mixed-income development?
- 2) What are the experiences and outcomes for public housing residents and residents of other income levels?
- 3) What is the nature of social relations and community use and engagement?

Background Context: Chicago

- Plan for Transformation – 1999 - 2014
 - 15 years, \$1.5 billion (plus)
 - Demolish 22,000 units
 - Build or renovate 25,000
 - 11 new MI developments
 - 17,000 total units, including
 - 7,700 for public housing

Qualitative Data

	MI Sites	Sample
Developers and social service providers	9	26
Public housing relocated residents	N/A	69
Jazz on the Boulevard residents	1	46
3-site case study: resident interviews	3	65
3-site case study: stakeholder interviews	3	47
3-site case study: meeting observations	3	66

Early Status and Insights

- Development process
 - Complexity of development process
 - Strength of early market demand
 - Impact of current housing market crisis
 - Challenge of recruiting public housing residents
- Early resident experiences
 - Improved quality of life
 - Tensions around use of public space
 - Low levels of social interaction
 - Tenure-segregated governance structures
 - Multiple relevant forms of “mix”

Implications

- Who benefits: support for relocators and returners
- Balancing screening with inclusion
- Support “housing plus” strategies
- Role of non-profit developers
- Promoting and sustaining well-functioning developments
 - Safety
 - Inclusive governance
 - Neighborhood amenities
- Building housing vs. Building community
 - Design
 - Property management
 - Inclusive services and amenities, community outreach