

Urban Law Annual ; Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law

Volume 11

January 1976

Public Policy for Suburban Integration...The Case for New Communities

Raymond J. Burby Jr.

Shirley F. Weiss

Follow this and additional works at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_urbanlaw



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Raymond J. Burby Jr. and Shirley F. Weiss, *Public Policy for Suburban Integration...The Case for New Communities*, 11 URB. L. ANN. 101 (1976)

Available at: https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_urbanlaw/vol11/iss1/4

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Urban Law Annual ; Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact digital@wumail.wustl.edu.

PUBLIC POLICY FOR SUBURBAN INTEGRATION . . . THE CASE FOR NEW COMMUNITIES †

RAYMOND J. BURBY, III*
SHIRLEY F. WEISS**

Suburban integration of blacks and low- and moderate-income households has received increasing attention as a means of redressing the racial and economic imbalances that characterize most metropolitan areas. According to the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Kerner Commission), "developing an adequate housing supply for low-income and middle-income families and true freedom of choice in housing for Negroes of all income levels will require substantial out-movement."¹ More recently, however, it has been noted that, "many of the arguments both for and against mixing are based more on ideology than on concrete evidence."² In this article we examine the integration experience of one type of suburban community — new communities developed from the ground up — to determine whether integration has been beneficial to blacks and low- and moderate-income households, whether it is acceptable to the affluent white majority, and whether new community development is a desirable means of fostering integration.

†Support for this research was provided by the National Science Foundation, Grant Number APR 72-03425. However, any opinions, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Dr. Thomas G. Donnelly, Dr. Edward J. Kaiser, and Dr. Robert B. Zehner, who were our co-principal investigators in this study, and Dr. Helene V. Smookler, who conducted a special study of the decision to provide subsidized housing in new communities.

*Senior Research Associate, Center for Urban and Regional Studies, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. A.B., The George Washington University, 1964; M.R.P., The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1969; Ph.D., The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1969.

**Professor, Department of City and Regional Planning, and Associate Research Director, Center for Urban and Regional Studies, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. A.B., Douglass College, Rutgers University, 1942; M.R.P., The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1958; Ph.D., Duke University, 1973.

1. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMM'N ON CIVIL DISORDERS, REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS 225 (1968).

2. Marrett, *Social Stratification in Urban Areas*, in *SEGREGATION IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS* 186 (A. Hawley & V. Rock eds. 1973).

I. RACIAL AND INCOME INTEGRATION IN NEW COMMUNITIES

One of the most persistent elements of the new community concept has been the belief that new communities, as microcosms of larger cities, will promote social balance — including racial and income integration. Downs, Weaver and others have noted a number of reasons why new community development should foster integration.³ First, large-scale new community projects provide developers with “elbow room” to accommodate low- and moderate-income housing that is less profitable than market-oriented dwelling units. Secondly, central control of planning and initial marketing — together with the creation of a large, new and, to some degree, self-contained environment — provides an opportunity to establish a nondiscriminatory ethos from the start of development. Thirdly, to the extent that new communities offer a better living environment than other suburban communities, consumers may find a racial and income mixture more palatable. Finally, Gans has suggested that the exhilarating experience of moving into a new community may result in some people coming with the intention of giving up their old habits and associating with different racial and income groups.⁴

In spite of these supposed advantages, the record of new community development during the 1950's and 1960's led many observers to discount their value as vehicles for suburban integration. Based on a study of new communities in California during the mid-1960's, Eichler and Kaplan concluded that “the very thing buyers in new communities hope to avoid is the inclusion of lower-income families” and there was little chance “that many families with low incomes would become residents of these developments.”⁵ Clapp noted that “[t]he majority of current new town developers in the United States could not be considered to be seriously pursuing the development of socially

3. See A. DOWNS, *OPENING UP THE SUBURBS: AN URBAN STRATEGY FOR AMERICA* 160 (1973); Weaver, *Housing and Associated Problems of Minorities*, in *MODERNIZING URBAN LAND POLICY* 49-81 (M. Clawson ed. 1973). Others who have argued for racial and income integration through new community development include: AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS, *THE AIP TASK FORCE ON NEW COMMUNITIES, NEW COMMUNITIES: CHALLENGE FOR TODAY, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS BACKGROUND PAPER No. 2* (M. Allen ed. 1968); NATIONAL COMM. ON URBAN GROWTH POLICY, *THE NEW CITY* (D. Canty ed. 1969); and Weissbourd, *Satellite Communities: Proposal for a New Housing Program*, 5 *THE CENTER MAGAZINE* No. 1, at 7 (1972).

4. Gans, *The Possibilities of Class and Racial Integration in American New Towns: A Policy-Oriented Analysis*, in *NEW TOWNS: WHY — AND FOR WHOM?* 137, 140 (H. Perloff & N. Sandberg eds. 1973) [hereinafter cited as Gans].

5. E. EICHLER & M. KAPLAN, *THE COMMUNITY BUILDERS* 172-73 (1967).

balanced communities . . .”⁶ Summing up these findings, the National Commission on Urban Problems (Douglas Commission) reported that “[i]n most cases, new towns have almost no relevance to the overriding problem of housing low- and moderate-income families, for they provide no low- and moderate-income housing.”⁷

Other problems in racial and income integration through new community development have also been noted. Fava and Grigsby have questioned whether many black households are really interested in living in integrated new communities where they will form a small minority of the population with little political power.⁸ Clapp and Gans have indicated that lower-income households moving to new communities may face a number of problems, including the possible lack of nearby jobs and necessity of commuting to work, hostility from their more affluent neighbors, and the lack of supportive facilities, such as public transit, neighborhood medical clinics and inexpensive shopping facilities.⁹

Unfortunately, most discussions of racial and income integration through new community development have been speculative in nature. This has stemmed from the comparatively recent emergence of balanced new communities in the United States and the lack of systematic empirical research in new community settings. To overcome this problem, research support was secured from the National Science Foundation's RANN Directorate in 1972 for a national evaluation of new community development.¹⁰ Data were gathered in thirty-six communities. These included seventeen new communities, thirteen developed by the private sector without federal assistance, two communities that are participating in the federal new communities

6. J. CLAPP, *NEW TOWNS AND URBAN POLICY: PLANNING METROPOLITAN GROWTH* 246 (1971).

7. NATIONAL COMM'N ON URBAN PROBLEMS, *BUILDING THE AMERICAN CITY, REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMM'N ON URBAN PROBLEMS TO THE CONGRESS AND TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES*, H.R. DOC. NO. 54, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 178 (1968).

8. Grigsby, *Views on the Feasibility of Integration*, in *NEW TOWNS: WHY — AND FOR WHOM?* 189-93 (H. Perloff & N. Sandberg eds. 1973); Fava, *Blacks in American New Towns: Problems and Prospects*, *SOCIOLOGICAL SYMPOSIUM*, No. 12, at 111 (1974).

9. CLAPP, *supra* note 6, at 249; Gans, *supra* note 4, at 145.

10. For a summary report of the results of the entire study see R. BURBY, III & S. WEISS with T. DONNELLY, E. KAISER, R. ZEHNER, D. LEWIS, N. LOEWENTHAL, M. MCCALLA, B. RODGERS & H. SMOOKLER, *NEW COMMUNITIES U.S.A.: RESULTS OF A NATIONAL STUDY* (1976).

program, and two communities specifically designed for the elderly.¹¹ In order to evaluate new communities in comparison with less-planned traditional modes of urban development and control contextual factors, such as climate, data were also gathered in a sample of conventional communities. Each of the non-federally assisted and federally assisted new communities was paired with a significantly less-planned conventional community that was similar in terms of the age, price range, type of housing available, and location. Because the conventional communities did not have sufficient black and low- and moderate-income populations for comparison with the new communities, information was gathered in four additional conventional communities. These included two suburban communities with subsidized

11. The sample of new communities was designed to be representative of new communities now under development in the United States. The new community sample was selected in three stages. In the first stage, 27 new communities that met the following criteria were identified: (1) location in the continental United States; (2) built or under construction since 1960; (3) nonspecialized character (to exclude resort and retirement communities); (4) planned for an eventual population of at least 20,000; and (5) population of at least 5,000 residents. The sampling frame used to identify these communities was an enumeration of 63 large developments and new communities prepared by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. NEW COMMUNITIES DIVISION, COMMUNITY RESOURCES DEV. ADMINISTRATION, U.S. DEP'T OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEV., SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF LARGE DEVELOPMENTS AND NEW COMMUNITIES COMPLETED OR UNDER CONSTRUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE 1947 (1969). From this list five new communities were selected on the basis of a series of additional inclusion criteria: Columbia, Md. (over 10% black); Reston, Va. (recognized outstanding design); Lake Havasu City, Ariz. (freestanding); Irvine, Cal. (projected population over 150,000); and Park Forest, Ill. (substantially completed new community).

In the second stage of sample selection eight additional new communities were randomly selected. These included: Elk Grove Village, Ill., Forest Park, Ohio, Foster City, Cal., Laguna Niguel, Cal., North Palm Beach, Fla., Sharpstown, Tex., Valencia, Cal., and Westlake Village, Cal.

In the third stage of sample selection four other new communities were added. In order to assure inclusion of new communities that were participating in the federal new communities program, Jonathan, Minn., and Park Forest South, Ill., were selected. Both communities have received loan guarantees and other assistance under the provisions of the New Communities Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3901-14 (1970), and the Urban Growth and New Community Development Act of 1970, *id.* §§ 4501-32, *as amended*, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4512, 4514-16, 4519 (Supp. IV, 1974). Although at the time of this writing 15 new communities are eligible to receive federal assistance, these two were the only federally assisted new communities with an adequate population for a baseline evaluation when the sample communities were chosen in 1972. In order to assure the inclusion of new communities that were designed especially for the elderly, two retirement new communities, Rossmoor Leisure World, Laguna Hills, Cal., and Sun City Center, Fla., were also selected.

housing and two suburban communities with predominantly black residential areas.¹²

The results of this study indicate that new communities, in fact, have achieved modest amounts of both racial and income integration. (See Table 1.) Racial integration (and nonintegration) has tended to follow one of three patterns. In some new communities, such as Columbia, Reston, and the two federally assisted communities, Jonathan and Park Forest South, the developers' goals for the construction of complete communities implied social and racial balance.¹³ Community advertising and marketing was designed to connote openness and this non-exclusionary ethos attracted a racially mixed population. A second pattern of racial integration has been the in-migration of blacks into previously white neighborhoods. This has been the pattern of racial integration in three of the oldest new communities studied, Forest Park, Park Forest, and Sharpstown, where blacks did not begin to move in large numbers until well after initial residential settlement had occurred. The third and more usual pattern of integration (and occasional nonintegration) has occurred where developers have not viewed blacks as a sufficiently important segment of the market toward which to direct their advertising, and where there were few nearby black neighborhoods or communities to provide a ready source of potential black in-migrants. The result in communities such as Elk Grove Village, Foster City, Irvine, Laguna Niguel, Lake Havasu City, North Palm Beach, Valencia, Westlake Village and the two retirement new communities has been the attainment of negligible black populations.

12. The data reported in this paper were collected in a series of 90-minute household interviews. A total of 3,395 interviews were conducted with the adult residents of the non-federally assisted new communities, including special subsamples of black and subsidized housing residents. One thousand five hundred twenty-two were obtained with paired conventional community adult residents, 204 with adult residents of the retirement new communities, and 313 with adult residents of the two conventional communities with subsidized housing samples and two conventional communities with black samples. The universe sampled included household heads and spouses. The sample was selected so that every household head or spouse who had moved to the communities before January 1, 1973, had a known probability of selection. Interviews were conducted during the spring of 1973.

13. In Reston, for example, the developer listed as one of his major goals the intent "to build a community where barriers created by race, income, geography, education and age are removed." Urban Land Institute Project Brochure, Reston, Va. at 2 (Feb. 1, 1976).

TABLE 1
RACIAL AND INCOME INTEGRATION IN NEW COMMUNITIES, 1973

New Communities (Respondents)	Percent of Respondents		Subsidized Housing ^b	
	Black	Family Income under \$10,000 (1972)	Number of Units	Percent of Housing Stock
<u>Non-Federally Assisted</u>				
Columbia (n = 290) ^a	19	16	532	7
Elk Grove Village (n = 199)	0	8	0	0
Forest Park (n = 277) ^a	9	13	201	4
Foster City (n = 176)	3	9	0	0
Irvine (n = 202)	2	6	0	0
Laguna Niguel (n = 208)	0	6	0	0
Lake Havasu City (n = 256) ^a	0	33	64	3
North Palm Beach (n = 202)	1	16	0	0
Park Forest (n = 216) ^a	6	16	354	4
Reston (n = 278) ^a	4	14	926	11
Sharpstown (n = 203)	5	22	0	0
Valencia (n = 202)	1	6	0	0
Westlake Village (n = 206)	2	5	0	0
<u>Federally Assisted</u>				
Jonathan (n = 207) ^a	2	40	151	36
Park Forest South (n = 219) ^a	10	12	46	4
<u>Retirement</u>				
Rossmoor Leisure World (n = 104)	0	49	0	0
Sun City Center (n = 100)	1	37	0	0

^aData from community have been weighted to adjust for oversampling of blacks and/or subsidized housing residents.

^bIncludes dwelling units subsidized under the following programs: FHA 202; FHA 213; FHA 221(d)3; FHA 235; FHA 236; Turnkey; and Illinois Housing Development Authority.

Income integration has been achieved in new communities through participation in state and federally subsidized housing programs. Although suburban resistance to low- and moderate-income housing is legendary, over a third of the non-federally assisted new communities (five of thirteen) and both federally assisted communities had some form of subsidized housing. (See Table 1.) With the exception of Park Forest South, each of these communities also had a greater than average proportion of households with 1972 family incomes below \$10,000. Income integration of new communities has also been achieved by filtering down older housing to lower-income families. With the

exception of Elk Grove Village, each of the older new communities where initial residential occupancy occurred prior to 1960 (Forest Park, North Palm Beach, Park Forest and Sharpstown) also had higher than average proportions of lower-income households. On the other hand, among newer new communities where the filtering down process has not taken place and subsidized housing has not been constructed — Foster City, Irvine, Laguna Niguel and Westlake Village — less than ten percent of the households in each community were in the lower-income bracket.¹⁴

The extent of racial and income integration that has already occurred in new communities probably will be far outstripped by the current wave of federally assisted new communities now under development. The Urban Growth and New Community Development Act of 1970¹⁵ (Title VII) provides federal assistance for new community development, in part, to “increase for all persons, particularly members of minority groups, the available choices of locations for living and working, thereby providing a more just economic and social environment; . . .”¹⁶ and requires that an assisted project “[make] substantial provision for housing within the means of persons of low and moderate income. . . .”¹⁷ Current commitments by the sixteen new community developers who have been approved for federal assistance call for the provision of 76,570 low- and moderate-income housing units, which will constitute twenty-six percent of the total number of units to be built in these communities.¹⁸ Progress by developers in fulfilling their

14. An analysis of factors that have facilitated and inhibited the construction of subsidized housing in new communities is presented in H. SMOOKLER, *ECONOMIC INTEGRATION IN NEW COMMUNITIES: AN EVALUATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION* (1976). *Ed. Note:* While up-to-date information on the status of subsidized housing was not available from each of the four mentioned newer new communities, current information was obtained on two of them. In Irvine the percentage of low-income housing remains negligible. Letter from Martin A. Brower, Director of Pub. Relations, The Irvine Co., to the *Urban Law Annual*, Mar. 3, 1976. The status of subsidized housing in Laguna Niguel is in a similar state, with no such housing being available. Telephone interview with Joseph W. Smith, Director of Sales, Avco Community Developers, Inc., Laguna Niguel, Cal., Feb. 11, 1976.

15. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4501-32 (1970), *as amended*, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4512, 4514-16, 4519 (Supp. IV, 1974).

16. *Id.* § 4511(f).

17. *Id.* § 4513(a)(7).

18. OFFICE OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH, U.S. DEP'T OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEV., *EVALUATION OF THE NEW COMMUNITIES PROGRAM, EVALUATION REPORT NO. 1* (HUD-PDR-98) 52 (1975).

commitments, as well as in following an affirmative marketing strategy, is monitored by the New Communities Administration in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Although it is too early to tell whether the federally assisted new communities will be successful in meeting their low- and moderate-income housing goals, it is noteworthy that as of the fall of 1975, twenty-eight percent of all housing built in Title VII new communities has been housing for low- and moderate-income families.¹⁹

In sum, contrary to the negative expectations voiced just a few short years ago, new communities are providing suburban housing for low- and moderate-income households and are serving as vehicles for suburban racial integration. Moreover, as Table 1 illustrates, in a number of cases both racial and income integration have been achieved in the same new communities.

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF BLACK AND SUBSIDIZED HOUSING RESIDENTS

The data summarized in Table 2 indicate the extent of resident heterogeneity in two groups of new communities where special subsamples of black and subsidized housing residents were interviewed. The first two columns of data compare the characteristics of black and nonblack residents of Columbia, Forest Park, Park Forest, Park Forest South and Reston. The second two columns compare the characteristics of subsidized housing and nonsubsidized housing residents of Columbia, Forest Park, Jonathan, Lake Havasu City and Reston.

The black residents of new communities differed in several important respects from nonblack residents of the same communities. In terms of family life cycle characteristics, blacks tended to be somewhat younger and black families were significantly more likely to consist of a married couple with children than were nonblack families. Although not shown in Table 2, black households were more likely than nonblack households to have moved from the central city of the same metropolitan area, and as might be expected of families in the child-rearing stage of their life cycle, were much more likely to have purchased a home (71%) than to be renting (29%). Fava has hypothesized that new communities may serve the same function for blacks escaping from the central cities that the suburbs did for an earlier generation of nonblack households.²⁰

19. *Oversight Hearings on the New Communities Program Before the Subcomm. on Housing and Community Development of the House Comm. on Banking, Currency and Housing*, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. 7 (1975) (consensus statement of the League of New Community Developers, delivered by League President Lester Gross).

20. Fava, *supra* note 8, at 120.

TABLE 2
RESIDENTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Percent of Respondents			
	Five New Communities ^a		Five New Communities ^b	
	Black Respondents	Nonblack Respondents	Subsidized Housing Respondents	Nonsubsidized Housing Respondents
<u>Life cycle Characteristics</u>				
Age of head of household:				
Under age 40	71	66	79*	62
Age 40-54	26	24	16	23*
Age 55 or older	3	10*	5	15*
Household composition:				
Unmarried adult(s) without children	6	14*	4	13*
Unmarried adult(s) with children	7	4	20*	3
Married couples with children	76*	62	67*	58
Married couples without children	11	21*	9	26*
<u>Socioeconomic Characteristics</u>				
Education (household head):				
High school or less	34*	26	67*	29
Some college or college graduate	34	42*	30	38*
Graduate or professional training	32	32	3	33*
Occupation (household head):				
Professional or managerial	57	61	24	62*
Other white-collar	13	19*	18	15
Blue-collar	30*	20	59*	23
Family income:				
Under \$10,000	15	14	62*	16
\$10,000-14,999	16	25*	26	26
\$15,000-24,999	44	44	10	40*
\$25,000 or more	25*	17	2	18*
Race:				
Nonblack	0	100	83	94*
Black	100	0	17*	6
Number of respondents	280	1,018	275	976

*Difference between black and nonblack or subsidized housing and nonsubsidized housing respondents statistically significant at .05 level of confidence.

^aThe five new communities in which subsamples of black residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Park Forest, Park Forest South and Reston. Other minorities, while included in the nonblack category, were not statistically significant. The percentages of nonblack minorities in the above five new communities are Columbia 1.4%, Forest Park 0%, Park Forest 2.4%, Park Forest South 0% and Reston .4%.

^bThe five new communities in which subsamples of subsidized housing residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Jonathan, Lake Havasu City and Reston.

This supposition is supported by the life cycle characteristics and housing-type choices of new community black residents and is further supported by the reasons blacks gave for moving to a new community. Compared to nonblack households, black households were much more likely to mention aspects of the community that made it a good social environment for the family, including perceptions of the community as a good place to raise children (mentioned by 55% of the black households vs. 35% of the nonblack households), the character of public schools (27% vs. 17%), and safety from crime (14% vs. 5%).

A major factor inhibiting greater racial integration in new communities is the cost of housing. As shown in Table 2, new communities have tended to attract higher status blacks whose family incomes are well above the average of black households in the same metropolitan areas, and are somewhat higher than those of nonblack households living in the same new communities.²¹ To achieve income parity and thus afford to live in a new community, black households were significantly more likely than nonblack households (61% vs. 33%) to have both the household head and spouse employed. Gans has suggested that racial integration in new communities will be more feasible when there are no class differences between racial groups.²² As shown in Table 2, this is precisely what has occurred. A majority of the black and nonblack household heads had at least some college education and a majority of each group was employed in managerial or professional occupations. However, since the pool of high status blacks who are potential migrants to new communities is limited, the extent of black in-migration will be sharply circumscribed if it is restricted to members of this group.

One means of encouraging greater racial integration in new communities is through the construction of subsidized housing. For

21. Bradburn, Sudman, and Gockel reported similar results from a comparative study of a national sample of white and black households living in neighborhoods characterized by varying degrees of racial integration. The median income of black households living in open (less than 1% black) and moderately integrated (1 to 10% black) neighborhoods was substantially higher than that of blacks living in substantially integrated (over 10% black) and Negro segregated (all black) neighborhoods. The median income of black households living in open neighborhoods was somewhat higher than that of the white residents of the same neighborhoods. N. BRADBURN, S. SUDMAN & G. GOCKEL with the assistance of J. NOEL, *RACIAL INTEGRATION IN AMERICAN NEIGHBORHOODS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY* 120-36 (1970), also reported in N. BRADBURN, S. SUDMAN & G. GOCKEL with the assistance of J. NOEL, *SIDE BY SIDE: INTEGRATED NEIGHBORHOODS IN AMERICA* (1971). See Connolly, *Black Movement into the Suburbs: Suburbs Doubling Their Black Populations During the 1960's*, 9 URBAN AFFAIRS Q. 91 (1973).

22. Gans, *supra* note 4, at 149.

example, Table 2 shows that while six percent of the nonsubsidized housing respondents were black in the five new communities where special subsamples of subsidized housing residents were interviewed, seventeen percent of the subsidized housing residents were black. This is noteworthy, since it has generally been held that a combination of income and racial mixing in the same neighborhood and community is not feasible and may work at cross-purposes.²³ In addition, the data in Table 2 indicate that subsidized housing residents not only had lower incomes than nonsubsidized housing residents, they also had distinctly lower social status characteristics. Two-thirds of the subsidized housing residents had only a high school education or less versus less than a third of the nonsubsidized housing residents of the same new communities. While sixty-two percent of the nonsubsidized housing residents were employed in professional and managerial occupations, fifty-nine percent of the subsidized housing residents were blue-collar workers. Finally, one out of five of the subsidized housing households was a broken family consisting of an unmarried adult and children. This condition characterized just three percent of the nonsubsidized housing families. In short, new communities have not only provided vehicles for suburban racial and income integration, they have also shown that racial and class integration can be successfully accomplished in the same communities.

III. INTEGRATION OUTCOMES

The success of racial and income integration can be gauged from both minority and majority perspectives. In the case of minority perspectives, we shall first examine black and subsidized housing residents' perceptions of improvements gained as a result of their move to a new community, and then examine how they evaluate various characteristics of their housing, neighborhoods and communities. In the case of majority perspectives, we are primarily interested in whether integration has been accompanied by greater or less tolerance of neighborhood racial and income integration.

23. See, e.g., ADVISORY COMM. TO THE DEP'T OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEV. NAT'L ACADEMY OF SCIENCES — NAT'L ACADEMY OF ENGINEERING, FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN HOUSING, REPORT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES PANEL, DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMM. 6 (1972); Fava, *supra* note 8, at 121.

Table 3
IMPROVEMENTS GAINED FROM THE MOVE TO A NEW COMMUNITY

Community Characteristic	Percent of Respondents Who Reported that the New Community Was Better than Their Previous Community			
	Five New Communities ^a		Five New Communities ^b	
	Black Respondents	Nonblack Respondents	Subsidized Housing Respondents	Nonsubsidized Housing Respondents
Good place to raise children	83*	64	67	71
Overall community planning	83	80	78	79
Layout and space of the dwelling and lot	82*	69	67	65
Nearness to the outdoors	77*	60	71	69
Appearance of the immediate neighborhood	71*	58	51	62*
Opportunities for participation in community life	66	70	69	66
Public schools	66*	51	59*	46
Safety from crime	66*	40	44	48
Recreational facilities	63	64	74	71
Shopping facilities	54	47	42*	36
Construction of dwelling	52*	44	43	43
Ease of getting around the community	44	47	60	56
Type of people in the neighborhood	42	47	32	48*
Convenience to work	33	36	54*	42
Cost of buying or renting	27	34*	55*	26
Health and medical services	27	28	35*	26
Finding a job in the community	25	30	45*	28
Climate	21	18	33	32
Cost of living in the community	11	15	27*	12
Number of respondents	280	1,018	275	976

*Difference between black and nonblack or subsidized housing and nonsubsidized housing respondents statistically significant at .05 level of confidence.

^aThe five new communities in which subsamples of black residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Park Forest, Park Forest South and Reston.

^bThe five new communities in which subsamples of subsidized housing residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Jonathan, Lake Havasu City and Reston.

A. Minority Perspectives

A majority of the black and subsidized housing respondents reported that their move to a new community had resulted in improvements over their previous communities in eleven of the nineteen community characteristics summarized in Table 3. In addition, in a number of cases blacks and subsidized housing residents were significantly more likely than nonblacks and nonsubsidized housing residents to feel that they had improved their living conditions as a result of the move.

Improvements perceived by a majority of the black respondents included the community as a good place to raise children, community planning, layout and space of the dwelling and lot, nearness to the outdoors, appearance of the immediate neighborhood, opportunities for participation in community life, public schools, safety from crime, recreational facilities, shopping facilities and construction quality of their dwelling. Achieving these gains, however, also involved some costs. In five instances higher proportions of black respondents reported that their new community was worse than their previous community. These included: (1) the cost of buying or renting (27% better vs. 57% worse); (2) the cost of living in the community (11% better vs. 53% worse); (3) convenience to work (33% better vs. 42% worse); (4) job opportunities in the community (25% better vs. 31% worse); and (5) health and medical services (27% better vs. 33% worse). Both the gains and losses achieved by blacks who have moved to new communities are not difficult to understand when it is recalled that black households were significantly more likely than nonblacks to have moved to a new community from a central city location. This also aids in explaining differences between black and nonblack perceptions of improvements gained from the move. Blacks were significantly more likely than nonblacks to feel that their move to a new community had resulted in improvements in safety from crime (26% difference); the community as a good place to raise children (19% difference); nearness to the outdoors (17% difference); the public schools (15% difference); layout and space of the dwelling and lot (13% difference); appearance of the immediate neighborhood (13% difference); and construction quality of the dwelling (9% difference).

Improvements over their previous communities perceived by a majority of the subsidized housing residents included, in order of the proportion of respondents who mentioned them: overall community planning, recreational facilities, opportunities for participation in community life, good place to raise children, layout and space of the dwelling and lot, ease of getting around the community, public schools,

the cost of buying or renting, convenience to work and the appearance of the immediate neighborhood. Inasmuch as better access to suburban job opportunities has been one of the primary goals of suburban income integration, it is notable that significantly higher proportions of subsidized housing than unsubsidized housing residents reported that they had gained improvements in both convenience to work and available job opportunities within their communities. In addition, other data collected for this study indicate that a significantly higher proportion of household heads in subsidized housing than in unsubsidized housing lived within five miles of their place of work (42% vs. 34%), while a significantly lower proportion (23% vs. 33%) lived 15 or more miles from work.²⁴ Thus, the data do not support Clapp's contention, noted earlier, that income integration of new communities will further complicate the commuting problems of lower-income workers.²⁵

The data also do not suggest that minority status due to race or income will produce hardships due to social isolation. Although the interviews did not collect information on the extent of interracial and interclass social contacts, it is notable that far higher proportions of blacks and subsidized housing residents thought that both opportunities for participation in community life and the type of people living in their neighborhood were better than in their former communities than thought that they were worse. For example, sixty-six percent of the black respondents rated opportunities for participation in community life as better than their previous communities, twenty-seven percent rated them as about the same, and only seven percent rated participation opportunities as worse. Blacks also did not seem to suffer from racial hostility in their neighbors. Only six percent of the black respondents reported that the type of people in their neighborhood was worse than in their former communities, while forty-two percent said the people were better and fifty-two percent rated them as about the same. Similar results were obtained from subsidized housing residents. Sixty-nine percent rated opportunities for participation as better than in their former communities, as opposed to only five percent who said they were worse. While thirty-two percent said the type of people were better, forty-four percent rated them as about the same, and twenty-four percent said they were worse.

24. See R. ZEHNER, *ACCESS, TRAVEL, AND TRANSPORTATION IN NEW COMMUNITIES: RESULTS OF A NATIONWIDE STUDY* (1976).

25. CLAPP, *supra* note 6, at 249. See Gans, *supra* note 4, at 145.

In fact, the degree of social integration of minority residents of new communities was highly comparable to that of majority residents. A significantly higher proportion of black than nonblack respondents (63% vs. 52%) said they felt a part of their communities; similar proportions (75% and 80%) thought that it was easy to make new friends in their communities; and similar proportions (67% and 75%) said that it was not more difficult to call on neighbors in time of need than in their former communities. Among the subsidized housing residents, over eighty percent reported that it was easy to make new friends in the community and that it was not harder to call on neighbors in time of need than in their former communities. Finally, there was little difference in the proportion of subsidized housing residents (49%) and nonsubsidized housing residents (56%) who said that they felt involved in their communities.

In order to determine whether affluent new communities whose design and services are geared to the needs of majority residents are also meeting the needs of minority residents, it is necessary to compare residents' evaluations of housing, neighborhoods, community facilities and overall community livability. These comparisons are summarized in Table 4 and Table 5.

In the case of housing and neighborhood evaluations (see Table 4), black homeowners tended to be more satisfied with their homes and neighborhoods than nonblack homeowners living in the same new communities. Subsidized housing homeowners and renters, on the other hand, tended to be distinctly less satisfied than nonsubsidized housing residents, though differences tended to be much greater among homeowners than among renters. For example, nonsubsidized housing homeowners gave distinctly higher ratings to the livability of their homes and immediate neighborhoods and to the adequacy of indoor space, neighborhood attractiveness, convenience, reputation, privacy, safety and upkeep. Nonsubsidized housing apartment renters gave significantly higher ratings to overall neighborhood livability, outdoor privacy, neighborhood attractiveness, quiet and reputation. These differences appear primarily to be due to cost constraints involved in the construction of subsidized housing rather than to characteristics of new community development. For example, as shown below in Table 7, housing and neighborhood evaluations of subsidized housing residents living in conventional suburban communities were not significantly different from those of subsidized housing residents living in new communities. More disturbing is the fact that subsidized housing owners and renters gave very low ratings to the attractiveness of their

Table 4
EVALUATIONS OF HOUSING AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Housing and Neighborhood Characteristics	Percent of Respondents			
	Five New Communities ^a		Five New Communities ^b	
	Black Respondents	Nonblack Respondents	Subsidized Housing Respondents	Nonsubsidized Housing Respondents
<u>Single-family-detached</u>				
<u>Homeowners</u>				
Dwelling unit evaluations:				
Enough indoor space	81	77	62	84*
Enough outdoor space	86	82	80	83
Outdoor privacy available	47	46	44	51
Completely satisfied with overall livability	44*	31	20	44*
Neighborhood evaluations: ^c				
Attractiveness	57*	39	16	47*
Convenience	60	52	42	57*
Friendliness	47	47	44	52
Good reputation	74*	57	35	63*
Privacy	57*	45	29	58*
Safety	55	49	46	61*
Upkeep	61	50	29	55*
Completely satisfied with overall livability	63*	53	31	56*
Number of respondents	167	533	110	381
<u>Apartment Renters</u>				
Dwelling unit evaluations:				
Enough indoor space	73	58	64	54
Enough outdoor space	80	73	71	75
Outdoor privacy available	24	33	22	39*
Completely satisfied with overall livability	15	19	18	14
Neighborhood evaluations: ^c				
Attractiveness	38	32	16	32*
Convenience	40	47	49	45
Friendliness	34	30	37	31
Good reputation	42	42	18	50*
Privacy	48	39	37	36
Safety	35	35	23	31
Upkeep	45	34	24	33
Completely satisfied with overall livability	41	37	28	43*
Number of respondents	59	234	76	122

*Difference between black and nonblack or subsidized housing and nonsubsidized housing respondents statistically significant at .05 level of confidence.

^aThe five new communities in which subsamples of black residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Park Forest, Park Forest South and Reston.

^bThe five new communities in which subsamples of subsidized housing residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Jonathan, Lake Havasu City and Reston.

^cHighest rating on five-point scale. Neighborhood was defined for respondents as "the area near here which you can see from your front door — that is, the five or six homes nearest to yours around here."

Table 5
EVALUATIONS OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND
OVERALL COMMUNITY LIVABILITY

Community Evaluations	Percent of Respondents			
	Five New Communities ^a		Five New Communities ^b	
	Black Respondents	Nonblack Respondents	Subsidized Housing Respondents	Nonsubsidized Housing Respondents
<u>Community Facilities</u>				
Health care facilities and services:				
Rated excellent or good	56	57	51	50
Satisfied with community expenditures for public health facilities	43	58*	45	47
Recreational facilities and services:				
Rated excellent or good	67	75*	73	83*
Satisfied with community expenditures for outdoor recreational facilities	56	61	62	65
Schools:				
Rated excellent or good	81	77	76	76
Satisfied with community expenditures for public schools	59	54	58	58
Shopping facilities and services:				
Rated excellent or good	74	74	43	60*
Transportation facilities and services:				
Satisfied with community expenditures for public transportation	46	54*	43	46
<u>Overall Community Livability</u>				
Community rated as an excellent or good place to live	86	84	79	86*
Community would be recommended to a friend or relative as a particularly good place to move to	84*	73	71	78*
Believe community will be a better place in which to live in five years	43*	32	41	45
Number of respondents	280	1,018	275	976

*Difference between black and nonblack or subsidized housing and nonsubsidized housing respondents statistically significant at .05 level of confidence.

^aThe five new communities in which subsamples of black residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Park Forest, Park Forest South and Reston.

^bThe five new communities in which subsamples of subsidized housing residents were interviewed include Columbia, Forest Park, Jonathan, Lake Havasu City and Reston.

neighborhoods and to neighborhood reputation. Obviously, the greater attention to architectural merit which characterizes new communities has not carried over to the design of subsidized housing (at least from the residents' perspectives), nor has the unified planning and design that is possible in new communities erased the psychological stigma that is attached to residence in subsidized housing projects. This problem, however, may be overcome by the current federal rent subsidy program which facilitates mixing of subsidized and nonsubsidized residents in the same apartment buildings.²⁶

The evaluations of community facilities and overall community livability summarized in Table 5 indicate that with some exceptions new communities have satisfied the needs of blacks and subsidized housing residents about as well as those of the majority population. Differences between blacks and nonblacks were greatest in the satisfaction with community expenditures for public health facilities; black respondents were considerably less satisfied with current expenditure levels. However, there was little difference in black and nonblack evaluations of community health care and medical services, either in relation to the respondents' previous communities (see Table 3) or in evaluations of facilities as excellent or good (see Table 5). New community black residents were also somewhat less satisfied with community recreational facilities than nonblack residents. In part, blacks' lower satisfaction may stem from the unavailability of facilities for their favorite out-of-home activities. For example, compared to nonblacks, black respondents were much more likely to mention bowling and basketball as their favorite leisure activities. New communities as a whole have not done well in supplying facilities for either of these activities. Also, blacks expressed greater interest than nonblacks in various entertainment facilities, which also tended to be lacking in many new communities. In spite of these shortcomings, however, black residents tended to be highly satisfied with overall community livability. Eighty-six percent of the black respondents rated their new communities as excellent or good places in which to live, and significantly higher proportions of blacks than nonblacks said that they would recommend their community to a friend or relative as a particularly good place to live.

Compared to nonsubsidized housing residents living in the same new communities, subsidized housing residents gave somewhat higher overall ratings to health and medical services and shopping facilities in

26. See notes 15-17 and accompanying text *supra*.

comparison with services and facilities in their previous communities (see Table 3). On the other hand, they gave significantly lower ratings to the excellence of recreational and shopping facilities and to overall community livability. The lower ratings given to recreational and shopping facilities were due solely to the lower satisfaction with these facilities in Forest Park. The FHA Section 235 subsidized single-family subdivision in Forest Park was located at the edge of the community, some distance from community shopping and recreational facilities. Also, the community's major recreational facility, a swimming center operated by a nonprofit community club, was priced beyond the means of many subsidized housing residents.

The somewhat lower ratings given by subsidized housing residents to overall community livability were due to the relatively low livability ratings given by Columbia and Reston respondents; in the three other new communities, Forest Park, Jonathan, and Lake Havasu City, differences in livability ratings given by subsidized housing residents and nonsubsidized housing residents were not significantly different. Twenty-nine percent fewer Columbia subsidized housing than nonsubsidized housing residents (54% vs. 83%) rated Columbia as an excellent or good place to live. Seventeen percent fewer Reston subsidized housing than nonsubsidized housing residents (78% vs. 95%) rated Reston as an excellent or good place to live. The greater dissatisfaction of subsidized housing residents in these communities was not due to differential perceptions of the quality of community facilities and services, which tended to receive similar ratings from both groups of residents. Instead, subsidized housing residents tended to rate community livability lower because they were much less likely to be satisfied with the livability of their homes and neighborhoods. Both of these factors, of course, are tied more to FHA standards for subsidized housing (and the cost constraints mentioned above) than to the design decisions of new community planners.

B. Majority Perspectives

Improvements achieved as a result of the move to a new community and residents' evaluations of housing, neighborhood, and community attributes indicate that the racial and income integration of new communities has been highly beneficial to minority residents. The question we now address is whether integration is acceptable to the majority of new community residents who are neither black nor poor. To explore this question new community respondents and respondents living in the paired conventional communities were asked whether the

construction of housing for moderate-income (\$5,000-\$10,000) white and black families within one-half mile of their homes would harm their neighborhoods. The responses to this question are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

ATTITUDES TOWARD NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRATION OF MODERATE-INCOME (\$5,000-\$10,000) WHITE AND BLACK FAMILIES

		Percent of Respondents Who Reported that Their Neighborhood Would Be Harmed by Housing within One-Half Mile for Moderate-Income:			
		White Families		Black Families	
New Communities/Conventional Communities	Paired Conventional Communities	New Community Respondents	Conventional Community Respondents	New Community Respondents	Conventional Community Respondents
New Communities with Subsidized Housing and/or Five Percent or More Black Population					
Columbia/Norbeck-Wheaton		10	35*	12	47*
Forest Park/Sharonville		24	16	38	50
Jonathan/Chanhassen		4	19*	6	35*
Lake Havasu City/Kingman		8	9	46	44
Park Forest/Lansing		16	35*	31	72*
Park Forest South/Richton Park		19	18	25	37*
Reston/West Springfield		15	28*	19	40*
Sharpstown/Southwest Houston		30	58*	46	73*
New Communities without Subsidized Housing and with Less Than Five Percent Black Population					
Elk Grove Village/Schaumburg		35	39	50	53
Foster City/West San Mateo		44	45	51	59*
Irvine/Fountain Valley		48	45	55	55
Laguna Niguel/Dana Point		45	36	62	54
North Palm Beach/Tequesta		40	31	75	68
Valencia/Bouquet Canyon		45*	30*	56	55
Westlake Village/Agoura-Malibu Junction		50	51	63	57

*Difference between new community and paired conventional community statistically significant at .05 level of confidence.

The first two data columns in Table 6 compare the proportions of new community and conventional community respondents who thought that housing for moderate-income white families would harm their neighborhoods. The third and fourth data columns compare the proportions of new community and conventional community respondents who thought that housing for moderate-income black families would harm their neighborhoods. The new communities are divided into two groups. The eight new communities listed at the top of the table (Columbia through Sharpstown) are those with subsidized housing and/or those in which black households comprised five percent or more of the population. The seven new communities listed in the bottom half of the table (Elk Grove Village through Westlake Village) are those without subsidized housing and without a significant proportion of black residents.

Two important findings are illustrated by the data in Table 6. First, new community residents' tolerance of both income and racial integration is much greater in the integrated new communities. The proportion of respondents who felt that housing for moderate-income white families would harm their neighborhoods ranged from four percent to thirty percent among the integrated new communities. Among the new communities without subsidized housing and with black population of less than five percent, perceptions of harm ranged from thirty-five percent of the respondents to fifty percent. Similar results were obtained in the case of perception of harm to the neighborhood from integration by moderate-income black families. Residents tended to be much more tolerant in the integrated communities. Comparison of each new community with its paired conventional community shows that this result is not a product of regional or other contextual factors. In five out of eight cases residents of the integrated new communities were significantly more tolerant of integration by moderate-income white households than were residents living in their paired conventional communities. In six out of eight cases they were more tolerant of integration by moderate-income black families. However, in the case of the new communities without subsidized housing and without significant black populations, little difference in attitudes toward integration is apparent between the new communities and paired conventional communities.

This finding has an important implication for new community planners who are responsible for implementing a policy of income and racial integration (and for the federal officials who are charged with monitoring their efforts). The data indicate that the timing of

integration is a key consideration. The conventional wisdom regarding the timing of integration has been summarized by Gans as follows:

In part the developer's options are a function of timing. If a large number of the initial residents are of low status or darker skin, then the new town is quickly given a definite status or racial image, and this may discourage buyers of higher status who dislike that image. On the other hand, if the developer starts out with higher-status residents and can create an accordingly high-status image for the town, he may find it easier to subsequently bring in minority people.²⁷

The present data sharply contradict this supposition. Instead, they suggest that new community residents either self-select themselves into communities which correspond to their previous attitudes about living in integrated communities or that they undergo a change of attitude through successful contact with black and lower-income residents.

If racial integration and the introduction of subsidized housing are delayed, or if the potential for population heterogeneity is not apparent to initial residents, they may resist later attempts at integration. In fact, this has actually occurred in five of the study new communities (Elk Grove Village, Foster City, Irvine, Laguna Niguel and North Palm Beach) where local governments were used to defeat or stifle proposals to build moderate-income housing.²⁸ On the other hand, by marketing a balanced community and introducing subsidized housing and encouraging racial integration at an early point in the development process, a much more tolerant population is likely to settle in the community, which should make the achievement of even greater integration and balance a feasible undertaking.²⁹

27. Gans, *supra* note 4, at 143-44.

28. To date, Irvine, for example, still has no low-income housing, and moderate-income housing is available only in rental apartments. Nevertheless, of 8,000 units planned for a new village in Irvine, slated for opening in June, 1976, 10 percent are to be moderate-income housing. Letter from Martin A. Brower, *supra* note 14.

29. This assumes, of course, that a sufficient pool of tolerant families exists in the new community market area. Unfortunately, there are not sufficient data to test this assumption. It should be noted, however, that most studies indicate that housing value for money expended, community services, and environmental quality are more important family residential location determinants than racial homogeneity preferences. For a summary of this literature see Millen, *Factors Affecting Racial Mixing in Residential Areas*, in *SEGREGATION IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS* 148-71 (A. Hawley & V. Rock eds. 1973). There is also evidence available indicating that desegregation is a cumulative process for both races. That is, the more intergroup contact which occurs, the more favorable are attitudes toward increased integration (assuming the contacts have been successful, which should be the case in new communities). For example, Pettigrew has written, "Interracial

The second major finding revealed by the data in Table 6 is the indicated presence of racial discrimination in new community and conventional community residents' attitudes toward integration. For example, in eight new communities (North Palm Beach, Westlake Village, Laguna Niguel, Elk Grove Village, Sharpstown, Forest Park, Lake Havasu City and Park Forest) the proportion of respondents who perceived harm to their neighborhoods from moderate-income black families was significantly higher than the proportion who perceived harm from moderate-income white families. In three other new communities (Foster City, Irvine and Valencia) differences in perceptions of harm from white and black moderate-income families were not statistically significant, but a large proportion of the respondents (more than 40%) perceived harm from both groups of moderate-income residents. In fact, the residents of only four new communities were highly tolerant (25% or less perceived harm to their neighborhoods) of both income and racial integration. These four new communities, Columbia, Jonathan, Park Forest South and Reston, are the ones noted above that have pursued an open marketing policy and have widely advertised their goals for social balance from the start of development. Again, this suggests that for successful integration through new community development, integration must be pursued as early as possible in the development process.³⁰

living will itself effectively erode racial opposition to open housing to the degree that it is characterized by . . . four situational criteria: equal status of the groups in the situation, common goals, group interdependence, and social sanctions." Pettigrew, *Attitudes on Race and Housing: A Social-Psychological View*, in *SEGREGATION IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS*, *supra*, at 180. Thus, the available evidence from other studies tends to support the contention that early integration of new communities is desirable and can facilitate increased integration over time.

30. Although integration of moderate-income white and black households has been shown to be feasible in practice and in terms of majority attitudes, neither racial nor income integration by poorer households (annual incomes of less than \$5,000) is acceptable to most new community residents. For example, there were only three new communities in which less than half of the respondents thought that their neighborhoods would be harmed by housing for low-income white families within one-half mile of their homes — Jonathan (26% perceived harm); Columbia (38% perceived harm); and Reston (49% perceived harm). Between 60 and 70 percent of the respondents of three new communities (Lake Havasu City, Park Forest South, and Park Forest) thought that their neighborhoods would be harmed by poor white families; in three others (Sharpstown, Foster City, and Forest Park) between 70 and 80 percent thought that poor white families would harm their neighborhoods; and in six new communities (Elk Grove Village, Irvine, Laguna Niguel, North Palm Beach, Valencia and Westlake Village) 80 percent or more of the respondents thought that their neighborhoods would be harmed. As might be expected, perception of harm from low-income black families was even more widespread. Opposition to low-income housing was paralleled by an almost total lack of such housing in the study new communities.

IV. NEW COMMUNITIES AS LOCATIONS FOR SUBURBAN INTEGRATION

In the preceding sections we have shown that suburban racial and income integration has been occurring in new communities, that integration seems desirable from the perspectives of minority residents, and that it is feasible in terms of majority attitudes. However, if priority is to be given to new communities as locations for suburban integration and if continued federal aid is to be channeled to new communities for this purpose, it must also be shown that new communities are preferable to other suburban communities as sites for integration. As noted by Gans, "Any policy calling for a large number of poor people to move into new towns . . . requires large subsidies for them. This raises the question of whether the subsidies are worth the benefits, and whether they could not be better spent elsewhere."³¹ HUD's Office of Program Analysis and Evaluation has concluded that particular benefits that might justify federal subsidies to integrated new communities include demonstration effects which indicate to other suburban communities that racial and income integration can be successful, as well as direct benefits to black and low- and moderate-income households stemming from access to better quality housing and higher levels of services and facilities than they could attain in other suburban locations.³²

Although demonstration effects cannot be illustrated by the data collected for this study, the widespread publicity given to successfully integrated new communities, such as Columbia, Jonathan, and Reston, suggests that they may be substantial. Our data do indicate, however, that new communities can provide better living environments for blacks and for low- and moderate-income residents of subsidized housing than they could reasonably expect to attain in available conventional suburban communities.

In addition to interviews with special subsamples of blacks and subsidized housing residents living in new communities, interviews were conducted in two suburban communities with large black populations living in predominantly black middle-class residential subdivisions. These two included the Carmody Hills subdivision bordering Seat Pleasant, seven miles from downtown Washington, D.C., in suburban Prince George's County, Maryland, and a predominantly black subdivision in Markham, Illinois, twenty-two miles south of Chicago's Loop. Conventional community subsidized

31. Gans, *supra* note 4, at 155.

32. OFFICE OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION, *supra* note 18, at 69-70.

housing residents interviewed included residents living in an FHA Section 235 single-family-detached subdivision in Richton Park, Illinois (located adjacent to Park Forest and Park Forest South), and the residents of three FHA Section 236 rental apartment projects near Laurel, Maryland, located seventeen miles northwest of Washington, D.C., in Prince George's County.³³

The data summarized in Table 7 compare housing, neighborhood and community evaluations of new community and conventional community black and subsidized housing residents. In general, residence in a new community or in a conventional community had relatively little impact on satisfaction with housing and neighborhood livability. The housing livability evaluations of new community and conventional community black and subsidized housing homeowners and renters were not significantly different. Reflecting FHA standards and cost constraints, there was also little difference between new community and conventional community subsidized housing residents' satisfaction with their immediate neighborhoods. New community black homeowners, on the other hand, were more satisfied with some aspects of their neighborhoods, including convenience, reputation, safety, upkeep and overall neighborhood livability.

The major benefits to blacks and subsidized housing residents from residence in a new community rather than a conventional suburban community were in the satisfactions they derived from various community facilities and the community as a whole. For example, in comparison with conventional community black residents, blacks living in new communities gave higher ratings to recreational facilities, schools, shopping facilities and to overall community livability. Thirty-eight percent more new community than conventional community black residents rated their community as an excellent or good place to live and almost fifty percent more said they would recommend their community to a friend or relative as a particularly good place to move to.

33. Although the black residents of the two conventional communities had above average family incomes (62% had incomes of \$15,000 or more per year), in comparison with new community black residents, they tended to be somewhat older, more likely to be working in blue-collar occupations, and to have ended their formal education with high school graduation. These distinguishing characteristics remained after differences in tenure (owning versus renting) were controlled. The subsidized housing residents of the two conventional communities tended to be somewhat younger than subsidized housing residents of new communities (83% vs. 64% were under age 35), but these two groups of subsidized housing residents did not differ significantly in terms of household composition, education, occupational status, income or race.

Table 7
EVALUATIONS OF HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY:
NEW COMMUNITIES vs. CONVENTIONAL SUBURBAN COMMUNITIES

Evaluation	Percent of Respondents			
	Black		Subsidized Housing	
	New Community Respondents ^a	Conventional Community Respondents ^b	New Community Respondents ^c	Conventional Community Respondents ^d
<u>Dwelling Unit Evaluations</u>				
Single-family-detached homeowners:				
Enough indoor space	81	89	62	63
Enough outdoor space	86	87	80	88
Outdoor privacy available	47	58	44*	19
Completely satisfied with overall livability	44	36	20	34
Apartment renters:				
Enough indoor space	73	e	64	71
Enough outdoor space	80	e	71	70
Outdoor privacy available	24	e	22	18
Completely satisfied with overall livability	52	e	18	21
<u>Neighborhood Evaluations^f</u>				
Single-family-detached homeowners:				
Attractiveness	57	45	16	15
Convenience	60*	38	42	32
Friendliness	47	38	44	48
Good reputation	74*	44	35	24
Privacy	57	48	29	37
Safety	55*	25	46	49
Upkeep	61*	42	29	29
Completely satisfied with overall livability	63*	43	31	34
Apartment renters:				
Attractiveness	38	e	16	18
Convenience	40	e	49	32
Friendliness	34	e	37	24
Good reputation	42	e	18	21
Privacy	48	e	37	32
Safety	35	e	23	18
Upkeep	45	e	24	32
Completely satisfied with overall livability	37	e	28	12
<u>Community Evaluations</u>				
Health care facilities and services:				
Better than previous community	27	24	35*	19
Rated excellent or good	56*	22	51	44
Satisfied with community expenditures for public health facilities	43	68*	45	40

Table 7 (continued)

Evaluation	Percent of Respondents			
	Black		Subsidized Housing	
	New Community Respondents ^a	Conventional Community Respondents ^b	New Community Respondents ^c	Conventional Community Respondents ^d
Recreational facilities and services:				
Better than previous community	63*	33	74*	37
Rated excellent or good	67*	26	73*	31
Satisfied with community expenditures for outdoor recreation	43	68*	45	40
Schools:				
Better than previous community	66*	50	59*	37
Rated excellent or good	81*	64	76	75
Satisfied with community expenditures for public schools	54	54	58	62
Shopping facilities and services:				
Better than previous community	54*	39	42	42
Rated excellent or good	74*	54	43	51
Transportation facilities and services:				
Ease of getting around community better than previous community	44*	27	60*	32
Satisfied with community expenditures for public transportation	46	66*	43	31
Overall community livability:				
Community rated as an excellent or good place to live	86*	48	79*	53
Community would be recommended to a friend or relative as a particularly good place to move to	84*	35	71*	35
Believe community will be a better place to live in five years	43*	30	41	49
Number of respondents	280	183	275	130

*Difference between evaluations by new community and conventional community respondents statistically significant at .05 level of confidence.

^aSubsample of black residents in five new communities: Columbia, Forest Park, Park Forest, Park Forest South and Reston.

^bSample of black residents in two conventional suburban communities: Seat Pleasant, Md., and Markham, Ill.

^cSubsample of subsidized housing residents in five new communities: Columbia, Forest Park, Jonathan, Lake Havasu City and Reston.

^dSample of subsidized housing residents in two conventional suburban communities: Richton Park, Ill., and Laurel, Md.

^eBlack residents interviewed in conventional suburban communities were all residents of single-family-detached homes.

^fHighest rating on five-point scale. Neighborhood was defined for respondents as "the area near here which you can see from your front door — that is, the five or six homes

In comparison with conventional community subsidized housing residents, subsidized housing residents of new communities gave higher ratings to health care facilities, recreational facilities, schools and transportation facilities. Twenty-seven percent more new community than conventional community subsidized housing residents rated their community as an excellent or good place to live, while thirty-six percent more said they would recommend their community to a friend or relative as a particularly good place to move to.

In summary, new communities provided better suburban living environments for minority residents than the comparison conventional suburbs.

CONCLUSIONS

In its 1974 report, the United States Commission on Civil Rights wrote:

Despite a plethora of far-reaching remedial legislation, a dual housing market continues today in most metropolitan areas across the United States. Inadequate enforcement by Federal agencies and circumvention or, at best, lip-service adherence by local authorities, builders, real estate agents, and others involved in the development of suburban communities have helped to perpetuate the systematic exclusion of minorities and low-income families. The result has been the growth of overwhelmingly white, largely affluent suburbs, and the concurrent deterioration of central cities, overburdened by inordinately large and constantly increasing percentages of poor and minority residents.³⁴

Obviously, new community development cannot serve as the sole means of overcoming this critical national problem. A number of efforts are underway across the nation to open up the suburbs to black and other minority residents, and to increase the supply of suburban housing for low- and moderate-income households.³⁵ Although some will achieve success in varying degrees, the many obstacles that have been encountered in integrating the suburbs require the use of all available strategies.

The data summarized in this Article show that new community development can be an effective means of integrating suburban areas.

34. U.S. COMM'N ON CIVIL RIGHTS, *EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN SUBURBIA* 64 (1974).

35. Many of these programs are reviewed and evaluated in Rubinowitz, *A Question of Choice: Access of the Poor and the Black to Suburban Housing*, in *THE URBANIZATION OF THE SUBURBS* 329-66 (L. Masotti & J. Hadden eds. 1973).

Contrary to the views of some writers, privately developed new communities have begun to achieve modest amounts of both racial and income integration.³⁶ Substantially greater integration will occur in new communities assisted under the Urban Growth and New Community Development Act of 1970.³⁷ Integrated new communities have demonstrated that racial and income integration can be successful in the same communities at the same time. New communities have shown that integration can result in a number of improvements in the living conditions of black and low- and moderate-income residents and that integration need not result in greater hostility toward integration among majority residents. In fact, residents of integrated new communities tend to be more tolerant of neighborhood racial and income integration than residents of communities that are not integrated. Finally, it appears that new communities are providing better living environments for blacks and low- and moderate-income households than conventional suburban communities.

Unfortunately, new communities in the United States are now in peril. As a result of the national economic recession which began in 1973, the pace of new community development has dramatically slowed. Very few wholly private new town ventures have been announced during the past two years. Because of mounting financial problems, on January 14, 1975, the Department of Housing and Urban Development's New Communities Administration ceased accepting applications for assistance under the federal new communities program.³⁸ The entire federal new communities effort is being re-evaluated by both the Administration and the Congress. The research presented in this Article strongly supports the resumption and strengthening of federal support for new community development as one of the more promising means for supporting a national commitment to increase housing options for minorities and to improve the residential living conditions of low- and moderate-income groups.

36. *Ed. Note:* The director of Public Affairs for Gulf Reston, Inc. recently stated, "Out of a total of 9,759 completed residential units today in Reston, we have a total of 843 subsidized units with an additional 626 more under construction, or, in the approval process. This means that by 1978, low and moderate living units will be 15% of the total mix: one of Reston's original primary targets!"

Letter from Peter L. McCandless, Director of Pub. Affairs, Gulf Reston, Inc., to the *Urban Law Annual*, Feb. 20, 1976. A spokesperson from Columbia also reports modest success at racial and income integration, with 6 percent or 3,226 people currently living in subsidized housing. Letter from Lesa Borg, Marketing Dep't, The Howard Research & Dev. Corp., to the *Urban Law Annual*, Feb. 19, 1976. See also Wash. Post, Jan. 19, 1976, §B, at 1, col. 4.

37. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4501-32 (1970), as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4512, 4514-16, 4519 (Supp. IV, 1974).

38. 3 Land Use Planning Rpts. No. 3, Jan. 20, 1975, at 4.

