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ABSTRACT

Gentrification can be defined as the influx of middle to upper-class residents into an area, usually with an old building stock, formerly occupied by working-class residents. This movement of people typically involves revitalization, displacement, and rehabilitation of neighborhoods or entire cities. In order to retain cultural and architectural heritage, preservationists must be conscious of how, when, and where gentrification occurs. This thesis provided an opportunity to measure gentrification in a historic neighborhood to then be used as a tool for planners, preservationists, and community members.

This thesis analyzed indicators related to architectural and social components of a neighborhood in order to measure gentrification in the East Side neighborhood in downtown Charleston, South Carolina over a sixty-year period. This study analyzed indicators of gentrification which include: vacancy, occupancy, housing values, density, race, sex, age, family versus individual occupation, and crime. Ultimately, this study created a tool for preservationists, planners, community members, and the like to use when studying gentrification in historic neighborhoods. This thesis answers the question – What does gentrification, neighborhood change, and displacement look like in terms of quantifiable metrics related to architectural and social factors? How does this understanding of change over time translate into anticipation of and confirmation of gentrification in historic neighborhoods?
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

“Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody.”

— Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*

Gentrification has been occurring in the United States since the middle of the twentieth century. Some of the first neighborhoods to experience gentrification include neighborhoods in Philadelphia, SoHo in Manhattan, and parts of London, England. According to Smith and Williams, gentrification is defined as “the rehabilitation of working-class and derelict housing and the consequent transformation of an area into a middle-class neighborhood.” Gentrification, for the purposes of this thesis, will be defined as the shift in demographics from working-class residents to middle to upper-class residents primarily in neighborhoods with older building stock. Gentrification typically occurs on a neighborhood scale that can gradually effect entire cities. Typically, gentrification is seen as a negative force driven by markets on residents in poor neighborhoods that may not have the resources to remain in the specific neighborhoods, which generations of their families have resided.

---

Scholars, planners, and preservationists have been studying gentrification since the middle of the twentieth century. Various studies based on anecdotal evidence, qualitative measures, and some quantifiable measures have taken place in cities across the world. Gentrification is generally measured through changes in prices, residential demographics, and interviews. This study measures gentrification strictly through measurable indicators in an attempt to forego bias and create a useable tool for studying gentrification.

This thesis analyzes various indicators of gentrification in order to determine when and how intensely gentrification is occurring using a case study in Charleston, South Carolina. The indicators are developed into two categories that address the architectural and social components of a neighborhood. The aim of this thesis is to determine if change over time of several social and architectural metrics are different, identifiable, and distinct in periods of gentrification vs. periods of stable inhabitation. This study will create a measure of gentrification for preservationists, planners, other professionals, and community members. The study of quantifiable data in the East Side neighborhood of Charleston led to the creation of a methodology that can be recreated for other neighborhoods, which can then be measured by stages and intensity based on the analysis of indicators.

In order to conduct the analysis of indicators of gentrification for this thesis, it is important to make the distinction between gentrification and displacement. According to Karen Chapple, a planning professor at University of California Berkeley,
gentrification and displacement are two separate measures of neighborhood change. In a study she conducted for the Urban Displacement Project, she outlined key differences of gentrification and displacement:

Displacement, which is distinct from gentrification, occurs in many different forms, places, and moments. While gentrification refers to a process of neighborhood change that encompasses local increases in real estate investment, household income, and educational attainment, displacement occurs when housing or neighborhood conditions force moves. Displacement can be physical (as building conditions deteriorate) or economic (as costs rise). It might push households out, or it might prohibit them from moving in, called exclusionary displacement. It can result from reinvestment in the neighborhood—planned or actual, private or public—or disinvestment.4

Understanding the difference in gentrification and displacement is crucial for analyzing the indicators of this thesis, because each can reveal how one or the other may be occurring. It is important to also note that gentrification does not only create negative effects on neighborhoods, but can lead to revitalization and the preservation of buildings. A prominent scholar who studies gentrification, Japonica Brown-Sarancino, describes some of these positives and negatives in her book, *The Gentrification Debates: A Reader.* She cites positives as “stabilization of declining areas, increased property values, reduction of suburban sprawl, and increased social mix.” She goes on to cite negative impacts as, “displacement, community resentment and conflict, loss of

---

affordable housing, increases homelessness, and under-occupancy and population loss.” It is important to recognize that gentrification is not necessarily an overarching nemesis to urban fabric and residents, but rather a facet of revitalization and urban change that should be analyzed and mitigated.

In order to understand the role that gentrification plays in urban change and historic preservation, the definition will be elaborated on slightly: the influx of upper to middle-class residents to historically working-class neighborhood, which is commonly correlated with people of color. Gentrification is an emerging interest in historic preservation that presents a long term focus on neighborhoods as a whole. This shift is a move towards a comprehensive approach to preservation, which includes changes to the built environment relevant to neighborhood change, composition, and gentrification. Historic preservation has a relationship with gentrification through the maintenance of intangible heritage associated with concentrations of diverse groups.

While gentrification and historic preservation are not synonymous; each one has an effect on the other. The neighborhoods affected by gentrification are typically filled with a large stock of old buildings, that can be adapted to a changing cultural and social demographic. According to Lance Freeman, “explanations of gentrification generally fall into two camps: ecological/economic and political economy.” The ecological/economic category addresses demographics, social trends, cultural shifts, cost of living, and a

---

6 Lance Freeman, *There Goes the Hood: Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up*, 96.
desire for old buildings. The role of old or historic neighborhoods, in contrast to new construction or underdeveloped areas of land, in the process of gentrification make it a relevant issue for historic preservationists and their field of study. The allure, character, and significance of old structures can fuel gentrification within neighborhoods that are predominantly made up of working-class minorities. Neighborhoods affected by gentrification are typically made up of working-class people who occupied the area generationally. Generally, low-income neighborhoods have vacancies, low-cost investment opportunities, and an architectural stock that can be revitalized for economic gain, which draw new residents or developers into places that had once been forgotten by affluent groups.

Planners, scholars, preservationists, and residents have been grappling with the rights and wrongs of gentrification since it was conceived in a post-World War II society. The literature surrounding gentrification will be examined in order to describe this development over the twentieth and twenty-first century. In order to understand the pros and cons of gentrification, the factors that create or influence it must be addressed. While this might not seem like the responsibility held by historic preservationists, it is imperative that as our built environment is sustained we do not lose our intangible heritage as well. The built environment carries less weight when the people who created and influenced are no longer present. UNESCO – the United Nations of Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization - created a list of recommendations

---

for “Historic Urban Landscape.” The list states, “Recognizing, the dynamic nature of living cities, noting, however, that rapid and frequently uncontrolled development is transforming urban areas and their settings, which may cause fragmentation and deterioration to urban heritage with deep impacts on community values, throughout the world.”8 These recommendations prescribed by UNESCO show that the built environment and urban spaces are heavily influenced by community and other aspects of intangible heritage.

Previously, gentrification has been loosely measured by qualitative data like interviews with community members as well as information regarding demographics, housing costs, and housing statistics. The research contained in this thesis is an attempt to measure gentrification strictly using quantifiable data. The East Side neighborhood in downtown Charleston, South Carolina from 1950 to 2010 serves as the case study for this thesis. The intention is that other neighborhoods will be able to use this method of data collection and assessment to determine the stages of gentrification and severity of indicators. This method will provide a baseline characterization to define gentrification in technical, quantifiable terms. The following pages will illustrate the goals of this thesis, the relationship between historic preservation and gentrification, background

---

information on the East Side neighborhood, policy surrounding preservation in Charleston, and the methodology that will be used to collect and analyze data.

This thesis ultimately aims to answer the question – What does gentrification, neighborhood change, and displacement look like in terms of quantifiable metrics related to architectural and social factors? How does this understanding of change over time translate into anticipation of and confirmation of gentrification in historic neighborhoods?

**Gentrification Meets Historic Preservation**

According to the Encyclopedia of American Urban History, gentrification is defined as “the movement of new middle-class residents into poor and working-class inner city neighborhoods, spurring the rehabilitation of a district’s previously abandoned or neglected housing stock and the revitalization of its commercial life...it involves as well the displacement of existing residents, usually with some experience of hardship or disadvantage.”9 In turn, preservation is defined as, “conserving, rehabilitating, restoring, and reconstructing the built environment as a useful primary source for the study and interpretation of history.”10 By looking to these two basic definitions, it is clear that gentrification is a concern for historic preservationists and community members alike. In order to sustain intangible heritage and our built environment,

---

10 Ibid, 303.
preservationists should be actors in mitigating, controlling, and monitoring
gentrification in an urban environment with historic neighborhoods.

Historic preservation has often been blamed as a catalyst for gentrification in
neighborhoods.11 Typically, residents of neighborhoods undergoing gentrification see a
direct relationship to historic district designations, preservation efforts, and
involvement from groups that want to conserve the built fabric. This association appears
valid at face value, but historic preservation does not directly spur gentrification. While
designating historic buildings or neighborhoods may affect the value of those places, it
does not directly link to the displacement of residents and the infiltration of newcomers.

Stephanie Meeks, CEO of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, recently wrote
The Past and Future City: How Historic Preservation is Reviving America’s Communities.

In her book, she dedicates a chapter to “The Problems of Affordability and
Displacement,” in which she writes:

Preservation shouldn’t be something that happens to communities. We have to
make sure we’re doing it right, and that the quality of life for existing urban residents isn’t
being diminished by the associated impacts that come when a street, a block, or
neighborhood begins to improve its fortunes. Affordability, displacement, the rising cost
of living, and loss of neighborhood identity are all issues that preservation and
revitalization efforts must contend with and, if possible, work to mitigate.12

---

Preservation is a fairly new field, in the United States, and has not always held these sentiments towards urban development, community development, and planning efforts. In the beginning, preservation was narrowly focused on individual buildings with prominence or high-style architecture. Over its history, the field has come to be more inclusive by including vernacular building types, entire neighborhoods, and intangible heritage, all of which are effected by gentrification.

Preservationists, planners, and community members have used their expertise and involvement in determining new ways to mitigate gentrification, while still conserving the built environment. In cities like Charleston, preservation professionals have put housing affordability, mitigation of gentrification, and the preservation of neighborhoods tangible and intangible character at the forefront of their initiatives. Historic Charleston Foundation has a “Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative” which focuses on neighborhood stabilization through engaging various interest groups.\textsuperscript{13} Historic Charleston Foundation does not intend to stabilize the community through one effort, but rather through their ability to rally various parties to communicate and plan. The foundation was able to fund a study conducted by a planning consultant, which can serve as a central document to convene around. This is a local example of how preservation professionals can engage in mitigating gentrification while conserving the built environment.

Other groups across the nation, from government organizations to nonprofits have also engaged in the overlap of historic preservation and urban planning. Cities like Charleston, San Francisco, Washington D.C., and Los Angeles are all facing issues dealing with displacement, housing affordability, and gentrification. These issues then directly impact historic preservation and cultural resource professionals. There are various methods used in the field of preservation to mitigate displacement while retaining historic fabric. In *The Past and Future City*, Stephanie Meeks lists methods to use against displacement. She includes: Community Benefits Agreements, Commercial Protections and Heritage Business Laws, and Community Land Trusts.\(^{14}\)

She writes, “The job of historic preservation is not to try to prevent change—communities are always in the process of change. Rather, it is to leverage the tools, techniques, and habits of our field to help neighborhoods move forward in a positive direction, in a way that minimizes community disruption and helps facilitate equity, affordability, and harmony among old residents and new arrivals.”\(^{15}\) Ultimately, gentrification is likely to be an issue as it is part of urban change. Historic preservation

---


These methods are used across the country as ways to control displacement and change. Community Benefits Agreements are decisions made before new developments begin construction that specify how the development can benefit the current community. Commercial Protections and Heritage Business Laws are local ordinances that subsidize local businesses that are over a certain age and can prove their cultural and historical significance to the area. The subsidies benefit landlords and business owners by supplementing rent and wages in order to retain successful, local businesses. Community Land Trusts are nonprofit organizations that purchase land and buildings and provide subsidized rent to tenants in order to retain cultural, social, and historic fabric. The trust owns the land, while the building is transferred normally, but to specific tenants like local business owners or first-time homebuyers.

\(^{15}\) Meeks, *The Past and Future City*, 222.
professionals with this set of tools should increase awareness of the reality of this phenomenon and continue to consider how to control and mitigate gentrification.

**Case Study: Charleston + East Side**

Charleston, South Carolina provides a unique opportunity to study the mechanics of gentrification. The historic city has been undergoing development and change for decades, while becoming a world-class destination for visitors, students, and workers. In 2016, Charleston was named the #1 Best City in the World by *Travel and Leisure* magazine, which cemented its place as a destination for travelers and new residents from all over the world. This nomination is only the newest outside influence on the development of the historic city center. This notoriety is part of a shift has caused displacement throughout the twentieth and twenty-first century in various neighborhoods. The rising affluence of neighborhoods began at the southern point and has continued to climb up the peninsula.

Forces from student and workforce housing demand, along with a return of white, middle to upper-class residents to neighborhoods on the peninsula have created immense changes in the built environment with respect to affordability and demographics. Neighborhoods like Ansonborough, Cannonborough-Elliotborough, and Harleston Village have all changed under pressures from development, urban change, and gentrification. Residents, city-officials, preservationists, and other community members face challenges of mitigating displacement without hindering the growth of
the city. All of these issues make the East Side neighborhood an ideal case study of
gentrification.

The East Side neighborhood in Charleston, South Carolina is located on the
northeast side of the peninsula. The neighborhood is bounded by Mary Street to the
south, Meeting Street to the west, Lee Street to the north, and East Bay Street to the
east. The neighborhood is one of the few left on the peninsula in Charleston that has
not completely undergone gentrification. The neighborhood is unique, because it does
not boast large hotels, tourist destinations, or many restaurants. The area is mostly
comprised of residential buildings: single-family residences, multi-family residences, and
government-funded housing. The area has small commercial buildings like corner stores,
a handful of restaurants, and nonprofits like the NAACP and the East Side Community
Development Corporation. The neighborhood also boasts a large four-square park,
which was laid out in the eighteenth century. This area currently houses public buildings
like churches, schools, and volunteer centers.
Figure 1.1: Map illustrating the East Side neighborhood and its building types. Map from Charleston County GIS Map, overlays by author.

The edges of the neighborhood are dramatically different from the core, which shows how displacement, urban change, and gentrification have already started to occur. Meeting Street and East Bay Street are the western and eastern borders of the neighborhood. These streets are two main arteries on the peninsula, which run north and south. The streets are lined with hotels, gas stations, large commercial centers, restaurants, and many new high-rise buildings. These edges are distinctly different from the core of the neighborhood, which shows the fast-paced development the neighborhood is up against. This development is taking form in large-scale housing...
developments and hotels that are beginning to populate Meeting Street from Calhoun Street to Lee Street. In 2016, the East Side lost a major chain grocery store that serviced the area, which has created a food desert for the residents in the neighborhood. The plans to develop this lot into a hotel have been fought by city officials and residents. These edges will be a major driving force of development and displacement that the East Side will face in coming years.

The demographics of the East Side have remained fairly unaltered over time. The neighborhood was laid out early in Charleston’s history as a planned area for wealthy, white merchants and planters, but soon became home to a majority African American population. The area has, for most of its history, been home to a majority of African Americans and working-class immigrants. During the nineteenth century, the area was home to the largest population of free African Americans on the peninsula. This demographic has defined the East Side’s cultural and built heritage over time, which is at risk of being lost to urban change and gentrification.


A food desert is defined by the USDA as “limited access to supermarkets, supercenters, grocery stores, or other sources of healthy and affordable food.”


This article addresses the plan Mayor John Tecklenburg has created along with community members to ensure fresh groceries are available to East Side residents once the grocery store closed. It also cites a plan to ensure that a grocery store is replaced as part of the new development.
East Side: History

Originally called Hampstead Village, the area, now known as Charleston’s East Side, was one of the first planned suburbs outside of the city center beginning in 1769. The neighborhood was laid out by Henry Laurens, a wealthy slave trader and planter in the late 1760s. Laurens created the neighborhood plan using inspiration from cities in England. He designed a large, central park with four exterior squares which was surrounded by parcels. He laid out 140 lots around the park and began to sell them in the following decades. The urban plan of Hampstead Village was dictated by the tidal creeks of the Cooper River, which projected into the peninsula like fingers. According to

---

a “Neighborhood History” written for the East Side Master Plan the, “eastern edge rose high above the river to command views of the harbor and to receive sea breezes.” This history also provides a chronology of street layout which shows that streets like Blake, America, and Reid street are original to the neighborhood. The neighborhood has been bordered by Meeting Street, Mary Street, and East Bay since its beginnings. Northern streets like Cooper and Lee Street were established later as the peninsula was filled in. Overall, the layout of the neighborhood has seen few changes with the exception of filling in marshlands, altering the shore for industry, and accommodating new populations. Figures 1.3 through 1.7 show this development of the East Side neighborhood from 1801 to 1980.

---

20 Ibid, 16.
Figure 1.3: Map of East Side in 1801. Map from East Side Master Plan.
Figure 1.4: Map of East Side from 1852. Map from East Side Master Plan.
Figure 1.5: Map of East Side from 1882. Map from East Side Master Plan.
Figure 1.6: Map of East Side from 1952. Map from East Side Master Plan.
The area where the East Side neighborhood is located was known as the Charleston Neck and was not incorporated into the City of Charleston until 1849. This distance from the city limits influenced the demographics of the area, as well as the architectural fabric. Early on the neighborhood was inhabited by wealthy merchants, planters and the enslaved Africans they owned. Some middle-class laborers and
craftsmen also resided in the area. The East Side had the largest population of free
African Americans before the Civil War with prominent, wealthy men like Richard
Holloway, Thomas Bonneau, and John Jones.21

Many groups were drawn to the area because it was distant from the city center
which meant lower rents and less policing. The area did not adhere to the same
regulations and ordinances of the city. The area did not have to follow laws regarding
fire protection, so the majority of structures in the East Side are wood-frame rather than
masonry. This exclusion from the law influenced the development of wood-frame
buildings in the Charleston single house style with piazzas, some front porches, and the
similar linear, narrow lots with outbuildings familiar from other parts of the peninsula.
The location of the East Side has had a substantial effect on the race, class, and social
demographics of the neighborhood as well as the built environment.22

At the turn of the twentieth century, the East Side demographics began to shift
towards a working-class immigrant population. Former middle to upper-class white and
black residents began to leave the neighborhood for suburbs like West Ashley and
neighborhoods south of Calhoun Street. This changed the demographics of the area to
mostly working-class residents, who were prominently black. This shift was permanent
throughout the twentieth century, which has characterized the East Side as a
prominently low-income area with a majority black population.23 The African American

22 “Between the Tracks: Charleston’s East Side During the Nineteenth Century,” 56.
population in the East Side has dictated which institutions populated the neighborhood. Churches, schools, community centers, and missions dot the landscape of the neighborhood. Prominent, historic African American Methodist churches were built in the East Side, like the AME church that once stood at the corner of Reid and Hanover Streets.24

The area was also home to much of the industrialization that happened in Charleston during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century. The earliest industry in the area was centered around the Cooper River and began to shift as the Industrial Revolution took form.25 The railroad track runs along the west edge of the neighborhood, which created commerce and jobs for people living nearby. The neighborhood was also home to one of the largest employers in Charleston during the twentieth century, the American Tobacco Company on East Bay Street. The American Tobacco Company employed many residents in the East Side until the late 1960s. The loss of jobs, because of the Cigar Factory closing, was detrimental to residents in the neighborhood and influenced the socio-economic status of residents during the second half of the twentieth century. The east boundary of the neighborhood looks over the Cooper River which was the location for various shipping, navy, and other commercial ventures.

The location of the East Side neighborhood has had tremendous effects on the residents and architecture historically. The neighborhood was a place for civil rights activism in the middle of the twentieth century, attempts at revitalization in the 1970s-1990s, and now it is one of the most affordable neighborhoods on the peninsula.

**Preservation and Planning Efforts**

Starting in the 1970s, preservation and planning efforts have included attention on the East Side neighborhood. This decade long period of preservation interest in the area is characterized by outsider efforts to protect the neighborhood’s historic fabric, define its character, and tried to create policy that would help homeowners and other residents rehabilitate their homes or purchase property. Various projects took place from 1977 to 1987. These projects included an *Analysis of East Side Impact Survey* (1977), *East Side Patterns: A Guide for Urban Design* (1977), *East Side Strategy Plan and Management Report* (1981), *A Job Creation and Community Revitalization Program* (1981), *East Side Master Plan Part I: Analysis* (1984), *East Side Design Guidelines* (1986), and *Between the Tracks: Charleston’s East Side During the Nineteenth Century* (1987), and an attempt at a National Register District nomination in 1988. While all of these efforts were pursued with assumed good intentions, the response from the neighborhood was overwhelming resistant.

Ultimately, these efforts are important to understanding the history of the neighborhood and outside influences on it. All of these document tried to categorize,
define, and protect the neighborhood - mostly in the sense of its architecture. Examining the successes and failures of these documents and preservation efforts lends insight into how the East Side may have become more or less susceptible to gentrification. The documents listed above catalogue information regarding architectural character, social demographics, history of the neighborhood, and steps for the future of development.

The *East Side Patterns: A Guide for Urban Design* (1977) and *East Side Design Guidelines* (1986) created a set of parameters that measured and illustrated the architectural fabric of the neighborhood. These two documents were successful in demonstrating the character of the area during this time period. The documents demonstrate character defining features in the neighborhood like various architectural styles that are present. These include Charleston Single Houses, Gothic Revival, Queen Anne, Greek Revival, and Corner Stores. The documents also express appropriate materials or designs to use in order to retain the character of the neighborhood, like wooden clapboard siding, decorative brackets around piazza entries, and repair of historic windows. Along with individual character defining features, the documents address the urban landscape and how to practice suitable urban design. These documents serve as helpful guides to understanding changes to the architectural fabric of the neighborhood. Without these documents the character of the East Side would not have been documented during this time period. While each one is not a quantifiable
data set, it may inform conclusions about character loss, alterations, and new
construction since the 1970s and 1980s.

A master plan was created in 1984 for the East Side neighborhood, which
analyzed quantifiable census data, ground-truthed data about the physical landscape,
and also provided a neighborhood history. The plan was divided into two parts—East
Side Master Plan Part I – Analysis and East Side Master Plan – Part II Proposal. The
analysis section focuses on neighborhood history and development, physical
environment, and social and environmental environment. The proposal section provides
an analysis summary, goals, plan development, and implementation schedule for the
master plan.26 The findings are presented in chart form that addresses findings,
objectives, actions, implementers, and cost.27 This master plan provided a baseline for
this thesis by providing an example of how neighborhoods are studied, but lacked the
identification of gentrification as a force that needs to be mitigated.

The history of the East Side provided by Between the Tracks: Charleston’s East
Side During the Nineteenth Century (1987) is important for understanding the context of
the neighborhood. Information regarding the creation of Hampstead Village,
demographics, and use during the nineteenth century are all included. This document
provides context about how the area has shifted over time in regards to people and

27 “East Side Master Plan Part II – Proposal,” (Department of Planning and Urban Development City of
Charleston, 1984), 32.
place. The research conducted provided a framework for understanding the physical and social makeup of the East Side in the nineteenth century. The document is broken up into a thematic and chronological history of the East Side with the final chapter addressing “Implications of Archaeological Research.”

The document used primary sources like censuses, directories, ward book, judicial records, city year books, and tax assessor books. The authors of the document note that the most influential group of documents were personal letters, diaries, and memoranda. The documents that informed the study used both quantifiable data, alongside qualitative data to create an informed study of nineteenth century life in the East Side neighborhood.

The other documents listed above addressed community outreach and involvement. Each document presented current demographics and created plans for the future of the neighborhood. These documents may not have been as successful as the ones mentioned above, because they provided actual plans to influence community development and change. These documents addressed issues of low-income housing, proportion of owner-occupation, and tried to create jobs for the population that had historically inhabited the East Side.

An effort during the 1980s was the attempt to include the East Side neighborhood in the National Register District in Charleston. The East Side is currently included in the local historic district in Charleston, known as the “Charleston Old and

28 “Between the Tracks: Charleston’s East Side During the Nineteenth Century,” ii, iii.
29 Ibid, 4.
Historic District.” This designation restricts property owners to approval by the Board of Architectural Review and protects structures from reckless demolition. The peninsula of Charleston also boasts a National Register District, which is smaller than the local designation.

![Charleston Old and Historic District](image)

Figure 1.8: The map above illustrates the local historic district of Charleston in red, while the National Register District is outlined in black. Map from the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office.

The National Register of Historic Places currently has more than 90,000 listings that include buildings, districts, sites, structures, and objects. The National Register is a list of significant historic properties in the United States. The Register offers some

---

protection to the listings, but does not impede upon personal property rights. The Register protects sites from federal intervention through its Advisory Council, makes sites eligible for state and federal tax credits, and encourages the preservation of historic resources.\footnote{“National Register of Historic Places Fundamentals: How to List a Property in the National Register -- National Register of Historic Places Official Website--Part of the National Park Service,” National Park Service. accessed February 16, 2017. https://www.nps.gov/Nr/national_register_fundamentals.htm.}

In the 1980s, the preservation community, the mayor, and other members in neighboring communities wanted to expand the district to encompass the East Side. Residents voiced their fears in multiple Post and Courier articles, one resident, Dorothy Evans said, “I’m afraid my property tax will go up and I won’t be able to pay it. If I can’t afford to pay my taxes, I’ll have to sell my home and I don’t want to do that.”\footnote{“Residents Cite Fears About Expansion of Register District,” Charleston News and Courier, December 29, 1988: 55, http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/image/v2:13CCA871AD118D5A@EANX-154BF7929E336E7A@2447525-154BF6CD38981467@54-154CB8088AC30140@?p=AMNEWS.} Another article cites that residents were concerned about including the East Side in the National Register because of displacement that had occurred in the Ansonborough neighborhood during the 1960s. In an article in the Post and Courier, by John Burbage, he wrote, “They fear increased taxes, higher rents, and expensive requirements for housing maintenance but no way for low-income families to pay for it. They point to nearby Ansonborough, and say many present East Side residents once lived there before being displaced because they no longer could afford living in a ‘gentrified’ neighborhood.”\footnote{Charleston News and Courier, July 14, 1986: 14, http://infoweb.newsbank.com/resources/doc/nb/image/v2:13CCA871AD118D5A@EANX-154D461B780AC5EE@2446626-154BF0CD52051DEC@13-154D9210849B4E58@?p=AMNEWS.}
concerns of residents likely stem from a massive preservation initiative conducted by Historic Charleston Foundation in the 1960s.

Ansonborough underwent a rehabilitation project sponsored by Historic Charleston Foundation in the 1950s and 1960s. The “Ansonborough Rehabilitation Project” was a milestone in historic preservation, which used the nation’s first revolving fund, to rehabilitate over 60 structures. HCF purchased properties in the Ansonborough neighborhood, completed some rehabilitation work, assigned covenants to the properties, and resold the properties to preservation minded buyers. This method of neighborhood revitalization was successful in mitigating the loss of historic buildings, but did not carefully consider the displacement of residents. This oversight has been acknowledged by HCF in recent decades, but caused lasting damage between preservation communities and low-income residents in downtown Charleston.34

Residents opposed to the campaign to enlist the East Side in to the National Register District of Charleston had witnessed the displacement in Ansonborough, which created a divide among community groups.

The concerns cited by residents of the East Side were legitimate, not because rising property taxes are necessarily associated with historic designation, but rather because they had witnessed displacement occur at the hands of historic preservation. This influence may have been interpreted by residents as a threat. These actions likely

---

influenced East Side residents to avoid incorporating their neighborhood into the National Register district. It is important to note that, the National Register does not directly affect property taxes, like the residents suggested. Instead, the designation of historic districts can aid in shifting property prices and influence of developers who can use tax incentives on historic properties. John Meffert, executive director of the Preservation Society of Charleston during this time, was quoted, “an increase in property tax and displacement of residents aren’t the results of an area being listed on the National Register,” he continued, “If someone lives in a neighborhood where the average price of a home is $50,000 and he sells his home for $100,000, property taxes in that neighborhood would increase.”\textsuperscript{35} Meffert is correct that National Register listing does not directly correlate with property tax increases, but it may influence development and spark an influx of new upper to middle-class residents. This in turn, could shift the economics of a neighborhood. The two factors are often corrolational, though not causational.

The effort to designate the East Side was ultimately unsuccessful, because of opposition from residents, who cited concerns about higher property taxes, attraction of developers, and displacement.\textsuperscript{36} This opposition and failure of the district may have influenced how the East Side neighborhood was able to avoid effects of gentrification until recent years. The East Side residents have created a strong sense of community,\textsuperscript{35,36}

\textsuperscript{35} “Residents Cite Fears About Expansion of Register District,” Charleston News and Courier, December 29, 1988: 55.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid, 55.
which has dictated policy and preservation in the neighborhood. Residents chose to
avoid historic designation, which in turn has led to a system of preservation by neglect
and a retention of local residents.

**Policy Influence on East Side**

Other factors that have affected and continue to affect the East Side
neighborhood in regards to policy are the restrictions placed on the built environment
by the Board of Architectural Review and zoning restrictions. These factors are not
directly related to the quantitative data that will be analyzed in this thesis, but they do
influence how the East Side has evolved socially and architecturally. These regulations
placed on the neighborhood by the city influence the built environment by controlling
physical changes to historic structures, new development and design, and restrict use
and density within the City of Charleston. Zoning and the architectural review process
influence the character, density, and fabric of the built environment within the City of
Charleston, which includes the East Side neighborhood. The purview of the BAR is less
encompassing than zoning laws, which stretch onto the upper peninsula and to James
Island.

**Board of Architectural Review**

The Board of Architectural Review in Charleston was created in 1931 with the
nation’s first historic preservation ordinance. The ordinance describes the purpose of
the board as, “the preservation and protection of the old historic and architecturally
worthy structures and quaint neighborhoods which impart a distinct aspect to the city
and which serve as visible reminders of the historical and cultural heritage of the city,
the state, and the nation.”37 The board oversees alterations, renovations, and new
construction that is visible from the public right of way. The board also oversees
demolitions on buildings over 50 years old north of the Old and Historic District, and any
building demolition located in the historic district. The board is comprised of a full time
staff that reviews minor projects, while other projects are presented in front of the
board once a week. Recently, the BAR underwent changes, which created separate
meetings for “small” and “large” projects. These projects are placed in their respective
category based on square footage. Once projects are presented to the board, they will
be either receive a “Certificate of Appropriateness” or be rescheduled with assigned
revisions and comments. Board members determine appropriateness based on a list of
“Charleston Standards.” These standards outline expectations for alterations and new
construction within the historic city center.38

These regulatory power of the BAR only applies to a partial area of the East Side
neighborhood. The BAR has power over the area between Mary Street and Line Street.
This means architectural fabric outside of the BAR’s purview is at risk for change and
demolition without approval or community input. Without this protection over design,

37 “Charleston, SC - Official Website - Board of Architectural Review (BAR),” accessed February 16, 2017,
38 Ibid.
certain areas of the East Side are more susceptible to inappropriate architectural changes.

Figure 1.9: Board of Architectural Review District Map provided by City of Charleston.

Zoning

The Zoning Ordinance in Charleston currently includes 44 base zoning districts, 12 overlay districts, 16 Old City height districts, 62 Planned Unit Developments, and 4 Neighborhood Districts.39 According to the City of Charleston website the goal of the zoning ordinance is, “To preserve our historic city and its neighborhoods, manage

tourism impacts, and protect our beautiful natural setting while accommodating growth and enabling economic development.” These overlays determine use, height, scale, and mass across the peninsula. The Zoning Ordinance also regulates details like setbacks, occupancy, public vs. private space, and other land use regulations. The overlays are influenced by the historic integrity of city and as a way to control development responsibly.

The Zoning Ordinance affects the entire city, but the East Side overlays have influenced its development and evolution. The neighborhood is comprised of eight
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zoning districts and five zoning overlays. The districts within the East Side include: Mixed Use, Mixed Use 2, Mixed Use-Workforce Housing 1, Mixed Use-Workforce Housing 2, Diverse Residential Zoning, Planned Unit Development, Residential Office, Light Industrial, and Limited Business. The majority of the neighborhood is comprised of Diverse Residential Zoning which allow single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, and multi-family residential. The edges of the neighborhood are comprised of the other districts listed above. These zoning districts have upheld the residential nature of the East Side neighborhood, while allowing development along the outskirts.

The Zoning Ordinance is also comprised of zoning overlays that regulate use on various parts of the peninsula. The East Side neighborhood is covered by four overlays, with one bounding against its western edge. These include the Amusement & Recreation Overlay, Old City Height District, Old City District Lower, and General Business Late Night. The Accommodations Overlay runs up the King and Meeting Street corridor, which meets the western edge of the East Side. The Amusement & Recreation Overlay prevents short term rentals and recreational vehicles in these areas. The Old City Heights District restricts height, scale, and mass. The Old City District Lower defines the area that the Board of Architectural Review has regulatory power. General Business Late Night regulates business hours from 7:00 AM to 11:00 PM. Finally, the

---


The individual descriptions of zoning districts and overlays are available through this website.
Accommodations Overlay determines where use for accommodations are allowed with
the exception of bed and breakfasts. These overlays have also played a role in the
residential use of the neighborhood, but the large corridor of the Accommodations
Overlay presents possible issues with development on the western fringe of the
neighborhood.

The Zoning Ordinance has played a role in retaining the residential character of
the East Side. It has upheld commercial corridors on the eastern and western edges of
the neighborhood, while retaining some mixed use within its center. The overlays
related to the Old City District have been instrumental in retaining historic fabric by
regulating additions, new construction, and changes to buildings in the East Side. These
regulations have upheld the character of the neighborhood through architectural and
social regulations.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Gentrification, as a category of scholarly analysis, was born out of a post-World War II society during a period of growth and change in the United States and Europe. The majority of scholarship is written in three, major time periods, the 1960s, 1980s-90s, and the 2000s. These time periods will present an opportunity to analyze the trends, developments, and critiques of gentrification and the role historic preservation has played in the larger body of literature. A 2010 textbook, *The Gentrification Reader*, addresses major authors who have contributed to the scholarship surrounding gentrification. Most of the authors listed in this comprehensive text will be identified in the following pages. The literature will be broken up into a chronological format focusing on gentrification, then looking at the relationship of gentrification and historic preservation presented by academics and professionals. Once a timeline of literature has been established, major trends will be distinguished. Finally, an analysis of any exclusions and contributions of future research will be addressed. In analyzing this assembly of literature, a clearer definition of gentrification will establish that will be used in this thesis and will establish the contribution of this research to the scholarly conversation surrounding gentrification.

---

Chronological Investigation of Gentrification Scholarship

Most scholars agree that the term gentrification was coined by Ruth L. Glass, a sociologist, working in London during the 1950s and 1960s. In Glass’ work, London: Aspects of Change she coined the term while describing the vast changes occurring in London neighborhoods during the 1960s. Glass wrote, “Once this process of ‘gentrification’ starts in a district, it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working class occupiers are displaced, and the whole social character of the district is changed.”43 This is the first written definition of gentrification. Throughout the rest of the twentieth century, the term continued to be redefined and studied. Her term has come to be one of the most controversial topics in planning, preservation, and social justice since its birth in 1964. While gentrification has occurred for centuries in terms of redevelopment of economically depressed areas and displacement of original residents, it was only recognized and named in the mid-twentieth century. The naming of this term has presented scholars and professionals with a difficult task of continually redefining and examining the term.

One of the most important works on planning, preservation, and urban studies came out before Glass coined her terminology for displacement of working class people in urban neighborhoods. This work was The Death and Life of Great American Cities by Jane Jacobs. While Jacobs’ work did not focus on the term gentrification, it addressed

what makes cities livable, enjoyable, and efficient for all residents. Jacobs’ was writing during the height of Urban Renewal in the United States. This practice completely decimated neighborhoods that were considered “slums” and rebuilt them from the ground up. Jacobs’ argues against this method throughout her influential work, but focused chapters on “Slumming and Unslumming” and the influence of “Gradual Money and Cataclysmic Money” in neighborhoods. She stated that architectural, social, and cultural aspects can be retained in neighborhoods if revitalization is introduced correctly. Jacobs’ did not just identify issues that urban centers faced, but she also put forth methods to revitalize them without losing the aspects that make them great.44 These methods were predecessors to anti-gentrification planning efforts.

After the 1960s, the next literature regarding gentrification was published in the 1980s and 1990s. Michael Lang in 1982, Lang wrote a book titled, *Gentrification Amid Urban Decline: Strategies for America’s Older Cities.* His text defines gentrification, the process of gentrification, the cycle of urban change, urban decline and revitalization, and strategic choice. These chapters focused on the influence of gentrification in older cities, which it primarily affects. Lang’s argument is framed by suggesting that gentrification can be mitigated and used as a tool for economically viable revitalization without government interference. He suggested that gentrification’s positive outcomes may outweigh the negative occurrence of displacement. He wrote, “Gentrification can help lead older cities back to a socioeconomic equilibrium while confronting the

contextual reality of general urban decline.”⁴⁵ Lang argued that the positive effects of gentrification can be achieved, but, “must safeguard the rights of existing low-income residents.”⁴⁶ His major argument is defined by “controlled” or “uncontrolled” gentrification. He proposed that controlled gentrification could produce, “smaller, but more vibrant, urban centers.”⁴⁷

In 1985, Peter Marcuse, a leading voice on gentrification since the middle of the twentieth century, wrote “gentrification, Abandonment, and Displacement: Connections, Causes, and Policy Responses in New York City.” This work defined the connection between gentrification and abandonment of urban areas, while it denounced the idea that gentrification was a positive way to revitalize neighborhoods. His article is framed in a way that presented the, then contemporary theory, on gentrification and abandonment, a large scale example of it, and policy changes to implement. Marcuse defined gentrification as, “Gentrification occurs when new residents - disproportionately are young, white, professional, technical, and managerial workers with higher education and income levels--replace older residents--who disproportionately are low-income, working class and poor, minority and ethnic group members, and elderly--from older and previously deteriorated inner-city housing in a spatially concentrated manner, that is, to a degree differing substantially from the

⁴⁶ Ibid, 3.
⁴⁷ Ibid, 141.
general level of change in the community or region as a whole.”

Marcuse also denounced the idea that gentrification is caused by the “return-to-the-city” movement and demanded that a more nuanced answer was necessary.

In 1986, a book that collected multiple pieces concerning gentrification was brought together by Peter Williams and Neil Smith. The book, *Gentrification of the City*, included works by various authors with the goal to include various viewpoints on gentrification rather than one viewpoint. The work is set in the context of, what Williams and Smith called, an “urban renaissance or revival.” This idea of a renaissance or revival is inherently romantic, which Williams and Smith find to be an oversimplification. The authors also place gentrification within history by concluding that gentrification is a product of a post-industrial world. They wrote, “Gentrification would be impossible in cities where there was no well-developed geographical division of residential location by class.”

In industrialized cities, people are separated based on their class. This means that socio-economic status determines where you live and is a product of post-industrialism and the creation of the lower, middle, and upper classes. This is in comparison to society that functions with people of all classes living in close proximity to one another. Southern cities before the Civil War were often divided like this or medieval towns where working class members lived amongst royalty. This

---


49 Peter Williams and Neil Smith, *Gentrification of the City*, 204.
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classification leads to their main argument, that gentrification is not a new phenomenon without its historic predecessors, but has developed over changing spatial patterns in human geography. They sum up their argument by writing, “We are arguing that just as suburbanization was the spatial expression of a larger social and economic process (Harvey 1978, Aglietta 1979), so too gentrification is a highly visible spatial process deeply rooted in current patterns of social and economic differentiation.”51

Furthermore, Williams and Smith present a platform for debate and research rather than a concrete identification of instances of gentrification. The authors place gentrification in a contemporary space so that it could be understood as an effect of a changing society. This work provided a theory of gentrification.

The 1990s brought on a new wave of scholarly interest in gentrification. One of the more important works was published in 1996 by David Ley. A Canadian, Ley’s The New Middle Class and the Remaking of the Central City addressed gentrification in terms of Canadian cities and an international scale. His argument focuses on the geography of gentrification, the new middle class established after the 1960s, the role of political reform, changes in labor forces, and other cultural factors. Ley described gentrification in broad, cultural terms that are important for understanding the patterns. He wrote, “It is important to see middle-class movement into the inner city not simply as the production of a submarket in a restructuring economy, but also as the self-production of
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Plural societies are societies made up of various ethnic groups, who display their cultural contrast. These groups function as independents within a larger society. Ley used “movements” as a way to interpret gentrification. He talked about the youth movement, counter-culture in the 1960s, labor movements away from blue collar work, and historic preservation movement. His framework did not provide more hard data about gentrification, but rather focused on the sociological implications that come along with it.

A culmination of gentrification literature was published in 2008 in the form of a textbook by Loretta Lees, Tom Slater and Elvin Wyly. The elaborate work simply titled, *Gentrification*, was a comprehensive piece of literature that encapsulated past, present, and suggested future work on gentrification in Europe and the United States. The work begins by analyzing the beginning of gentrification in the 1950s and 1960s and moves through “mutations” and “consumption” to the final analysis of the future of gentrification. By 2008, scholarship surrounding gentrification has moved away from the “back-to-the-city” movement reasoning and gentrification is understood as an economic and social process. This holistic approach is important in understanding the progress of research on gentrification. Including social and economic forces is crucial for the final
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analysis of this thesis. The authors of *Gentrification* recognized that the future of gentrification is intricately tied to the future of urban studies. Gentrification occurs under the umbrella of urban studies and therefore should be a concern for planners, community leaders, designers, and preservationists.54

A new perspective on gentrification and social preservation was presented by Japonica Brown-Saracino in 2009. She focused her book on the concept of social preservation, which includes the preservation of groups of people, their culture, customs, and use of the neighborhood. This concept is commonly known as intangible heritage in the field of historic preservation.55 Her book, *A Neighborhood that Never Changes: Gentrification, Social Preservation, and the Search for Authenticity* began with an anecdote about a woman the author met while working in Provincetown in the summer. This woman, Mary, was the catalyst for the research into gentrification and social preservation. The author created typologies of people who are participating in gentrification in order to gain a more varied understanding of gentrification. She wrote, “The typologies capture, not types of people, but rather how individuals position themselves, ideologically, behaviorally, in relation to a political, economic, and cultural
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UNESCO defines intangible heritage as “traditions or living expressions inherited from our ancestors and passed on to our descendants, such as oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, rituals, festive events, knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe, or the knowledge and skills to produce traditional crafts.”
process in which they are engaged.” Her research presented a new way of observing gentrification by creating classifications of gentrifiers and uncovering the uncharted territory of social preservation. This is an intangible measure of how the gentrification affected neighborhoods and had not been examine before.

In some of the most recent literature surrounding gentrification, Chase Billingham has called on scholars to be more comprehensive in their understanding and analysis of gentrification. The critique he presented in 2015, said that gentrification is a broad topic that has many different facets. He said that this is not a downfall of gentrification, but an opportunity to encourage a wider breadth of research. His article, “The Broadening Conception of Gentrification” is a call to arms for researchers, planners, sociologists and others to accept the wide range of influences on gentrification. He wrote, “I argue that by overly circumscribing the range of processes subject to analysis under the framework of ‘gentrification’ theory, the scope of trends open to evaluation, and thus open to critique, has tended to overly narrow in mainstream American urban sociology.” Billingham’s article is a critique of other authors and their conflict over semantics within the debate of gentrification. The article is a proposition to move to a more contemporary study of gentrification that addresses

changing American cities, their populations, demographics, and built environment. He concluded his article when he wrote, “Reinvigorating that critical perspective requires first that urban sociologists acknowledge a broad array of urban changes as symptoms of gentrification in contemporary American cities.”

This timeline of literature shows that the research and understanding surrounding gentrification has morphed significantly over more than half a century. The scholarship surrounding gentrification has produced data driven studies, social examples, inclusive, holistic methods, and created various camps within the topic.

**Gentrification + Historic Preservation**

Gentrification and Historic Preservation are not consistently studied together. Both subjects fall into the realm of planning, urban design, and community organization, but they have not been directly studied at great length. Typically, the literature surrounding historic preservation in regards to gentrification is a defense or outcry against preservation as an ally or enemy of gentrification. The following review of literature will address the scholarship of historic preservation and gentrification in order to understand how the two subjects relate and will serve to diagnose options for further research at this intersection of topics. It is necessary to clarify that historic preservation used throughout this thesis as the term covers: heritage preservation, heritage
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conservation, and historic conservation, which are all synonymous with historic preservation.

In 1980, Richard C. Collins wrote an article called “Changing Views on Historical Conservation in Cities.” His article focused on how historic preservation influences areas on a local level and he addressed the relationship between historic preservation and “urban development, urban planning, and city design.”59 His article is a defense for neighborhood conservation against groups that claim that historic preservation is a catalyst for gentrification. He argues that, “In fact, the disparity that exists between the actual evidence of displacement and the heated rhetoric that is attached to this phenomenon suggests that in addition to concern for the poor and their displacement, there are other economic and political interests using this position to cast doubt on the preservationist and the neighborhood conservation movement.”60 Collins ardently defends historic preservation and suggested that groups claiming gentrification is an effect of preservation were slandering the movement. He argued that preservationists were moving in a progressive direction towards inclusivity and responsible, sensitive revitalization.

In 1987, Sharon Zukin introduced her analysis of gentrification with a focus on the impacts of historic preservation on neighborhood change. Her article, “Culture and Capital in the Urban Core,” looked at what she called the “empirical stalemate” in the
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study of gentrification. She suggested that research had reached a point of repetition, which did not provide anything more than verifying the existence of gentrification. She suggested, “Nevertheless, further research on gentrification may overcome these issues by investigating urban morphology—the shape the city takes—in terms of economic and cultural analysis.”61 She also claimed that gentrification had regional tendencies and happened in areas with some historic significance, which brought her argument to historic preservation. She called out historic preservation as a subheading in her article and discussed the role of gentrifiers as lovers of historic or old architecture. She claimed that gentrifiers typically have an affinity toward, “restored brownstone, red brick, or gingerbread houses as well as manufacturing lofts that are converted to residential use.”62 Her major claim is that gentrifiers are consciously or unconsciously historic preservationists, that they migrate toward old building stock rather than more contemporary neighborhoods. Herein lies the major dilemma faced by historic preservationists during this time period and today: how do we save our built environment without displacing residents? Zukin posed an interesting question which was, “A quest for historic districts implies more, of course. It confronts the plane of modernity with the rich and varied temporality of the past—but which past, and
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whose?” Ultimately, she suggested a strong analysis of the economics of gentrification and “social, spatial, and economic restructuring of the central city.”

An article addressing historic preservation policy was published in 1998 by Charles E. Fisher. In his article, he addressed tax credits that were created by the federal government to incentivize the reuse of historic structures. This facet of historic preservation has been an issue for residents concerned about gentrification. The notion that tax breaks and low housing prices will displace residents is not a new concern for residents, community leaders, planners, and others and remains one today. This article, “Promoting the Preservation of Historic Buildings: Historic Preservation Policy in the United States,” claimed that “contrary to early concerns that the program would foster gentrification of urban neighborhoods, these tax credits have been used to develop over 30,000 affordable housing units for residents of older communities. In 1997 alone, a record 6,239 housing units were created.” These numbers show that historic preservation may not be an inherent villain to residents in neighborhoods threatened by gentrification. While this argument is not robust, it presents the awareness of the relationship between gentrification and historic preservation.

Donovan Rypkema wrote “The Oversimplification of Gentrification” in 2004 for the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In this article, the author does exactly what
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the title states, oversimplifies the chaotic, confusing, and multi-faceted social effects of gentrification. The author proposed a different way to address gentrification and historic preservation by examining the idea that historic districts and gentrification are not synonymous. While gentrification typically occurs in historic districts or neighborhoods with historic designations it does not mean that the two have a cause and effect relationship. The author claimed, “I certainly acknowledge that there is gentrification in historic districts but is historic designation the cause? The underlying causes of gentrification are long-term economic and market forces.”66 This argument does not address gentrification in social and cultural terms. The broader benefit of this article is the recognition of gentrification in historic preservation. By analyzing the role, it plays, more can be determined about cause and effect relationships or other connections.

In 2004, N. Edward Coulson and Robin M. Leichenko investigated if historic district designation promoted gentrification within a neighborhood. The study looked at Ft. Worth, Texas during two census periods of 1990 and 2000. Different data sets were assembled in order to measure change over time and see if designation directly affected changes. The authors looked at race, vacancy, ownership, number of designated homes, income, and others in order to assess the city. Their findings concluded that there is not a direct correlation between historic district designation and neighborhood change.

Overall, the conclusions determined, “Concerning the effects of designation on local economic conditions, we found evidence that historic preservation increases property values, but has little effect on other measures such as vacancy rate and rates of owner-occupancy.” These findings are significant, but only demonstrate data from one city. This type of study would be a useful tool for other cities in order to determine how region affects gentrification and historic preservation.

Another source from 2004, addressed gentrification as it relates to historic preservation by examining local preservation programs. David F. Tipson wrote “Putting the History Back in Historic Preservation” as a way to address many ills that local preservation programs face. His interpretation of gentrification is interesting, because it focuses on significance, compatibility, tourism, and the “disneyfication” of history and the built environment. Tipson proposed the idea that, “the talismanic designation of ‘significance’ with regard to older buildings, and the requirement of ‘compatibility’ for newer buildings, has undoubtedly worked to make historic districts more exclusive than they might otherwise be.” He also mentioned the notion that certain requirements in historic districts drive up prices for repairs and alterations, which affect lower-income owners and favor more affluent owners. His understanding of tourism and the “disneyfication” of history also plays into gentrification in historic neighborhoods.
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Tipson wrote, “While historic districts may have had some success in preserving the built environment, they have the opposite effect on traditional social and economic relationships in the community. The emphasis placed on tourism by local programs often has the effect of converting downtowns that served residents to downtowns that cater to the needs and expectations of tourists.”69 This idea is particularly important to the broader context of this study, because of the nature of Charleston as a tourist destination. His framework presented a different critique on historic preservation and gentrification by examining effects created at a local level rather than broad ideas of displacement because of tax incentives or other economic forces. Tipson proposed that, “If historic districts are to overcome the serious problems that afflict them, a strong theory of preservation must cohere around the needs of the local community as distinct from those of tourists.”70 He presented a thorough examination of the then current state of preservation and proposed a more community driven approach through the development of a unifying theory.

In 2009, Ned Kaufman undertook the task of compiling essays for a book titled, *Place, Race, and Story: Essays on the Past and Future of Historic Preservation*. The main themes in the book did not cover gentrification, but gentrification mentioned in the text. The essay argues that historic preservation does not enable gentrification or cause it but rather is a form in which it can take place. An important quote from the end of the
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book presented a well-rounded response to the role of gentrification in historic preservation and vice versa. The author wrote:

There is much debate over whether historic preservation causes, results from, or simply accompanies gentrification. What is clear is that preservation in itself does not bring about the death or displacement of traditional communities. The movement of capital does that, as the pressures of the real estate market encourage relatively affluent people to see certain underpriced neighborhoods as good investment opportunities. The impact of their disproportionate investment power on the property values and population of those neighborhoods would be roughly the same whether the newcomers built grand new houses or restored old the existing ones. It is the openness of neighborhood to the flows of capital which exposes them to gentrification, not the specific form taken by those flows. Historic preservation is just one of the forms that they may assume.  

This quote identifies the issue surrounding historic preservation and gentrification in a clear, concise way. This argument claimed that historic preservation is not a direct cause of gentrification, but rather a vehicle through which capital (the real enemy) can be moved. This argument moves the blame away from historic preservation and onto the system of capitalism. This is an interesting way to pose the idea, because it addressed the issue that historic preservation and gentrification do not have a cause and effect relationship.

The literature that has defined the relationship between historic preservation and gentrification has been filled with gaps, lack of research, and recently moved in the
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direction of finally trying to analyze the relationship. In the past, historic preservation has been blamed for gentrification without proper analysis or data to defend this accusation. It seems that preservationists are now moving forward to lead the discussion on the role historic preservation has, will, and should play in the contemporary phenomenon of gentrification.

The literature surrounding gentrification is vast, somewhat confusing, and occasionally contradictory. The term that was first coined by a British, sociologist in the 1960s has become one of the most controversial, politically charged topics in urban studies, sociology, historic preservation, and policy decisions. The word itself is generally accepted as meaning middle-class or affluent people moving into typically low-income (minority) neighborhoods, which in turn displaces traditional residents because of wealth and income shifts in the community. This idea has been examined countless times and the authors listed above are only a sampling of the literature surrounding the topic. Overall, some general trends can be seen in the research of gentrification. The study has moved from early stages of creation to two camps that believe gentrification is driven by economics or driven by political will and policy. These two arenas have also been challenged by more recent literature that includes intangible aspects of gentrification like social preservation, which studies the people experiencing gentrification and the roles they play. In 2016, the debate is still a major topic that needs to be investigated further in order to understand the negatives, positives, and
historical effects on urban centers. It can also provide a way to study our built environment through historic preservation.

The literature surrounding historic preservation and gentrification has not been as thoroughly investigated as gentrification. The first mentions of the relationship between the two is seen in the 1980s. Since the analysis of the relationship is still being developed, this presents a great time to do further research. Some major trends have been the accusatory nature that comes with the perceived relationship between historic preservation and gentrification. Typically, it has been seen as a catalyst or a cause and effect issue rather than plainly related. Also, issues surrounding tax credits and the economic changes that historic preservation presents to a neighborhood have caused concern. Overall, the relationship between historic preservation and gentrification has not been examined to the fullest extent and deserves much more attention.
Gentrification is a pervasive phenomenon present in cities across the world, but it does not have refined tools to diagnose it. Various studies on gentrification, re-urbanism, and displacement have been employed, but these studies do not usually address the role of historic preservation or quantifiable ways to measure gentrification. In order to address how gentrification manifests in historic neighborhoods, this study will employ various sources of data. The data collected will ultimately be used to determine if a historic neighborhood, specifically the East Side in Charleston, is undergoing gentrification. The neighborhood provides a sizeable, geographic area, a predominance of old building stock, and a predominantly minority population. The neighborhood is one of the slowest to change on the peninsula, but still faces challenges because it is a constantly evolving neighborhood. These factors contributed to the decision to use the East Side as a case study.

In order to analyze gentrification strictly through the lens of measurable data, various parameters are set. First, the data used will be collected from a sixty-year period from 1950 to 2010. To begin this analysis, the definition of gentrification, developed from the literature review will be used as the baseline to compare the results of the architectural and social data sets. The literature review provided an in depth look at how scholars have defined gentrification over time. These definitions informed the
analysis and conclusions. Next, this thesis will use quantifiable data sets to determine if
gentrification is occurring by understanding patterns in the data over a 60-year period.
The goal of focusing on quantifiable data, rather than a traditional anecdotal or
interview based analysis of gentrification within the field of historic preservation is to
provide a scientific, less biased approach to understanding how gentrification can be
defined, identified, and anticipated. The measureable components within the
architectural and social categories were chosen because they are hypothesized to
correspond to gentrification. Examining these components through quantities and
changes over time will inform a sense of which factors serves as indicators of
gentrification, neighborhood change, and possible displacement. This will bring a new
level of clarity the definition of gentrification in Charleston and beyond.

The data is grouped in two major categories - architectural and social. These two
categories of the data are grouped based on if gentrification is experienced as a social or
physical change. The architectural data tracks the change in occupation from owner-
occupied to renter occupied buildings, as well as the shift in housing market prices in
the East Side. These quantities and patterns of change over time are examined to see if
they can predict or reveal gentrification. The social data tracks the changes in
demographics across the East Side, compared to an overall view of population changes
in Charleston, South Carolina. The demographics that are tracked are age, race, and sex.
Overall changes in crime across Charleston county can be identified from 2010 through
2015. This data set does not cover the entire period of study, but can aid in informing
the most recent shifts in the neighborhood. The architectural and social data will be the main focus of analysis, but the analysis will be framed with interviews, anecdotes, and opinions of longtime residents, community members, and others involved with the East Side neighborhood. Quantifiable data, like the sets used in this case study, provide a measureable archive of how place and people have changed in a neighborhood. Monitoring trackable changes shows how a neighborhood has changed physically and socially. These changes are compared to the earliest data from the 1950s – 1970s, which provide a baseline of neighborhood composition, to compare to the latter half of the study period. For example, monitoring changes in racial demographics can be an indicator of how groups of people stay, exit, or are displaced in a neighborhood, like the East Side.

The primary sources used for this analysis are United States Census Bureau records, tax assessor files from the County of Charleston, Zillow Real Estate, and Social Explorer. The relevant U.S. census data for this study was collected from Census Tracts 7, 8, 9, 10, and 13, which make up the East Side, for the years 1950 through 2000. In 2010, Census Tracts 10 and 13 were redrawn and renamed 51 and 53. The change in Census Tract is notated for the year 2010 in order to not skew the data.
The demographic and occupancy data was gathered through U.S. Census Bureau documents available online for years 1950 to 1970, through scanned PDFs of city-level census as well as the U.S. Census Bureau platform, American Fact Finder, for the year 1990. Census data for 1990 to 2010 was gathered using Social Explorer. City maps of Census Tracts and Blocks were made available through the Charleston County Library. Social Explorer, a website accessible through Clemson University account, also provided
occupancy and demographic data. Social Explorer maps census data on various geographic levels like Census Tracts and Census Blocks. Social Explorer is also used to represent change in a visual representation through annotated maps of the East Side neighborhood and Charleston as a whole. Maps that show overall changes to populations, race, and occupancy in Charleston are placed in the beginning of the analysis in order to frame the changes seen in the East Side. The Charleston County Tax Assessor website and Zillow Real Estate provided the information concerning individual housing prices. Charleston County has a searchable database that provides housing cost and years of sale. Zillow provided a real-time map of properties listed for sale, as well as the sale price of properties over time which helped determined the properties chosen. These platforms supplied the consistent data collection that will aid in the analysis of gentrification occurring in the East Side neighborhood.

In order to understand the data that will be collected, it is necessary to look at the location and physical makeup of the East Side neighborhood. The East Side neighborhood has varying boundaries, depending on the source. For this thesis, the study area will be defined as East Bay Street to the east, Mary Street to the south, Meeting Street to the west, and Lee Street to north.
Architectural Factors

The architectural analysis of this thesis includes subsets that address: vacancy, occupancy type, density, and housing market trends. The main indicators examined are vacancy, owner-occupied vs. renter occupied, density, and housing prices from various decades. The owner-occupied vs. renter occupied data will be gathered from the U.S. Census Bureau. This data is listed on a Census Tract level, which will be the level of analysis. Census Tracts are geographic areas determined by the U.S. Census Bureau with populations between 2,500 to 8,000 people. These tracts generally follow neighborhood...
The decades of 1950, 1960, and 1970 all include Census Block level information. This provides a higher level of detail than Census Tract level. This information has been gathered, but will not be interpreted in the analysis, because the detail cannot be maintained throughout the study period. This fine grain data collection could be used for a further analysis of individual blocks within each tract. Instead, each year of the study period will be analyzed on a Census Tract level. Each tract within the East Side neighborhood will be represented as a pie chart that shows the percentage of occupancy based on owner-occupation or rental for each of the six decades of Census data. These individual charts will be presented alongside a chart that displays the cumulative totals for all tract that makes up the East Side neighborhood.

The analysis of housing prices is gathered through current market listings and records of past selling prices. Tracking fluctuations in sale prices will show patterns over time and inform the analysis of how expensive the housing stock is over time in the East Side. The housing prices in the East Side will be compared against a baseline of Charleston housing market trends provided by the City of Charleston Century V Plan. This is because housing prices should be seen in the context of a larger city-wide housing market context. For example, learning that the price of an East Side house increased in market value by $40,000 over a fifteen-year period is not as meaningful without the comparison, as a hypothetical example, that the average price of a home
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anywhere in Charleston rose by $90,000 within the same period. One hundred properties were used as the sample set. The one-hundred properties were chosen randomly from within the boundaries declared earlier in the thesis. The sample set was made up of randomly chosen properties that had sold within the last 10 years.

Housing prices and sale dates were tracked using the real estate website, Zillow, which shows past sales data and current market listings was used when choosing the random data sets and also provided recent sales data for the properties. For each of the one-hundred properties, the Charleston County Tax Assessor was used to collect sale data from the 1940s to current. It is important to note that not every property was bought and sold regularly from the 1950s onward. To make the comparison of prices over time more consistent, inflation of the property prices will be accounted for using the Bureau of Labor Statistics “CPI Inflation Calculator.” The housing price data will be displayed through a line graph, which will show rates of change through the slope of the line as well as spikes and dips in the housing market over the 60-year period. This data will be compared to general trends in the housing market within Charleston, because not all dips and spikes in the prices of properties can be attributed directly to gentrification. These factors of owner-occupation vs. rental occupation and property prices makeup the architectural category of exploring the influence of gentrification in the East Side neighborhood.
Social Factors

The social category for this thesis will be populated with demographics of age, race, sex, family occupancy versus individual occupancy, and crime. The demographics for the East Side will be gathered from the U.S. Census from 1950-2010. These statistics are available on a Census Tract level, not a Census Block level. These statistics were captured using the website Social Explorer, which translates Census data into maps. The populations of each Census Tract will be demonstrated through bar graphs that represent Census data in each of the ten-year Census capture periods. Total population shifts are demonstrated through bar graphs showing a delta in overall number of residents and race, age, and sex of residents. Maps generated using Social Explorer are included to show migration patterns and changes in the social indicators. The maps are annotated with Census Tract numbers and displayed in various ways, which include dot density and shaded density. The overall and individual tract changes will represent changes in neighborhood demographics which may indicate gentrification.

Understanding how population demographics changes, predict, and correspond with gentrification provides preservationists with tools to predict and react to gentrification more decisively and effectively.

The shifts in age, race, and sex will be informative about how population shifts relate to gentrifying and gentrified neighborhoods. The demographics of the tracts of the East Side neighborhood are represented in ten year increments over the 60-year period as a way to monitor small and large scale changes. The bar graphs that represent
each demographic factor at a point in time during the taking of the census will be accompanied by a line graph that maps the shifts over the course of sixty years. These trends will ultimately inform how to chart changes that indicate gentrification and neighborhood change.

Analyzing shifts in the number of people of a given race who occupy the neighborhood will be important in understanding how original racial groups have been displaced or left the area. Age will chronicle if populations of families shift to young, single individuals residing in the East Side. Age demographics from the Census Tracts show how certain age groups have become more or less populous over time. Along with the collection of age demographics is the collection of single vs. family households in the East Side neighborhood. This other data set will reinforce the changes determined by the ages of the population through the representation of aging in place, exiting the neighborhood, or an influx of individuals vs. families. Sex will also reveal if there is a shift from families with an expected balance of male to female to individuals with a predominance of either male or female. All of these demographic changes will be important in the analysis of how gentrification can manifest in neighborhoods. This manifestation will be charted on a city and neighborhood scale and at the individual tract level.
Outside Influences

Outside influences on the architectural and social data are present as well, so they must be taken into consideration. Every change seen in the architectural and social data cannot be directly or exclusively linked to urban change and gentrification. Some of the major influences are the rise of student populations and the economic recession of 2008. Other challenges are presented are lack of data available and challenges in collection of data. A clear picture has been created from the data collected, but it is important to understand the challenges. Understanding the limitations of this thesis will aid in crafting a stronger analysis, that can be used a way to continue future research. Using the data available will provide an outline on how to measure gentrification based on architectural and social parameters, but inconsistencies, lack of data, and time restrictions must also be addressed. Each of these factors must be considered in order to complete a well-rounded analysis.

The data chosen for this analysis will inform the conclusions on how to measure gentrification through quantifiable data, but some information is more difficult to assess or access. Student residency patterns could inform how the general population of the peninsula is changing and the effect of that on the East Side. Some of this shift can be inferred by the age demographic information, but a further analysis into specific student populations could be useful. Also, when examining the fluctuations in housing prices, the recession of 2008 must be addressed. The recession had immense effects on the housing market across the country and would show a major dip in the housing market.
This dip will be noted alongside the other data as a way to prevent any skewing. The recession can be monitored and acknowledged by including housing market trends in the City of Charleston as a whole and the nation.

Along with these two outside contributing factors to the results seen in the architectural and social data, results should be understood in light of limitations to the data. Detailed amounts of information are only available for specific years on the census records. Other data was considered for this study of neighborhood change, but was excluded based on the access available. For example, building permits are available through the City of Charleston’s Planning, Preservation, & Sustainability department. These files are sorted based on address and were difficult to monitor on a neighborhood level based on the amount of records and the time it would take to analyze them. These files could be useful in monitoring architectural changes in neighborhoods experiencing gentrification, but were excluded based on time restraints.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS + ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the results gathered from data collection and presents an analysis of findings to identify and describe gentrification based on the architectural and social categories as described in the methodology. The analysis aims to outline if, when, and why gentrification has manifested in the East Side neighborhood. This study of gentrification in terms of quantifiable information removes the human aspect, which is crucial to understanding how gentrification changes individuals and the built environment. In order to recognize the inherent human quality of gentrification, this section will be framed with personal accounts from members of the neighborhood. This framework recognizes the importance of studying personal accounts, while separating them from this analysis. These accounts are not meant to replace or undermine the quantifiable data, but rather to exemplify the necessity of this study. This format provides a platform to begin the analysis, while identifying issues present within the neighborhood. It also provides information concerning visual change and perceptions of place that inherently create change. Following this framework, the results of the data will be presented in two broad categories.

The presence and character of gentrification is measured through various data series, which identify and track change over time at a neighborhood level. The results and analysis are charted using various types of graphs in order to explain change over
time visually. Overarching themes, shifts on the peninsula of Charleston, and distinct shifts in time are addressed beyond of the specific data collected and analyzed for the East Side neighborhood. The scaled out approach creates an opportunity to show change occurring outside of the East Side and to highlight how the risk faced in the East Side are similar to many other neighborhoods. The data sets collect information for the East Side only. The data sets include occupancy, housing market trends, race, age, sex, density, individual occupancy vs. family occupancy, and crime. These factors are organized into two groups. The two groups are architectural data and social data. Each set will be presented with an initial hypothesis of expected findings followed by calculated results represented visually through graphed information. The chart below shows the indicator type, indicators, and data sources that will be used in the analysis of factors influencing gentrification in the East Side neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Type</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Architectural Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Values</td>
<td>Sale prices, current asking prices, availability</td>
<td>Zillow, Charleston County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>Rental units compared to owner occupied units, vacancy, density</td>
<td>Census records, Social Explorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Shifts in age, race, and sex within neighborhood. This includes single vs. family occupation</td>
<td>Census records, Social Explorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>Changes in arrests, policing, crime types</td>
<td>Social Explorer data available for limited years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People + Perceptions

In recent years, gentrification in Charleston has become an issue for residents, historic preservationists, city officials, and other community members. Neighborhoods like Radcliffeborough, the West Side, and Elliotborough-Cannonborough have seen swift changes in populations, affordability, and occupancy. According to long-time residents, these changes have begun to trickle into the East Side neighborhood. An interesting facet of gentrification is that it can be seen and measured by what the participants and the bystanders witness. This visualization is usually one of the defining factors of gentrification, because it is apparent through the eyes of residents. Understanding the visualization of gentrification from people and the perceptions they create can frame the discussion around quantifiable data that tracks, exposes, and reveals gentrification. Perceptions and concerns voiced by residents, community members, and professionals deserve an investigation when analyzing gentrification. This section of the analysis aims to provide an outline of how qualitative data is used to measure gentrification, but stands separately from the analysis of the quantitative data.

This section uses first-hand accounts from local residents and journalists in the city of Charleston. The information comes from various opinion-pieces, interviews, and articles collected from the City Paper and the Post and Courier. Housing affordability, gentrification, and displacement are issues that have been on the minds of Charleston’s residents, community members, and professionals for years. This concern can be documented by following a trend in reporting on shifts on the peninsula.
In 2013, Jenna Lyles, a *City Paper* writer, penned the piece, “Gentrification Breaks a Neighborhood Down from the Inside Out.” She interviewed Joe Watson, a lifelong East Side resident, about his experience with gentrification in his neighborhood. Watson said, “[Gentrification] ain’t something that I should feel bad about, it’s how do I overcome it? You overcome it by putting the Staying Put Initiative in place, you overcome it by bringing jobs in there, you overcome it by making sure that a segment of every major housing development like that one right there on Meeting and Spring Street is reserved for low income folks. That’s how you neutralize gentrification.”73 Residents like Watson are aware of the changes occurring in their neighborhood and have taken measures to mitigate or change the future of the neighborhoods. Former City Council member, Kwadjo Campbell, makes a note in the article about inclusivity and how residents have to be involved in housing, tourism, and jobs in the East Side in order to keep neighborhood buy-in.74 The voices of Campbell and Watson are cited in various stories about gentrification in the East Side. They represent individual residents who understand gentrification and neighborhood change are and will continue to shift the East Side neighborhood.

In a neighborhood not far from the East Side, residents have already seen the effects of gentrification. In the Elliotborough-Cannonborough neighborhood, changes
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have already shaped the demographics and the uses in the area. The neighborhood had
been home to working-class immigrants and African American communities during most
of its inhabitation, but saw a shift in the early 2000s towards upper-class white residents
and students. Now the neighborhood is home to large population of college students,
coffee shops, trendy restaurants, and retail stores.

While this change has revitalized the area, some former residents are concerned
that the neighborhood will shift away from live-in residents to part-timer residents. In a
City Paper article from 2013, author Corey Hudgins recounts concerns from Mary Miller
and Peggy Clement who, “worry what’s happening in Manhattan—a widening gulf of
the very rich and very poor—is also happening in Charleston. They’re afraid the South of
Broad mentality, where some houses are occupied for just a few weeks a year, is
creeping north. What kind of community does that leave? Miller asks rhetorically.”75
The changes that have already occurred in other neighborhoods in downtown
Charleston prove that the East Side faces challenges ahead in order to mitigate
gentrification and displacement. The tide of gentrification is a force that moves, in the
case of Charleston, to the north. The geography of the city leaves neighborhoods yet
untouched to the north, east, and west in the sites of neighborhood change,
displacement, and gentrification. The geographic movement of gentrification in

75 Corey Hutchins, “Cannonborough-Elliottborough Has Transformed Whether You like It or Not,”
Charleston City Paper, accessed March 7, 2017,
http://www.charlestoncitypaper.com/charleston/cannonborough-elliottborough-has-transformed-
whether-you-like-it-or-not/Content?oid=4822884.
Charleston can be seen through the larger patterns of populations, racial demographics, and occupancy mapped out in the next section.

In 2014, Paul Bowers wrote an article titled, “It’s Hip, It’s Getting Safer, and the Rent is Going Up in Charleston’s Eastside,” which addressed the major changes affecting the neighborhood. The article touches on new residents, rising housing prices, affordable housing, and the important of retaining the culture of the neighborhood. According to the article, a Charleston realtor had recently listed a house in the East Side for $335,900 in order to “set the price bar.”76 The rise in housing prices shows a shift in perception towards the East Side neighborhood. The issues of livability and safety have been addressed and incoming residents perceive the neighborhood in a way that supports higher property prices. One resident, King Grant-Davis understood that gentrification was occurring in his neighborhood and stated, “gentrification in itself may not be bad, but the part of pricing racial or ethnic groups out, making accommodations too expensive for them because of their economic status, that’s bad, certainly that troubles people, and it changes the fabric of the community.”77 This is an insight into how perceptions of the East Side have changed in recent years and the effects gentrification have begun to take hold. Residents note these changes through changes in populations and prices.

77 Ibid.
The visual change to the building stock and streetscape, perceptions, and people that are inherent to gentrification tell a story outside of the data sets used to identify, analyze, and narrate gentrification. These patterns and observations are crucial to facilitating a study like this one, because they speak to the need to understand gentrification comprehensively. What data can alert preservationists and planners to impending gentrification in addition to anecdotal information from residents? The intent of this research is to supplement the anecdotal informal reaction to identifying gentrification not to undermine its validity. Understanding that gentrification is currently identified and named shows that neighborhood change happens on the ground and affects individuals along with a neighborhood scale.

**Charleston Patterns + Themes**

Before considering the East Side data specifically, it is important to address some larger themes occurring across downtown Charleston, which mirror themes in the East Side neighborhood. First, there is a widespread consensus that Charleston, as a whole, is experiencing gentrification. Loss of populations, shifts from a majority black population to a majority white population, and occupancy type have changed the most since 1960. According to a recent study by Realtor.com, Charleston ranks number one in the top ten gentrifying cities in the United States.78 The study was conducted by analyzing home

---

values, income, and education levels from 2000 to 2015 using Census data. This analysis is similar to the study conducted for this thesis, but looks at a shorter study period. This study also differed because the analysis monitored all the Census Tracts in downtown Charleston, rather than studying one historic neighborhood. Findings from the study provide good context for this thesis. The overall finding for describing gentrification in Charleston is, “the median price for a home in Charleston, South Carolina, was just $152,000. By 2015, that number had spiked 77.5 percent to $270,000. Over the same period, the city’s population shifted as well, with traditionally working-class, African-American neighborhoods becoming increasingly middle-class and white.”

These shifts of the past fifteen years reflect changes that are occurring all over downtown Charleston.

Charleston Population Trends

Population in downtown Charleston has been steadily declining since the middle of the twentieth century. This shift shows that the city has lost substantial density with fewer residents living on the peninsula. Like the city overall, this area has dramatically decreased in population, along with neighborhoods that border the East Side to the north and west. Though most density on the peninsula is diminishing, it is not a universal truth. Certain areas have remained high density. The area near College of

---

Charleston, which includes Harleston Village and Ansonborough, has been consistently, heavily populated throughout the study period. The central core of the peninsula, including Cannonborough-Elliotborough, has not seen much change related to population, likely due to the population of college students and higher density housing. The east and west sides of the peninsula have seen a steady decline in populations, with increased projections going into the next decade.80

Figure 4.1 below illustrates the decrease in population in downtown Charleston from 1960 to 2010. The red dots on the map represent two individuals so the larger amount of red dots on the left map from 1960 compared to fewer red dots on the right from 2010 show the loss of density in downtown Charleston. This decrease in population and this percentage of density is pained with a steady increase of white residents and an alarming decrease in black residents in downtown Charleston and the East Side neighborhood, which is indicated with a black border. Though the peninsula saw an overall reduction in population, the most dramatic change is visible in the East Side neighborhood. The line graph located below indicates the overall population within the East Side neighborhood. It depicts the overall theme of a decreasing population on the peninsula of Charleston. This shift shows that changes that occur at a larger geographic scale can be mapped onto individual neighborhoods in order to show a snapshot of change. These changes show that the population in Charleston has

decreased significantly, it occurred disproportionately in different areas, and the change in population is represented through changes in race.

Figure 4.1: Total Population Comparison of downtown Charleston. 1960 population totals located on the left, 2010 population totals located on the right. Each red dot represents two residents. Data and map provided by Social Explorer.
Though seemingly paradoxical, the decrease in black residents and influx of white residents reflects a “back to the city” movement happening across the country. Population density decreases can be seen in downtown Charleston as young, white, middle-class residents begin to move in. According to a study conducted by Nathaniel Baum-Snow and Daniel Hartley at the Federal Reserve of Chicago the “back to the city movement” has been booming since the turn of the twenty-first century. Their research indicated, “between 2000 and 2010, the share of high-income, high educated white households living in downtowns increased in roughly two-thirds of the U.S. metros the study tracked.”81 The study points out the driving forces for the re-urbanization of high-income, white residents has to do with proximity to amenities and job centers.

The study noted, “even with this back-to-the-city incursion of the educated and affluent, urban neighborhoods remain less affluent and less white than the suburbs.”\textsuperscript{82} In other words, urban areas are still more diverse than suburbs, but displacement is occurring in neighborhoods faced with an influx of middle to upper-class white and black residents. The disadvantages of this movement are demonstrated when displacement, instead of integration occurs. Despite an apparent integration while demographics show diverse population in Charleston, segregation in fact results in, “growing inequality and spatial segregation as the less advantaged are pushed out of the urban core and into either suburbs or less advantaged and more economically isolated areas of the city.”\textsuperscript{83} This return movement to the city is likely to influence the changing cityscape of Charleston and the East Side neighborhood. While populations have decreased significantly, ages and races have shifted away from traditional residents of color and lower socio-economic status towards new, upper-class whites. The changing population of the peninsula is one broad theme of gentrification and revitalization seen on the peninsula in Charleston.

\textit{Race}

Along with a decrease in population across the peninsula, a major shift in black and white residents has occurred in downtown Charleston. This macro-trend is not mirrored

\textsuperscript{82} Richard Florida, “The Downsides of the Back-to-the-City Movement,” \textit{CityLab},

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid.
exactly in the East Side, which still boasts a majority black community, but the demographics are beginning to shift towards a larger white population which has been occurring throughout downtown Charleston. In general, black residents have been moving off the peninsula since the middle of the twentieth century to suburban areas like West Ashley and James Island.84 Figure 4.3 below illustrates how the racial demographics on the peninsula have shifted since 1960 to 2010.

Census Tracts that were once primarily occupied by black residents have flipped to white majorities. Census Tracts 7, 8, and 10 were all populated by majority black residents in 1960, but as of 2010 possess a white majority. These tracts, 7, 8, and 10 are part of the East Side study area. Changing racial profiles of neighborhoods is closely linked to shifting compositions of neighborhoods. Racial demographics should not be the only dimension considered, however. These changes are not immediate, but occur gradually over decades of movement by groups of people. Gentrification has to do with these changes and also the rate of change over the timeline.

---

Figure 4.3: Map of racial demographics illustrating white and black populations in downtown Charleston. The map on the left shows 1960, while the map on the right shows 2010. Map and data from Social Explorer.
Shifts in density and black and white populations in downtown Charleston follow a trend relating to geography. Downtown Charleston’s location on a peninsula restricts movements to the east and west and the historic core is located farther south on the peninsula, therefore migration patterns seem to move north. White populations have been gradually increasing on the peninsula from the southernmost point upwards to the neighborhoods in the middle and upper peninsula. Though not originally so, the East Side neighborhood was predominantly black during the 1960s. Now the edges of the neighborhood have begun to change. This change can be seen in other neighborhoods on the peninsula, like the West Side, Harleston Village, the King Street Meeting Street Corridor, and Hampton Park have all been subject to the displacement, movement, and loss of black residents.

This change could be attributed to many factors including an influx of college students, black families moving to suburbs, the back-to-the-city movement of white individuals, population changes in downtown Charleston, advanced growth in the urban center, or the displacement of black residents based on rising housing prices. Population and racial demographic changes are distinct in the East Side neighborhood and downtown Charleston. It is not the aim of this thesis to resolve the question of why the neighborhood is changing. It is important, however to consider the wider trends that characterize the market-value equations which that population could be diminishing, because of residents electively leaving, which could mean that demand is low. A fixed supply of housing options in the East Side suggests that demand is high and has made it
that people who prefer the luxury of lower density are pressuring current residents out of the neighborhood. It is possible that as residents are exiting the neighborhood, there is an increase in vacancy which leads to less density. Specifically, in the United States and the American south economic affluence is disproportionally associated with race, combing the factors of falling populations and the shift from dense black populations to majority white populations. The changes to the East Side have occurred at different rates depending on the area of the neighborhood.

**Occupancy**

Owner occupation versus rental occupation has not shifted dramatically over time in downtown Charleston. The rate of occupancy has remained consistent from 1960 to 2010. In most neighborhoods renters make up the majority of the population with the exception of some neighborhoods. Neighborhoods like South of Broad and North Central, boasted slightly more owner-occupied units than other areas. In general, this characteristic did not change in a significant way over the study period. Some loss of owner occupation can be seen in the study area, but this may be contributed to the overall decrease in population. Fewer inhabitants mean fewer owners and renters in the area. Figure 4.4 below shows the changes in occupancy from 1960 to 2010. Across the whole Charleston peninsula, the percentage of owner occupation was expected to shift toward a higher percentage of rental occupation as gentrification and neighborhood
change occurred, but as a trend in downtown Charleston the rates have remained constant.

Figure 4.4: Map showing owner occupation vs. rental occupation on the Charleston peninsula. The map on the left shows 1960, while the map on the right shows 2010. The map and data were provided by Social Explorer.
Owner and rental occupancy invokes an idea of permanency, which leads to the hypothesis of a shift away from owner-occupancy when gentrification occurs. Based on the trend of occupancy in downtown Charleston remaining similar over time despite the consensus that gentrification is happening in downtown Charleston, it seems that occupancy does not play as significant of a role in determining when a neighborhood is changing. Partially because this could be true examining owner vs. rental occupation does not indicate who ownership belongs to or what groups are renting, which leaves a gap in understanding race, age, and income level. Two of these factors are addressed individually related to the East Side and how its population has shifted.

**East Side Study**

**Architectural Factors**

_Hypothesis of Vacancy: Vacancy was expected to decrease over time, because of greater development interest in the area. Vacancy tends to decrease as a neighborhood experiences gentrification, which brings an influx of new residents. It seems that vacancy would be higher in the years leading up to gentrification and would drop as it continued to occur. Vacancy was expected to be a strong indicator in the advanced stage of gentrification._

Along with occupancy, vacancy has increased in the East Side neighborhood. Vacancy statistics are available for the years: 1950, 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010. It is important to note that even without available vacancy statistics, it is known that some
buildings were vacant during 1960 and 1970. In this period, vacancy in each tract associated with the East Side saw an increase or held constant. This statistic may be associated with the decrease in population that has affected downtown Charleston as a whole. In Figure 4.5, vacancy in the East Side is presented in a line graph over time. In general, vacancy has increased over the sixty-year study period.

![Graph showing vacancy over time in the East Side neighborhood.](image)

The loss of occupants leads to more empty buildings, which in turn may influence the likelihood of the East Side experiencing rapid urban change as there is a larger, underused and therefore likely undervalued housing stock available. It should be noted that development moving into the East Side underutilizing vacant buildings is different than gentrification, because this type of change occurs without displacing residents since the buildings were vacant previously. A higher rate of vacancy can still influence market trends in the East Side making gentrification occur and displacing
people from buildings in the area. The factors of a high rental population and increasing vacancy create an area that is more susceptible to neighborhood change and gentrification. Increased vacancy over the sixty-year study period may indicate that the neighborhood has been in decline and residents have exited rather than being displaced. The character of the neighborhood has been dominated by renter occupation throughout the study period, which makes the East Side vulnerable to urban change.

_Hypothesis of Occupancy: The rate of owner-occupancy was expected to dramatically shift towards rental occupancy as gentrification occurs. This reinforced the idea that ownership is related to displacement in the sense that gentrification forces or allows residents to sell property because of being priced out or that new owners may capitalize on the growing desirability of a neighborhood to gain profit through leasing. Overall, trends of less owner-occupancy was expected. Occupancy was expected to be a strong indicator in the initial stage of gentrification._

Occupancy rates in the East Side neighborhood were monitored from 1950 to 2010 using census records. These records indicated if a given dwelling as owner-occupied, a rental, and in some years, if it was vacant. Analyzing gentrification, as a product of owner vs. renter occupancy and vacancy rates, within the East Side is based on the assumption that long-time residents are homeowners. The hypothesis that high owner-occupancy suggests less neighborhood change may not be fully probably or inherently valid. However, increased vacancy and rental units make a neighborhood
more susceptible to change or short term interests in the neighborhood. On the other hand, an increasing proportion of buildings being owner occupied reflects that a new generation of residents are moving in, and settling where renters are leaving or being displaced.

Since it is not possible to isolate one understanding of the correlation between owner occupancy and renter occupancy, the main issue that should be examined to look for evidence of gentrification is to see if large fluctuations in the proportions of owners and renters occur over time. A dramatic change may signal a symptom of gentrification. This in turn created an expectation of a drop in owner-occupancy across the Census Tracts that form the East Side neighborhood. The changes of the all the Census Tracts within the East Side neighborhood are analyzed, with specific attention paid to tract 9 since it is composed of the core majority of the neighborhood. Figure 4.6 below shows the changes of Census Tract from 1950 to 2010.
Figure 4.6: Pie graphs show occupancy changes in Census Tract 9. This tract makes up the majority of the East Side. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graphs by author.
Owner-occupancy did not change drastically, but increased over time. Over the course of sixty-years, owner-occupancy in Census Tract 9, which contains the majority of the East Side neighborhood, has actually increased. The rate of owner occupied buildings has occurred in small percentages with the first major change occurring in 1980. This change is represented by pie graphs in figure 4.6 above, which show the explicit change that became a trend from 1950 to 2010.

Owner occupancy, rental occupancy, and vacancy have all changed since 1950, but not dramatically. As vacancy increased over the sixty-year period, rental occupation dropped rather than a loss in owner occupation. This change may be attributed to the decrease in population. In general, owner-occupancy has risen slightly in the East Side neighborhood over the sixty-year period, while rental occupancy has remained mostly consistent. Figure 4.7 below shows the overall shifts from 1950 to 2010.
Each graph in Figure 4.7 includes owner and rental occupancy, but vacancy statistics are only available for particular years. In 1950, owner-occupancy was listed as 16%, rental occupancy was 81%, and vacancy was 3%. In 1960 and 1970, vacancy information was unavailable. Owner occupancy was at 15% and rental occupancy was at 85% in 1960. In 1970, owner occupancy was at 18% and rental occupancy was at 82%.
Through this thirty-year period, occupancy statistics did not shift greatly. In 1980, owner occupancy was listed as 21%, rental occupancy was listed as 69%, and vacancy was at 10%. In 1990, owner occupancy was listed as 22%, rental occupancy was at 59%, and vacancy was at 19%. The ten-year period between 1980 and 1990, shows a sharp increase in vacancy across the Census Tracts that make up the East Side. This change may be related to dropping populations of residents moving to suburban areas in Charleston.

In 2000, owner occupancy was listed as 20%, rental occupancy was listed at 64%, and vacancy was at 16%. In 2010, owner occupancy was listed at 19%, rental occupancy was 60%, and vacancy was listed at 21%. Owner occupancy saw a strong increase from 1980 onward, while rental occupancy hovered around the 60% margin. Vacancy in the East Side fluctuated between 10% and 20% depending on the year. The drop in rental occupancy seems to be related to vacancy in the East Side, as rental occupancy decreases—vacancy increases and vice versa. The connection of rental and vacancy relates to the instability of neighborhood dynamics in the East Side. The slight increase in ownership in the East Side is likely related to a new influx of homeowners.

According to a study from 2011, high populations of renters is related to the risk of displacement associated with gentrification. 85 Another recent study conducted by William Martin and Kevin Beck, showed that, “controlling for other factors, renters face

a 2.6 percent greater probability of being displaced in a gentrifying neighborhood compared to 1.3 percent overall. It’s greater than the difference between residents of subsidized and unsubsidized units and about the same as the difference between a married renter and one who is divorced."86 Typically, rental units change more often than owner occupied housing since they are dictated by yearly leases, where monthly payments can be adjusted to reflect changing market conditions in contrast to a mortgage. This more frequent change may be responsible for the likelihood of displacement as rents rise or residents are forced to find new housing as leases end.

The study of occupancy has yielded information regarding how residents within the East Side have exited or been displaced. It can be assumed that as occupancy type shifts, there if is a change related to residents. During the periods of high vacancy, owner occupation also rose compared to previous years. This trend can be seen in the analysis of Census Tract 9, along with the tracts that make up the East Side as whole. Since 1950, there has been a steady increase in owner occupancy and vacancy, while rental occupancy has dominated as the majority type for residents. The shift towards more owners shows, at least, that there is more permanent investment in the neighborhood. The historic housing stock in the East Side is prevalent, which can be adapted for single-family or multi-family use. The increasing rates of vacancy, alongside

an increase in ownership shows that the original makeup of the neighborhood is changing. Based on earlier years of high occupancy, in rental units, and low vacancy, the East Side would have been a more densely populated area.

All of these factors related to occupancy changes show that neighborhoods shift over time in various ways. This data analysis creates several takeaways about the relationship of gentrification and owner vs. renter occupancy in the East Side during the study period. In the 1980s, the proportions of owner occupancy to rental occupancy changed, which signals some sort of change in the neighborhood. The proportional change toward owner occupancy from renter occupancy is beneficial to the preservation of historic buildings in the East Side, but shows a loss in the intangible cultural heritage of the East Side, since residential demographics were changing.

*Hypothesis of Density:* Density in the East Side neighborhood was expected to become significantly lower, which follows trends from Charleston. The increase in vacancy and decrease in general population suggests that less residents are inhabiting a particular area. Density was expected to be a moderate indicator in the initial stage of gentrification.

The examination of density is related to the occupancy and vacancy of the East Side neighborhood, which shows how significantly less people inhabit the area. The data of male and female residents provided counts of the entire population to show how the neighborhood was once inhabited by significantly more people. This may be related to
low-income residents occupying less space with more people. The neighborhood has seen a 50% decrease in residents from 1960 to 2010, which could relate to a growing affluence in the neighborhood. The idea of affluence is related to more space for less people shows how the East Side has begun to gentrify. Figure 4.8, below as created illustrates the change in population density through the shaded areas. The East Side neighborhood is outlined in black.

The East Side neighborhood has become significantly less dense since 1960, which is a pattern that occurred across downtown Charleston. The loss of density speaks to aging populations where children have moved away, smaller family size, non-multi-generational households, and residents moving out of the city to suburbs. This assumption follows the historic moving patterns of residents in downtown Charleston,
which are outlined in the East Side Master Plan. These influences, which lead to decreased density may be the product of gentrification. Decreasing density may be explained as larger, families being displaced because of rising rents or it may be a result of self-selecting exiting. As Charleston becomes a destination for visitors, a hub for college students, and a mecca for young professionals the issues of gentrification will not go away. Understanding how demographics can point out the phases of gentrification will help in mitigating the loss of current residents, while providing an identification and planning tool for those concerned with maintaining neighborhood character.

**Hypothesis of Market Trends:** Housing prices are expected to dramatically increase over the 60-year period of study, because of normal market change and gentrification forces. Housing prices were expected to dip in housing market during recession of 2008. Overall, an increase in perception of value reflected in market price are expected. Housing market trends were expected to be a strong indicator in the intermediate stage of gentrification.

House prices in the East Side were collected randomly from within the study area for 100 houses from 1953 to 2016. The prices were collected using Zillow Real Estate and the Charleston County Auditor’s website, which provided sales data based on
This data set differs from the others, because individual home prices are not available through Census records. The sale prices from each of the properties were compiled in chronological order in order to graph the change in pricing over time. The data was used to create an image of property value over time. The data reveals a sharp increase in the value of houses beginning around the early-2000s, with the values growing into the 2010s. This increase was plotted alongside typical market trends in Charleston. The neighborhood had fairly consistent home prices and values until the late 1990s, when pricing began to shift. Figure 4.9, below shows the increase in properties in the early 2000s and the steady climb up until 2016.

**Figure 4.9: Scatter plot of housing prices from 1953 to 2016 in East Side. Data collected from Zillow Real Estate and Charleston County Tax Assessor. Graph by author.**

---

87 See methodology chapter for explanation of how properties were chosen for this analysis section, 62-63.
Economic forces are one of the main drivers of gentrification. The housing market shows how this force affects neighborhoods. In the East Side housing values have increased steadily since the 1950s, but show a major change in the 2000s. The following scatter graph, in Figure 4.10, show the housing market data collected for the East Side neighborhood from 1953 to 2016. This graph is illustrated with a trend line, which shows the period of sharp increase and steady uptick throughout the 2010s. The third graph, in Figure 4.11, shows a 10-year project of home sale prices in the East Side. Based on the sharp increase in housing prices in more recent years, it is likely that market forces are influencing gentrification, displacement, and neighborhood change in the East Side.

Figure 4.10: Scatter plot of housing prices in East Side from 1953 to 2016 with trend line. Data collected from Zillow Real Estate and Charleston County Tax Assessor. Graph by author.
This change is influenced by inflation, but is also indicative of neighborhood change and forces that may be perpetuating displacement. According to James Frank Dy Zarsadiaz, gentrification has been driven by capitalism and neo-liberalism since the 1950s. He wrote, “In the economic context of cities, neo-liberal ideology encourages free enterprise, open competition, deregulation, and the dismantling of public goods. It relies on the private market for quotidian matters such as education, health care, housing, transportation, and even amusement. Instead of being seen as rights or services, these become commodities for purchase.”

neighborhoods and the amenities of cities is inherently capitalistic, which drives the free market.

As neighborhoods become more desirable, the housing prices begin to rise. In the case of the East Side, which has a large stock of old buildings and swaths of vacant houses, it creates a prime market opportunity. The frequency of sales also implies that housing in the East Side is being treated like a commodity. The East Side is a smaller piece to a larger machine of rising housing prices in downtown Charleston and its surrounding suburbs. Comparing the market shifts in the East Side to changes in Charleston and the nation provided a baseline to study the rate of change in the neighborhood.

Figure 4.12: GIS map illustrating the “Crosstown” in downtown Charleston. Image from City of Charleston GIS.

The housing market in Charleston has been increasingly desirable since the 2010s and is projected to keep growing. Data taken from the City of Charleston’s
Comprehensive Plan: Century V Plan Update provided median housing data for houses above the crosstown from 1990 to 2009. This time period does not line up exactly with the period examined in the East Side, but shows that the neighborhood is following larger trends in downtown Charleston. The data for homes above and below the Crosstown, formally known as Septima Clark Parkway, that runs east to west through the middle of the peninsula, were graphed alongside the East Side housing prices. Figure 4.12, above, illustrates the Crosstown running east to west across the Charleston peninsula.

The graphs, in Figures 4.13 and 4.14, below show the median home price above and below the Crosstown in comparison to the housing data gathered for the East Side.
Figure 4.14: East Side housing market trends + Charleston median home prices below the Crosstown. Scatter represents East Side housing trends. Blue line shows Charleston median home price. Data provided by Charleston Master Plan Century V Plan. Graph by author.

Figure 4.15: Line graph of Charleston median home prices. Grey line represents median home prices below Crosstown. Blue line represents median home prices above Crosstown. Data from the City of Charleston Master Plan Century V Plan. Graph by author.
The data above, in Figures 4.13, 4.14, and 4.15, shows how prices in the East Side and Charleston have both increased over the sixty-year study period. The housing market trends are consistent throughout the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s, but begin to diverge in the 1990s. In the 1990s and beyond, the faster rate of rising housing prices creates an environment where renters and some homeowners are likely priced out of their neighborhood, especially since the East Side has a high population of renters. This pattern should sharpen focus on the East Side during the 1990s to 2010s as prime financial forces seem be presenting as an indicator of gentrification.

The market for housing prices is projected to continue to rise in Charleston and will affect the demographics within the East Side neighborhood. Further purchase opportunities for vacant properties and higher values leading long-time owners to capitalize on the housing market may push gentrification into the advanced stage. The flexibility of landlords to alter rental prices may in turn drive residents out of the East Side. The market trends show that prices will be higher than ever before in the East Side neighborhood. If this trend continues, this change will greatly affect less permanent residents, like long-time renters and low-income individuals and families who own property, but are greatly impacted by increased property taxes. Neighborhood growth and revitalization that occur alongside higher housing prices is not inherently negative, but should be monitored in order to protect current residents. The main issue concerning growth in market trends is the entrance of developers and new homeowners who may drive out residents and drive up prices for rental units.
This concern has been addressed by the City of Charleston through various efforts. The rising housing market in the city has caused concern for affordable workforce housing and mitigating gentrification in certain areas. In the Century V Plan Update Comprehensive Plan, city officials addressed issues of availability, affordability, and new development of housing within Charleston. The study defined housing as, “a fundamental building block of good neighborhoods and cities must foster an environment where people thrive in the context of preservation of old homes and where new homes are built as an extension of the culture, lifestyle, or civic pride in the community. Ideally, communities provide its population with housing choice through a broad range of housing types, styles, and prices.” ⁸⁹ This statement reflects the need for affordable housing and conscious urban planning in neighborhoods, like the East Side, that face issues surrounding displacement, gentrification, and possible loss of historic and cultural fabric.

Social Factors

Hypothesis of Racial Demographics: Changes in race were expected to shift dramatically.

This hypothesis was based on trends in downtown Charleston of the loss of African American residents on the peninsula and the definition of gentrification. The East Side is a historically black neighborhood so using race as an indicator was expected to show a large demographic shift as gentrification occurs. Racial demographics were expected to be a strong indicator in all stages of gentrification.

Gentrification is often defined by major demographic shifts within neighborhoods from lower socio-economic status to middle and upper class residents, which is often conflated with race. Changing racial demographics not the only factor of gentrification, but it does show how populations change when neighborhoods are undergoing rapid change. The Census Tracts that make up the East Side and surrounding neighborhoods, like Charleston as a whole, had large black populations for much of their history. In recent years, the data shows these populations have begun to shift through some combination of self-selecting exiting and displacement. Figure 4.16, below, shows the timeline of racial demographic change in the East Side as a whole. From 1960 to
2010, the black majority population has decreased significantly while white residents became the majority by 2010.

The racial demographic data collected for this section of the analysis determined that black populations are significantly lower than before, while white populations are rising. In each Census Tract that makes up the East Side, majority black populations have begun to flip to majority white populations. Figure 4.17, below, illustrates the change in black and white populations in the East Side through a map, which represents black residents in orange and white residents in green. The tracts that make of the East Side have seen varying degrees of this demographic change, but each one has been affected.

Figure 4.16: Racial demographic totals from all Census Tracts in the East Side from 1960 to 2010. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.
The contrast between 1960 and 2010 is dramatic, which shows how new populations change neighborhood compositions. The built heritage and intangible culture created by the communities within these historically black neighborhoods are at risk as the residents begin to disappear.

In the 1960s, each of the Census Tracts that make up the East Side had majority black populations shown in figure 4.18. Into the 1970s and 1980s, the white populations in this area were almost nonexistent shown in figures 4.19 and 4.20. The 1990s showed the beginning of demographic changes in the East Side and its surrounding area. The
white population was still a minority, but was beginning to grow. By 2000, all of the Census Tracts in the study group saw a sharp rise in white populations.

**Figure 4.18:** Racial demographics on the East Side from each Census Tract in 1960. Data provided by U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.

**Figure 4.19:** Racial demographics on the East Side from each Census Tract in 1970. Data provided by U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.
Figure 4.20: Racial demographics on the East Side from each Census Tract in 1980. Data provided by U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.

In Census Tract 7, the population had grown from 1,305 white residents in 1990 to 2,292 residents in 2000. With this increase, Tract 7 had become a majority white neighborhood. In Census Tract 8, the population had shifted from 432 white residents in 1990 to 559 in 2000. Census Tract 9, which contains the largest area in the East Side, saw a less dramatic shift in overall populations. In 1990, Tract 9 was composed of 1,083 black residents and 7 white residents. By 2000, it was composed of 1,544 black residents and 105 white residents. This is a dramatic increase in the white population, but black residents still remained the majority. In Census Tract 10, the population grew from 113 white residents in 1990 to 567 white residents in 2000. In Census Tract 13, white populations grew from 57 residents in 1990 to 128 in 2000. These demographics
changes are illustrated below in figure 4.21 and 4.22. The graphs show the racial demographic changes for 1990 and 2000.

Figure 4.21: Racial demographics on the East Side from each Census Tract in 1990. Data provided by U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.

Figure 4.22: Racial demographics on the East Side from each Census Tract in 2000. Data provided by U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.
These racial shifts continued into 2010 with white populations in each Census Tract growing even more. This trend is illustrated in figure 4.23 above. Census Tract 7 was the first to flip demographically and is located furthest south. By 2010, the majority of Census Tracts had tripled in the number of white residents. In Census Tract 7, the white population increased by 26%. In Census Tract 8, the white population had increased by 98%. In Census Tract 9 the white population had increased by 180%. In Census Tract 10, the white population had increased by 166%. In Census Tract 13, the white population had increased by 424%. These demographics shifts are significant to understanding the effects of gentrification on the East Side. It is important to note that the overall populations of white and black residents were not becoming significantly larger or smaller, but rather white residents were replacing black residents.
Racial composition, on its own, does not explain gentrification in a neighborhood, but could serve as an early indicator of neighborhood change or be tied to measuring the impact of gentrification, identifying it, and quantifying it. The changes in the racial composition within the East Side are particularly pronounced from 1990s to current. This change coincided with the upwards shift of housing prices in the East Side neighborhood. While these areas were originally composed of mixed populations, the later shifts show a complete flip from high populations of black residents to majority white residents in certain Census Tracts. This change in populations indicates that the East Side is experiencing a dramatic urban change and gentrification, likely through the changes of racial composition. Figure 4.24 below illustrates the change over time of racial composition within the neighborhood. The slow, steady decrease in black populations, while white populations are increasing shows that the neighborhood is
The social makeup of the neighborhood is shifting from original residential composition to a new composition of residents.

Figure 4.24: Racial demographics from each Census Tract in the East Side from 1960 to 2010. Data provided by U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.

Racial boundaries can be informative to understanding when gentrification is occurring in a neighborhood, according to a study conducted by Jonathan Tannen. Tannen collected data related to racial boundaries in 100 U.S. cities in order to determine how neighborhoods are racially divided and how they change. According to his study, neighborhoods were not desegregating but resegregating into new
boundaries. He discovered the boundaries were shifting, but not necessarily creating more diversity. This differs from Japonica Brown-Saracino’s supposition that a positive effect of gentrification is increased social mix from her book, The Gentrification Debates: A Reader. Diversity and revitalization are often cited as benefits as gentrification. It is important to understand that the benefits are not always inclusive and can create negative effects for residents who miss out on the change. Tannen stated, “You’re not seeing this historically black area becoming five percent white over ten years and then ten percent white. Instead, they went from almost 100 percent black to almost 100 percent white over ten years.” This specific instance cited above from Philadelphia speaks to the data collected related to the East Side. From the period of 2000 to 2010, major changes to demographics occurred and some areas of the East Side completely flipped racial populations. This racial shift is one of the strong indicators that occurs in the intermediate and advanced stage of gentrification.

92 Ibid.
Hypothesis of Sex Demographics: Changes in populations of male and female residents were expected to remain stable. Shifts in males and female residents was not a main component of the original hypothesis and major changes were unknown. This change was not expected to pinpoint gentrification in the East Side neighborhood necessarily, but, because of the sex was one of the categories in the Census and because of anecdotal evidence of gentrification speak of the influx of primarily female, college students moving into the area. Sex demographics were expected to be a weak indicator in the advanced stage of gentrification.

The demographic shift in sex in the East Side neighborhood is consistent with population changes across the peninsula. The relationship of gentrification to sex can be difficult to correlate, but some connections exist between women and gentrification. As women entered the workforce during the middle of the twentieth-century, a new class of people with buying power developed. This added buying power created an opportunity for women to participate in gentrification. Another component of the influence of sex on gentrification in the East Side neighborhood is the population of residents who are female students. The College of Charleston has a population of 11,294 students, 64.4% of which are female. 3,247 students live on campus, which leaves the majority of the student population to find housing elsewhere in downtown Charleston.93 The East Side has been an area of lower-income residents with a large

---

building stock, which has led to low rental prices. The affordability of the East Side has drawn college students to the area, which has affected the spike in young, white, female residents in the area. The data reflects a consistent population of female residents in the East Side, but other factors contribute the analysis of change. Figure 4.25 below shows how sex demographics have not dramatically changed over time.

The two defining factors that relate women to gentrification are the buying power coupled with women in the workforce, as part of a larger, national trend. In the case of the East Side, which has always had a large female population, gentrification affects low-income women when residents are displaced or exit the area.

*Figure 4.25: Changes in male and female demographics from all Census Tracts in the East Side 1960 to 2010. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graph by author.*
According to Liz Bondi, “Feminist geographers have demonstrated a close connection between the restructuring of urban space and changing definitions of gender identity and gender difference.”94 The relationship of women and gentrification can be seen through market forces and buying power that middle to upper-middle class women have available to them. As women entered the workforce in the twentieth-century, women needed the amenities of particular neighborhoods like proximity to work. Bondi cited the idea that, “different forms of gentrification express strategies adopted by career-oriented, middle-class women at different stages of the life-cycle, associating commercially-led gentrification with highly affluent, dual-career households containing childless women, and the investment of ‘sweat equity’ to upgrade single properties with family households, including a high proportion headed by lone women.”95 Higher populations of women, therefore, may show that gentrification has started to occur. In the East Side neighborhood, increasing female populations may be an early indicator of gentrification or could be a specific phenomenon of the neighborhood.

Hypothesis of Age Demographics: Age ranges were expected to shift toward younger populations from the range 18 to 34 as gentrification occurred based on anecdotal evidence. The East Side neighborhood has been a location of families and multi-

95 Ibid, 194.
generation households, but an influx of college age students was expected in these areas in the East Side. Influxes of older, wealthy residents may be another way to use age as an identification and signifier of gentrification. Age demographics were expected to be a moderate indicator in the intermediate and advanced stages of gentrification.

The data gathered for the age demographics showed how populations in the East Side have shifted over time. Changes in the populations of ages within a neighborhood can indicate what groups are living there and how they age in the neighborhood. Aging in place, large populations of children, and a steady elderly population show that the East Side is remaining consistent rather than experiencing major changes of populations. The East Side had a diverse range of ages throughout the 1960s to 1990s, but changed to a majority of one age group in 2000 and 2010. Age demographics can also show if more families reside within a neighborhood, rather than individuals. The change from original occupancy of families to individual occupancy in the East Side shows how original residential make up has shifted over time.

A range of ages also shows how a neighborhood has a diverse community, rather than one group quickly becomes dominate an area. Gentrification is often seen through the influx of a certain group that begins to dominate demographics of an area. For example, if a particular age group, like 18 to 34 year olds, is dominating a neighborhood, it is likely that gentrification is occurring. This could be said about an area that sees a drop in elderly residents, while school-age children increase, which would suggest that certain residents are being replaced by others. The dramatic increase of one group, that
was not previously present, over a balanced range of ages can be an indicator of gentrification.

Ages in the East Side reflect residents and their family composition and the shift towards individual persons living in the neighborhood. From 1960 to 2010, age groups shifted dramatically. In 1960, individuals under 18 made up the highest populations. The next highest population was 35 to 64 year olds, which could be estimated to be the parents of the large population of children. This indicates a family structure where children outnumber parents. The East Side also had a large 18 to 34-year-old population, but it was still significantly less than the children under 18 and adults from 35 to 70 years old. In general, populations of people over 65 years of age have remained consistent from 1960 to 2010, which shows how residents have aged in place in the East Side. Figure 4.26, below, shows the age demographics of the East Side in 1960.

![Figure 4.26: Age demographics in 1960 in all Census Tracts of the East Side. Data from Social Explorer. Graph by author.](image-url)
Elderly populations, in the East Side appear to be a consistent data point, a control group of sorts, that shows what groups exit or are displaced during gentrification. The shift towards a younger, majority population is seen during the 1980s and 1990s in the East Side, which relates to the era of movement to the suburbs. From the 1990s to 2010, the population of 18 to 34 year olds grew significantly. Figures 4.27, 4.28, and 4.29 below, show the consistency of people of 65 years of age through the timeline, while the 18 to 34-year-old age group continues to grow. This growth coincides with the shift toward white, female populations. This maps onto the notion that young, college age students and professionals are beginning to compose the neighborhood.

![Figure 4.27: Age demographics in the East Side from 1970. The 65 and over population remained consistent, while the 18 to 34-year-old group grew. Data from Social Explorer. Graph by author.](image-url)
Figure 4.28: Age demographics in the East Side from 1980. The 65 and over population remained consistent, while the 18 to 34-year-old group grew. Data from Social Explorer. Graph by author.

Figure 4.29: Age demographics in the East Side from 1990. The 65 and over population remained consistent, while the 18 to 34-year-old group grew. Data from Social Explorer. Graph by author.
Figure 4.30: Age demographics in the East Side from 2000. The 65 and over population remained consistent, while the 18 to 34-year-old group grew. Data from Social Explorer. Graph by author.

Figure 4.31: Age demographics in the East Side from 2010. The 65 and over population remained consistent, while the 18 to 34-year-old group grew. Data from Social Explorer. Graph by author.
Figures 4.26 through 4.31 above, illustrate the changes in age demographics in the East Side neighborhood over time. The most significant shifts toward 18 to 34-year-olds occurred after 1990. The population of 65 years of age and older remained consistent throughout the study period, which illustrates what groups of residents have stayed in the neighborhood. The influx of younger groups of people to areas with formerly, diverse age ranges is indicative of gentrification since it shows a demographic shift in residency.

Shifts towards young, adult populations have been used to predict and determine gentrification in cities like New York. A study by New York University’s Furman Center mapped 55 neighborhoods in New York to determine if they were experiencing gentrification. The study showed neighborhoods that were gentrifying, non-gentrifying, and high-income. These areas were judged based on income, age, and education.96 According to the study, “Between 2000 and 2010-2014, higher-income neighborhoods started to lose their adult shares, while non-gentrifying neighborhoods saw their shares increase slightly. In gentrifying neighborhoods, the share of adults increased by more than any other neighborhood.”97 The increase in 18 to 34 year olds across the East Side from 1960 to 2010 was 27%. This increase reflects a major change in demographics of the East Side, which reflects gentrification that is occurring.

---

97 Ibid.
The graph below outlines the change in age demographics from 1960 to 2010 in all of the Census Tracts that make up the East Side neighborhood. Certain tracts, like Tract 13, have not experienced such stark changes. The overall trend is moving away from diverse age groups to a higher population of young people. This trend is indicative of gentrification, because it shows how neighborhoods lose their former residential makeup to single member households particularly from the East Side neighborhood. The East Side has seen this shift most dramatically in the years of 1990 to 2010, similarly to the changes to housing values and racial demographics. Figure 4.32 shows the overall changes in age groups in the East Side neighborhood.

Figure 4.32: Age demographics on the East Side from all Census Tracts from 1960 to 2010. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau and Social Explorer. Graphs by author.
Hypothesis of Family versus Individual Occupation: Changes in the family occupation and individual occupation were expected to shift over time based on the age demographic data. This indicator was expected to show a large increase in individual occupation and the loss of family occupation as the neighborhood changed. This change is related to gentrification, because it shows how original residential make-up shifts from families to individual occupation. Family versus individual occupation was expected to be a strong indicator in the advanced stage of gentrification.

In order to reinforce the symptom of gentrification related to shifting age populations data was collected related to family households compared to individual households in the East Side neighborhood. The change from larger populations of children and adults to large populations of 18 to 34 year olds suggests that families are exiting or being displaced in the East Side and surrounding area. This finding is confirmed by analyzing the changes to family occupancy in the neighborhood. This data set showed how occupancy of families and individuals changed drastically over the study period. Since 1960, the East Side has seen a steady drop in populations of family occupied households to a growing number of individual occupied households. The largest shift in this trend occurs from 1990 to 2000, with the number of individuals steadily increasing into 2010. Figure 4.33 illustrates this change, which begins in the
1990s and completely flips from majority family occupancy to individual occupancy by 2000. This change in majority populations continues into 2010.

This change indicates that, like the other data sets, that the East Side has been experiencing symptoms of gentrification. The change in family populations began shifting in the 1990s and has steadily increased. The influx of individual households shows that new groups of residents are moving into these areas, which were primarily composed of families. The change in demographics related to families illustrates how gentrification can be measured by the loss of diverse age groups and the influx of another. Figure 4.34, below, shows this change mapped onto the study area. This visual aid shows how the East Side neighborhood, along with other parts of downtown Charleston, has almost completely flipped. Areas that were once made up of families
are now comprised of individual households and vice versa. It is important to note that the areas that are comprised of family households in 2010 are wealthier neighborhoods, while individual households are located in more affordable areas of Charleston.

Figure 4.34: Map showing the change in family occupation vs. individual occupation from 1970 and 2010. Map and Data collected from Social Explorer.
This change illustrates the onset of gentrification within the East Side neighborhood. The area has been affected by an influx of new residents who are mostly single member households. This is evident through the data collected related to age, race, sex, and household composition. These factors each indicate gentrification in a different facet. A change in family households to individual households reiterates the changing demographic landscape of the East Side. Originally, a neighborhood composed of working to middle-class, black families has now shifted to young, white individuals.

*Crime: Based on newspaper reports and sense of place, crime rates were expected to drop with gentrification. Crime, according to researchers of gentrification, is one of the most indicative changes that facilitates gentrification. Crime was expected to be a high indicator in the initial stage of gentrification.*

The available data for crime rates is limited to recent years of 2010 to 2014 so it does not offer the same depth of the longitudinal study. Crime rate statistics were collected from the Federal Bureau of Investigation using the Social Explorer platform. Violent and property crime statistics were available on a county level from 2010 to 2014. Violent crimes are defined as murder, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. Property crimes are defined as arson, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. Crime statistics in the Charleston dropped significantly in the four-year period. Overall, the data allows for a small view of how crime has changed in Charleston County. The
The overwhelming majority of crimes committed were property crimes rather than violent offenses. The graph below shows the changes in crime rates in Charleston County.

![Graph showing changes in crime rates in Charleston County from 2010 to 2014.](image)

*Figure 4.35: Violent and property crimes in Charleston County from 2010 to 2014. Data collected from Social Explorer. Graph by author.*

The notion of a safer neighborhood is conflated with gentrification. Insinuating that crime goes away when neighborhoods experience an influx of middle to upper-class residents places the blame of crime on low-income residents. Another way to assess the change in crime in neighborhoods experiencing gentrification could be more directly related to the presence of a police force or crime rates related to gentrification. Crime
rates across the nation have been dropping since the 1990s and urban areas have seen some of the lowest crime rates in decades.  

A lowering crime rate can be a major indicator of gentrification, but the two do not necessarily happen simultaneously. Gentrification tends to follow a lower crime, rather than being a catalyst for changing crime rates. According to research conducted by Ingrid Could Ellen. Ellen establishes that crime rates affect different groups of people in various ways. The research concluded, “higher-income and college-educated—and to a lesser degree, whites—appeared significantly more sensitive to changing crime levels in their housing decisions than other groups. Lower-income and minority households, for instance, didn’t become more likely to move to cities as they grew safer.” Changes in crime rates can serve as an indicator for gentrification by monitoring when rates change. When crime rates drop, it would be useful to monitor demographic changes to neighborhoods. Crime rates serve as an early indicator for gentrification, because it is preemptive of an influx of new residents.

---

Summary of Findings

All of the architectural and social indicators showed changed during the sixty-year study period. This section provides a summary of how each indicator changed over time from 1950 to 2010.

Vacancy: The data for vacancy was available for the years 1950, 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010. In general, vacancy in Census Tracts 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13 increased over time. This increase shows how the neighborhood lost residents, which has left empty structures to be filled with new residents. In 1950, there were 146 vacant building. By 1980, this number increased to 467, which showed a 219% increase. In 1990, there were 826 vacant buildings, which was a 76% increase from 1980. As of 2000, 734 buildings were vacant, a slight decrease from 1990. Vacancy increased once again 2010, from 734 to 1240, an 68% increase.

Owner versus Renter Occupancy: From 1950 to 2010, rental occupancy was the dominate form of occupancy in the East Side. In each ten-year period, rental occupancy remained the majority over owner occupancy and vacancy. Rental occupancy always remained over 45% of the occupancy type in the East Side. In Census Tract 9, rental occupancy remained over 46% over the study period. Up until 1980, rental occupancy made up more than 80% of the buildings in Census Tract 9. Overall, rental occupation has always been the majority in the East Side.
Density: Density in the East Side neighborhood decreased significantly from 1960 to 2010. The East Side became 50% less dense over the study period. This change is related to the increase in vacancy and a general decrease in population in the East Side.

Housing Market Trends: The average home price in the East Side, based on the sale prices collected for 2000, was $85,336. In 2010, the average price had increased to $155,536, which is an 82% increase over a ten-year period. As of 2016, the average sale price had increased to $387,487, which is an 149% increase over a six-year period. Based on the one-hundred home prices surveyed, the East Side study area has seen a dramatic increase in mean home prices in the past sixty years.

Race: Racial demographics in each Census Tract shifted from significantly larger black populations to an increase in white populations. In 1960, the East Side had a black population of 21,381 and a white population of 3,527. The white population dramatically decreased by 85% in 1970, but continued to increase through the next forty years. As of 2010, the white population in the East Side had become the majority even with a decrease in population overall. From 1950 to 2010, the black population decreased by 74% and the white population increased by 83%.

Sex: Male and Female populations did not experience as much change over time as racial demographics. The East Side neighborhood boasted a majority female population from 1960 until 2010, even with a decrease in population. Steady male and female demographics were useful in determining density and overall populations. Once
the indicator was paired with race and age, it became a more effective indicator for measuring gentrification.

**Age:** Demographics of age in the East Side changed significantly from diverse populations of ages to a majority population of 18 to 34-year-olds. In 1960 and 1970, children under 18 and 35 to 64 year-olds made up the majority of ages in the East Side. These ages are related to family aged individuals. By 1990, the 18 to 34-year-old age group had become the majority population in the East Side neighborhood. In 1990, 18 to 34-year-olds had a population of 3,370. By 2010, this population doubled to 6,461. This demonstrated a 91% increase in this age group.

**Family versus Individual Occupancy:** From 1970 to 2010, family occupancy dramatically decreased in the East Side overall, while individual occupancy increased. In 1970, family occupancy was at 71%, while individual occupancy was at 28%. As of 2010, family occupancy had dropped to 35% and individual occupancy increased to 64%. In Census Tract 9, Family occupancy changed from 391 family households in 2000 to 260 family households in 2010, which is 33% decrease. In 2000, there were 232 non-family households, which increased to 304 in 2010. This was a 31% increase over the ten-year period.

**Crime:** From 2010 to 2014, Charleston county experienced a significant drop in violent and property crimes. As of 2012, 13,084 crimes had been documented in the Charleston county area, which dropped to 2,260 documented crimes by 2014. This is a 82% decrease in documented crime.
Synthesis of Factors

The goal of this analysis was to collect data related to factors that would be indicators of gentrification. The ability to predict, identify definitively, and use this understanding to inform mitigation of gentrification can be measured by using the architectural and social factors described above. The architectural and social factors used in the analysis can be viewed as indicators of gentrification in a neighborhood. The following section outlines how each correlational indicator is defined by its severity and occurrence related to gentrification. The intensity of indicators is based on the relationship of how strongly each indicator effects the occurrence of gentrification in the East Side neighborhood. The amount of change for each indicator determines, which level of severity the indicator falls under. The stage of each indicator is based on how the correlation indicator explains gentrification through time. The stages are broken down into initial, intermediate, and advanced based on how early or late each one changed during the study period. The following sections explains this tool of measuring gentrification specific to the data collected for the East Side neighborhood. The use of these measures will be explained in broader terms, for use in other neighborhoods and cities, in the following chapter.

How is Gentrification Occurring in the East Side?

The level of each of these indicators is divided into categories of weak, moderate, or strong. Weak indicators are not directly related to gentrification or do not
show immediate change. Moderate indicators are symptoms of gentrification, but cannot be a symptom without another factor. Strong indicators are factors that can be seen early on and are symptomatic of gentrification on their own. The intensity of correlation for each factor was determined by the changes of each indicator during the study period. The intensity is based on the quantity of change over time, rather than a rate of change over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>VACANCY</th>
<th>OCCUPANCY</th>
<th>HOUSING VALUES</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>FAMILY OCCUPIED VS. INDIVIDUAL OCCUPIED</th>
<th>CRIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Table shows the various levels associated with each indicator, which is based on the amount each indicator changed in the East Side over time. Table created by author.

Table 4.2 above outlines the intensity level of each indicator of gentrification in the East Side neighborhood. The intensity of indicators is influenced by their relationship to each other and how drastically each has changed.

**Weak Indicators – Occupancy + Sex**

Occupancy, showed a dramatic change in certain periods related the percentage of vacant buildings, but owner and rental occupation did not change as drastically, therefore it rates as a weak correlational indicator. Owner or renter occupancy is not symptomatic of gentrification on its own. In general, over the study period, the ratio of owner versus rental occupation remained steady. Changes in percentages occurred in specific years of the study, but the amount of rental occupancy always remained larger.
than owner occupancy. This indicator is not directly indicative of gentrification and did not show a significant change over time.

Sex was determined to be a weak indicator based on how little it changed over the study period in the East Side. The populations of male and female residents remained similar from the beginning of the study period to the end. The indicator of sex is not directly related to gentrification in the East Side and did not change dramatically. The East Side continually had a larger female population from 1960 to 2010. Changes in male and female composition of the neighborhood is only an indicator of gentrification when viewed alongside changes in race and age.

**Moderate Indicators – Vacancy + Age**

Vacancy was determined to be a moderate correlational indicator for anticipating and measuring gentrification. The changes in vacancy were related to the loss of residents in the East Side neighborhood and provided opportunities for redevelopment of the properties. The loss of residents and vacant structures are indicative of gentrification. This in turn shows that vacancy is symptomatic of gentrification on its own, but is related to density and occupancy, which puts it in the moderate category of indicators.

Age was determined to be a moderate correlation indicator for anticipating and recognizing gentrification. The changes in ages showed an influx of certain groups, but also showed aging in place. The shifts from diverse age groups to significantly larger
populations of certain age groups is why age is a moderate correlational indicator. The distinct change in the distribution of age groups proves that age is symptomatic of gentrification on its own. The indicator can also be paired with sex and family occupied versus individual occupation to provide a more in-depth analysis of gentrification in the East Side. Since age can be related to gentrification without another indicator, but is reinforced by other indicators, it is a moderate correlational indicator.

**Strong Indicators – Housing Values, Race, Density, Family versus. Individual Occupancy + Crime**

Housing values is a strong correlational indicator, because it shows that gentrification has reached an increased stage and is symptomatic on its own. The changes in housing values shows how market forces effect neighborhoods. The uptick in housing values is a strong correlational indicator because of its influence on neighborhood change. Housing values is related to the populations that occupy a certain area and when they change so do the groups of people who inhabit them. In the East Side, along with downtown Charleston in general, housing prices rose dramatically over the study period.

Race is a strong correlation indicator based on the dramatic change seen in the East Side since 1960. The racial composition in the East Side has completely shifted in certain Census Tracts and is projected to continue changing. Racial demographics in the East Side changed drastically during the study period. Some Census Tracts within the
East Side completely switched from majority black populations to majority white populations within a twenty-year period. The intensity of change related to race in the East Side makes it a strong correlational indicator.

Density also changed significantly over the 50-year period. The East Side populations became much lower, which created a more sparsely populated area. The significant drop in population in the East Side neighborhood showed how changing populations affect gentrification. The loss of residents is a strong correlation indicator of gentrification, because it demonstrates the movement of people from neighborhoods. The stark change in populations over the study period is why density is a strong correlational indicator.

Family occupation versus individual occupation was determined to be a strong correlation indicator because of the dramatic change from family occupancy to single member households that occurred. All of the Census Tracts within the East Side changed from a majority of family occupation to individual occupation by 2010. The change in occupation shows how a particular group has moved out of an area or been displaced by a starkly different group. Family versus individual occupation is a strong indicator that suggests that gentrification has reached a developed stage. The influence of this indicator on neighborhood make and the degree of change over the study period make it a strong indicator of gentrification.

Crime is a strong correlational indicator of gentrification in the East Side. The change in the amount of crimes documented in Charleston was studied for shorter
length of time, but it dramatically decreased. The substantial change in crime rates in Charleston makes it a strong correlation indicator. Crime was also one of the early indicators of gentrification, which shows the influence regarding the anticipation and measure of gentrification.

*When is Gentrification Occurring in the East Side?*

The indicators are also divided into stages of gentrification. The stages of gentrification are defined as initial, intermediate, or advanced. The stages are determined by the time period, in which each indicator began to change, within the East Side neighborhood. A measure of the stages of gentrification was created using each factor and then divided into individual Census Tracts that were affected. As of 2010, all of the Census Tracts were experiencing some stage of gentrification. Table 4.3, below, shows the various stages of gentrification in the East Side. The stages of gentrification in the East Side are related to when correlational indicators changed significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.3: Table illustrates stages of gentrification over time in each Census Tract in chronological order. Table created by author.*

As of 2010, Census Tracts 7, 8, and 10 were all in a stage of advanced gentrification. Each architectural and social factor had changed significantly since 1950.
Populations, race, density, occupation, and housing prices were all drastically different from the original data set. As of 2010, Census Tract 9 was undergoing gentrification, because most of the factors had changed since 1950. Certain factors had not completely undergone total shifts of demographics by 2010. Census Tract 9 is comprised of the majority of East Side properties. Census Tract 13 was in the early stages of gentrification, because all of the architectural and social factors had not changed completely from the original data from 1950 forward. This tract contains East Side properties on the north side of the neighborhood. All of the Census Tracts were in the advanced stage of gentrification when related to the social factor of crime. This is because crime rates had dropped significantly across Charleston County and affected each area of the neighborhood. Crime, as a factor of gentrification, is one of the earliest indicators.

Figures 4.36, 4.37, 4.38, 4.39, and 4.40 illustrate how individual Census Tracts that make up the East Side neighborhood changed through a visual format. The maps illustrate the geographic tendency of gentrification to move north on the peninsula of Charleston. Along with the history and initial neighborhood composition, the East Side neighborhood took longer to begin to experience the effects of gentrification. Census Tracts 7, 8, 10, and 13 each include properties in the East Side study area, but Census Tract 9 is populated with the most properties in the study area. The changes in each tract are important, but Census Tract 9 is the core of the East Side neighborhood.
Figure 4.36: Stages of gentrification in the East Side as of 1970. Map from Social Explorer. Overlays by author.

Figure 4.37: Stages of gentrification in the East Side as of 1980. Map from Social Explorer. Overlays by author.
Figure 4.38: Stages of gentrification in the East Side as of 1990. Map from Social Explorer. Overlays by author.

Figure 4.39: Stages of gentrification in the East Side as of 2000. Map from Social Explorer. Overlays by author.
Gentrification, in the East Side neighborhood, generally started to occur in the 1980s and 1990s as evidenced by the changes in occupancy, housing prices and demographics began shifting away from the original residential makeup of the neighborhood during this decade. From 1990 to 2010, substantial changes to the original fabric of the neighborhood were occurring. Each set of data can be related to this thirty-year period. While individual tracts saw various rates of change over time, each one experienced severe shifts beginning in the 1990s. This time period is consistent with patterns of urban change in other cities across the nation. Other cities began to witness gentrification during the 1990s into the 2010s. Cities like New York,
San Francisco, and Philadelphia all experienced similar urban change. Gentrification during this time period cannot be pinpointed to one issue, but rather is a product of various issues. Factors like larger populations, a healthy economy, decreases in crime, and flight back to urban areas all contribute to gentrification.

Why is Gentrification Occurring in the East Side?

The East Side neighborhood has and is experiencing gentrification for a number of reasons. The East Side is one of the last neighborhoods in downtown Charleston that had not experienced gentrification up until the 1990s. It is composed of old housing stock, a desirable location, affordable rent, areas for development, and a place for a rising population in downtown Charleston. Each of these factors, along with the general trend of popularity of Charleston, have contributed to the gentrification of the East Side.

The East Side neighborhood reached a tipping point of gentrification during the 2000 and 2010 study period. Factors that influenced this tipping point include changes in racial demographics, the relationship of ages to those racial demographics, the change in family occupancy to individual occupancy, and rising housing market prices. Census Tract 9 makes up the majority of the East Side, so it is used for determining the tipping point in the neighborhood. In Census Tract 9 from 2000 to 2010 the white

---

population increased from 105 individuals to 295 individuals. This is an 180% increase over a ten-year period. Demographics related to age experienced major changes as well. From 2000 to 2010, individuals in the 18 to 34-year-old age group changed from 364 in 2000 to 471 in 2010. This is a 29% increase, which coupled with the change in racial demographics illustrates a shift in populations in the East Side neighborhood. In Census Tract 9, Family occupancy changed from 391 family households in 2000 to 260 family households in 2010, which is 33% decrease. In 2000, there were 232 non-family households, which increased to 304 in 2010. This was a 31% increase over the ten-year period. The types of households flipped in percentages over this period, which shows a tipping point from a family occupied neighborhood to an influx of individual households. Last, housing prices in the East Side have been climbing since 2000, which have continued to increase through 2017. The average home price in the East Side, based on the sale prices collected for 2000, was $85,336. In 2010, the average price had increased to $155,536, which is an 82% increase over a ten-year period. As of 2016, the average sale price had increased to $387,487, which is an 149% increase over a six-year period. These stark changes in mean home prices shows how the East Side has been experiencing gentrification, while informing the tipping point being situated around 2000 for Census Tract 9.

The East Side neighborhood, specifically Census Tract 9, began to experience gentrification around 2000. Earlier indicators show changes that occurred in the 1990s for this area. The tipping point for gentrification in this neighborhood was reached as
majority populations of black residents began to be replaced with white residents, different age groups moved in, family populations decreased while individuals increased, and as mean home prices steadily increased. In order to anticipate this change, it is crucial to monitor these factors. As they begin to change, it can be understood that the neighborhood is shifting. Monitoring neighboring areas also showed how gentrification was beginning to affect the core of the East Side neighborhood.

The neighborhoods surrounding the area have already undergone gentrification and neighborhood change. This shows how the peninsula of Charleston is prone to neighborhood change and gentrification. When surrounding areas are desirable, but become unaffordable, because of gentrification, neighboring areas begin shift as well. This is known as endogenous gentrification. Veronica Guerrieri, Daniel Hartley, and Erik Hurst from the National Bureau of Economic Research define this type of gentrification as, “gentrification is the endogenous response to city-wide housing demand shock and the gentrifying neighborhoods are the poor neighborhoods on the boundary of the richer neighborhoods that experience the largest housing price increase.” 100 The East Side has been experiencing gentrification since the 1990s, which can be seen in figure 4.32. In 1990, Census Tract 9 was moved into the initial stage of gentrification. The

neighborhood has changed at different times depending on the location, but overall has seen major shifts in architectural and social factors which determine gentrification.
Recommendations + Ways to Mitigate

This study has provided an analytical tool for measuring gentrification and created a snapshot in time regarding the stages of gentrification in the East Side. As of 2010, gentrification was occurring at various stages across the East Side, which has only progressed into 2017. This section will provide recommendations and tools to mitigate gentrification based on various tools used in Charleston and other cities. Community engagement, positive relationships between residents and city officials, inclusive discussion, and active participation are all key in mitigating gentrification. The resistance by residents can offer a defense against gentrification, but should be complimented with other tools.

The Nathalie P. Voorhees Center for Neighborhood and Community Improvement created a list of “Helpful Tools for Communities.” The researchers at the Voorhees Center divided gentrification into stages: before, mid-stage, and late stage. This thesis developed stages of gentrification for the East Side, which are similarly labeled: initial, intermediate, and advanced. The Voorhees Center emphasizes, “building partnerships with local officials, community businesses, and neighbors, encouraging
likeminded people to collaborate.”\textsuperscript{101} The tools listed include: coalition building, tenant or non-profit developer “right to purchase,” community land trusts, inclusionary zoning, limited equity co-op housing, community benefit agreements, strengthened rental protections for tenants, tax abatement policies, protections against condominium conversion, rehabilitation and preservation, employer assisted housing, affordable housing trust fund, housing levies, addressing “not-in-my-backyard” sentiment.\textsuperscript{102} Many of these suggestions could be appropriate in the East Side neighborhood as ways to mitigate gentrification. Since gentrification is in advanced stages in the East Side, particular tools will be more helpful. Community land trusts, inclusionary zoning, protection against condominium conversion, rental protections, and providing affordable housing opportunities.

Community Land Trusts (CLT) are non-profit organizations that “owns, develops, and stewards properties on behalf of a community.”\textsuperscript{103} CLT’s own and manage properties by community-involved groups that can provide affordable housing for first-time home buyers, long-term residents, and renters. This program provides an opportunity for community involvement, while allowing residents to have buy-in and ownership in their neighborhoods. The property can still be passed down through generations by creating long-term leases. It also allows for residents to have basically all

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid.
of the same property rights, while controlling properties in a way that mitigates displacement and gentrification

Inclusionary zoning are ordinances, usually put in place at the state level, that require developments to include a certain percentage of affordable housing units. An inclusionary zoning policy would provide a permanent amount of affordable housing within the neighborhood, which could be applied to new developments and rehabilitations. Managing housing affordability is an early way to mitigate gentrification since it provides consistent opportunities for current and future lower-income residents to live in an area. This type of zoning would have to be passed through the South Carolina State legislature, in order to be enacted in Charleston. Another option for mitigation is protection against condominium conversion which regulates the change from apartments to condominiums in order to charge high prices. This tool can regulate the housing market, which would retain current residents and always provide a place for different socio-economic classes in the neighborhood. This tool can be instituted at local level through city ordinances.

Rental protections and affordable housing opportunities are two other tools to use against gentrification. Rental protections come in various forms like rent control or rent reduction. Instituting rent control or reduction could alleviate displacement and allow residents to stay in their neighborhoods. This can be incentivized through tax credits or be written into law as a way to mitigate gentrification. Affordable housing should be available in the East Side neighborhood. Affordable housing can be achieved
through the suggestions listed above, as well as other forms of enforcement on a state or local level. It can be enforced through nonprofits, housing authorities, or other groups who want to protect the East Side from further gentrification.

Other opportunities to mitigate gentrification in the East Side include regulating student housing, creating a more effective transit system, engaging community members, and regulating development. In order to create equitable, urban spaces multiple issues need to be addressed. By addressing issues of gentrification, neighborhood change, affordability, and conservation of the built environment, preservationists can become active members in the fight against displacement and gentrification.

Gentrification is at the forefront of issues faced by community members, residents, urban planners, historic preservationists and other professionals. Gentrification impacts cityscapes on a neighborhood level that eventually creates change that can leave these areas unrecognizable if not mitigated. Gentrification affects tangible and intangible heritage of neighborhoods. In order to preserve the built environment effectively, it is important to retain intangible culture associated with the built environment. In order to more efficiently mitigate gentrification, it is important to understand how, when, and why it occurs in neighborhoods. This thesis used nine data sets compiled into two categories—architectural and social—to comprehend the stages, severity, and symptoms of gentrification. The analysis of the data sets allowed for the
creation of a checklist for measuring gentrification in the East Side neighborhood. The indicators were divided into two different measures: intensity and stages.

The Census Tracts used for the data collection were composed of properties within the East Side. Census Tract 9 was the most populated tract relative to the East Side neighborhood boundaries. It was determined based on the data sets that, as of 2010, the East Side (Census Tract 9) was undergoing gentrification. The surrounding tracts were in various stages of gentrification. Census Tract 13, the northern edge of the East Side, was in the early stages of gentrification. Census Tracts 7, 8, and 10, located in the southern and western edges of the East Side, were all experiencing advanced gentrification. The main effects of gentrification were seen from the 1990s into 2010 across the East Side. The study period shows that gentrification suggests that gentrification will continue occurring in the East Side neighborhood. The correlational indicators from the data sets were divided into intensity and stages of gentrification based on their influence of how gentrification occurs.

Now in 2017, these factors have continued to shift and presented more issues for the neighborhood. The progress of gentrification and growth is high. The loss of a grocery store, the construction of new hotels and condos, and the evolving social makeup of the East Side has not slowed down and shows no signs of stopping.
How to Use

The stage of gentrification is measured by the changes which have happened in a neighborhood with respect to social and architectural with different data being weighted more heavily, if found to be highly correlated indicator or less weighted if found to be a low correlational indicator. For example, if two low correlational indicators show change in an area then gentrification is not happening or maybe in early stages. In the same fashion, if one low correlational indicator is found changing with multiple mid to high correlational indicators then gentrification is undergoing. Advanced gentrification would be determined if all of the categories of demographic and architectural change is reflected by shifting indicators. The tool can be to either target which sets of data should be collected to test if there is a sense that gentrification is beginning or can situate a neighborhood within a stage of gentrification when each category is known.

For example, a preservationist or planner could use the data from crime rates or racial demographics to monitor and examine change within their city or neighborhoods. By examining indicators independently or as a group, professionals can determine the correlational indicator intensity or the stage of gentrification within a given area.
Certain factors proved to have more influence on neighborhood change than others. Each factor was rated based on the case study analysis of the East Side neighborhood. For example, crime is a harbinger of gentrification therefore it is high correlational indicator and it also happens to be an early stage indicator. Occupancy is an advanced indicator and a low correlational indicator, because it does present as a symptom of gentrification early in the process. It is also impossible to measure the change in occupancy relative to gentrification without data about specific home-owners or renters. Housing values are high correlational indicators, but exhibit symptoms in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ Vacancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Housing Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Family Occupied v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: This chart explains the intensity level of each indicator of gentrification. This chart can be used in order to analyze changes to architectural and social indicators in other places. The strength of each indicator was determined by the intensity of change each one exhibited. Chart created by author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ Vacancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Housing Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Density</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Family Occupied v.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: This chart explains the stages of gentrification that can be determined using each indicator. Using this chart can help identify what stage gentrification is currently in. It is important to note that an advanced stage of gentrification would boast most or all of these indicators.
mid-stage of gentrification, because it may occur after other indicators have changed, like race, but has a massive effect on a neighborhood. Race is high correlational and early stage indicator. Race can show how residential demographics are changing early in the process of gentrification and have a larger effect on the area.

Sex is a low correlational indicator, but can be seen at various stages of gentrification from early to advanced. This is because, sex as an indicator of gentrification must be associated with a separate indicator. Like changes in density or the age of shifting male and female populations. Age is a mid-level correlational indicator and can be seen at various stages of the gentrification process. Age is related to the occupancy of neighborhoods by long-term residents, families, families with children, and individual occupants. Depending on the change of ages related to the above indicators, age can present as an early indicator or later. Density is high correlational indicator, which is present in the advanced stage of gentrification. The association of affluence to density suggests that wealthier groups who are gentrifying an area can live in less crowded neighborhoods. The ability to “spread out” in neighborhoods that were once heavily populated shows how density is a high correlational indicator that appears in the advance stage of gentrification. Family vs. individual occupation is high correlational indicator that can be observed in neighborhoods undergoing gentrification and areas suffering from advanced gentrification. The relationship of family vs. individual occupation as a symptom of gentrification suggests that areas which are occupied by more individuals, when there
was once a large population of families have changed. This indicator can be reflected in
density, race, and age. The relationship to other factors are what place it in the high
correlational indicator category.

By analyzing the factors of change and weighing different indicators based on
their level of correlation, an observer can be informed about the stages and intensity of
gentrification. These factors are available across the nation through the United States
Census Bureau, which creates a universal format for applying the study to other
neighborhoods and cities.

The study can be manipulated to fit within various contexts, but generally
provides a platform for researching, analyzing, and mapping gentrification. This tool can
be used by urban planners, historic preservationists, and involved community members.
Gentrification will continue to be an obstacle in urban and rural places, which is why this
study is important. In order to begin to mitigate, manage, and control gentrification, it
must be understood. Gentrification can be a menace to the built environment and
intangible heritage, but with proper tools and research, it can be become responsible
rehabilitation that respects our built and human culture. Using this tool can be a way to
find early warning signs or confirm beliefs about an area.

Future Research

Avenues for future research using the parameters of this study include adding
factors to the architectural and social categories in order to provide more information.
Income and education are two factors that could add a layer to the study in the social category and are seen in other research on gentrification. Using a photographic survey to show architectural changes within a neighborhood threatened by gentrification would be a visual aid for the past and a record of the built environment. This factor is not strictly quantifiable, but a method could be developed to make observed conditions quantifiable. While changes can be noted and documented, it is hard to connect anecdotal accounts directly to gentrification. Building permits are a possible addition to the architectural category. The number of permits to make improvements on a building could indicate areas seeing disproportionate rehabilitation, which could be correlated to gentrification. The organization of building permits by neighborhood could aid in the ability to collect and analyze this information. These additional factors could provide further insight into neighborhood change and gentrification in the East Side and Charleston more broadly.

This case study provides a framework for other communities to use, which means that various data sets may be available based on the neighborhood, city, or state. The methodology should be applied broadly allowing for specific changes to made to be suitable for the area of study. Using data sets unique to the area of study can enhance the analysis of gentrification alongside the larger framework.

Another important component of future research is understanding that gentrification is not occurring in a vacuum. This study focused on the time period of 1960 – 2010, which created a baseline of architectural and social data about the
neighborhood as a way to analyze the change seen in the latter half of the time period. Examining the current demographics and architectural factors with projections to the future is important to determining the outcome of neighborhood change. These various suggestions for future research are listed as way to continue the discussion around studying, analyzing, and managing gentrification in the East Side and a broader context.

This case study serves as an analytical tool for historic preservationists to use in order to be responsible stewards of the built environment. The future of preservation should be more inclusive of buildings, place, and people. Retaining cultural heritage and urban spaces should be a priority of preservationist, not only the conservation of the built environment. Affordability, equity, and conservation of heritage are important issues for preservationists to address. The future of historic preservation should focus on issues related people and not just the built environment. The President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Stephanie Meeks, wrote in her self-declared manifesto:

The key tool in accomplishing these goals is our historic fabric—the older and historic buildings that are all around us. When, through smart urban policy, the amazing potential of this fabric is realized, these buildings and communities can accelerate economic growth and attract residents and tourists, create opportunity and mitigate inequality, reduce energy costs and help save the planet, and create the foundations for a stronger American future.  

104 Stephanie Meeks, The Past and Future City, 120.
Historic preservation is a multi-faceted, interdisciplinary field currently and should continue to be inclusive and forward-thinking. Creating livable places for all residents while retaining historic fabric is key to a progressive approach to preservation. Preservationist should use their varied toolkits to protect historic fabric, while creating equitable urban spaces. Various approaches to mitigating gentrification, while respecting historic fabric exist. Tools like historic districts, local preservation ordinances, and design guidelines should be utilized with the intention to protect cultural and built heritage.
Appendix A

Charts and Graphs

1950 Census of Housing

East Side Total | Tract 9 + 10

Tract 9

Tract 10

Figure A-1: 1950 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau
Figure A-3: 1960 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tracts 9, 10, and 13. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-7: 1970 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tract 9, 10, and 13. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-6: 1980 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tract totals, Tract 7, and Tract 8. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-7: 1980 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tracts 9, 10, and 13. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-8: 1990 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tract totals, Tract 7, and Tract 8. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-9: 1990 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tracts 9, 10, and 13. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-10: 2000 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tract totals, Tract 7, and Tract 8. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-11: 2000 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tracts 9, 10, and 13. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-12: 2010 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tract totals, Tract 7, and Tract 51. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-13: 2010 Occupancy Graphs for East Side. Tracts 9, 10, and 53. Data collected from U.S. Census Bureau.
Figure A-14: Housing Market Trends in East Side. 1953 to 2016. Top graph shows no projection; bottom graph shows five-year projection. Data collected from Zillow Real Estate and Charleston County Tax Assessor.
Figure A-15: Housing Market Trends in East Side. 1953 to 2016. Top graph shows ten-year projection; bottom graph shows fifteen-year projection. Data collected from Zillow Real Estate and Charleston County Tax Assessor.
Figure A-16: Housing Market Trends in East Side. 1953 to 2016. Graph shows twenty-year projection. Data collected from Zillow Real Estate and Charleston County Tax Assessor.
Figure A-17: Sex Demographics from 1960 to 1980. Shows all tracts on the East Side. Data collected from U.S Census Bureau.
Figure A-17: Sex Demographics from 1990 to 2010. Shows all tracts on the East Side. Data collected from U.S Census Bureau.
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