

University of North Carolina at Asheville

Lessons Learned:

The East Riverside Project, Asheville, North Carolina

A Senior Thesis Submitted to
The Faculty of the Department of History
In Candidacy for the Degree of
Bachelor of Arts in History

By

Nathanael B. Lytle

Asheville, North Carolina

November 2012

The first lines of a pamphlet called *East Riverside, Asheville. N.C.*, published in the 1970s by the City of Asheville, states that “Cities are a lot like people. They are born, they grow up, they reach maturity- and in the process, cities, like people, sometimes run down.”¹ Asheville certainly had its fair share of run-down neighborhoods. Much like any city of comparable size, Asheville was beginning to show its age. The city had grown in fits and spurts over the first half of the 20th century. Between two wars and a nationwide depression, with much of the growth in the 1920s and 1950s, the city had around sixty thousand residents in 1960.² The East Riverside district of Asheville, a neighborhood below the main downtown business area (the area now filled with tourist-friendly shops and restaurants), deteriorated as the 20th century progressed. One such neighborhood was the East Riverside area. Home to a predominantly black population, the area had been run down as the twentieth century progressed, and by 1960s, the area was considered to be blighted.

The City of Asheville and Buncombe County embarked on a years-long effort to improve the area, through a system of rehabilitation, relocation, and redevelopment. Though the process was not as damaging as complete slum clearance, where the existing buildings would be almost exclusively demolished to make way for the government’s planned housing, it was still a complicated process. The Asheville Redevelopment Commission, or the ARC, and the Asheville Housing Authority, or AHA did its best to help the citizens of East Riverside and engage in a project of not just urban renewal, but human renewal. As Larry Holt, who was involved with the

¹ “East Riverside, Asheville, N.C.,” from the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. 1970s. Accessed Oct. 4, 2012.
http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1970_east_riverside_asheville/default_east_riverside_asheville.htm.

² “A Population and Economic Analysis of the Asheville Metropolitan Area and the Western North Carolina Region That It Serves.” City of Asheville Housing Authority Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. May 1966. Accessed Sept. 12, 2012.
http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1966_population_economic_analysis/a_population_and_economic_analysis_full_text.htm.

Asheville Housing Authority, said in 1978, the city learned a lesson. “We can no longer afford to let our housing fall apart.”³ To prevent a neighborhood from decaying, a city cannot afford to wait until it is turning into a slum to do something. Action has to be taken before it ever starts.

There has not been much peer-reviewed scholarship written on the East Riverside project, nor any of Asheville’s urban renewal and housing projects. Various presidents, starting with Franklin Delano Roosevelt, have each taken different approaches to the question of low-cost urban housing. With the change in political tides, the ways the government has approached it has varied from Roosevelt’s Housing Acts to Ronald Reagan’s Section 8 legislation. The history of these swings is recorded by various housing projects throughout the United States, and they can be detected in Asheville’s housing efforts as well. The dramatic swings between exclusively publicly funded housing and its deregulation and privatization can be studied both in the buildings, the lives of their inhabitants, and the research done on both.⁴

Alex F. Schwartz’s *Housing Policy in the United States, Second Edition* is a weighty textbook about the ins and outs of housing policy in the United States.⁵ It is a comprehensive work on public housing in the United States and serves as a comparison to the way that Asheville was handled. Another urban housing policy book that has proved helpful is the collection of essays edited by John F. Bauman, Roger Biles, and Kristin M. Szylvian, *From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in Twentieth Century America*.⁶ Kenneth Tremblay and Don Dillman published a book in 1983, *Beyond the American Housing Dream*.

³ Rodney Brooks, N. D., “East Riverside Businesses and Families Return to the Area” *Asheville Citizen*, N. D. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁴ Peter Dreier, “Federal Housing Subsidies: Who Benefits and Why?” in *A Right to Housing: A Foundation for a New Social Agenda*, Rachel G. Bratt, Michael E. Stone, and Chester Hartman, eds., (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006), 105.

⁵ Alex F. Schwartz, *Housing Policy in the United States, Second Edition*, (New York City: Routledge, 2010).

⁶ John F. Bauman, Roger Biles, and Kristin M. Szylvian, eds. *From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in Twentieth-Century America*, (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000)

This book is a result of a study conducted by the authors in the early 1980s to find out what kind of housing Americans wanted to live in. Their findings were very similar to some of the things the East Riverside residents wanted out of their urban renewal project.⁷ Another invaluable book is *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda* which is a collection of essays that support the claim that Americans need to have more affordable housing.⁸

Public housing in the United States is rarely the specter that many make it out to be. Of course, there are some housing projects that are in ill repair and slum-like, but often they're the exception, not the rule.⁹ In 1937, on its third time around, the U. S. Congress passed the United States Housing Act. The act established the U. S. Housing Authority, or USHA. Conservatives in the Federal government picked apart the bill that New York Senator Robert Wagner, a Democrat, had backed, so that when it passed it was significantly less effective than the Senator imagined. Provisions like setting a five-thousand-dollar cap on unit price and exclusion of everyone except the lowest income groups severely hindered the act's effectiveness.¹⁰

The next major milestone for the evolution of public housing in America was the Housing Act of 1949. It called for the construction of over eight hundred thousand new housing units over the next six years. However, that goal was not reached until 1968.¹¹ The next major development occurred under President Lyndon Baines Johnson. After a major victory in 1964, Johnson spearheaded the creation of a cabinet-level department, the Department of Housing and

⁷ Kenneth R Tremblay, Jr., and Don A Dillman., *Beyond the American Housing Policy Dream: Accommodations to the 1980s*, (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1983).

⁸ Rachel G. Bratt, Michael E. Stone, and Chester Hartman, eds. *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006).

⁹ Schwartz, 125.

¹⁰ Gail Radford, "Government and Housing During the Depression" in *From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in Twentieth-Century America*, (John F. Bauman, Roger Biles, and Kristin M. Szylyan, eds. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).

¹¹ Schwartz, 126.

Urban Development, or HUD, in 1965. A Presidential cabinet department on urban problems had been a goal of many metropolitan mayors and Democrats in Congress since the 1950s.¹²

One of the unique aspects of constructing public housing is doing so in a way that would not affect the private housing market. This meant that the residents of a public housing facility would have to have an income far below what would be necessary to cover private housing in their area. Initially, tenants of public housing facilities would have to meet stringent criteria in order to live in public housing, including an income restriction. When public housing was starting out in the 1930s and 1940s, the intended beneficiaries were members of the working poor who just needed a little extra help in order to thrive.¹³ It was not a civil right. As Peter Dreier said, “Housing assistance for the poor is not an entitlement, like food stamps or Medicaid. The available funds can only serve a small fraction of those who meet the eligibility criteria.”¹⁴ Many of the East Riverside residents in the 1960s were members of the working poor, and just like their counterparts in a larger city, they needed a little extra aid in order to be a healthy and vibrant community.

The neighborhood of East Riverside is a roughly rectangular 425-acre area south of Asheville’s main business district. Its approximate borders are Hilliard Avenue to the north, Livingston Street to the south, McDowell Street to the east and Clingman Avenue and Depot Street, close to the French Broad river (thus the name of the neighborhood) to the west. The main road running through it is South French Broad Street, which bisects it.¹⁵ Most of the buildings,

¹² Dreier, 115.

¹³ Schwartz, 129.

¹⁴ Dreier, 111.

¹⁵“ East Riverside, Asheville N. C.,” 6-7.

about thirteen hundred structures, in the neighborhood were residential, single-family housing units.¹⁶

The project was started in the middle of the 1960s. It was initially named the South Side Urban Renewal Project, and the Mountain View, but finally the name East Riverside was chosen so that it wouldn't interfere with any private subdivision names. HUD gave the City of Asheville \$150,000 to get started on planning the project in 1965.¹⁷ A Citizen's League, formed later in that year, was established to serve as a liaison between the ARC and the residents of the area. The League was to help with the rehabilitation process and to do social work in the neighborhood.

In early 1966, the Redevelopment Commission asked Ruth L. Mace, from Chapel Hill, to lead a diagnostic survey of the East Riverside area. She led a team that interviewed over 1200 of the approximately 1300 households in the area, with about two percent of households refusing to be questioned.

The results of the survey were not a surprise to those who lived in Asheville in the 1960s. One aspect that stood out was the ratio of men to women who worked. According to the study, women were by and large the financial backbone of the neighborhood. Also, at the time, there was a 58% rate of home ownership in the area, which was higher than the average home ownership for most non-white neighborhoods in the South and was higher than the rate of home ownership in Asheville, which was around 49%. Despite such high ownership numbers, housing

¹⁶ "Public Hearing on the East Riverside Urban Renewal Project given by the Asheville Redevelopment Commission May 31, 1966" City of Asheville Housing Authority Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. Accessed Sept. 12, 2012. http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1966_public_hearing_east_riverside/default_public_hearing.htm .

¹⁷ Philip Clark, 1965. "Southside Project Given Third Name" *Asheville Citizen*, January 13, 1965. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

dissatisfaction was high, with many citing the need for repairs to be done to their houses.

However, most lacked the funds to do so.

The East Riverside area had about 4,000 residents in the middle part of the 1960s. It was a predominantly poor neighborhood, with 52% of its households earning less than three thousand dollars a year.¹⁸ In 1966, over 60% of households in the area earned less than three thousand dollars. 15% earned less than \$1200. Most of the workforce comprised of unskilled labor. Unemployment in the area was also higher than normal.¹⁹ 16% of the residents in the area did not have a job, which is twice what the national unemployment average was then for non-Whites, and four times that of whites. Whites in the neighborhood, on average, fared little better than the rest of the residents. In fact, the study *Inside East Riverside* reports that “The white households are among the poorest in the East Riverside community—19 out of 20 earn below \$3,000 a year, and half, less than \$1,200.”²⁰

The larger Asheville community, according to a report prepared by the Asheville Metropolitan Planning Board in May 1966, had a fluctuating unemployment rate that correlated to the economic ups and downs that the city experienced since the end of World War II. Work in the city was affected by seasonal employment. As the study reported, “Excluding the latter years of World War II, unemployment has historically plagued Metropolitan Asheville for approximately 80 years. This condition was primarily attributable to the seasonal nature of the tourist trade and inadequate growth of manufacturing jobs.”²¹ Factory work in the area included

¹⁸ “Inside East Riverside.” City of Asheville Housing Authority Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. 1970s. Accessed Sept. 12, 2012.
http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1970_east_riverside_asheville/default_east_riverside_asheville.htm, p. 6.

¹⁹ “Inside East Riverside,” 87.

²⁰ “Inside East Riverside,” 6.

²¹ “A Population and Economic Analysis...,” 45.

textile manufacturing, lumber and furniture production, and one of the biggest employers, chemical production.²²²³²⁴

Whites were a rather small minority in the area. With a 98% black population, the East Riverside area housed half of the black families in Asheville. However, whites there did not really hold any position of superiority over their African-American neighbors. More whites were on welfare or unemployed than their African-American neighbors. White unemployment was about four times as high as the neighborhood average. However, unlike the neighborhood's gender balance, there were more white men than there were white women.²⁵ According to *Inside East Riverside*, whites were one of the most isolated groups in the neighborhood.²⁶

The purpose of the revitalization project had specific goals for the East Riverside area. One of the major problems, according to city Housing Authority officials and other community leaders, was that the area was suffering from blight. Buildings were deteriorating, roads were falling into disrepair, and the general neighborhood infrastructure was beginning to show its age. Schools, parks, and other community facilities were far from adequate to meet the needs of the area's residents.²⁷ James W. Greer, the executive director of the Asheville Redevelopment Commission, stated in a public hearing held on May 31, 1966, that, in addition to the failing facilities, social problems and crime were also rampant in the area. Fourteen percent of the city's Tuberculosis cases were in East Riverside, fifty percent of rapes and assaults, and twenty-six percent of venereal diseases cases. For perspective, the area was home to only eight percent of the city's population.²⁸ Greer went on to say in a February 1967 interview that "Disease and

²² "A Population and Economic Analysis..." 94.

²³ "A Population and Economic Analysis..." 83.

²⁴ "A Population and Economic Analysis..." 96.

²⁵ "Inside East Riverside," 39.

²⁶ "Inside East Riverside," 74.

²⁷ "East Riverside, Asheville, N.C.," 4.

²⁸ "Public Hearing..." 10.

death rates are very high in East Riverside. Considering the extremely poor sanitary facilities within the area it is a testimony to human endurance that this rate is not still higher.”²⁹

Schools in the area ran the gamut from being in good shape to being in need of serious repair. The Livingston Street School, an elementary school, in the neighborhood, was in need of facility expansion to comfortably accommodate its students. Before the process of proposal for the revitalization had gotten seriously underway, a new high school, French Broad High School, had also been constructed.³⁰ The Catholic parochial school of St. Anthony of Padua, run by the Allegheny Franciscan Sisters, which did not extend to high school, was in the neighborhood.³¹ According to the website of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Charlotte, which Asheville is a part of, the school catered to predominantly African-American students and was shut down in 1969.³²

In addition to residents’ dissatisfaction with their current housing situation, there was also the problem of how to properly care for the area’s numerous elderly. Over six hundred of the population was elderly; although Ms. Mace does point out that many questioned did not want to describe themselves as elderly, even if it was “obviously the case.” She points out that only six hundred and ten people who describing themselves as elderly was probably an understatement. Regardless of the actual number, this was a very high concentration for Asheville. Despite the aging population, the many of the older residents of East Riverside continued to work. Mace describes the elderly population of East Riverside as “an active, independent, and uncomplaining group.”³³

²⁹ “Greer Gives Redevelopment Plan Facts” *Asheville Citizen*, February 19, 1967. Newspaper File Collection Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

³⁰ “East Riverside, Asheville, N.C.,” 10.

³¹ *The Community Improver*, July 1966. In the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library at the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

³² Roman Catholic Diocese of Charlotte, “St. Anthony of Padua School in Asheville,” Roman Catholic Diocese of Charlotte, <http://www.charlottediocese.org/ministries-a-departments/archives/190/569>, (accessed October 30, 2012).

³³ “Inside East Riverside,” 21-22.

The poorest also were a major problem. In terms of Mace's study, the poorest were defined as those households who earned less than twelve hundred dollars a year. This subgroup relied even more heavily on women as wage earners, and participated less in community functions. However, they had roughly the same level of job satisfaction as other groups in the neighborhood. As the study said, "Considering that all of the working people in this group earn much below what is needed for subsistence, it is startling to observe that only a fourth of them are dissatisfied with their pay and only 14% with the kind of work that they do."³⁴

The planners of the project did not want to completely demolish the existing structures and build an entirely new neighborhood, despite its troubles. First, they wanted to preserve what houses they could. Many of the houses could be repaired and lived in with a bit of assistance. For the houses and structures that were not repairable, they would be torn down and adequate structures would be built in their stead. The commercial centers of the neighborhood would be more centrally located, making it more convenient for those who did not have reliable transportation to get their groceries and other necessary purchases more easily. New community facilities would be constructed, like a Y.M.C.A. and public parks. Schools would be improved by providing accommodation for more students. Streets would be improved. Finally, the commercial district that was on a flood plain of the French Broad River would be relocated to a less flood-prone place.³⁵

Another blemish in the area was the creek running through the area, which was colloquially termed Nasty Branch. According to the November 1966 *The Community Improver*, the creek was filled with "filth, germs, old beer cans, bottles, innerspring mattresses, discarded

³⁴ "Inside East Riverside," 30.

³⁵ "East Riverside, Asheville, N.C.," 6.

refrigerators, junk sofas, old tires, rusting pieces of tin, scrap lumber, and a little water.”³⁶ The creek was a breeding ground for germs and diseases, and any renewal project that the city undertook in the area would have to clean it up.³⁷ Although many wanted the creek to be covered up, doing so would be economically impractical. Greer promised that the creek would be cleaned up, the sewage leaks found and corrected, and the banks of the creek grassed over and landscaped.³⁸

Another major risk to the neighborhood was fire. Faulty wiring in old houses can overheat quickly, and when it does an aging wood-frame house becomes little more than kindling for an inferno. Another cause of fire in the area was careless smoking. Cigarettes, tobacco pipes, and other smoking paraphernalia involve the use of burning ash, which may not be outright producing a flame but can be induced to without much provocation other than a fuel source. Especially when used-up yet still burning cigarette butts could be tossed on the ground without a second thought, the risk for fire can increase dramatically. In several issues of the *Community Improver*, a rather patronizingly didactic author (the articles were not signed) implored the citizens of the area to keep an eye on their electricity use, heating, and smoking habits so that the fire risk does not become worse.³⁹

Before any new construction was to be done in the area, the Redevelopment Commission sought to first bring as many existing residences up to the Asheville Housing Code as they could. It would also be less costly to the government, as the grants (for the elderly) and loans (for the non-elderly adults) would cost far less than purchasing a new home. According to the November 1966 issue of *The Community Improver*, “When funds are approved for the East Riverside Urban

³⁶ *The Community Improver*, November 1966. In the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library at the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

³⁷ “Public Hearing...,” 10.

³⁸ “Greer Gives Redevelopment Plan Facts.”

³⁹ *The Community Improver*, November 1966, 2-3.

Renewal Program, owners of these houses that can be rehabilitated (improved to meet the standards of the housing code) will have the advantage of expert architectural and financial planning. Many owners will be eligible for very low-interest (3 %) long-term (up to 20 years) loans to improve their properties.”⁴⁰

In addition to rehabilitating existing homes and building new ones, two public housing projects were to be undertaken in the neighborhood. One seven-story high rise beside Aston Park, and about a hundred single, double, or triple family houses spread around Livingston Street.⁴¹ Public housing has had very negative connotations in the United States, but in many cases that is not true. The images of decrepit concrete towers in an unforgiving urban environment are just one small facet of the American public housing system. Most Public Housing Authorities, or PHAs, run less than 500 units of public housing. About half of them oversee less than 100.⁴²

One of the main ways that houses were deemed to be in decent shape was whether or not the dwelling was in accordance with the Asheville Housing Code. Houses that could not be repaired in agreement with the Housing code in a cost-effective manner would be purchased by the city and their owners relocated to adequate housing. According to the April 1966 issue of the *Community Improver*, a newsletter published by the Asheville Redevelopment Commission (ARC), those houses deemed inadequate would be appraised several times and the owners would be offered a fair price based on those appraisals. Owners of houses deemed fixable would be offered low-interest rate loans or grants to improve their houses.⁴³

⁴⁰ *The Community Improver*, November 1966, 1.

⁴¹ “Public Hearing...” 28.

⁴² Schwartz, 125.

⁴³ *The Community Improver*, April 1966. from the Archives of the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. Accessed Oct. 3, 2012.

http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1966-67_community_improvers_newsletter/02_april_1966/default_community_improver_april_1966.htm.

The cost of the project would be, in 1966 dollars, around \$8.7 million dollars. Asheville would only have to pay about three million of it, the rest would be covered by the Federal government. The city's cost included the construction of low-cost housing and the French Broad High School, which subtracted \$1.5 million dollars from the city's contribution. As Robert Gaines said at the May 31, 1966 public hearing, "We are getting a project of almost \$10,000,000.00 total cost for a total cost to the City of \$1,400,000.00. This, if we want to carry out the urban renewal project, is very, very favorable financing. Most cities are not fortunate enough to have this type of contribution toward the carrying out of the redevelopment project."⁴⁴ The Redevelopment Commission approved the plan for the project on May 17, 1966 and the next step in the process was a public hearing, to be held on May 31.⁴⁵

Most of the residents of the East Riverside area, in addition to most community leaders were in favor of the project. *Inside East Riverside* stated that most of the people in the area were aware of it and were generally hopeful that renewal would positively affect the area. However, some viewed it as unnecessary intrusion and vehemently opposed it. About one in ten people, according to the study, were opposed to it, believing that it just would not accomplish anything, or at least unnecessarily put people out of their homes.⁴⁶ Fannie B. McCoy, who lived on Church Street right off of Hilliard Avenue, likened the potential efforts of the ARC to those of the Soviet Union. In a speech at the same city council meeting that James Greer praised the project, she said of the city officials,

They simply want to control the land so they can control the man. This is dictatorship, the same kind they have in Russia. High taxes, poisoned water, and then you come to a time when the City Council, the Mayor, and the Dictator will

⁴⁴ "Public Hearing...", 13-14.

⁴⁵ "Public Hearing...", 1.

⁴⁶ "Inside East Riverside," 19.

be replaced by men given the jobs, not by voting, all the way for the Democrats, or voting for the Republicans... Who has charge of the elections in our city? Does the City Officials run the show or we the people? How can we keep our freedom in Asheville and Buncombe County? Wake up before it is too late to complain.⁴⁷

Ms. McCoy also argued that Americans preferred to live in single-family housing units. She said, “The overwhelming majority of Americans prefer to live in single family homes well out from the central metropolitan area.”⁴⁸ McCoy argued that people wanted space for their families, not to be in multi-family units. The idea of a single-family housing unit has pervaded throughout the forty or so years since McCoy addressed the City council with claims of Communism. In a study published in 1983, seventeen years after the East Riverside project began to get off the ground, Kenneth R. Tremblay and Don A. Dillman published a study that stated that Americans will want to live in “conventional single family detached homes which are owned.”⁴⁹ Unlike McCoy, however, they did concede that most Americans in the future will live in multifamily complexes. Today, owning a house is still a status symbol among upwardly mobile Americans.

Despite Ms. McCoy’s vociferous objection, many in the community were in favor of revitalizing their neighborhood. The deal, according to men like James Greer and then-City Councilman W. F. Algary, was almost too good to pass up; with much of the funding being provided by the Federal government, Asheville would have to pay little out of pocket and only have to raise about a \$1.5 million dollars to fund the project in order to get the approximately \$6

⁴⁷ “Public Hearing...,” 21.

⁴⁸ “Public Hearing...,” 20.

⁴⁹ Tremblay and Dillman, 117.

million from the Federal government. The grant was approved later in 1966 and Roy A. Taylor, one of the Congressmen who represented Asheville and the surrounding area, announced that the \$6.2 million dollar grant was approved. The stipulation for receiving the grant was that Asheville had to successfully attain the \$1.4 million bond that was up for vote. The grant was originally going to be around \$5.8 million, but an extra \$400,000 was added on to help cover moving expenses for those whose houses would be bought and demolished.⁵⁰

In September 1966, progress on the project was delayed. In the wake of two of the project leaders departing—W.E. Roland, one of the city’s rehabilitation advisors, left for involvement in a community advocacy corporation, and architect Vito LePore went to Atlanta to be a part of the Urban Renewal office there—the City Council was unsure it could secure its share of the funding. The Commission’s rehabilitation office had to cease operation, and the future of the project was unsure.⁵¹ Ironically, the house where the rehabilitation office operated out of later became the base of operations for Roland’s new employer, the Opportunity Corporation.⁵²

On December 15, 1966, the Asheville City Council gave their permission for the City Manager to prepare for a bond election.⁵³ Throughout the months preceding the election, Greer and the *Community Improver* urged the residents of the neighborhood to go and vote “yes” on the bond. The bond passed in late 1967, with 6,616 voters for the bond and 5,374 against.⁵⁴

During the months preceding the bond election and the start of the project, rumors began to circulate throughout the East Riverside area. Although the ARC had established an office in

⁵⁰ “\$6.2 Million Okayed for Renewal” *Asheville Citizen*. August 23, 1966. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁵¹ *The Community Improver*, October 1966. From the Archives of the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville, at the D. H. Ramsey Library at the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

⁵² *The Community Improver*, December 1966. From the Archives of the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville, at the D. H. Ramsey Library at the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

⁵³ *The Community Improver*, December 1966.

⁵⁴ “Voters Approve Bond Issue” *Asheville Citizen*, December 6, 1967. Newspaper File Collection at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

the neighborhood and was doing the best it could to get information out there, many residents chose instead to listen to the word on the street and not from the officials. Much like anything with political connotations and large scale financial ramifications, the hearsay surrounding the project abounded, such as allegations that the ARC was trying to discourage property owners from improving their property.⁵⁵ Even if the program of improvements had widespread acceptance, it was not hard for word of mouth to outdo what the city officials were trying to say.

In order to help garner support for the project, officials involved with the project tried to present the project as not a drain on taxpayer dollars, but an investment with large returns for the city and its residents. In February 1967 interview, James Greer said “About one third of what we buy will go back on the tax books. And that which goes back on the tax books will return more to the city than all these parcels do now.”⁵⁶

The plan as of 1967 was highly ambitious. A five year plan was initiated, but Greer said it would probably be more like 6 or 8 years to complete it. The primary goal was to provide better living conditions, and as stated before, improve the city’s tax base. There would be a major emphasis on keeping as many structures as possible in the area, through improvements made possible by low cost loans or in some cases, grants to the residents. The homeowners would be assisted and advised as to what the best course of action would be for their home. However, some houses would be demolished for the greater good of the area in order to make way for planned public projects. The owners of homes to be demolished would be given a fair price for their home and would not have to move until safe, sanitary housing was available for them. Relocating people into adequate housing was one of the reasons the project would take so

⁵⁵ *The Community Improver*, August 1966, From the Archives of the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville, at the D. H. Ramsey Library at the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

⁵⁶ “Remedy for a Blighted Area: \$9 Million Project Promises New Life for East Riverside” *Asheville Citizen*, February 14, 1967. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

long. Moving expenses for the displaced residents would be taken care of by the city.⁵⁷ Local support continued for the project. Greer said, “It should be noted...that the East Riverside residents have given overwhelming support to the program since its inception, both on a face-to-face interview basis as well as in small and mass meetings in the area.”⁵⁸

In comparison to other North Carolina cities, the money initially given to Asheville by HUD was significantly lower. In early 1967, Charlotte received about \$8 million with an extra \$15 million applied for. Durham’s projects totaled around \$19 million, and Greensboro totaled around \$16 with another \$6 million applied for. Winston-Salem’s funding came in at around \$25 million. Asheville’s \$9 million at the time was only about a fraction of what these other cities were receiving their urban renewal efforts. One of the few cities that received less than Asheville was Raleigh, which had received less than \$1.5 million dollars.⁵⁹

The East Riverside project moved forward as the 1960s reached a close. Under the guidance of the ARC, substandard properties in the area were bought up and their occupants moved to other parts of the city. As the project started, the ARC hoped that by 1975, the area will be transformed into a “more livable, healthier neighborhood” with improved streets, a better park, and other improved recreational facilities. Construction began with several low-cost housing units along South French Broad Avenue, where an 11 story high-rise building was to be constructed. The Asheville-Biltmore Hotel on Market Street was also purchased. The former hotel was slated to become housing for the elderly. In November 1969, HUD approved a \$1.2 million dollar increase in the funds it was giving Asheville to help with moving costs for those being displaced. Under the 1968 Housing Act a homeowner would be entitled to receive at least \$5,000 from the government to help purchase another house. At the site office in the area, classes

⁵⁷ “Remedy for a Blighted Area...”

⁵⁸ “Greer Gives Redevelopment Plan Facts.”

⁵⁹ “Remedy for a Blighted Area...”

were also taught to help start a process of “human renewal” to complement the urban renewal process. Hat making, typing, sewing, and other skills were taught at night, as well as remedial classes through Asheville-Buncombe Technical College in math, English and grammar.⁶⁰

One of the major issues that faced the ARC when working on East Riverside was the issue of single-family housing. Like Ms. McCoy claimed in 1966, East Riverside residents wanted to live in more single-family housing units. The AHA and ARC had taken her concerns, as well as those who were less strident in their demands, when planning the project because there were going to be many single-unit houses available for habitation. Greer said, “This housing will have much more room in terms of yard space and it will be more attractively landscaped.” In response to resident demands, the Asheville Housing Authority voiced its support for more single family housing units, instead of conventional low-rent apartments, in September 1971.⁶¹

As the project progressed, more and more money was required for the project to be completed. The original \$9 million dollars that the project started with was increased to \$11 million dollars in 1972. Fortunately for the City of Asheville, most of the increase in funds came from the federal government and HUD, and not from the taxpayers of Asheville or Buncombe County. The \$1.4 million dollar bond passed in 1967 would not need to be increased substantially. In 1973, the total cost of the project was raised again to around \$15.7 million dollars. This increase was to provide for more improved land use and street layout and also a major cleanup of the Nasty Branch creek. At a meeting in May 1973, the City Council was told that there could be a possible \$5 or 6 million dollar increase to the projects, which would cost the

⁶⁰ Henry Robinson. “Big Gains Made in Slum Clearance & Low Cost Housing” *Asheville Citizen*, January 1, 1970. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁶¹ Mary Cowles, “Housing Authority Supports Building of One Family Units” *Asheville Citizen*, September 15, 1971. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

city an extra \$200,000.⁶² The City Council approved the increase with little objection, but again there was no more cost to the city due to a change in credits to the city.⁶³

More public housing units were being constructed as the cost rose. One of the major concerns of the East Riverside area was how to house the many elderly that lived there. With more than 300 elderly men and women waiting for affordable housing, Ray Wheeling, one of the major leaders of the Asheville Housing Authority, said that “Housing for the elderly is our greatest need right now.” Construction of new housing had been a drawn-out issue since the project began. Construction of public housing, especially for the aging, had been delayed several times. However, HUD authorized the AHA to start building new housing units. The former Asheville-Biltmore hotel, which had been purchased in the late 1960s, could finally serve its intended purpose.⁶⁴

Improvements to the area continued in the mid-1970s with the planned construction of still more housing units, this time single-family duplexes and triplexes. Livingston Street School, which by then was a community center, was to come under the authority of Asheville Parks and Recreation Department. Streets would be widened and extended, and a new fire station was to be built. Parks were to also be improved, with more recreational facilities.⁶⁵

As the 1970s drew to a close, the project, which James Greer had imagined only taking 8 years, was nearing completion almost a decade after it started. Larry Holt of the Asheville Housing Authority estimated that it was about 80% complete in 1977. He conjectured that it

⁶² Mary Cowles, “Council Told of Urban Renewal Amendment” *Asheville Citizen*, May 30, 1973. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁶³ Warren Nye, “Council Oks Revised Urban Renewal Plan,” *Asheville Citizen*, June 22, 1973. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁶⁴ “Units Authorized for City’s Elderly,” *Asheville Citizen*, August 25, 1973. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁶⁵ Henry Robinson, “Giant Earth Movers Giving East Riverside Terrain a New Look” *Asheville Citizen*, August 24, 1975. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

would be at least another year or two before it was finished, if everything went as planned. However, he did point out the successes of the project. He said, “With a Federal grant of \$15 million, the city moved to do what private development could not do—buy the decayed portion of the community, restore it, and promote private development.”⁶⁶

The progress made on the area was significant. In 1977, acquisition of property and relocation of residents was 99% complete, according to Holt. That process was the one that Greer said in the late 1960s that could substantially lengthen. Planned improvements, such as demolition of condemned buildings, improving streets, drainage services and other utilities was 65% complete. Holt said that it also took some time to complete these tasks because it was done in parts, and not all at once. This was so that the whole area would not be inundated with new construction, which would be a major inconvenience to people living and working in East Riverside. The disposition of acquired property, that is, selling it back to private entities, was only 20% complete.⁶⁷ In 1978, the project entered its final stage—moving people and businesses back in to the area.⁶⁸ This would be the final test of the East Riverside project. The millions of dollars spent on improving the area would be worthless if no one wanted to live there. East Riverside would be a success only if people and businesses moved back into the area and not just existed, but thrived.⁶⁹

Over a decade after the project started, the construction aspect of the East Riverside project was coming to an end. 483 families, 241 individuals, and 66 business had been relocated. Over \$18 million had been poured into the area. 757 structures had been removed, and many

⁶⁶ Tom Oliver. “East Riverside Project Nears Completion” *Asheville Citizen*, July 25, 1977. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁶⁷ “East Riverside Project Nears Completion.”

⁶⁸ “A New Look for Asheville’s East Riverside” *Asheville Citizen*, July 2, 1978. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁶⁹ “East Riverside Project Nears Completion.”

more remodeled and brought up to the Asheville housing code. However, the project gave the area a makeover that it would have been impossible without government intervention.⁷⁰ It could have happened at some point, but the process would have taken far longer than ten years to yield any tangible results. Without the help of the ARC, the AHA, and other government entities, the East Riverside area could have remained a crumbling, decaying neighborhood today.

Although private developers could have completed a similar project, they might not have been as invested in “human renewal” as they would be in gaining capital and exploiting a captive consumer base. In fact, in East Riverside, the properties owned by outside investors were mostly in worse conditions than occupant-owned houses.⁷¹ This had been a problem for most of the project’s lifetime. One of the major issues in successfully acquiring property in the area was “Slum landlords refusing to sell their property,” according to Dave Jones, of the ARC.⁷²

The East Riverside project was mostly a success, especially since the area is not as decrepit as it was in the late 1960s. It kick-started the renewal of the area and saved it from becoming completely blighted. With the guidance of the government, safe, sanitary and affordable housing was made available to people who could not have afforded it on their own. They also improved and added community facilities so that the residents of the area would have safe and quality places to spend their free time.⁷³ All of this was part of the “human renewal” that the project aimed to do.

One of the main side effects of the project came from the displacement of its residents. Since the overwhelming majority of the population was African-American, the majority of those displaced would be too. This served to integrate areas in Asheville that had not been previously.

⁷⁰ Rodney Brooks. “East Riverside: Businesses and Families Return to the Area.” *Asheville Citizen* N. D. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

⁷¹ “East Riverside: Businesses and Families Return to the Area.”

⁷² “Big Gains Made in Slum Clearance...”

⁷³ “East Riverside: Businesses and Families Return to the Area.”

According to Larry Holt, the relocation program integrated both the Kenilworth and Montford neighborhoods. Holt contended that without the mass, government-mandated movement of people, much of the African-American community in Asheville (much of which resided in East Riverside in the 1960s) could still be in the same place for another 50 or 60 years.⁷⁴

The process of the East Riverside project taught the City of Asheville a lesson. It must never let a neighborhood get so run-down again. Although it was fortunate that the East Riverside area could still hold on to some of its original structures, not all urban renewal plans were so lucky. This project avoided much of what is called “slum clearance,” or almost total demolition of existing structures to be replaced with new structures, often eviscerating the fabric of the community. The project aimed almost from the start to not only eradicate the blight from East Riverside, but also make sure it doesn’t ever deteriorate the way it had.⁷⁵ As Larry Holt said, “We can no longer afford to let our housing fall apart. Once it deteriorates, the only recourse is to tear it down.”⁷⁶

East Riverside has become an example of what the government of a city can do once it decides to take action against community blight. Though the project was largely a successful venture, the process taught Asheville, as well as any other city, a lesson. In order to prevent urban blight, it has to be stopped before it is able to spread.

⁷⁴ “East Riverside: Businesses and Families Return to the Area.”

⁷⁵ “Greer Gives Redevelopment Plan Facts.”

⁷⁶ “East Riverside: Businesses and Families Return to the Area.”

Annotated Bibliography

Primary Sources:

“\$6.2 Million Okayed for Renewal” *Asheville Citizen*. August 23, 1966. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This article, archived without an author, described the announcement of the 6.2 million dollars that the city of Asheville would be given by the federal government to start the urban renewal process in the East Riverside area. It briefly described what was going to happen in the area and how Roy Taylor, a local politician, made the announcement.

“A New Look for Asheville’s East Riverside” *Asheville Citizen*, July 2, 1978. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This brief mention of the East Riverside project accompanied an aerial shot of the area and the improvements that had been made to it. It was a great point of reference for looking at the photographs of the area before the project got started and what had been improved. It was archived without an author.

“A Population and Economic Analysis of the Asheville Metropolitan Area and the Western North Carolina Region That It Serves.” City of Asheville Housing Authority Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. May 1966. Accessed Sept. 12, 2012.

http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1966_population_economic_analysis/a_population_and_economic_analysis_full_text.htm.

This study outlines the characteristics of the population and economic bases of the Asheville Metropolitan Area and Western North Carolina. It goes through various demographics and serves as a frame for data collected by Ruth Mace and her associates. It also goes delineates the economic climate of the region at the time published.

Brooks, Rodney, N. D., “East Riverside: Businesses and Families Return to the Area” *Asheville Citizen*, N. D. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

Rodney Brooks, writing for the *Asheville Citizen*, describes some of the statistics from the East Riverside project and then goes on to describe how people are moving back in to the East Riverside Area. Brooks also quotes Larry Holt, who was one of the major players in the Asheville Housing Authority, about the issues that the AHA faced and will face with the area and the city as a whole.

Brooks, Rodney. "East Riverside: Businesses and Families Return to the Area." *Asheville Citizen* N. D. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This article describes the movement of men and women, as well as businesses, back into the East Riverside area after a lengthy urban renewal process. Larry Holt was interviewed for this article and brings much valuable information, as well as interesting side notes, about the project as a whole and its ramifications.

Clark, Philip. 1965. "Southside Project Given Third Name" *Asheville Citizen*, January 13, 1965. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This very brief article in the *Asheville Citizen*, one of the first of the press clippings at the North Carolina Room about the East Riverside project, states that the project had been given a third name and why.

The Community Improver, April 1966-March 1967. In the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library at the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

This group of newsletters, published by the Asheville Redevelopment Commission, was disseminated to help the residents of the East Riverside area become acquainted with the concept of their neighborhood getting dramatically reworked. Its style is a little patronizing and the language very simple, but in order to reach a population with a low average education level such tactics would surely be necessary.

Cowles, Mary, "Housing Authority Supports Building of One Family Units" *Asheville Citizen*, September 15, 1971. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This brief article describes how the Asheville Housing Authority, in response to resident requests, will authorize the construction of more single-family housing units in the East Riverside area. It is useful especially in regards to other documents which contain support the idea of single-family housing units across the range of the research conducted for this paper.

Cowles, Mary, "Council Told of Urban Renewal Amendment" *Asheville Citizen*, May 30, 1973. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This article describes the meeting of the Asheville City council where the increase of money coming in to the East Riverside project was initially discussed. The article was also a general summary of the meeting, most of which was about the increase in money given to the project.

“East Riverside, Asheville, N.C.,” from the Housing Authority of the City of Asheville Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. 1970s. Accessed Oct. 4, 2012.
http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1970_east_riverside_asheville/default_east_riverside_asheville.htm.

This small pamphlet outlines the many problems that the East Riverside has and what can be done to fix them. It uses very simplistic language that is intended to get the message out and be easily understood by people with a range of education levels. It can be a bit patronizing at times, but it was a great introduction to the issues facing the area.

“Greer Gives Redevelopment Plan Facts” *Asheville Citizen*, February 19, 1967. Newspaper File Collection Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

James Greer, one of the leaders of the Asheville Redevelopment Commission, gave this lengthy interview to the *Times* in February 1967. He spoke of some of the issues facing the East Riverside area, and what can be done to improve it. He also talked about some of the ways that the area will be prevented from declining again, and how the city will make sure that no one will take advantage of the situation and exploit the residents or the government.

“Inside East Riverside.” City of Asheville Housing Authority Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. 1970s. Accessed Sept. 12, 2012.
http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1970_east_riverside_asheville/default_east_riverside_asheville.htm.

This publication is the result of a study, conducted by Ruth Mace and her associates, into the conditions of the East Riverside area before the urban renewal project got underway. It was an invaluable resource on some of the problems facing the area, such as population, income level, and unemployment. It was also very thorough, with almost all of the residents responding to the queries.

Nye, Warren. “Council Oks Revised Urban Renewal Plan,” *Asheville Citizen*, June 22, 1973. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This article describes how the City Council of Asheville improved the increase in money given to the East Riverside project. It was a brief article but provides the next part of the story that Mary Cowles’ May 1973 article discussed.

Oliver, Tom., “East Riverside Project Nears Completion” *Asheville Citizen*, July 25, 1977. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

Tom Oliver’s lengthy article about the successes and drawbacks to the East Riverside

project is one of the last in the North Carolina Room's clippings on the project. It outlined where the project stood in July 1977 and what was left to do. Oliver interviews Larry Holt about the successes and drawbacks of the project and what Asheville could glean from the decade-long undertaking. A lot of the article was reiteration of information that previous sources provided, but Holt's quotes from the article were invaluable.

“Public Hearing on the East Riverside Urban Renewal Project given by the Asheville Redevelopment Commission May 31, 1966” City of Asheville Housing Authority Archives at the D. H. Ramsey Library, UNC-Asheville. Accessed Sept. 12, 2012. http://toto.lib.unca.edu/findingaids/mss/housing_authority_city_asheville/haca_publications_local/1966_public_hearing_east_riverside/default_public_hearing.htm.

This transcript of a public hearing was very important to my research. Although much of it is standard public meeting protocol, some parts of it, such as Fannie McCoy's speech, shine through and put a face on some of what the residents of the area were feeling at the time.

“Remedy for a Blighted Area: \$9 Million Project Promises New Life for East Riverside” *Asheville Citizen*, February 14, 1967. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This article, which quotes ARC leader James W. Greer, talks about the problems facing the East Riverside district and what can be done to improve it. It also stresses the benefits to taxpayers if the project were to commence and how much the project will cost to the City of Asheville. The article was archived without an author.

Robinson, Henry. “Big Gains Made in Slum Clearance & Low Cost Housing” *Asheville Citizen*, January 1, 1970. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This article goes through the process of obtaining the funds for the East Riverside project and what will be done with it. This includes street improvements, facility improvements, and public housing construction. It is one in a series of many articles at the North Carolina Room Newspaper Archives that outlines the progress of the project.

Robinson, Henry, “Giant Earth Movers Giving East Riverside Terrain a New Look” *Asheville Citizen*, August 24, 1975. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

The picture that accompanied this article showed massive mounds of earth and bulldozers in the East Riverside area. It was one of the articles towards the end of the North Carolina Room's clippings about the project. Although it was brief, it provided a valuable progress report for the project from August 1975.

“Units Authorized for City’s Elderly,” *Asheville Citizen*, August 25, 1973. Newspaper File Collection, Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

Housing for the elderly was a major concern for the planners of the East Riverside project. This article, archived without an author, describes how the hotel that was purchased by the city in the late 1960s will be converted into a housing facility for the area’s elderly, and other projects would serve the same purpose in the area.

“Voters Approve Bond Issue” *Asheville Citizen*, December 6, 1967. Newspaper File Collection Vol. 29 File 30 B-F at the North Carolina Room at Pack Memorial Library, Asheville, N.C.

This article was archived without an author but was a valuable source for the vote on the bond issue in late 1967. It described the outcome of the various issues being put up to vote at the election, including the East Riverside bond and the one concerning the construction of the Civic Center in Asheville.

Secondary Sources:

Bauman, John F., Biles, Roger, and Szylvian Kristin M., eds. *From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in Twentieth-Century America*, (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000)

This collection of essays was a useful source for information on the evolution of housing policy in the United States on more of a case-by-case standpoint. Gail Radford’s essay on housing policy during the United States Great Depression was particularly useful.

Bratt, Rachel G., Stone, Michael E., and Hartman, Chester, eds. *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006).

This collection of essays was invaluable in research American housing policy. The book makes the case that there is a great need for more housing for low-income Americans if the country is to be a success. Particularly useful was Peter Dreier’s essay on federal housing subsidies.

Dreier, Peter. “Federal Housing Subsidies: Who Benefits and Why?” in *A Right to Housing: A Foundation for a New Social Agenda*, Rachel G. Bratt, Michael E. Stone, and Chester Hartman, eds., (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006).

In this essay, Peter Dreier presents a basic outline for the history of housing policy, especially in regards to federal housing subsidies, since the times of President F. D. Roosevelt. The essay is rich in statistical information that applies to the growth and decline of federal housing subsidies.

Roman Catholic Diocese of Charlotte, “St. Anthony of Padua School in Asheville,” Roman Catholic Diocese of Charlotte, <http://www.charlottediocese.org/ministries-a-departments/archives/190/569>, (accessed October 30, 2012).

This little blurb was one of the very few sources of information available about the St. Anthony school in East Riverside. Apart from being mentioned in some of the other works researched, information about the school was scarce. This bit of information about the school was a huge help in finding out what it was and why it closed.

Radford, Gail, “Government and Housing During the Depression” in *From Tenements to the Taylor Homes: In Search of an Urban Housing Policy in Twentieth-Century America*, (John F. Bauman, Roger Biles, and Kristin M. Szylvian, eds. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).

Gail Radford’s work about the Government’s intervention into public housing during the 1930s and beyond was useful, as it showed how F. D. Roosevelt and his New Deal legislation really set the tone for American housing policy to come later on in the 20th century. It was a great starting point for the evolution of public housing in the United States.

Schwartz, Alex F., *Housing Policy in the United States, Second Edition*, (New York City: Routledge, 2010).

This textbook served as an introduction to housing policy and provided a frame for the research conducted on East Riverside. More so than any other sources, it goes in-depth on the policies of various Presidents and Congresses in regard to housing.

Tremblay, Jr, Kenneth R. and Dillman, Don A., *Beyond the American Housing Policy Dream: Accommodations to the 1980s*, (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, Inc., 1983).

This book is the result of a study conducted by the authors in the early 1980s. The study tries to ascertain what kind of housing the American people prefer. The results of the study were not surprising given the climate of the time it was published as well as some of the research conducted on the East Riverside project, especially in regard to the push for single-unit public housing in the area.