

SECONDARY RESEARCH: CITATIONS

Hwang, J., & Yoon, H. (n.d.). Shifting and Persisting Neighborhood Hierarchies ... Retrieved from
<http://paa2019.populationassociation.org/uploads/192117> .

DeVerteuil, G., Yun, O., & Choi, C. (2017, July 7). Between the cosmopolitan and the parochial: the immigrant gentrifier in Koreatown, Los Angeles. Retrieved October 9, 2019, from
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649365.2017.1347955> .

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099> .

Wolch, J., & Li, W. (2002, May 25). Shifting Margins of Housing Status in Los Angeles. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X97906001> .

Molina, N. (2015, February 1). The Importance of Place and Place-Makers in the Life of a Los Angeles Community. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from
<https://scq.ucpress.edu/content/97/1/69.abstract>.

Hwang, J. (2015, December 21). Pioneers of Gentrification: Transformation in Global Neighborhoods in Urban America in the Late Twentieth Century. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13524-015-0448-4> .

BULLSEYE DIAGRAM

Sources:

Molina, N. (2015, February 1). The Importance of Place and Place-Makers in the Life of a Los Angeles Community. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from <https://scq.ucpress.edu/content/97/1/69.abstract>.

DeVerteuil, G., Yun, O., & Choi, C. (2017, July 7). Between the cosmopolitan and the parochial: the immigrant gentrifier in Koreatown, Los Angeles. Retrieved October 9, 2019, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649365.2017.1347955>.

Hwang, J. (2015, December 21). Pioneers of Gentrification: Transformation in Global Neighborhoods in Urban America in the Late Twentieth Century. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13524-015-0448-4>.

Wolch, J., & Li, W. (2002, May 25). Shifting Margins of Housing Status in Los Angeles. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089802X97906001>.

Hwang, J., & Yoon, H. (n.d.). Shifting and Persisting Neighborhood Hierarchies ... Retrieved from <http://paa2019.populationassociation.org/uploads/192117>.

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099>

By their very place-spanning nature, immigrants are taken to be natural cosmopolitans, the very agent of the transnational. Their mobility 'joins the taken-for-granted world'. Yet simultaneously, immigrants can be downright parochial, in terms of operating closed ethnic economies as well as employing mutual aid and survival techniques that draw strength from insularity and self-segregation

Koreatown has, in twenty-five years, gone from crime-ridden and riot-prone to a hip place to visit and inhabit, tirelessly promoted by such luminaries as chef-turned-entrepreneur Roy Choi. Many of the interviewees were fully aware that gentrification threatened other kinds of diversity that may have brought them to Koreatown in the first

Koreatown becomes more parochially segregated not just by race but also by built environment – incoming gentrifiers living in 90% Korean new-builds have little chance encountering a Latino population living in older, crowded and degraded apartments built between the 1920s and the 1970s, and increasingly subject to gentrification-induced displacement.

In the City of Los Angeles, for example, population grew by 135,000 between 1990 and 1994, during which time only 18,500 additional housing units were added to the stock (City of Los Angeles, 1995). The result was rapid price/rent escalation.

Recently enacted changes in the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, the Food Stamp Program, and in the Supplemental Security Income Program will inevitably push many individuals, especially children and disabled people, from their precarious housing arrangements onto the streets.

By the end of 2004, the HOPE VI programme had demolished approximately 63 000 units and more than 20 300 units were redeveloped, however, HOPE VI has not aided the revitalisation of depressed

The legacy of immigrant and minority place-makers is fragile because these actors frequently are not activists, politicians, or organizers. They make history quietly.

The growth of new immigrants increases demand for low-cost housing in central cities. The rise of gentrification results in a new dynamic such that more households are competing for low-cost housing, which may, in turn, affect which neighborhoods gentrify

Restaurants can serve as social spaces that shape the neighborhoods in which they are located in ways that empower those who inhabit the surrounding area.

Evidence from New York City suggests that Hispanic neighborhoods had strong organizational capacity that was able to maintain affordable housing, which may have prevented gentrification in neighborhoods with high levels of Hispanic growth, and the continued rapid growth of immigrants into these neighborhoods may have limited points of entry for gentrifiers as low-cost vacancies quickly disappeared.

The movement of middle-income groups into low-income areas creates overwhelmingly negative effects, the most significant of which is the displacement of low-income groups

Metropolitan areas experiencing the highest rates of immigrant growth, have sprawling suburban areas with low relative housing costs, perceived good schools, low crime, established networks of other immigrants, and often major employment centers.

Terms like urban renaissance, urban revitalisation, urban regeneration and urban sustainability are used, avoiding the class constitution of the processes involved and neutralising the negative image that the process of gentrification brings with it. It is difficult to be for gentrification, but who would oppose 'social mixing'?

Gentrification leads to displacement and socio-spatial segregation, rather than alleviating social segregation, as working-class and minority residents are steadily priced out of gentrified areas

Gentrification research has shown that increased social mix within declining neighbourhoods can worsen the quality of life for existing residents

In the past new people and incumbents have often not mixed well when they were of different races or socioeconomic statuses. The normative integration that is a prerequisite for upgrading does not develop ... This probably becomes more serious when racial mix is combined with socioeconomic mix.

Gentrification is not just about changing the present; intentionally or not, it erases the past."

Place-makers from the past pictured improving the neighborhood through community legal services and affordable day care centers. The twenty-first-century solution is to fight crime in Echo Park by opening a beer bar with seventy-three California craft brews on tap, plus a full bar and food service

In cities with low levels of segregation and growing Asian and/or Hispanic populations, these groups become increasingly segregated as they form their own communities

The middle-class gentrifiers engaged in little social mixing with local low-income groups. Social interaction was greatest in areas where other groups had been largely pushed aside.

"What I want to bring to your attention is the importance of recognizing and memorializing the placemakers who helped to shape the urban landscape of Echo Park and of other, similar places. If we fail to acknowledge and value these actors' roles, we risk viewing gentrification as merely an uncomplicated urban renaissance in which a new set of place-makers revitalizes a rapid cultural wasteland filled with crime and blight.

The homeless policy continues to emphasize emergency assistance, while the welfare, human service, and employment assistance supports so critical to preventing homelessness are being cut.

There is the strong possibility that in the near future, no one will know this piece of immigrant and multicultural Los Angeles history or the role Echo Park has played in the formation of cross-racial bonds.

Housing redifferentiation is a policy of adding more expensive dwellings to low-income areas by removing inexpensive dwellings through demolition, together with the sale and upgrading of existing dwellings—the idea being to create a more socially mixed population in neighbor

Notes from:

Hwang, J., & Yoon, H. (n.d.). Shifting and Persisting

Neighborhood Hierarchies ... Retrieved from

<http://paa2019.populationassociation.org/uploads/192117> .

As gentrification has become widespread across cities throughout the US over the last two decades, the growth of new immigrants and shifting patterns of immigrant settlement and profiles have reshaped metropolitan contexts.

Analysis based on US Census and American Community Survey data from 1990 to 2014 shows a negative relationship during the 1990s but a positive relationship after 2000 between immigration and the prevalence of gentrification across cities.

First, we find limited preferences for diversity governed by a racial hierarchy in the spread of gentrification whereby the influx of immigrants in black neighborhoods is associated with increased odds of gentrification but decreased odds in other neighborhood ethnoracial compositions. Second, we find evidence of housing competition dynamics such that, in high immigration cities, immigrant influx is negatively associated with the likelihood of gentrification. This process is racially patterned during the 1990s but not the 2000s. Together, these dynamics explain the higher likelihood of gentrification in predominantly black neighborhoods during the 2000s relative to other neighborhoods.

Whereas central city depopulation and decline and suburbanization characterized US metropolitan areas for most of the twentieth century, metropolitan areas in the late twentieth century have undergone widespread demographic shifts as immigration rates increased significantly, the Hispanic and Asian population grew, and gentrification became increasingly widespread (Ehrenhalt 2013).

Gentrification—the process by which low-income central-city neighborhoods experience investment and renewal and an in-migration of middle-and upper-class residents (Smith 1998: 198)—occurred across several US cities since the mid-twentieth century, but, beginning in the late 1990s, the process became much more rapid and widespread compared with the past (Connor et al. 2018; Hackworth and Smith 2001). Distinct from before, the recent wave of gentrification is characterized by its spread beyond downtown neighborhoods into “economically risky” ones, greater involvement by larger investors and developers and the state, and the decline

in effective resistance (Hackworth and Smith 2001; Lees 2008; Wacquant 2008).¹ In line with these observations, others have noted the increased prevalence of gentrification occurring in minority, particularly black, neighborhoods (Goetz 2010; Owens 2012; Freeman and Cai 2015; Hyra 2017).

Although the foreign-born population significantly increased in the US from 9.7 million to 19.8 million from 1970 to 1990 with the passage of the 1965 Hart-Celler Act, which eased immigration restrictions from specific regions, the foreign-born population increased substantially during the 1990s at unprecedented levels, growing to 31.1 million by 2000 and to 42.4 million by 2014 (Singer 2004).

Notes from:

Hwang, J., & Yoon, H. (n.d.). Shifting and Persisting

Neighborhood Hierarchies ... Retrieved from

<http://paa2019.populationassociation.org/uploads/192117> .

To explain the increased prevalence in minority neighborhoods in particular, explanations point to: an increased focus of federal housing policy to deconcentrate poverty with the demolition of large-scale public housing projects and transformation into mixed-income developments, changing racial attitudes (Hyra 2017); and the growth of middle-class minorities who often drive gentrification initially in predominantly minority neighborhoods

Since the 1990s are from Asia or Latin America, but the

share of immigrants from Mexico declined precipitously over the period, as more immigrants from other countries increased (Massey 2008). Between 2008 and 2009, the share of Asian arrivals surpassed that of Latino arrivals (Waters et al. 2015). Asian immigrants continue to include a large number of highly educated, professional, and entrepreneurial migrants while Hispanic immigrants – specifically Mexicans – continue to be largely low-skilled labor migrants

while more immigrants now live in the suburbs compared with central cities, in traditional gateways and in the largest metropolitan areas, immigrants are still more likely to live in central cities than the suburbs compared to the overall population (Wilson and Singer 2011; Frey 2014; Waters et al. 2016). New immigrants traditionally moved to the urban cores of metropolitan areas, which serve as a base for low-SES residents for eventual assimilation (Logan et al. 2002; Singer et al. 2009), but metropolitan areas experiencing the highest rates of immigrant growth, such as Atlanta, GA, Austin, TX, and Portland, OR, have sprawling suburban areas with low relative housing costs, perceived good schools, low crime, established networks of other immigrants, and often major employment centers.

several ethnographic accounts of gentrifying neighborhoods note the prior presence of Asian and Hispanic immigrant groups, including well-known examples of gentrified neighborhoods such as Brooklyn's Williamsburg (Susser 1982) and Chicago's Wicker Park (Lloyd 2006).

Across 23 US cities, Hwang (2015, 2016) finds that neighborhoods in cities with relatively higher shares of foreign-born residents have a higher probability of gentrifying and that the presence of Asians during the early and mid-1970s positively predicted gentrification.

. First, the rise of immigrants replenished the population of depopulating cities and neighborhoods as non-Hispanic white and black populations continue to grow in the suburbs in decline in cities (Winnick 1990;

Their influx established commercial businesses in vacant storefronts and increased the demand for housing that may have otherwise remained vacant (Lin 1998; Muller 1993; Winnick 1990). Immigrants continue to revitalize local economies through entrepreneurship and increased demand for housing and consumption

- “*Pioneering*” Hypothesis: The influx of immigrants to neighborhoods is positively associated with the likelihood of gentrification; more broadly, the influx of immigrants to cities is positively associated with the prevalence of gentrification in cities.

Notes from:

Hwang, J., & Yoon, H. (n.d.). Shifting and Persisting

Neighborhood Hierarchies ... Retrieved from

<http://paa2019.populationassociation.org/uploads/192117> .

In addition, the in-migration of immigrants is negatively associated with violent crime (McDonald, Hipp, and Gill 2013; Sampson 2012; Vigdor 2014), and studies cite large crime declines across cities since the mid- 1990s as an important contributor to increased gentrification

Thus, immigrants may stabilize and improve the social and economic conditions of neighborhoods that may make neighborhoods or central cities, more broadly, more attractive for gentrification.

the large increase in the Hispanic and Asian populations associated with the growth of immigrants, especially since the 1990s, alters the ethnoracial compositions of many neighborhoods that may in turn make neighborhoods more attractive for gentrification.,

Evidence on the preferences of gentrifiers document both an aversion to predominantly minority, especially black, neighborhoods in this early period (Laska and Spain 1980; Smith and Williams 1986; Smith 1996) and an aversion to homogeneously white, middle- and upper-class neighborhoods that characterized the suburbs

Neighborhoods are now increasingly multiethnic(Zhang and Logan 2017), potentially bringing the ethnoracial diversity that appeals to gentrifiers' preferences. While much of this literature focuses on individuals' neighborhood preferences, these preferences certainly interact with neighborhood selection processes by developers, investors, and the state

- “*Deterring*” Hypothesis: The influx of immigrants to neighborhoods is negatively associated with the likelihood of gentrification; more broadly, the influx of immigrants to cities is negatively associated with the prevalence of gentrification in cities.

Blalock (1967) argues that, rather than increasing racial integration, larger shares of minorities exacerbate preferences to avoid minority neighbors.

- Other studies find that, in cities with low levels of segregation and growing Asian and/or Hispanic populations, these groups become increasingly segregated as they form their own communities
- Other research also finds an increasing aversion to these groups by natives as immigration continues to rise and as areas become less educated and less white (Saiz and Wachter 2011; Sanchez 1997).
- Hwang's (2016) study on gentrification during the 1970s and 1980s finds that areas that served as enclave destinations for immigrants were unlikely to gentrify.

The processes described thus far can occur directly in specific neighborhoods to which immigrants move, but the influx of immigrants and subsequent changes to the social, economic, or compositional conditions of the neighborhoods across cities, more broadly, may make urban living more or less attractive, regardless of the specific neighborhoods with growing immigrant populations.

the growth of new immigrants increases demand for low-cost housing in central cities. The rise of gentrification results in a new dynamic such that more households are competing for low-cost housing, which may, in turn, affect which neighborhoods gentrify

Notes from:

Hwang, J., & Yoon, H. (n.d.). Shifting and Persisting Neighborhood Hierarchies ... Retrieved from <http://paa2019.populationassociation.org/uploads/192117> .

At the neighborhood-level, the influx of immigrants may deter gentrification and offset gentrification pressures to other neighborhoods, and, at the city-level, the influx of immigrants may limit the prevalence of neighborhoods that experience gentrification.

Whereas the metropolitan areas to which immigrants tended to migrate during the 1990s had a negative relationship with the prevalence of gentrification, there is a strong positive relationship during the 2000s. This is likely explained by the shifting patterns of immigrant settlement to different metropolitan areas and to different areas within them and by shifting profiles of immigrants.

the distinct relationships between immigration and gentrification at the neighborhood-level relative to the metropolitan-level are noteworthy and suggest that there are distinct sorting processes between gentrifiers and immigrants. For both decades, the influx of immigrants to a neighborhood is negatively associated with the neighborhood's odds of gentrifying on average, but the influx of immigrants to the city or metropolitan area is positively associated with the odds of neighborhood gentrification during the 2000s.

the recent wave of gentrification continues to follow processes reflecting a ethno racial hierarchy. The influx of immigrants into predominantly black neighborhoods significantly increases their likelihood of gentrification across both decades, while it significantly decreases the likelihood of gentrification in other-minority and nonminority neighborhoods.

These findings are consistent with a process of buffering in which gentrifiers are more willing to live in black neighborhoods if there is a substantial influx of immigrant residents, and they also demonstrate limited preferences for diversity by gentrifiers. The influx of immigrants to predominantly white neighborhoods is negatively associated with gentrification as they become more diverse, and the influx of immigrants to other-minority neighborhoods is also negatively associated with gentrification across both decades as they become more homogeneous

The lack of an influx of immigration to neighborhoods is positively associated with gentrification in high-immigration cities. This suggests that, as gentrifiers and recent immigrants compete for affordable housing, they differentially sort into distinct neighborhoods. . For predominantly black neighborhoods, the combination of this process and the positive effect of immigrant influx on black neighborhoods explains their greater likelihood of gentrification compared with other neighborhood compositions during the 2000s after accounting for other neighborhood- and metropolitan-level characteristics. The increased demand for low- cost housing imposed by both rising numbers of recent immigrants and the spread of gentrification creates a new dynamic shaping patterns of uneven development within cities.

the gentrification-immigration relationship is negative in supplementary models that examine the influx of recent immigrants from the prior decade. Thus, the influx of immigrants does not lead to more gentrification in the subsequent period but, instead, indicates that gentrification is growing in places where immigration is also growing.

As immigration flows continue, cities become increasingly multiethnic, and gentrification continues to spread across cities, the patterns we find during the 2000s provide insights into the future of US cities and neighborhood hierarchies. As gentrification has evoked considerable debate surrounding its implications for racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic inequality, understanding the nature of uneven development and its changing dynamics are important for developing interventions to mitigate its impacts

Notes From:

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099>.

The benefits of functionally as well as socially mixed urban communities have become something of an unquestioned gospel in policy discourse. Yet there is a poor evidence base for the widespread policy assumption that gentrification will help increase the social mix, foster social mixing and thereby increase the social capital and social cohesion of inner-city communities.

There is an “uneasy cohabitation” between gentrification and social mix.

Sociocultural diversity is a *leitmotif* in the new tastes for central city housing and neighborhood.

In research undertaken in one of the first neighborhoods in London to gentrify, Barnsbury in Islington, such a *leitmotif* is certainly to be found. Pioneer gentrifiers in Barnsbury were part of a left-liberal new middle class who actively sought social mixing, as seen in the fact that they were champions of the comprehensive school revolution of which Margaret Malden's Islington Green was a prototype.

The present trend towards a rising proportion of the middle classes in the population will continue. This will help create a better social balance in the structure of the community, and the professional expertise of the articulate few will ultimately benefit the underprivileged population.

The assumed social advantages of the balanced community have been at the heart of nearly all debate on new towns and urban renewal ... The difficulty with the concept is that, despite numerous empirical investigations, very little is known about the advantages and disadvantages of different kinds of mix, nor at what level—street, neighborhood, district, community—social balance would be a worthwhile goal for policy objectives (Pitt, 1977, p. 16).

. In the past new people and incumbents have often not mixed well when they were of different races or socioeconomic statuses. The normative integration that is a prerequisite for upgrading does not develop ... This probably becomes more serious when a racial mix is combined with a socioeconomic mix (Clay, 1979, p. 70).

Notes From:

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an

Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099>.

Encouraging socially mixed neighborhoods and communities has become a major urban policy and planning goal in the UK, Ireland, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Australia, Canada and the United States.

post-industrial cities have a growing interest in marketing themselves as being built on a foundation of 'inclusive' neighborhoods capable of harmoniously supporting a blend of incomes, cultures, age-groups and lifestyles

Three distinct rationales in policy debates for social mixing:

- the 'defending the neighborhood' argument claims that since middle-class people are stronger advocates for public resources, socially mixed neighborhoods will fare better than those without middle-class households.
- The 'money-go-round' argument claims that socioeconomically mixed neighborhoods are able to support a stronger local economy than areas of concentrated poverty.
- The 'networks and contacts' argument draws on Putnam's (1995) influential account of bridging and bonding social capital to promote social mixing as the way to generate social cohesion and economic opportunity.

The rhetoric of 'social mix' hides a gentrification strategy and in that a hidden social cleansing agenda. The concept of social mix has been operationalized through gentrification in order to address—that is, cleanse—the long-term disinvestment and poverty in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside

Terms like urban renaissance, urban revitalization, urban regeneration, and urban sustainability are used instead, avoiding the class constitution of the processes involved and neutralizing the negative image that the process of gentrification brings with it. *It is difficult to be for gentrification, but who would oppose 'social mixing'?*

The U.S., U.K., and the Netherlands enacted similar but different ways of promoting social mixing as part of their urban renaissance agendas.

- U.K. has promoted the state-led gentrification of public housing through a mixed community policy and the housing market renewal of areas of supposedly failing owner-occupied housing (usually working-class).
 - In recent policy statement 1 they sell gentrification, which they prefer to call 'urban renaissance,' to us through the neutralizing vein of social mixing
 - The British government's stated intention to bring the middle classes back to the central city, read gentrification, is motivated by, and indeed sold to us, as an attempt to reduce socio-spatial segregation and strengthen the 'social tissue' of deprived neighborhoods.
 - Social mixing and improved social balance are viewed as key to reducing what they term 'neighborhood effects.'

Notes From:

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an

Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099> .

○ “Through producing more socially balanced neighborhoods via gentrification and thus reducing socio-spatial segregation, the British government expects to increase the stocks of social capital in disadvantaged neighborhoods. The mixing of low-income and middle-income communities is, therefore, a necessary part of the British government’s program to reduce social exclusion.”

○ The current strategy for the demolition and rebuilding of the Aylesbury estate lists the construction of 3200 private new-build homes and only 2000 social rented new-build homes. This fulfills the UDP requirement for 40 percent social housing. In essence, they seek to demolish the vast majority of the Aylesbury estate (despite much of it being structurally sound) and to create a new-build development for a privileged middle class. This plan does not acknowledge the current mix already in the area (which is already very socially and ethnically diverse), nor does it address issues of social sustainability.

§ Demolishing low-cost working-class houses in order to build high-value products that middle-class people will allegedly buy violates a whole way of working-class ‘being’ towards houses (as places to dwell rather than a position within the space of positions).

· The U.S. has promoted social mixing through policies that seek the spatial deconcentration of poverty.

○ Local urban renaissance initiatives are seeking to entice more affluent populations into low-income areas—what Stuart Cameron (2003, p. 2373) calls a policy of ‘positive gentrification’ or ‘gentrification as a positive public policy tool’—in order to diversify the social mix and dilute concentrations of poverty in the inner city.

○ . In cities that are highly dependent on property taxes as a source of revenue, seeking to increase your tax base by increasing the percentage of middle-class homeowners in the central city is seen to be fiscal pragmatism

○ The current trend in U.S. housing redevelopment is to replace existing high-density social housing ‘projects’ with new lower-density mixed-income communities. This is the central thrust of the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development’s HOPE VI program, which has been used to mix socially, and gentrify public housing.

○ By the end of 2004, the HOPE VI program had demolished approximately 63 000 units, and more than 20 300 units were redeveloped (Atkinson, 2005). Cunningham (2001), however, in his critique of HOPE VI in Washington DC, argues that HOPE VI has not aided the revitalization of depressed neighborhoods, rather it has reduced, affordable housing and caused spiraling rents and prices

○ This neo-liberal formula of social mixing that promotes gentrification can be seen operating at perhaps a more disturbing level in post-Katrina New Orleans

§ They aim to lure middle-class families back into New Orleans and to build over, displace or ‘culturally integrate’ the African American/ low-income communities

§ both programs involve the displacement of very large numbers of low-income households of color

Notes From:

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an

Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099> .

- The Netherlands has pursued policies of breaking up, through demolition and rebuilding, significant areas of low-income housing. In a similar vein to the U.K., it has also enacted a policy that regulates new developments by requiring mixed occupancy as a condition for planning approval and/or funding.

- In the Netherlands, a policy of 'housing re-differentiation' as they call it, has been underway since 1996

§ Housing redifferentiation is a policy of adding more expensive dwellings to low-income areas by removing inexpensive dwellings through demolition, together with the sale and upgrading of existing dwellings—the idea being to create a more socially mixed population in neighbor

- The motivation for promoting such policies is not about the social well-being of disadvantaged individuals; rather, it is about the need to strengthen the economic position of Dutch cities overall.

- City governments in the Netherlands see the facilitation of social mix as a way of attracting higher-income residents who will improve the tax-base, support local businesses and improve the governability of the city—for well educated, middle-class urbanites are less of a burden on social services and are likely to play an active part in neighborhood revitalizations

Butler with Robson (2003) suggests that higher levels of social mixing, and thus conceivably also of social capital and cohesion, are more likely to be achieved in socially homogeneous, rather than socially mixed, areas.

- At too local a scale, it can create tensions—especially when there are marked economic, social and cultural differences between residents—and residents may withdraw rather than mix
- a large quantitative study using data from the U.K. census and the Scottish longitudinal study, were forced to "conclude that the policy of deliberately mixing tenures in housing developments in order to improve social well-being remains largely unsupported by the research evidence so far available".

Social mixing is being promoted through gentrification in the face of evidence that gentrification leads to social segregation, social polarization and displacement. The movement of middle-income groups into low-income areas creates overwhelmingly adverse effects, the most significant of which is the displacement of low-income groups

There are long standing claims, mostly from the U.S., that gentrification leads to displacement and socio-spatial segregation, rather than alleviating social segregation, as working-class and minority residents are steadily priced out of gentrified areas (for example, Marcuse, 1986; Smith, 1996; Wyly and Hammel, 2004).

Notes From:

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099> .

The spatially based mechanisms designed to increase social mixing—such as reduced spatial segregation, better urban design and compact cities (the exact policy ingredients in the case of new-build gentrification along the Thames)—have been ineffective in increasing social mixing at the neighborhood/community level.

Walks and Maaranen concluded that gentrification in these cities was followed by declining, rather than improving, levels of social mix, ethnic diversity and immigrant concentration within affected neighborhoods.

Gentrification was implicated in a growth in neighborhood polarisation and inequality: “the more that gentrification has progressed in a neighborhood, the greater the reduction in levels of social mix, and the less ‘mixed’ the local social structure in 2001”

Gentrification was found to have a deleterious impact on the immigrant-reception function of inner city neighborhoods.

The middle-class gentrifiers interviewed by Butler (1997), Butler and Robson (2001) and Butler with Robson (2003), engaged in little social mixing with local low-income groups. Social interaction was greatest in areas where other groups had been largely pushed aside and, where they had not, gentrification tended to result in ‘tectonic’ juxtapositions of polarised socioeconomic groups rather than in socially cohesive communities. Butler (1997) found that Hackney’s gentrifiers sought out people with similar cultural and political values, ones attuned to what inner-city living had to offer, such as social and cultural diversity. Yet Butler points to some interesting contradictions. He argues that “there appears to be an increasing tendency towards spatial segmentation within the middle class both occupationally and residentially” (Butler, 1997, p.161). Despite the Hackney' new' middle classes' desire for diversity and difference, they tended to self-segregate.

- The willingness of the new urbanites to live cheek by jowl with low-status communities may testify to the apartness that some feel from those communities”.
- Butler and Robson supported these earlier findings about social interaction and found that middle-class gentrifiers tended to associate with other middle-class people in their neighborhood, primarily through their children. They were clear: “There is little evidence of numbers of cross class friendships.”

It is not realistic to assume that people from different social class backgrounds or income bands living cheek-by-jowl will actually mix, let alone integrate.

Some authors have pointed out that socially mixed communities are just as likely to engender social conflict as social harmony due to the clash of different cultures, classes and socioeconomic groups (Goodchild and Cole, 2001). Freeman (2006) found conflict between the gentrifiers and the more established residents, and resentment stemming from feelings of irrelevance that the neighborhood improvements were not being made for them. As Atkinson (2006, pp. 829–830) argues, “If diversity is to be encouraged, it may be possible only through a vision of a vibrant *city*, rather than an enforced social blend at the *neighborhood scale*”. As Galster says

precisely *how* and *why* neighborhoods matter must be unpacked carefully before one can leap to any policy implications regarding neighborhood mixing (Galster, 2007, p. 35; original emphasis).

Notes From:

Lees, L. (1970, January 1). Gentrification and Social Mixing: Towards an Inclusive Urban Renaissance? - Loretta Lees, 2008. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042098008097099> .

The middle-class pre-school clubs were, and remain, highly exclusionary of non-middle-class children". Gentrification-induced social mix did not then engender social mixing for either adults or children.

Once you include the experiences of non-gentrifiers, the inadequacies of arguments about the influence of residence on class relations in gentrifying neighborhoods become apparent (see Bridge, 1994; also Freeman, 2006). Davidson (under review) surveyed and interviewed both gentrifiers and non-gentrifiers and found little evidence of social interaction between the residents in the newly built middle-income developments along the Thames and the lower-income residents living in the adjacent neighborhoods.

In part, this was due to the transitory nature of the new-build residents and in part it was due to the spatially segregated nature of the new-build developments with respect to the adjacent low-income communities. As Davidson argues

The lifeworlds of the two populations rarely intersect. [They] did not work in the same places or use the same means of transport. They did not frequent the same restaurants or public houses. They had different household structures. They had different expectations and aspirations about community and mixing (Davidson, under review).

Social ties rarely crossed class and racial lines, the social networks in the neighborhoods seemed impervious to the changes taking place around them and there were clashes between the norms of gentrifiers and those of the longer-term residents.

Gentrification research has shown that increased social mix within declining neighborhoods can worsen the quality of life for existing residents.

Gentrification-induced social mix threatens the welfare benefits and supportive networks that emerge from living in neighborhoods with complementary and similar households. It destroys one kind of social capital to try and create another.

Churches, service organizations, schools and institutions have been affected by it. Their numbers have dwindled or their constituencies changed. Many small churches have closed; public school enrolment has decreased in the most gentrified sections, and higher-income children are taking over local private schools.

Policy documents that promote social mixing fail to define what a good social mix is, or what kinds of communities are well balanced

social mix is merely a description that may apply to virtually any urban neighborhood. No neighborhood has a completely homogeneous population.

Notes From:

DeVerteuil, G., Yun, O., & Choi, C. (2017, July 7). Between the cosmopolitan and the parochial: the immigrant gentrifier in Koreatown, Los Angeles. Retrieved October 9, 2019, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649365.2017.1347955>.

- . Yeoh (2004) deemed cosmopolitanism as an ethos of tolerance, diversity, and openness joined to a political project that promotes elitism and neoliberalism, using the case of Singapore and its highly articulated strategies to globalize at all costs. This paradox is captured by the sense that while respectful of difference and diversity, cosmopolitanism only tolerates the packaged and elitist versions, and rejects certain ‘others’, particularly migrants and other transgressors. While potentially emancipatory, cosmopolitan is cast as global citizenship, which is decidedly elitist with no ‘language of questions or resistance’ (Wyly, 2015, p. 2531), alongside a lack of roots, attachment and obligations, linked to European colonialism and modernity (Venn, 2002)
- Encounters never take place in a space free from history, material conditions and power. The danger is that contemporary discourses about cosmopolitanism and new urban citizenship, by celebrating the potential of everyday encounters to produce social transformations, potentially allow the knotty issue of inequalities to slip out of the debate. (2008, p. 333)
- By their very place-spanning nature, immigrants are taken to be natural cosmopolitans, the very agent of the transnational (Portes, Guarnizo, & Haller, 2002; Vertovec, 2009). Their mobility ‘jolts the taken-for-granted world’ (Ley, 2004, p. 159; Smith, 2001). Yet simultaneously, immigrants can be downright parochial, in terms of operating closed ethnic economies (Portes et al., 2002) as well as employing mutual aid and survival techniques that draw strength from insularity and self-segregation (DeVerteuil, 2011a; Marr, DeVerteuil, & Snow, 2009)
- , gentrification is assumed to be more parochial, spatially-bounded and homegrown, locally contingent and locked into specific built environments and historically- embedded infrastructure, ‘gentrification in cities’ (Wyly, 2015, p. 2515) rather than ‘gentrification as a dimension of planetary urbanization’.
- so gentrification remains deeply localized and territorial; Maloutas (2011) further reinforced the indigenous nature of gentrification, that the term remains firmly embedded to its Anglo-American heartland and does not travel easily.
- , immigration and gentrification occupy different positions along the cosmopolitan-parochial continuum and in tension with each other: immigration veers toward the cosmopolitan but still has a place-embedded parochial side via self-imposed insularity and segregation, while gentrification is more place-bound but also has cosmopolitan tendencies via gentrifier disposition and ambition

Notes From:

DeVerteuil, G., Yun, O., & Choi, C. (2017, July 7). Between the cosmopolitan and the parochial: the immigrant gentrifier in Koreatown, Los Angeles. Retrieved October 9, 2019, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649365.2017.1347955>.

- Korea town is often represented variously as an immigrant neighborhood, a hub for ethnic entrepreneurialism, an ethnic enclave and crucible for the Korean-American experience, but also the site of ethnic difference and occasional strife, a struggling, crime-ridden inner-city neighborhood, and increasingly as a gentrifying place.
- Los Angeles Koreatown has been experiencing unprecedented geographic changes, transforming itself from an immigrant ethnic enclave filled with small businesses into a transnational economic space developed by hegemonic development actors'.
- Koreatown remains balkanized by race (heavily non-White, divided between Asians and Latinos) and class (mostly working poor), both an immigrant reception area and an area undergoing incipient gentrification. The complexities are underlined by the demographics: Latinos are the majority population 1 in this majority foreign-born, non-white space, while Koreans make up but 20% of the area's population yet own the bulk of the commercial space.
- : the pattern of gentrification has been highly uneven as well. Real estate data (Data Quick, 2013) for the 2003–2013 period showed that Koreatown as a whole saw median prices increase 25%, which is between the City of Los Angeles (37%) and Los Angeles County (18%) increases, save for 90010 zip code, whose increase of 55% sets it apart. Not surprisingly, this was the only zip code with a Korean majority in Los Angeles (going from 13% in 1990 to over 57% in 2010), as well as the only one with significant new- build gentrification
- . Los Angeles never saw the gradual inner-city disinvestment that many older cities (such as New York and London) did in the 1970s and 1980s followed by relentless reinvestment. Rather, rent gaps have been produced by sharp shocks, such as the destruction wrought by the 1992 unrest that deflated most of inner-city Los Angeles' real estate value but also sowed the seeds for future redevelopment:
- the post-1992 period as a 'unique catalyst' during which certain owners significantly expanded their holdings, a sort of 'shock' disinvestment/reinvestment that overlapped with the 1997 Korean financial crisis, bringing a wave of transnational capital seeking safe haven (Park & Kim, 2008). It was during this period that Koreatown began to experience homegrown commercial gentrification (Light, 2002), laying the groundwork for more recent residential gentrification, 'enclave' style. However, the sense was that residential gentrification was only partially abetted by transnational flows and largely overshadowed, as we shall show, by an important internal financing by long-established, first generation Korean immigrant-investors themselves.
- , the process of gentrification in Koreatown remained more a homegrown affair, grafting onto a longstanding immigrant enclave growth machine. In this respect, Koreatown gentrification represents a distinct phenomenon – the equivalent of older, Americanized Italian immigrants returning to and solely gentrifying Little Italy in New York!

Notes From:

DeVerteuil, G., Yun, O., & Choi, C. (2017, July 7). Between the cosmopolitan and the parochial: the immigrant gentrifier in Koreatown, Los Angeles. Retrieved October 9, 2019, from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14649365.2017.1347955> .

- Koreatown has, in twenty-five years, gone from crime-ridden and riot-prone to a hip place to visit and inhabit, tirelessly promoted by such luminaries as chef-turned-entrepreneur Roy Choi. And yet, many of the interviewees were fully aware that gentrification threatened other kinds of diversity that may have brought them to Koreatown in the first place.
- As Koreatown becomes more parochially segregated not just by race but also by built environment – incoming gentrifiers living in 90% Korean new-builds have little chance encountering a Latino population living in older, crowded and degraded apartments built between the 1920s and the 1970s, and increasingly subject to gentrification-induced displacement. This upends the usual White-minority dynamic, ‘an uneasy fit within gentrification models that stress racial privilege rooted in historical forms of segregation and exclusion within urban America’
- What is evident, despite professed intentions, is that spaces of encounter follow more of a bubble model (Butler, 2003), in which gentrification and diversity are tectonic – they exist alongside each other but rarely meet and never act in concert. This links to the idea that areas of highest diversity are also frequently among the most deprived

Notes From:

Wolch, J., & Li, W. (2002, May 25). Shifting Margins of Housing Status in Los Angeles. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0049089X97906001>.

- In the City of Los Angeles, for example, population grew by 135,000 between 1990 and 1994, during which time only 18,500 additional housing units were added to the stock (City of Los Angeles, 1995). The result was rapid *price/rent escalation*. Overall, in real terms, Los Angeles County rents rose over 50% during the 1980s, and regional house prices, equal to the national average in 1974, were 55% above that norm by the mid-1980s (Baer, 1986). Such price escalation effectively eliminated low-cost units. Between 1974 and 1985, the number of affordable units fell by 42%; such units were 35% of the stock in 1974, but only 16% by 1985.
- The *diversity gap in crowding* was the most striking aspect of the overcrowded housing picture: whereas non-Hispanic White households had experienced little crowding, crowding among African American households was twice the White rate. But both of these rates, while increasing somewhat over the decade, were low compared to Asian and Hispanic households. Among Asians, moderate crowding was four times the White rate while extreme crowding was nine times higher; Hispanic households had five times the moderate crowding rate of Whites and 13 times the extreme rate. More than 40% of Asian and almost 60% of Hispanic households were crowded by these definitions .
- Recently enacted changes in the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, the Food Stamp Program, and in the Supplemental Security Income Program will inevitably push many individuals, especially children and disabled people, from their precarious housing arrangements onto the streets.
- , the need for additional income assistance is even more profound than our estimates suggest, given the severe post-1989 recession in California that resulted in falling incomes among less affluent households (Reed, Haber, and Mameesh, 1996) and the fact that virtually all manufacturing jobs lost in the state were located in Southern California. Such a strengthening of the safety net is not, of course, what is happening at either the national level or the local level in the Los Angeles region. Instead, homeless policy continues to emphasize emergency assistance, while the welfare, human service, and employment assistance support so critical to *preventing* homelessness are being cut.
- As in the case of Michigan, which eliminated local relief entirely in the early 1990s, the results are bound to be devastating. The tenuous hold on shelter among the growing ranks of precariously housed households in the region can only be sustained by a major reversal of welfare, employment, and housing subsidy policies at all levels.

Notes From:

Hwang, J. (2015, December 21). Pioneers of Gentrification: Transformation in Global Neighborhoods in Urban America in the Late Twentieth Century. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13524-015-0448-4>.

- Thus, gentrification is broadly a process of neighborhood selection—not only by relatively well-off individual households but also by developers, businesses, and institutions—that results in the physical, demographic, and cultural transformation of a low-income area into a higher-value, middle- or upper-class neighborhood.
- The influx of immigrants following the passage of the 1965 Hart-Celler Act, which eased immigration restrictions, influenced the development of gentrification. The rise of predominantly Asian and Hispanic immigrants to central cities in the United States beginning in 1968, when the new immigration laws became effective, preceded the rise of gentrification in U.S. cities that occurred in the late 1970s and 1980s (Hackworth and Smith 2001).² Ethnographic accounts of neighborhoods that began gentrifying during this time indicate that Hispanic and Asian immigrant groups were present prior to the influx of middle- class residents. These include well-known examples of gentrified neighborhoods, such as Brooklyn's Williamsburg (Susser 1982), Manhattan's Lower East Side (Mele 2000), and Chicago's Wicker Park (Lloyd 2006).
- Some of these neighborhoods eventually became established ethnic enclaves,³ which have only begun to face gentrification pressures in recent decades as gentrification became rapid and widespread (Hackworth and Smith 2001; Hum 2014; Wilson and Grammenos 2005); however, the neighborhoods to which most of these immigrants arrived were not traditional ethnic enclaves at the time, even in traditional immigrant destination cities
- new immigrants revitalized declining areas by increasing housing demand in emptying neighborhoods and populating previously vacant residences and commercial storefronts (Winnick 1990), thereby creating more desirable economic and social neighborhood conditions that could attract gentrification.
- The new rise of Asians and Hispanics during the 1970s provided a “demographic renewal” to older, inner-city neighborhoods that had fallen out of favor and undergone population declines (Muller 1993; Winnick 1990). Many of these neighborhoods were marked by low residential and commercial rents and high vacancy rates, which provided opportunities for affordable housing and entrepreneurship (Lin 1998; Winnick 1990).
 - Consequently, they stabilized and spurred local economic growth by creating demand for local services, establishing their own enterprises, and replenishing demand in local housing markets
 - This revitalization of declined neighborhoods by immigrants did not necessarily result in the influx of higher-class residents and investment that characterizes gentrification, as defined earlier; but by stabilizing relatively low-cost, declining neighborhoods through filling vacancies and stimulating the local economy and housing market, the influx of Asians and Hispanics improved the social and economic conditions of these areas, potentially increasing their desirability to gentrifiers.
 - Evidence from New York City suggests that Hispanic neighborhoods had strong organizational capacity that was able to maintain affordable housing (Winnick 1990), which may have prevented gentrification in neighborhoods with high levels of Hispanic growth, and the continued rapid growth of immigrants into these neighborhoods may have limited points of entry for gentrifiers as low-cost vacancies quickly disappeared.

Notes From:

Molina, N. (2015, February 1). The Importance of Place and Place-Makers in the Life of a Los Angeles Community. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from <https://scq.ucpress.edu/content/97/1/69.abstract>.

- restaurants as urban institutions and forms of public space in which ethnic entrepreneurs act as “placemakers.”
- restaurants can serve as social spaces that shape the neighborhoods in which they are located in ways that empower those who inhabit the surrounding area.
- El Nayarit (A restaurant) became a crossroads, a physical and social space that regularly brought together individuals whose ethnicity, class, language, and sexual orientation differed. Equally important, the restaurant engendered among its almost exclusively Mexican immigrant workforce a “politics of the possible.”
- , the restaurant engendered among its almost exclusively Mexican immigrant workforce a “politics of the possible.”
- They did not organize unions or lead protests, but they did contribute to the creation of working environments in which they felt valued and where they received fair compensation for their work. They did not don zoot suits or establish political parties, but they did generate a sense of community that reached across racial, ethnic, class, and generational boundaries. Moreover, some employees went on to open their own restaurants, and other enterprises and collectively helped to define the areas where they did business as ethnic spaces.
- She and her staff were placemakers. They enhanced the neighborhood’s identity by running a business that drew people both from inside and outside the neighborhood, providing opportunities for all to forge bonds of understanding.
- Served as an entry point that offered a ready-made social network for immigrants new to a hauntingly large, foreign city. Access to a space in which the language, food, and atmosphere were reassuringly familiar helped to better position recent arrivals for success in their new lives.
- By the 1950s, when the larger El Nayarit was in place, Echo Park was experiencing white flight like many other areas of Los Angeles. As some white residents relocated to other parts of the city and the suburbs, Mexicans, and some Asians, attracted by low housing prices, replaced these residents.
- “What I want to bring to your attention is the importance of recognizing and memorializing the place-makers who helped to shape the urban landscape of Echo Park and of other, similar places. If we fail to acknowledge and value these actors’ roles, we risk viewing gentrification as merely an uncomplicated urban renaissance in which a new set of place-makers revitalizes a vapid cultural wasteland filled with crime and blight. Gentrification is not just about changing the present; intentionally or not; it erases the past.”

Notes From:

Molina, N. (2015, February 1). The Importance of Place and Place-Makers in the Life of a Los Angeles Community. Retrieved October 8, 2019, from <https://scq.ucpress.edu/content/97/1/69.abstract>.

- But beginning in the early 2000s, rents started to double and triple; the median home price doubled by the mid-2000s; and apartment buildings that had long been subject to the city's rent control protections and that offered federally subsidized rent for low-income tenants were bought by investment groups. Residents were given notice to relocate. The councilman for the district at that time, Eric Garcetti (now mayor of Los Angeles), expressed support for low-cost housing by holding community forums and tenants' rights seminars and by backing legislation for stricter rent stabilization. Garcetti argued that "Echo Park [was] hanging on to being one of the last remaining mixed-income communities in Los Angeles."⁵³ None of his efforts, however, produced meaningful positive results.
- . Placemakers from the past, such as the founders and supporters of the Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee and the local parents Jackie Goldberg collaborated with, pictured improving the neighborhood through community legal services and affordable daycare centers. The twenty-first-century solution, as proposed by Yanow, is to fight crime in Echo Park by opening a beer bar with seventy-three California craft brews on tap, plus a full bar and food service.⁵⁹
- This is one of the most troubling—and least often acknowledged—aspects of gentrification: the strong possibility that in the near future, no one will know this piece of immigrant and multicultural Los Angeles history or the role Echo Park has played in the formation of cross-racial bonds. The legacy of immigrant and minority placemakers, is fragile because these actors frequently are not activists, politicians, or organizers. They make history quietly. Yet, without written histories of people of color in Echo Park, negative cultural representations of them, particularly of Mexicans, abound and readily circulate.