Historical Context of Racist Planning

How land use planning segregated Portland

Institutional / Explicit
Policies which explicitly discriminate against a group.

Example: Police department refusing to hire people of color.

Institutional / Implicit
Policies that negatively impact one group unintentionally.

Example: Police department focusing on street-level drug arrests.

Individual / Explicit
Prejudice in action – discrimination.

Example: Police officer calling someone an ethnic slur while arresting them.

Individual / Implicit
Unconscious attitudes and beliefs.

Example: Police officer calling for back-up more often when stopping a person of color.
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule

“Recipients also must take actions to address segregation and related barriers for groups with characteristics protected by the Act, as often reflected in racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty.”

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, “Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing; Final Rule” Related to the Fair Housing Act

Key Points in Portland’s Racist Planning History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1900-1930</th>
<th>Early Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Portland’s first zoning code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s-1980</td>
<td>Expansion of single-family zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>The Fair Housing Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Population Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-2000</td>
<td>Contemporary Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Portland’s first Comprehensive Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-2000</td>
<td>Annexation of East Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Albina Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Outer Southeast Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Southwest Community Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early Zoning - 1900 to 1930

1917
Buchanan v. Warley,

• Some U.S. cities created separate areas for black and white households

• This practice was overturned by the Supreme Court in Buchanan vs. Warley

• Still, cities ways to continue to segregate through zoning.

Early Zoning - 1900 to 1930

Racially Restrictive Covenants

Racist covenant on property in Laurelhurst, 1913
Early Zoning - 1900 to 1930

Concentration of Black Households in Albina

Source: OPB
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Early Zoning - 1900 to 1930

1924 Portland’s First Zoning Code

Zone I - Single Family
Single-family Zoning 1930s to 1980s

1937 Redlining (& Greenlining)

Albina Redlined

Kings Heights Greenlined
Single-family Zoning 1930s to 1980s

1943 Portland Improvement Plan

1959 Portland Zoning Code
- Single-family expanded.
- Duplexes & apartments reduced.

Federal and State changes - 1950 to 1980

Prohibiting housing discrimination
- 1958 Oregon Fair Housing Act
- 1968 U.S. Fair Housing Act

New models of community development
- 1966 U.S. Model Cities Program (Used in Albina)

Oregon land use system
- 1973 Oregon SB100

Addressing impacts of redlining
- 1977 U.S. Community Reinvestment Act
Contemporary Planning - 1980 to 2000s

1977 Population Strategy

“Increasingly the city is becoming a community of extremes, populated by the young and the old, the lower income and unemployed, minorities and renters.”

- Goal to reverse “white flight”
- Prioritized interests of educated, employed, middle class families
- Guided the 1980 Comprehensive Plan

Contemporary Planning - 1980 to 2000s

1980 Comprehensive Plan

Inner SE Portland, pre 1980 Comp Plan
Contemporary Planning - 1980 to 2000s

1980s Community Planning Program

Disparate Treatment: Albina vs. Southwest
Contemporary Planning - 1980 to 2000s

• 2000 Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area Plan

• Goal #6 of the Housing Strategy:
  “Increase the housing stability of existing residents and **protect them from involuntary displacement caused by gentrification**, increases in housing costs and loss of housing choices.”

• Goal to produce 2,000 units of affordable housing in the area.

• The City **failed** to implement these anti-displacement goals.
Racial Equity in Planning - Current Era

VisionPDX, 2008
Engaged community members, particularly underrepresented groups, in shared vision of Portland

The Portland Plan, 2012
Set achieving equitable outcomes and addressing long-standing racial disparities as the foundation.

“The benefits of growth and change are equitably shared across our communities.”

Regional Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, 2011

• City of Portland, City of Gresham, and Multnomah County
• Fair housing complaints, demographics, mortgage data, zoning, and land use policies

• Findings:
  • Single-family zoning contributes to overwhelmingly high white student body at Alameda Elementary and Grant High School
  • Low-income residents and communities of color concentrated in low opportunity areas
City’s Response: New practices and investments

- Fair Housing Advocacy Committee - Portland Housing Bureau
- Annual State of Housing report - Portland Housing Bureau
- Preference policy for Northeast Portland - Portland Housing Bureau
- Opportunity mapping - Portland Housing Bureau
- Housing Bond - Portland Housing Bureau
- Landlord discrimination testing - Portland Housing Bureau
- Rental Services Commission, Rental Services Office - Portland Housing Bureau
- Tax Exemption Program changes - Portland Housing Bureau
- Inclusionary Housing - Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Racial Equity in Planning - Current Era

2035 Comprehensive Plan (2016)

5.10: Fair housing programs
5.11: Remove barriers
5.12: Impact analysis

3.3.f: Coordinate housing, economic development, and public facility plans and investments to create an integrated community development approach to restore communities impacted by past decisions.
Persistent patterns of inequity

Racially Concentrated Areas of Affluence

Legend

- 1927 Zone I Areas
- Percentage of White Population (Highest 2 Quintiles)
- City Boundary

Persistent patterns of inequity

Percent Household living at 140% MFI and greater (2015)

- 0% - 16.9%
- 17% - 27.5%
- 27.6% - 39.3%
- 39.4% - 54.6%
- 54.7% - 81.2%
Persistent patterns of inequity

Households Vulnerable to Housing Insecurity
- Renter households
- Low-income households (0-80% MFI)
- People of color
- Lacking four-year degree

Housing Insecurity Risk Score
- 0 - 4
- 5 - 9
- 10 - 13
- 14 - 16

Average Mortgage Interest Deduction (MID), per Claimant

Legend
- Average MID, per claimant (2016)
  - $5,814.29 - $7,265.38
  - $7,265.39 - $8,314.78
  - $8,314.79 - $9,810.39
  - $9,810.40 - $11,473.81
  - $11,473.82 - $14,004.88
- City Boundary
Persistent patterns of inequity

Change in Home Value for 1937 Neighborhood Rating

On average, a Black Portland household could not afford to purchase a home without becoming cost burdened and spending more than 30% of their monthly income on housing, not including taxes, insurance, or utilities.
Conclusion

The legacy of past policy is still present.

- Current zoning patterns still **benefit privileged white homeowners** more than others,
- They reinforce past **harm to the Black community** from exclusion and speculation.
- They reflect the lost opportunity for Black households to **build inter-generational wealth**.

Conclusion

Today, **exclusion in some areas contributes to displacement in others**.

- **Zoning changes are needed** to mitigate growing housing cost burdens and create economically accessible, high opportunity neighborhoods.
- **Zoning changes are not enough alone** to undo historical inequities.
Conclusion

Pursue equitable community development:

• Partner with community and those impacted by displacement on these strategies.

• Use cross bureau strategies to grow, make needed improvements and mitigate displacement.

• Finish addressing old zoning patterns that create barriers to equitable citywide outcomes.

• Get those that benefited most from past policy to join in this work.

“Hold the City, County, and Metro accountable for the HUD mandate to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing by **ending racial segregation from opportunity**, providing community development and investment **without displacement**.”

The People’s Plan, PAALF, 2017
Questions

1. What is compelling about this history?
2. What do you want to learn more about?
3. What does this mean for your organization?
4. How can we use this knowledge in our work?