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Executive Summary

This project was developed by the Center for Housing and Community Studies (CHCS) in response to a request by City of High Point NC to conduct a “housing market segmentation” study for the purposes of providing data for prioritizing redevelopment and revitalization of the Core City of High Point, an area that has been plagued with blighted empty lots, vacant buildings, substandard housing, and whose residents have long experienced a lack of opportunity. The focus of this project is on three important and interrelated facets of housing in the Core City: the physical state of housing; the socio-demographic condition of neighborhoods; and the overall opportunity presented by careful market analysis.

While the existence of vacant and abandoned properties is often indicative of economic distress and disinvestment in a neighborhood, these properties must also be approached as more than just a symptom of these forces. Property abandonment is also a cause of disinvestment. Once there are a few vacant and abandoned properties in a neighborhood a cycle of disinvestment and decline sets in. This makes it vitally important to target investment and redevelopment efforts in areas with high concentrations of such properties. By definition, distressed properties present the surrounding communities with a variety of problems that have been divided into three general categories.

The areas under study in the Core City are some of the most segregated and impoverished neighborhoods in High Point. Poverty plays a significant part in ethnic segregation. Geospatial analysis of the region shows a picture of concentrations of poverty which intersect with concentrations of race/ethnic minorities resulting in an intergenerational lack of opportunity and little chance of upward social mobility. For example, segregated and impoverished areas result in “zones of denial” for mortgage applications, making it very difficult for those seeking to purchase affordable homes to obtain a mortgage. Such residential concentrations of a particular ethnic group combined with high rates of poverty may lead to the designation by the federal government as racial or ethnic concentrations of poverty or an “R/ECAP.” A third of the neighborhoods in this study have been designated as R/ECAPs. R/ECAPs are accompanied by factors that have negative consequences for the health of individuals and families. Five neighborhoods have greater than 61% of the population living in poverty. Many of the poorest neighborhoods have only limited access to amenities such as good schools, health care, or affordable and nutritious foods. Access to retail shopping and high quality child care is also quite limited in most of these areas. Combined with the relative lack of extensive public transit systems, persons living in such areas are greatly disadvantaged. Concentrated poverty itself becomes a significant impediment to fair housing choice because those living in such areas must spend far more time and money in order to purchase groceries or medicine, find opportunities for entertainment, or place their children in day care while working. Since employment opportunities are also limited in such areas, residents must commute outside their residential communities for virtually all of their daily needs.
Comprehensive housing market segmentation analysis involves consideration of a wide variety of economic, sociocultural, geographic and structural variables. Multiple statistical models exist for evaluating and predicting price movements and for identifying trouble spots in urban areas which might benefit from targeted redevelopment efforts and public investment. However, High Point is a unique city with unique needs, strengths and weaknesses. Many of the models and general suggestions from experts regarding urban renewal efforts are easily adaptable to the unique qualities of the High Point core city area; but, determining the optimum strategies that might garner the greatest return on investment and effort will require careful planning and tailoring of solutions.

Recurring Themes in Previous Studies

The City of High Point has made many plans to restore and redevelop housing while maintaining vibrancy and character that the city has been known for since the 1920s. Despite these efforts, longstanding areas of concern have persisted. While there have been a variety of issues and approaches noted in redevelopment plans since the 1960s, several themes have emerged in the review.

Funding

Discussions regarding the necessity of continued funding for proposed development projects have been ongoing since at least the 1980s. Understandably, a lack of funding can clearly stall redevelopment efforts and thus is a necessary concern. However, utilization of allocated funds must also be addressed. Underutilization of funds in previous years may be related to unrealistic plan/program expectations, incorrect areas of focus, or additional needs in terms of program oversight, or any number of other issues. However, a continued effort should be made to ensure that funds are allocated and used in the most effective manner to meet the goals and objectives of adopted plans.

Vacant/Substandard Housing

Commissioned reports since the 1960s have clearly indicated an ongoing concern regarding vacant and substandard housing. However, comparisons amongst reports and data collected by the Center for Housing and Community Studies in 2015 indicate that vacant and substandard housing has not improved, and appears to have spread and/or further deteriorated in some cases. This continued focus implies that vacant and substandard housing has not been adequately addressed throughout the years in the City of High Point. Further, neighborhoods will continue to deteriorate if current implementation and tactics to address poor housing conditions and vacancies are not modified.

Code Enforcement

Code enforcement has been addressed in each plan reviewed since the 1960s to address the condition of housing stock in High Point. While some plans have proposed relatively general ideas, other plans have made more specific recommendations, such as assigning individual inspectors to specific areas with concerns. Despite these continued recommendations, there is no evidence of how, or if, these recommendations have been acted upon. Additionally, many plans have outlined the need for demolitions of structures (residential, commercial, and/or industrial) that are unsuitable for rehabilitation; a priority on code enforcement would likely assist in collecting information regarding
substandard properties that may require demolition. A focus on code enforcement may also provide needed context for any necessary modifications to existing codes and ordinances, should the need exist.

**Best Practices in Development**

In reviewing best practices in mid-small town redevelopment efforts, a few patterns become clear. The most successful redevelopment strategies undertake an integrated approach that addresses three areas: housing, infrastructure, and business interests. These plans are innovative, and take advantage of the assets that already exist in the community. Developers who are able to make use of CDBG, Brownfield, and other federal funding sources to rehabilitate properties can expand and maintain affordable, adequate housing. It is especially important to stabilize residential neighborhoods and central business districts by promoting ownership and investment in these areas. An underlying theme in all of the successful revitalization efforts is community involvement, whether in the form of business owners or homeowners. Finding ways to encourage people to become active members in their community and providing opportunities to become community stakeholders to those who have previously lacked such means are vitally important aspects of all of these plans. Infrastructure improvements are equally important in these endeavors because they facilitate both accessibility and aesthetic appeal of the residential and commercial districts.

Future redevelopment and revitalization efforts should especially take note of the strategies that have been employed in the North Carolina cities of Asheville, Hendersonville, and Jacksonville. Each city had its own reasons for falling into decline and each plan had its own strengths. Asheville and Hendersonville heavily emphasized the work of local business owners and encouraged these economic stakeholders to invest in their own core city areas as a way to improve conditions. The neighborhood action plan in Jacksonville much more heavily tackled the issues related to deteriorating housing stock. The Main Street approach offers a useful framework as well, especially when incorporated in such a way that capitalizes on

---

**REVITALIZATION MEASURE**

1. Stimulating development via public-sector funding
2. Streetscape and facade improvement programs
3. Erection of public buildings
4. Solving transportation and parking issues
5. Restoration of natural amenities
6. Increased marketing and event planning
the assets of each individual community and highlights the unique, historical character of a region. Revitalization efforts in High Point may do well to blend the strengths of these planning strategies in a way that would maximize impact.

Secondary Data Analysis

The data collected in the parcel assessment was matched with current data from the City of High Point (lists of condemned, vacant, and nuisance buildings, crime data, public services data, etc.) as well as information on community economic, demographic, and social conditions. ArcGIS was used to produce maps showing the Core City overlaid with geospatial data from various sources including: National Sources: American Housing Survey, Decennial Census, American Community Survey, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), US Postal Service, ESRI data, HUD Tools, etc. Local Jurisdictional Sources: Guilford County tax records, Foreclosures (registrar of deeds), Crime data, Housing code enforcement data, Utility shut-offs, etc. Univariate and bivariate descriptive statistics were also generated using SPSS and are reported in the section entitled “Secondary Data Analysis.”

Highlights

Population

- The average number of persons per square mile among all High Point Core City Census block groups is 964.
- In the core city area of High Point (total population 30,879), the percentage of African-American residents was 47.7%; White, non-Hispanic residents was 40.2%; Asian residents was 4.6% and all other race/ethnic combinations including multi-racial was 7.5% (ACS 2014 5-year, 2010-2014).
- The estimated percent of foreign born residents for all Census block groups is 11.8%.
- The percentage of residents 18 years old or younger across all core city Census block groups is approximately 24.7%.
- The percentage of residents 65 years old or older across all core city block groups is approximately 13.5%.
- Over a fifth (22.5%) of residents moved in the last year.

Economics

- The median household income for all of Guilford County is approximately $45,400
- Nearly a third (29%) of residents had less than high school educational attainment; 31.6%. a high school diploma or GED; 26% some college level education or a two year degree; 10.2% a 4 year degree; and 3.8% post-graduate or professional school.

Housing

- The lowest concentrations of vacant properties are located in the central northwestern quadrant of the Core City area. The largest concentrations of vacant housing units are located roughly along a circular periphery of block groups surrounding the central core city.
- More than half (59%) of units are renter occupied.
• The neighborhoods with the lowest rates of owner-occupancy are concentrated in the center of
the Core City.
• The estimated average city core rent was $648 monthly.
• Taxes are delinquent on 7.6% of parcels.

Parcel-level Assessments
The Center for Housing and Community Studies conducted primary data collection in the form of a
parcel-level housing stock assessment for the Core City of High Point using Loveland Technologies
software. CHCS collected data on over 15,000 parcels in the nine Census Tracts (32 Block Groups) of the
Core City. The remote external assessment tool was used to enumerated the number and condition of
the parcels indicating if they were occupied, vacant, abandoned, and the condition of structures on the
properties. Descriptive statistics were generated for each of the factors documented and are provided in
the section entitled “Parcel Assessments.”

Highlights
• Of the total parcels surveyed nearly one-in five lots was vacant. Vacant lots are missed
opportunities for tax revenue as without improvement, they are valued much less.
• In the Core City of High Point, 1,425.42 acres total were vacant. The combined tax value of these
vacant lots is currently $99,448,500 (excluding publicly owned and non-taxed land).
• Most structures in the Core City were designated as residential (83.4%), followed by commercial
(8.4%), industrial (4.7%), and institutional 2.8%.
• Of residential parcels, 1% (118) were apartments, 2.7% (335) were multi-family residences,
76.9% (9,409) were single-family residences, and 3.4% (415) were townhouses or
condominiums.
• Most 90.3% (11,131) appeared to be occupied. Unoccupied properties had a combined taxable
value $40,254,325. Many of these homes are also tax delinquent.
• Out of total structures surveyed (n=12,323), 29.1% (3,586) were reported as showing signs of
deterioration or damage: 21.7% (2,674) were rated as fair, and 5.2% (643) were rated as poor.
For .3% (31) of this sample, the surveyor suggested demolition for the structure.
• Few structures showed fire damage: 3.1% (110) structures had superficial fire damage, 1.2%
(43) had moderate fire damage, and .6% (22) had major fire damage.

Market Segmentation
In the final stage, data from our primary collections efforts were matched with other sources to create a
geospatial market segmentation index. Market segmentation is a process of analysis that divides an area
by natural geographic bounds as well as by demographic, social, economic, political, and cultural
divisions. We added these scores to our Geographic Information System to provide a housing stock
profile for the City of High Point and used in the section entitled “Neighborhood Summaries.”
FIGURE 1 - MARKET SEGMENTATION HIGH POINT

Stable markets
Functioning markets
Constrained markets
Weak markets
Extremely weak markets

Pct. Substandard

- Less than 9.8
- 9.8 to 23.6
- 23.7 to 33.2
- 33.3 to 39.8
- Greater than 39.8
Stable Markets

Stable neighborhoods were all located in the northwest of the City Core. Median home values are high, vacancy rates are low, and homeownership is high. Few homes are rated substandard and few lots are empty.

- **137.4** This neighborhood needs little more than continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. High Point Country Club dominates much of the acreage as do a few large homes with 5-15 acre parcels. A few vacant lots scattered about the neighborhood present opportunities for limited infill. The area lacks racial/ethnic and social class diversity. High property values and little available land limit the possibilities for income stratification.
- **137.5** This neighborhood is stable. It needs continued code enforcement, active neighborhood associations, and in the eastern and southern ends, possible targeted rehabilitation of some properties. There are a few vacant lots and substandard structures scattered about the neighborhood presenting some opportunity for infill. Due to lower property values, more rental, and more availability of properties it may present an opportunity for targeted racial/ethnic and social class diversification.
- **137.1** This neighborhood needs continued code enforcement, active neighborhood associations, and targeted rehabilitation of properties and vacant lots especially to the east near Main Street. Property values are quite high, but a vacancy rate of 12% and availability of a few empty lots may present an opportunity for targeted racial/ethnic and social class diversification. Some homes may qualify for historic preservation status.
- **137.2** There are very few empty lots, but the vacancy rate is relatively high. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. Property values are moderate overall, but range broadly. Modest housing on the north and east sections of the neighborhood are well-maintained in general. The high vacancy rate of 23% and availability of some empty lots may present an opportunity for further diversification.
- **137.3** This is a stable neighborhood partially due to the high rate of owner occupancy. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. There may be opportunity in the existence of some empty lots along Westchester, on Overbrook Ct., Whitehall St., Long St. and a few others scattered in the area. Substandard homes are scattered in the west and north of the neighborhood; however, there is a cluster of substandard housing in the east along Idol Street and southeast along State Ave.
- **136.24** This neighborhood is ranked as stable due to long tenures for both renters and homeowners, low vacancy rates, and low percentage of homes identified as substandard. Scattered empty lots and substandard homes present some opportunity. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. Because of affordability and the fact that over half the homes are rental, the neighborhood could easily slip in score to functional or even constrained. Home-buyer programs are encouraged. Property values are very moderate overall (many in the $40k range), though availability is very limited. At the time of this report, there were only three homes for sale in the neighborhood.
• 136.23 This neighborhood is ranked as stable due to long tenure of owners, relatively low vacancy rates, and low percentage of homes identified as substandard. Property values are moderate. Scattered empty lots and substandard homes present some opportunity for improvement and back fill. There is a possible infill opportunity on a larger scale in the contiguous vacant lots between Hamilton and Johnson Street. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. Home-repair programs are encouraged.

**Functioning Markets**

Functioning neighborhoods were all located in the north and west of the City Core. Median home values are more moderate, vacancy rates are varied, and homeownership is moderate. More homes are rated substandard and some lots are empty.

• 136.22 Empty lots and substandard homes are concentrated in the northern portion of the block group. Stabilization of this area should be a priority. There are 5 contiguous empty lots (four owned by Coggin’s JE LLC) at the end of Howard Place in the middle of the block group, presenting an opportunity for high density in-fill. High Point University has recently acquired 5 lots on Centennial. Clear plans for High Point University’s growth into the very stable area east of Armstrong Park should be discussed. There is a cluster of vacant property in the north of the neighborhood on Guilford and Howard. The City of High Point owns lots surrounding a water tower that could be used for urban gardening or other community use. Low valued and substandard homes along Putnam should be targeted for rehab and owner-occupied low-income buyer programs.

• 136.12 As a functioning market, this neighborhood needs targeted code enforcement and community action plans focused on maintaining the character of the Sherwood Place community. The ethno-racial diversity, modest home values, and long tenure of residents are strengths for this neighborhood. However, the continued expansion of High Point University may be an issue as it changes the character of the neighborhood and impacts property values. Coordination and planning between the City and University are vital.

• 136.11 As a functioning market, this neighborhood needs targeted code enforcement and community action plans focused on the few vacant or substandard properties as well as strategic home beautification identified in the housing assessments. The high vacancy rate may need addressing. Trails Crossing Condos in the center of the block group provides a high density and modestly priced housing options for owner occupancy. The ethno-racial diversity, modest home values, and long tenure of residents are strengths, but high poverty and unemployment will lead to decline as properties are not maintained and owner-occupancy declines.

• 136.02 As a functioning market, this neighborhood needs targeted code enforcement and community action plans focused on the vacant or substandard properties and strategic home beautification identified in the housing assessments. The ethno-racial diversity, modest home values, and long tenure of residents are strengths. There are 11 vacant wooded lots along the south side of E Hartley Drive that create a buffer for the neighborhood from the high traffic road and High Point University, but they may also present an opportunity for infill. In the south of this
block group there are more homes with substandard conditions. The high rental rate also may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

- 140.2 This neighborhood needs considerable focus on the high number of vacant and substandard properties. Home repair programs should be encouraged. Likewise, the highly industrial south and east of the neighborhood present concerns for health and safety as well as the value of residential properties. Strategic long-range planning should be considered. The high rental rate and high poverty rate may also lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

- 138.3 Many of the homes are rated as fair, needing mostly cosmetic work. There are a few scattered vacant lots and homes in poor condition. Home repair programs or “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. There is a 7 acres of vacant land off Montlieu Ave owned by New Bethel Baptist Church that could be a potential development site. The lack of ethno-racial diversity is concerning. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, poverty, and population decrease may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

Constrained Markets
Constrained neighborhoods encircled the downtown area. Median home values are moderate, vacancy rates are higher, and homeownership is low. Homes are rated as substandard and many more lots are empty. Poverty and unemployment is higher.

- 142.2 This fact that the neighborhood is surrounded by a public golf course could be a major asset, but recently homes have been selling in the $20k to $50k range to investor buyers. Half of the homes are rated as fair or poor. Home repair programs or “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. Most of the housing stock is 1940s and 50s and needs updating. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, high poverty, and unemployment may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

- 140.1 This neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to short tenures for both renters and home owners, high vacancy rates, and high percentage of homes identified as substandard. Scattered empty lots and homes in poor condition present opportunity. The area needs strategic investment. Empty lots across from High Point Central (owned by GCS) and a vacant block on Edgeworth and Campbell (owned by Share of North Carolina Inc.) may present development opportunities. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, high poverty, and unemployment may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

- 143.4 This neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to population decrease, vacancy and substandard parcels, low incomes, and high crime. Many contiguous empty lots present opportunity for land banking or land trusts. The area needs strategic investment. Vacant industrial should be reclaimed, demolished or rehabbed as potential housing. Owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.
• 145.12 This neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to high rental rates, high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant lots, low incomes, and high poverty. The long tenure of homeowners provides some potential stability, though less than a quarter of homes are owner-occupied. Owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs. Many contiguous empty lots in the south present opportunity for industrial development. The area needs strategic investment and planning and consideration should be given to moving from mixed residential-industrial to all industrial. In the north, a pocket of 5.6 acres owned by Guilford County is found off Chase Ave and could have residential or recreational potential. Industrial development in this area should be discouraged as housing is more concentrated.

• 138.5 This neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to high rental rates, high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant lots, extremely low incomes, and high poverty. The very long tenure of homeowners provides some potential stability, though just over a third of homes are owner-occupied. Owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs. The area needs strategic investment and planning and consideration. More than 30 empty lots (many contiguous) are readily available for infill. Continued expansion of High Point University may be an issue as it changes the character of the neighborhood and impacts property values.

• 139.3 This neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant lots, low incomes, high poverty, and very high unemployment. The very long tenure of homeowners and high rate of owner-occupancy are stabilizing factors. Home-owner repair and assistance programs should be considered. More than 30 empty lots (many contiguous) are readily available for owner-occupied infill. High density, New Urbanist development along Brentwood St may be possible and should include a supermarket or other food resource. Code enforcement needs to address vacant and unsecured properties as well as fire damaged units.

Weak Markets
Weak neighborhoods are scattered south and east of the City Core area. Median home values are low, vacancy rates are higher, and homeownership is low. Homes are rated as substandard and many lots are vacant. Poverty and unemployment is very high.

• 142.3 This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the short residential tenure. With 35% of homes having visible issues from the street, a home repair program and “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. There are many building opportunities. For example, the 15 contiguous light industrial lots along Park St. and Wheeler Ave end in four multi-family lots at the end of Wheeler. Potentially this entire block could become multifamily or high density infill. An additional 15 contiguous empty lots or more are found between E Kerns Ave and Lake Ave with access via Blair Ave. There are additional contiguous empty lots along Grace St., Pershing St. and Richlands. Easy access to the Blair Park Golf Course could help with marketing and resale value.
of new or updated homes. A recent 2006 subdivision along Macedonia Way is showing property valuations up to 3 times the average for the rest of the neighborhood indicating market potential.

- 142.1 Again, the public golf course to the west could be a major asset along with Brentwood Park and the planned community center. Yet, nearly half (45%) of the homes are rated as fair or poor. Housing stock ranges from 1920s to late 1990s, need updating. Home repair programs and “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, high poverty, and unemployment may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs. There are more than 20 vacant residential lots, some contiguous, that could be used for affordable housing.

- 138.2 This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant homes and lots, low incomes, and high poverty. Moderate home values in the north end are being pulled lower due to conditions of homes in south and west. The area needs strategic investment and planning and consideration. Contiguous empty lots at Washington and College, as well as College and Graves, present potential. New Construction replacing severely distressed properties such as that along Brooks Ave should be considered in other areas. The ten dilapidated multi-family units along Saunders Place should be considered for rehabilitation. High Point University is encroaching upon the residential areas just west of College Dr.

- 138.4 This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high substandard property levels, vacant lots, extremely low incomes, high poverty, and very high unemployment. The very short tenure of residents and high rate turn-over are destabilizing factors. The presence of a large public housing complex will severely impact market viability of other homes (rental or owner-occupied) in the neighborhood. Scheduled redevelopment of the Daniel Brooks public housing community may present a unique opportunity to redevelop the entire neighborhood.

- 143.3 This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the relatively short residential tenure. There are many building opportunities on scattered vacant properties comprising nearly a fourth of all parcels. Close proximity to downtown and to industrial and commercial jobs could make it an attractive neighborhood for younger home seekers. Plans from Southwest Renewal include this neighborhood along a proposed greenway.

- 145.11 This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to very low incomes, high poverty, high percentages of vacant parcels, low density and high transience among renters. There are many building opportunities on scattered vacant properties comprising nearly a third of all parcels; however, we advise that residential development not be a priority. Rather, the area should be allowed, or encouraged, to become all industrial. Existing housing quality should continue to be monitored by code enforcement. Current residents would be better served in affordable housing to the north in another higher-density neighborhood. Easy access to the highways and proximity to downtown could make it an attractive area for a large manufacturer.
• 139.4 This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to very high poverty, relatively high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high volatility. There are a number of scattered vacant parcels and poor condition houses in the southwest and north east of the neighborhood. Several wooded lots along Lamb or on Hoover present opportunities. The presence of nearby public housing will impact home values and may perpetuate the very high rental rate.

**Extremely Weak Markets**

Extremely Weak neighborhoods are concentrated in center of the City Core area. Median home values are the lowest, vacancy rates are highest, and rental rates are the highest. Many units are subsidized. Homes are rated as substandard and many lots are vacant. Poverty and unemployment is the highest.

• 139.2 This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to very high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. The significant amount of vacant parcels so close to downtown should present opportunity for urban high-density infill if other problems can be address (crime, resources and amenities). Along Smith St, Walnut St. and Whiteoak St. alone there are 40 empty residential lots. Very few owner-occupied properties have been bought in recent years. Large scale investment and long-term planning will be needed to create a stable housing market.

• 138.1 This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. The significant amount of vacant acreage owned by the County could present opportunity. The existence of the public housing impacts housing prices. Vacant lot infill and rehab of substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy to stabilize the neighborhood.

• 142.4 This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard, high rental rate and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. Vacant lots owned by the City could present opportunity. The existence of the public housing usually impacts housing prices, but the new Park Terrace Apartments are aesthetically well designed and offer both affordable and subsidized units. Development of additional mixed-income ‘villages’ may be possible; especially if owner-occupied units are included. Vacant lot infill and rehab of substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy since 96% of current units are rental.

• 143.1 This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to very high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels, high rental rate, as well as high mobility. Vacant parcels could present opportunity, such as 17 contiguous vacant lots found along Cassell St. and others scattered throughout the neighborhood. Large empty industrial lots are found on Potts Ave. SW Renewal plans include a greenway to pass through the area. There are many building opportunities; however, we advise that residential development be very selective due to the large amount of industry. Existing housing quality should continue to be monitored by code enforcement.

• 143.2 This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. The significant amount of vacant
parcels could present opportunity. Vacant lot infill such as found on Tryon and rehab of substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy to stabilize the neighborhood. Encouraging mixed-income development to balance extreme poverty should also be a goal. Proximity to downtown could be a factor, but taking care to avoid gentrification is essential.

- 139.1 This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to very high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels, high rental rate, as well as high mobility. Vacant parcels could present opportunity, More than 30 of the 80 or so parcels in the residential area are empty. There are many building opportunities; however, we advise that residential development be very intentional with the goal of whole-sale redevelopment of the area between Commerce and Granby.

**Recommendations**

1. **Action Items**
   - Use parcel-level assessment data collected by CHCS to identify individual opportunities: contiguous vacant lots, vacant buildings, moderate-severe fire damage, and ratings of poor or demo
   - Examine opportunities identified in each neighborhood
   - Look for “low-hanging fruit” such as: modest external repairs, side-lots, and delinquent taxes/foreclosures
   - Strategic demolition of vacant sub-standard building, acquisition of vacant parcels, and consolidation of multi-parcel packages for redevelopment (land-banking).
   - Take advantage of assets that already exist and identified in the report.
   - Promote ownership and investment in areas identified as having low owner-occupancy.
   - Make infrastructure improvements that increase accessibility and aesthetic appeal of the residential and commercial districts.
   - Match appropriate strategies with each market segment (See Figure Next Page)

2. **Address housing, infrastructure, and business interests.**
   - Encourage community involvement. Plan for charrettes with community: residents, landlords, community/neighborhood leaders, developers, investors, realtors, and housing/planning professionals.
   - Explore public-private partnerships with private investors, as well as Habitat for Humanity and other non-profits to leverage limited resources.

3. **Improve Data**
   - Continue to develop additional instruments and tools to visualize neighborhood-level data for informed and targeted decision making (QoL Explorer).
   - Develop property scoring matrix to prioritize investments
   - Update data regularly to inform and target code enforcement
4. Budgeting

- Resources are required for targeted stabilization and code enforcement in weak and constrained markets while exploring long-term funding/financing for extremely weak markets (e.g. grant-writer).
- Most previous plans failed at implementation due to cost limitations
- Leverage private investment with federal and state funds to support affordable, mixed use, high density development.

**Stable markets**
- Tactical code enforcement

**Functioning markets**
- Neighborhood Action Plans
  - Asset Based Micro Plans

**Constrained markets**
- Property Acquisition

**Weak markets**
- Blight Elimination Plans

**Extremely weak markets**
- Wholesale Redevelopment

*Figure 2 - Recommended Strategies for Each Market Segment*
Introduction

The terms home and neighborhood indicate geographic locations where many Americans live out their daily existences. Home is the essential foundation for everything else in a person’s life; one of three most basic needs. To be without a safe and dependable home makes every aspect of daily living more complicated. The availability of fair, affordable and safe housing plays a critical role in the economy and in communities by creating jobs, attracting new industry, reducing the incidence of foreclosures, increasing local tax revenues, and allowing working families to spend more on health, education, food, and other needs.

There is a complex dynamic between housing conditions, socio-demographic factors, and negative community outcomes. Suitable housing stock, stable communities with few vacant properties, well-planned public spaces, and strong “collective efficacy” among neighbors have also been linked to reducing crime and enhancing quality of life. Shortage of affordable housing, public housing projects that create and maintain concentrations of poverty, lack of public transit to access affordable options in better neighborhoods, suburbanization, zoning and planning favoring creation of exclusive neighborhoods, and the disparate impact of mortgage lending practices are some of the structural barriers to housing choice that have made it difficult to overcome the legacy of segregation, leaving some neighborhoods in perpetual poverty with few opportunities for improvement.

Background

This projects was developed by the Center for Housing and Community Studies (CHCS) in response to a request by Michael E. McNair, Director of Community Development and Housing – City of High Point NC to conduct a “housing market segmentation” study for the purposes of providing data for prioritizing redevelopment and revitalization of the Core City of High Point, an area that has been plagued with blighted empty lots, vacant buildings, substandard housing, and whose residents have long experienced a lack of opportunity. The focus of this project is on three important and interrelated facets of housing in the Core City: the physical state of housing; the socio-demographic condition of neighborhoods; and the overall opportunity presented by careful market analysis.

The project was conducted over a 6 month period (July 2015 to Dec 2015). During the course of the project four status briefings were made to City staff covering each stage of the project. This report will synthesize data from each stage and expand upon what has been presented. Findings will be presented in an easy-to-read, straightforward manner without technical jargon and with the assistance of figures, charts, maps and diagrams to clarify important findings. The reports includes an executive summary, methodological overview, narrative summary of findings (Parcel-Assessment, Analysis of Core City, and Market Segmentation Study of 32 Neighborhoods), conclusions and recommendation, and appendices that include reference tables and maps. The data used in the final report has been carefully analyzed and summarized. It provides a solid basis for the conclusions and recommendations, including
recommendations for future planning and allocation of resources. Using a Market Segmentation Model (the “Youngstown Model”, adapted for local conditions) the report clearly identifies neighborhood as: Stable, Functional, Constrained, Weak, or Very Weak. All data from secondary and primary sources has been documented and will be made available to the City of High Point. The parcel-level mapping of the home assessments for the Core City will be available through a Loveland Technologies online map.

Segregation, Poverty, Substandard Housing and Negative Outcomes

The areas under study in the Core City are some of the most segregated and impoverished neighborhoods in High Point. Poverty plays a significant part in ethnic segregation. Poverty in the Piedmont Triad has increased from 12.3% of individuals in 2000 to approximately 16.4% of the population today. Nationally, this trend has been well established - the poor, and especially poor minorities, have been increasingly concentrated in segregated areas such as the redevelopment areas in High Point. A recent study by Lichter, Parisi, and Taquino (2012) entitled “The Geography of Exclusion: Race, Segregation, and Concentrated Poverty” found, “America’s poor and affluent Populations are increasingly being sorted unevenly across poor (and economically declining) and non-poor communities. Geographic isolation is a central component to the notion of “concentration effects” on employment outcomes, maladaptive behaviors (e.g., drug use) and cultural patterns that reflect and reinforce poverty.” Geospatial analysis of the region shows a picture of concentrations of poverty which intersect with concentrations of race/ethnic minorities resulting in an intergenerational lack of opportunity and little chance of upward social mobility. For example, segregated and impoverished areas result in “zones of denial” for mortgage applications, making it very difficult for those seeking to purchase affordable homes to obtain a mortgage. Such residential concentrations of a particular ethnic group combined with
high rates of poverty may lead to the designation by the federal government as racial or ethnic concentrations of poverty or an “R/ECAP.” A third of the neighborhoods in this study have been designated as R/ECAPs.

Race/Ethnic concentrations of poverty are accompanied by factors that have negative consequences for the health of individuals and families. Five neighborhoods have greater than 61% of the population living in poverty. Many of the poorest neighborhoods have only limited access to amenities such as good schools, health care, or affordable and nutritious foods. Access to retail shopping and high quality child care is also quite limited in most of these areas. Combined with the relative lack of extensive public transit systems, persons living in such areas are greatly disadvantaged. Concentrated poverty itself becomes a significant impediment to fair housing choice because those living in such areas must spend far more time and money in order to purchase groceries or medicine, find opportunities for entertainment, or place their children in day care while working. Since employment opportunities are also limited in such areas, residents must commute outside their residential communities for virtually all of their daily needs.
Health outcomes are disproportionately negative among racial and ethnic minorities with greater incidences of disease and deaths (HHS 2002). Clearly, while some diseases are genetically linked to ethnic/racial groups, the cause of the disparity can be attributed to socioeconomic differences between racial/ethnic groups. Kawachi, *et al* (2005) investigated the concepts of race and class as they related to health disparities and determined that race and class are co-determinants which cannot be observed separately, thus underscoring the importance of the intersection of poverty and race/ethnicity. Krieger *et al* (2005) also demonstrated that geocoded health data when linked to census tract information, proved useful in demonstrating the interrelationship between race/ethnicity, socioeconomics, and location. Haan *et al* (1987) found a clear elevation in mortality for residents in high poverty areas as compared with residents of non-poverty areas. Using the same data Yen and Kapln (1999) employed multiple logistic regression models to demonstrate that depression and self-perception of health status were also higher for those living in areas of high poverty. Mental health concerns may be especially acute among children as unhealthy, unsafe housing and impoverished community conditions may lead to multiple stressors on the child as found in a cumulative ecological risks model by Evans and English (2002). In the edited volume *Unhealthy Housing: Research, Remedies, and Reform* Burridge and
Ormandy (1993) presents a variety of methodological approaches, from case studies to statistical analysis of large datasets, in demonstrating the causal relationship between substandard housing and health. Likewise, in a review of existing studies, Dunn (2000) found that housing could be one of the most important factors in predicting health inequalities. As Matte and Jacobs (2000) found, these disparities could be due to specific health hazards of substandard housing including: mold from excessive moisture, exposure to lead, exposure to allergens that may cause or worsen asthma, rodent and insect pests, pesticide residues, and indoor air pollution. Similarly Rauch et al (2002) investigated specific health-related causal factors, finding that allergen levels may be related to household disrepair, insect activity, frequent changes of residence (community instability). Saegert and Evans (2003) employed the concept of a niche model that explored poverty’s constraints on residential markets and the subsequent impact on health and access to human and social capital.

The “Problem” of Vacant and Abandoned Property

The Center for Community Progress defines vacant properties as “residential, commercial, and industrial buildings and vacant lots that exhibit one or both of the following traits: 1) The site poses a threat to public safety (meeting the definition of a public nuisance), or 2) The owners or managers neglect the fundamental duties of property ownership (e.g., they fail to pay taxes or utility bills, default on mortgages, or carry liens against the property.)” (National Vacant Properties Campaign, 2005).

![Figure 6 - Percentage Vacant Housing](image)
While the existence of vacant and abandoned properties is often indicative of economic distress and disinvestment in a neighborhood, these properties must also be approached as more than just a symptom of these forces. Property abandonment is also a cause of disinvestment. Once there are a few vacant and abandoned properties in a neighborhood a cycle of disinvestment and decline sets in (Accordino and Johnson 2000: 301-302). This makes it vitally important to target investment and redevelopment efforts in areas with high concentrations of such properties. By definition, distressed properties present the surrounding communities with a variety of problems that have been divided into three general categories.

The first way in which these problems manifest is through the costs to communities. The presence of vacant properties tends to correlate with an increase in crime rates. In one instance, when the City of Richmond, VA, conducted an analysis of crime data from the 1990s and tested economic and demographic variables, researchers found that the presence of vacant and abandoned properties had a higher correlation to incidences of crime than any of the other variables tested. (National Vacant Properties Campaign, 2005, pp. 3) Arson and accidental fires are also highly associated with vacant and abandoned properties (Ahrens 2009). An ongoing Kresge Foundation funded project with Cone Health, the Greensboro Housing Coalition, and the Center for Housing and Community Studies has also found a correlation between the occurrence of asthma and vacant housing.
The second set of problems associated with vacant and abandoned properties have to do with property values and tax revenues. Close proximity to vacant or abandoned properties can substantially decrease property values of other buildings. A study conducted by Blight-Free Philadelphia in 2001 found that the average value of homes that were located within 150 feet of a vacant home in some cases decreased by over $7,000. Vacant and abandoned properties also present a loss in tax revenues to cities. An evaluation of St. Paul, Minnesota, found that in a comparison of rehabilitated properties, un-renovated occupied properties, and vacant lots, a rehabilitated property could bring in twice the tax revenue of an un-renovated property and more than eleven times the tax revenue of a vacant lot (Goetz, Cooper, Thiele, and Lam 1998).

The third category of problems is in the indirect costs to homeowners that are not easily measured. Homeowners that live in close proximity to vacant or abandoned properties often face higher insurance premiums because vacant properties may be considered by insurance companies as hazardous liabilities. Homeowners surrounded by vacant properties also report a lower quality of life that may manifest in many ways, such as social fragmentation, isolation, and loss of aesthetic appeal. Childhood asthma, lead exposure, and cancers have also been shown to be possible negative effects of living in proximity to vacant lots, boarded homes, and high-density traffic areas, and in substandard housing.

FIGURE 8 - EXAMPLE OF VACANT HOME IN TRACT 136.02
Redevelopment in High Point

The city of High Point was founded May 26, 1859, taking its name from surveyors of the North Carolina Railway who described the location as “the highest point on the line of survey” (High Point Museum 2015). Beginning with a small population of less than 300, High Point grew quickly during the late nineteenth century when burgeoning manufacturing economies were taking root across North Carolina’s Piedmont region. High Point’s first furniture factory was established around 1892, and by 1910 the city was home to more than 60 manufacturing enterprises (Farriss 1915; Whittington and Hoover 1910). In addition to furniture production, High Point industries included manufacturers of “paper, glass, trolleys, cash registers, organs and machinery” (High Point Report 1987:12). As workers migrated to the city for jobs, the demand for housing increased greatly. The early twentieth century saw a residential construction boom in High Point: “for the past five years... the town made the incomparable record of building a house every day in each year” (Whittington and Hoover 1910). During the 1920s the town’s population grew to over 22,000 residents (City Plan 1926). As a result of continued growth and following the Supreme Court decision which legalized zoning codes in the Euclid v. Ambler Realty case of 1926, High Point’s first city plan was developed in 1928 (Knowles 1928). The plan was “designed to improve the existing municipal facilities and to define a policy of development sufficient to provide for an anticipated growth of 50 years into the future” (Knowles 1928). Priorities identified in the plan included improvements to High Point roadways, along with the construction of new schools and recreation facilities.

The city hosted its first furniture exposition in 1921. During subsequent decades the furniture industry in High Point grew rapidly, remaining centralized in the city core (Phillips 2014). As a result, a large majority of existing housing within High Point’s core city area was constructed prior to 1950 (High Point Core City Plan 2007). After growth declines experienced during World War II, the city’s industrial base experienced a second wave of rapid growth during the middle twentieth century. Other industries, such as textiles, were added to High Point’s manufacturing base. Also in this post-war period, the quality of furniture produced in High Point increased drastically.

**Figure 9 - Southern Furniture Exposition Building**
Warehouses were rapidly constructed up to the 1960s, and attendance at what is now known as the city’s International Home Furnishings Market grew. Yet, since the early 1970s High Point has experienced a significant erosion of its manufacturing base, along with many other cities across North Carolina’s Piedmont region. The globalization of trade, which has accelerated since the early 1990s, has compounded losses to the city’s economic fabric. Because of these large shifts, many of the structures, homes and neighborhoods built in earlier years have fallen into disuse and disrepair, leading to significant blight in High Point’s core city areas.

Revitalization Efforts in East Central
The East Central Area of High Point (Census Tract 139) has been consistently recognized as one of the more blighted areas in the city core and was targeted for redevelopment in plans from the 1960s and 1980s. However, this area continues to face serious challenges and remains underdeveloped with high concentrations of vacant and substandard housing units. As part of a 1962 urban renewal plan developed for this area, Planning Associates Inc. conducted external and internal assessments of properties in East Central High Point. In their final report, the surveyors classified 77% (1,061) of structures in this area as deficient. They cited several “blighting” influences in the area. These included obsolete buildings not suitable for rehabilitation or conversion, buildings converted to unsuitable living uses, inadequate street layout, and undersized structures used for habitation. Planners proposed five renewal actions: 1) acquisition and clearance of dilapidated structures; 2) redevelopment of cleared areas for public and private use; 3) rebuilding and construction of streets, sidewalks, utilities and other public improvements; 4) provision and development of community facilities to serve the area adequately; and 5) rehabilitation of salvageable structures by individual owners and residents.

![Figure 10 – East Central Urban Renewal Area](image-url)
The 1986 East Central Small Area Plan identified seven principal points of focus for revitalization efforts. These included: 1) the age, condition and appearance of existing housing stock, 2) economic conditions and neighborhood commercial investment, 3) optimal provision of city services, 4) recreational opportunities and facilities, 5) transportation infrastructure and services, 6) updating land use classifications and zoning codes, and 7) garnering community support and investment in revitalization efforts. Between 1985 and 1987 the City Council committed $331,179 of CDBG funds to the East Central area. However, this budget fell short in meeting the required costs of the recommended development initiatives and housing rehabilitation efforts. Also, the CDBG grants were not guaranteed after 1987. Thus, the revitalization plans included reliance on growing private investment in the area to accomplish all of these goals.

![Figure 11 - Map of Substandard Housing Units in East Central (1986)](image)
Figure 12 - Map of Vacant and Substandard Properties in Census Tract 139
Southside Revitalization

The Southside neighborhood, positioned in the southwest corner of High Point near the central business district, was addressed in the Southside Revitalization Plan. Completed in 2004, the Plan noted the area had “transitioned significantly in the last couple of decades from a flourishing, vibrant, and diverse neighborhood to one with acute socio-economic problems” (Southside Revitalization Plan 2004:1). The plan, intended to provide guidance regarding development and revitalization in the Southside neighborhood, outlined several identified issues. These included dilapidated buildings near residences, considerable amounts of abandoned housing, “under-utilized lots and industrial buildings”, and “old and derelict commercial property at edge of neighborhood” (Southside Revitalization Plan 2004:4). The Plan noted that over 80% of housing in the area was rental property. Further, the study found that 12.8% of housing units were vacant and noted the population decline in the area over the last decade. Goals of the plan included protecting Southside’s single-family character and maintaining a variety of affordable housing options. Objectives outlined to meet these goals focused on housing, capital improvements and investments to encourage revitalization, and emphasis of public-private partnerships to support revitalization and redevelopment within targeted areas adjoining the central business district. Further direction included acquisition of parcels to develop housing and providing infill design guidelines, targeted code enforcement, completing demolitions as deemed necessary, resident education on available resources for home repairs, and support of homeownership programs aimed at a variety of income brackets. The Southside Revitalization Plan was later included in the Core City Plan of 2007.
Figure 14 - Empty Lots, Vacant & Substandard Housing “Southside” (Tract 143)
Core City Master Plan

The High Point Core City Plan was adopted by the City Council February 8, 2007 with the purpose of providing direction to better the physical, economic, and social aspects of the core city area of High Point. According to the plan, the core city area is vitally important to the City of High Point not only because of its role as a commercial and industrial hub, but also because one-third of the city’s population resides in this area. The Core City Plan specifically identified thirteen historic neighborhoods located within the area: Blair Park (CT: 142); East Central (CT: 139); Emerywood (CT: 137); Highland Mill Village (CT: 143); Kendall Avenue (CT: 143); Macedonia (CT: 142); North Central Neighborhoods (CT: 136.02;138); Oak Hill (CT: 145.01); Southside (CT: 143); Washington Drive (CT 138); Washington Terrace (CT: 138; 136.01); West End (CT: 140); and West English (CT: 140). The Core City Master Plan identified seven goals, which included establishing clear direction for the future of the core city area, identifying existing issues and needs, thorough consideration of redevelopment tools, plotting focus areas for redevelopment and revitalization efforts, determining feasible strategies for implementation, establishing the marketability of the Core City Plan recommendations, and ascertaining the financial impacts of the recommendations laid out by the Core City Plan. Priority actions highlighted in the Core City Master Plan included the creation of a Core City entity with the primary purpose of leading overall redevelopment plans in the area. Additional elements of the plan included strengthening the biannual International Home Furnishings Market and encouraging other economic uses in the downtown area, implementing uniform development and redevelopment design standards, encouraging mixed-use development, infrastructure improvements, financial investment in neighborhoods, and branding of the city’s core area as a center of economic growth.
City Project
Per recommendations of the Core City Master Plan, an office was created and later rebranded to “The City Project” to steer development plans. A non-profit with its own board of directors and funding support from the City, The City Project moved forward with the intent of revitalization of the Core City through implementation of the Core City Plan (Core City Action Plan Update May 2014). In 2013, The City Project contracted for the development of a master plan for Uptowne, Showroom, College Village, and Oak Hollow Mall Districts, and determined areas of focus including Uptowne, SoSi (the rebranded commercial district in Southside running along S. Main Street) and the Washington Street commercial district, which was added to National Historic Register in 2010. Despite its establishment “outside of City Hall” as per recommendations, concerns were raised by some residents regarding the organizational structure. Subsequently, the executive director was moved to City Hall in effort, as indicated by Council members, to spread revitalization efforts through the entire core city (“City Project, Ignite High Point dispute” June 3, 2014). Other concerns centered around the time and monetary focus placed on the Uptowne area have also been debated; City Project Chairman Richard Wood stated in May 2014 that studies had indicated that Uptowne would yield a high return on their investments (“Tensions remain high” May 29, 2014). The Core City Action Plan Update (May 2014) indicated the City Project had “tackled nearly all the projects proposed in the 2007 Core City Action Plan” and requested further direction from City Council regarding future priorities. Some Council members indicated concerns with the possible losses related to the project while others countered by stating the City takes loss on many public services, highlighting the potential benefits to the City in building its tax base over time, and reaffirming commitments to redevelopment.

Zoning
The Department of Development and the Community Development and Housing Department sponsored an amendment to create a new zoning category, RS-5 (Residential Single Family District), which was approved on March 3, 2008. Proposed to “facilitate the construction of infill housing in the Core City” (Annual Action Plan 2010:12) by allowing for higher density home building, and construction of homes on lots as small as 5,000 square feet, with the approval of the Council. City Council records indicate rezoning to RS-5 has been approved twice, and denied once. Rezoning of 126 acres in the Southside neighborhood (previously zoned RM-12 and RM-18) to RS-5 and Heavy Industrial (HI) was requested by the City, and approved July 21, 2008 (High Point Legislative Research Center File 080204). A 2010 request to rezone approximately 20 acres (previously zoned RM-8, RS-7, and LI) to RS-5 within the Graves Avenue area was also approved, and was noted as being “consistent with goals, objectives, and recommendations of the Core City” (High Point Legislative Research Center File 100251).

A zoning resolution was adopted November 21, 2011, in a 5-4 vote, regarding Land Use Plans for two Core City neighborhoods. Requested by the City of High Point Planning and Development Department, these neighborhoods were transitioned from mainly high intensity to lower intensity designations in line with Core City Plan recommendations. An additional resolution was adopted on January, 17, 2012 by unanimous vote to amend Land Use Plans for the remaining 6 neighborhoods from higher to lower
intensity designations in accordance with the Core City Plan (High Point Legislative Research Center File 110239).

**Community Housing Development Organizations**

Annual Action Plans from 2009-10 forward have focused on acquisition and preparation for redevelopment by affordable housing producers, particularly in Southside and Washington Drive areas. This focus was later expanded to include the Park Terrace area to provide for redevelopment needs of the High Point Housing Authority (Annual Action Plan 2014:21). Property acquisitions have included vacant lots and substandard units which have undergone demolition. Yearly goals have ranged from acquisition of 6 to 10 properties with some success; while 10 acquisitions were made in 2010-11 FY, none were made the following year despite the Annual Action Plan objective of 10 acquisitions. Opportunities appear to exist in utilization of funds budgeted for Infill Housing to meet yearly objectives. Though infill budget spending was over in 2010-11 by $85,167, end of year balances since 2009 have netted an average $50,400 per year of unused funds earmarked for acquisition and preparation of parcels for infill (including roll-over of previous year funds in 2012-13 and 2013-14).

There is indication of similar opportunities for utilization of funds allocated by the City for Community Development Housing Organization (CHDO) activities (required to be provided a 15 percent allotment of HOME funds). The City has in most recent years worked with two CHDOs, Habitat for Humanity of High Point, Archdale and Trinity (focus on Washington Terrace Park neighborhood) and Unity Home Builders, Inc. (focus on Southside neighborhood). Since 2009, Annual Action Plan have indicated goals of between 10-12 homes yearly. While progress has been made towards annual objectives for CHDO activity reported in Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Reports (CAPER) do not indicate these objectives have been met since 2009-10. However, progress can be difficult to gauge due to extended timelines for home construction which frequently do not correlate with the fiscal year. Funds for CHDO activity have been underused each year since 2009, and the use of rollover is unclear from reports. Further, available information regarding lots acquired by the City to facilitate infill does not seem to indicate lack of available properties for such activities. The 2012-13 CAPER did note that “Continued credit restrictions have made it more difficult for homebuyers to qualify for mortgages” (p. 21). To avoid project stall the City began working with Unity Builders to offer new homes on a lease-purchase basis. Unused yearly funds ranged from $13,424 (2011-12) to $185,392 (2013-14), with an average of $100,917 of remaining funds yearly from FY 2009-10 to FY 2013-14. In 2015, the City began working with Community Housing Solutions to construct two homes in Southside which will be offered on a lease-purchase basis. Additional discussions have taken place regarding reclamation of vacant properties on a larger scale than previously undertaken (“City may add to Southside project” 2015).

**Homebuyer Assistance Program**

The City’s Homebuyer Assistance and Core City Homebuyer Assistance Programs are meant to assist with down payments and closing costs for homebuyers by reducing out of pocket costs in the form of a deferred low interest rate loan. Assistance of up to $5,000 in most areas, and up to $7,500 in targeted neighborhoods (Macedonia and Southside) is meant to encourage and incentivize home purchases in
these areas (2009-2010 Annual Action Plan, p.19). Funds for Homebuyer Assistance Program has been consistently underutilized from 2009-10 forward, and had zero expenditure from the $100,000 budget allotted for 2012-13. Unused funds averaged $75,319 per year from 2009-10 to 2013-14. The Core City Homebuyer Assistance Program was adopted 11/3/2014 as an expansion to the program meant to encourage middle income homebuyers to purchase homes in specific Core City areas. Amendments to the program were approved 2/2/2015, which extended the program to the entire core city area, placed a $200,000 cap on purchase price, and limited assistance to $7,500 per transaction (High Point Legislative Research Center File 150033). The program expansion was enabled with funds already allocated for the prior program, and based upon prior program conditions, and set to expire on June 30, 2015.

**Emergency Repair Program**
The City’s Emergency Repair program has assisted resident homeowners as well as a few investors since 2009-10. The program is targeted to assist low-to-moderate income homeowners, to “provide quick action in response to homeowners experiencing a system failure that may endanger their health” (2009-2010 Annual Action Plan, p. 19). As funds are spent/linked to those allocated for Lead Hazard Control Activities, priority has been given for those built before 1978, and frequently in conjunction with those in which lead remediation projects have taken place, though exceptions may occur. Goals include “improve quality of existing low to moderate-income housing stock; to acquire dilapidated housing for repair and/or demolition; to mitigate blighting influences and lead-based paint hazards” (2009-2010 Annual Action Plan, p.19). When noted in Annual Action Plans, targeted number of services ranged from 25 to 35 per year. Actual number of completed repairs per year has ranged from 8 to 25. Allocated funds have been under budget yearly since 2010-11 (actual expenditure 200-10 not provided in CAPER), with a yearly average surplus of $69,249.

**Funds for Southside Revitalization**
Annual Action Plans from 2009 forward have addressed specific plans and needs as laid out within the Southside Revitalization Plan. Funds have been budgeted for each of these recommendations from 2009 Annual Action Plan forward, however yearly Consolidated Annual Performance & Evaluation Reports (CAPER) indicated allocated funds are frequently not fully utilized, and often, while there is progress on performance measures specific objectives are not realized. Budgeted versus actual expenditures of these under-utilized funds (2009-10 to 2013-14) indicate an average yearly surplus of $207,225.

Though funds have been allocated yearly towards plan implementation, it is unclear whether such funds may be applied to other CHDO activities and acquisitions as outlined in the yearly plans. Movement has been made towards objectives as laid out in the Annual Action Plans since 2009-10 (acquisition and construction) though CAPER does not show successful completion of all goals in any year. CAPER from 2011-12 forward indicated the slow of construction within Southside as related to the economic downturn and difficulties in mortgage qualification for new homebuyers. In response to these concerns, the city planned to contract with Unity Builders to offer homes on a lease purchase basis to allow
continued focus on increasing housing stock and to eliminate a halt in the project (CAPER 2012). An increase to homebuyer subsidies has also been considered as a means of increasing chances of successful mortgage applications.

Southwest Renewal Project
The Southwest Renewal Foundation has been engaged in plans to renew and redevelop the Southwest region of the core city of High Point as a place of natural beauty (Southwest Renewal Foundation 2015). These plans include making the area attractive to new business and industry, finding new uses for existing industrial buildings, improving the quality of life for both residents and businesses, making new greenways for walking by cleaning up streams and old railroad beds, and working with schools to engage in environmentally focused education to build interest in ecology and sciences. The Southwest Renewal plan focuses on environmental enhancement as a means to accomplishing the following benefits: save revenue, support sustainability, attract businesses, create jobs, increase real estate values, and improve health. The Southwest Renewal plan identifies the following keywords as the “New Language of Southwest”: Compact, sustainable, energy efficient, walkable, bikeable, mass transit friendly, low impact, and green.

There are four steps to the plan, the first of which is to create more incentives for economic development by nominating the nine historic furniture factories, textile and hosiery mills to the National Register of Historic Places. Federal and state income tax credits can be used to rehabilitate these structures and create jobs. This step also includes supporting the growing antiques and arts clusters in the southwest district. The second is to build a greenway that connects residents and employees to schools, work, shopping, parks and recreation. The greenway will improve the physical environment by keeping clean water in Richland Creek and its branches, providing sufficient storm water runoff and watershed protection, safeguarding against flooding, and preserving open spaces. The greenway will also promote other forms of transportation that may improve the health of residents. The third step is to create a high-end business park atmosphere that also values the district’s historic qualities. This includes establishing urban orchards and community gardens as well as native plant mini-parks. Developers also plan to build more bike lanes and place unique signs throughout the greenway and the rest of the district. The fourth component of the plan is to build collaborations to aid with implementation of these steps. These collaborative groups will also review zoning, development, and design guidelines. They will invest in connections with GTCC to help residents and other employees with access to job training and educational opportunities. Groups will also partner with police to promote safety (and the perception of safety) through work with churches and neighborhood associations. Finally, these collaborative groups will work to provide new infill housing.
FIGURE 16 - SOUTHWEST HIGH POINT RENEWAL PROJECT
Recurring Themes
The City of High Point has made many plans to restore and redevelop housing while maintaining vibrancy and character that the city has been known for since the 1920s. Despite these efforts, long-standing areas of concern have persisted. While there have been a variety of issues and approaches noted in redevelopment plans since the 1960s, several themes have emerged in the review.

Funding
Discussions regarding the necessity of continued funding for proposed development projects have been ongoing since at least the 1980s. Understandably, a lack of funding can clearly stall redevelopment efforts and is thus a necessary concern. However, utilization of allocated funds must also be addressed. Underutilization of funds in previous years may be related to unrealistic plan/program expectations, incorrect areas of focus, or additional needs in terms of program oversight, or any number of other issues. However, a continued effort should be made to ensure that funds are allocated and used in the most effective manner to meet the goals and objectives of adopted plans.

Vacant/Substandard Housing
Commissioned reports since the 1960s have clearly indicated an ongoing concern regarding vacant and substandard housing. However, comparisons amongst reports and data collected by the Center for Housing and Community Studies in 2015 indicate that vacant and substandard housing has not improved, and appears to have spread and/or further deteriorated in some cases. This continued focus implies that vacant and substandard housing has not been adequately addressed throughout the years in the City of High Point. Further, neighborhoods will continue to deteriorate if current implementation and tactics to address poor housing conditions and vacancies are not modified.

Code Enforcement
Code enforcement has been addressed in each plan reviewed since the 1960s to address the condition of housing stock in High Point. While some plans have proposed relatively general ideas, other plans have made more specific recommendations, such as assigning individual inspectors to specific areas with concerns. Despite these continued recommendations, there is no evidence of how, or if, these recommendations have been acted upon. Additionally, many plans have outlined the need for demolitions of structures (residential, commercial, and/or industrial) that are unsuitable for rehabilitation; a priority on code enforcement would likely assist in collecting information regarding substandard properties that may require demolition. A focus on code enforcement may also provide needed context for any necessary modifications to existing codes and ordinances, should the need exist.
Redevelopment Best Practices

Downtowns and core city areas often experience decline due to middle-class households relocating to the suburbs. This increased suburbanization may hit smaller cities especially hard in the downtown and core regions because they possess fewer resources than larger cities. Numerous redevelopment and revitalization strategies have been implemented in various small-to-mid-sized urban centers with mixed success. The following studies have sought to examine the successes of such policies and identify further problems and solutions for smaller city areas wishing to successfully revitalize their core.

A 2004 study that assessed the characteristics of 19 successful small metropolitan locales (population between 100,000 and 500,000) found that these cities tended to have greater street connectivity at the core area, a central business district (CBD) with distinct physical characteristics and retailers in the CBD that catered to niche markets and thus would not be in competition with suburban retailers (Filion, Hoernig, Bunting, and Sands 2004). The core city areas remained pedestrian-friendly. A significant portion of these cities also had a college or university located in close proximity to the CBD and their CBD’s possessed a distinct historical character. In their review, the authors of this study grouped previous downtown revitalization efforts into three stages: “adaptation to automobile accessibility, head-on competition with suburbs, and ...the accentuation of a distinct core area identity” (Filion et. al. 329). Traditionally, head-on competition with the suburbs involved creating retail shopping malls that mimicked the conditions of the suburbs, and these types of efforts almost always failed because there was no real attraction for shoppers to come into town to shop. In surveys with planners, academics, and business people in these successful small-metro areas, the majority consistently rated as important a street-oriented retail area, pedestrian-hospitable downtowns, and well-preserved neighborhoods.

Categories of Revitalization

Six categories of revitalization measures were identified as commonly present in these small-metro areas: (1) initiatives aimed at stimulating development, such as public-sector funding via taxes; (2) streetscape and facade improvement programs, public art; (3) erection of public buildings such as convention centers, courthouses, and municipal centers; (4) transportation and parking issues; (5) restoration of natural amenities such as waterfronts and ensuring easy pedestrian access to these sites; (6) increased visibility/awareness of downtown through marketing and event planning.

In the case of Asheville, NC, which experienced significant decline throughout the 1970s and into the early 1980s following the opening of a regional shopping mall in the suburbs, a collaborative approach between many different local actors was the most effective The City Development Office (tasked with revitalization), the Downtown Commission, the Downtown Association (responsible for programming and retail marketing), the Art Council, and merchant and residential organizations came together to
enact numerous entrepreneurial efforts and small-scale improvements to the built environment of Asheville. The revitalization efforts in downtown were more than just a few major projects and this more-integrated approach was much more effective (Filion et. al. 2004: 336-7).

Michael Burayidi examined cases of fourteen different small towns in Resilient Downtowns (2013) in order to identify issues unique to small towns and how these cities have rebounded from decline. Small cities and their downtowns typically possess less racial and social diversity because historically these areas have attracted considerably fewer minorities and immigrants. Smaller cities also tend to have several prominent families (rather than corporations as in larger cities) that heavily influence development and redevelopment decisions.

Hendersonville, NC is a good case of a smaller city that experienced substantial decline in the mid-20th century. Originally built up around transportation routes through the Blue Ridge Mountains and eventually the Southern Railway, the city became a tourist destination as well as a hub for surplus farm produce. As residential development grew, so did residential segregation along socioeconomic lines with the working class living closer to the railroads. In the 1960s and 1970s downtown Hendersonville began to experience blight, vacancy, and falling property values as more residents moved into the suburbs and buildings in the CBD were demolished in the name of “urban renewal”. As a solution, a group of downtown business owners came together in a community-wide effort to save downtown and formed the Hendersonville Merchants Association (HMA). As this was a community-wide effort, more than half of the members of the HMA did not actually have their businesses located downtown. Also, one of the members of the HMA was the manager of Rose’s, which was a major competitor to local businesses. The HMA created a special tax district for the purpose of raising revenue for downtown development and obtained a financial commitment from 250 business owners in the county to contribute to a loan that would be used to redevelop the

1. Stimulating development via public-sector funding
2. Streetscape and facade improvement programs
3. Erection of public buildings
4. Solving transportation and parking issues
5. Restoration of natural amenities
6. Increased marketing and event planning

REVITALIZATION MEASURE
downtown area. The HMA focused on the redesign of the Main Street area and formed a new downtown development organization, Downtown Hendersonville, Inc. (Burayidi 2013: 31-33).

**Main Street Approach**

The Main Street Approach is a strategy that has been employed by many small towns as a part of their revitalization program and is a program emerging from the National Main Street Center, an organization focused on community revitalization through historic preservation. According to their website, mainstreet.org, communities that have employed this approach and are now a part of the Main Street Network have rehabbed over 251,000 buildings, produced $61.7 billion in investment, and created 528,577 jobs to date (2015). This strategy uses a four-point approach of organization, promotion, design, and economic restructuring to “build a sustainable and complete community revitalization effort” (*The Main Street Four-Point Approach*, mainstreet.org 2015). There are several key components that are essential to the success of a Main Street approach, including a strong working coalition between the public and private sectors. Each community also must recognize its own individual assets and determine which of the four points should be emphasized the most for their particular approach.

A study of how the Main Street Four-Point Approach has actually been applied in cities found that promotion was consistently the most-heavily used component (Robertson, 2004). This was even more pronounced in towns that were satellites of larger cities (population >75,000) because these towns experienced greater competition with the larger cities. Special events and festivals were both the most utilized and most effective promotion strategies. Interestingly enough, economic restructuring has been the least-utilized of the four-points and, where implemented, have been judged the least effective. This is concerning because economic restructuring, according to this author, is arguably the most important
Cities must invest in safety. If residents do not feel safe downtown, they will not want to live there or spend their money there. This includes better lighting and a stronger police presence, as well as restorative policing and non-police safety patrols.

Element of redevelopment. Without restructuring, all of the organization, design, and promotion will not be as sustainable.

Burayidi is critical of the Main Street Approach (2013: 4-6), citing interviews with city officials and developers who have employed the Main Street Approach who ultimately found the program to be useful only to a certain extent in their communities. While showing success in many towns, this success is mostly limited to commercial revitalization and ignores some of the complexities associated with revitalizing the residential and other areas of the core city. This approach also makes assumptions, such as that downtown business owners also own the properties out of which they work. Phil Meyer, the Director of Community and Neighborhood Services for the City of Holland, Michigan, found that while the four-point approach was useful it did not evolve with the growing issues that the city experienced with housing, traffic, and parking and thus the city ultimately dismantled the program. A better approach for many cities seems to be to utilize the general principles of organization, design, promotion, and economic restructuring without fully committing to the Main Street Program.

Livablocal Downtowns

Growth in downtown living is also an important component in the revitalization of small urban centers (Burayidi 2013). When more people live downtown, there is a greater need for various commercial entities in the downtown region. This can serve the dual purpose of stimulating the downtown economy and promoting the maximum use of properties downtown. There are four major strategies intended to make downtown living more appealing to non-family, one-person, and elderly households (who are the most likely to move to a downtown area). The first is changing the image of downtown, specifically with actions such as getting positive media coverage of downtown and supporting initiatives that aid homeless populations. Secondly, and similarly to the changing image strategy, cities must invest in safety. If residents do not feel safe downtown, they will not want to live there or spend their money there. This includes better lighting and a stronger police presence, as well as restorative policing and non-police safety patrols.

Relaxing some zoning and other regulations is the third strategy suggested by Burayidi. This makes it easier to redevelop existing vacant properties into creative and affordable housing units. For example, in Holland, MI, over a period of years the school district saw a drop in enrollment to the point that it consolidated schools and had several empty buildings that were costly to maintain and not being utilized. A non-profit organization out of Grand Rapids, The Dwelling Place, assisted with the redevelopment of the old junior high building into affordable apartments for elderly residents of Holland. The old school is now known as Midtown Village. Midtown Village consists of thirty residential units for ages 55 and older and is within walking distance of downtown amenities such as the library and
parks. Developers were able to get most of the funding for the project from federal low-income housing tax credits, state historic credits, state brownfield credits, and federal stimulus money.

Another study (Nelson et al. 2004) found that the employment of urban containment policies was an effective means to spur core city development and revitalization. These policies work by limiting sprawl and preventing growth and development from continuing to expand outward away from the city core. As already identified, suburbanization is one of the leading causes of decline and disinvestment in the core city area because residents and businesses neglect and leave behind old inner city neighborhoods and structures, allowing them to fall into blight. The authors of this study suggest that there is correlation between containment boundaries and the level of development activities in center city environments. This is a multi-city, cross-sectional study that looks at the effects of containment on major private-sector development in center city. Found that cities with any of the three types of containment (closed/isolated/open) had higher per capita investment than cities without containment policies.

There is also the danger of pursuing revitalization strategies that are ultimately exclusionary to the residents of a particular community. The case study of Chester, Pennsylvania, illustrates the pitfalls of revitalization strategies that only focus on tourism and commercial attractions (Mele, 2013). Chester, which is just south of Philadelphia, is a small, low-income minority city that has been hit hard by disinvestment. Private and public developers created a plan that focused on the revitalization of the waterfront area. The city outsourced development to other contractors and built up the waterfront area with offices, casinos, and a racetrack. This was meant to bring more money back into Chester, create jobs, and jumpstart the local economy. However, this focus on capital investment, economic growth, and security overlooked the actual concerns stemming from racial inequality such as poverty, troubled labor markets, and inadequate low-income housing. Chester’s “rebirth” attracts thousands of day-tourists and white-collar workers from surrounding suburbs. This redevelopment site, however, remains separate from the rest of the city of Chester, where poverty, unemployment, and substandard housing still abound and businesses struggle to stay afloat. It was several years after the waterfront development before residents of Chester had access to a grocery store. This plan was criticized heavily
for largely ignoring the needs of the residents of Chester and only serving to stimulate the economy and bring in revenues for a few.

**Neighborhood Action Plans**

Jacksonville is a mid-sized city (pop. 70,145 in 2010) located off the coast of North Carolina and home to United States Marine Corps’ Camp Lejeune. The North Riverside neighborhood (census tract 26) is of particular interest. Historically this was a diverse, working-class neighborhood developed in the early 20th century and built as a result of employment opportunities from the local railroad. By the 1980s and 1990s, North Riverside had fallen into decline and saw a sharp drop (-29%) in owner-occupied housing units from 1980 to 2000 and an increased number of vacant and abandoned housing units. This shift in housing patterns was suggestive of absentee landlords with no real investment in the community.

North Riverside became the subject of a Neighborhood Action Plan that was adopted in 2003 and successfully addressed these community problems. Planners took advantage of North Riverside’s proximity to downtown as well as strong organization among the residents and business owners in the community, involving these community stakeholders in all phases of the planning process. An initial assessment found that 45% of properties were substandard, 20% of single-family homes were vacant, and 8% of commercial buildings were vacant.

The first element of this action plan was implementation of a new housing strategy. While there were some opportunities for development of vacant lots, the primary focus of the housing strategy was to increase home ownership and rehabilitate substandard housing stock in order to stabilize the neighborhood. The theory behind this approach is based on the idea that when people own the homes in which they live, they are more invested in the maintenance of those homes and the neighborhoods in which they live. Agencies would invest money in the rehabilitation of vacant and substandard homes in order to reduce rates of crime and provide opportunities for homeownership.

Planners proposed a Lease-to-Purchase program, in which a nonprofit agency buys the home on behalf of the prospective homebuyer (lease purchaser). For a three-year lease period, this nonprofit serves as owner, mortgagor, and property manager while working with the lease purchaser to provide homebuyer

“A Neighborhood Action Plan (NAP) is a short-range strategic document that sets forth a comprehensive vision, practical goals and specific actions that will facilitate the preservation and improvement of a neighborhood. The process provides a framework for neighborhood associations to address neighborhood issues through a step-by-step action plan. The development process also offers residents an opportunity to view neighborhood issues in a larger context by collaborating with decision-makers, service providers and city staff. Neighborhood associations are encouraged to develop their own plans.”

elpasotexas.gov
education, and financial and debt management counseling in order to ensure that the lease purchaser is prepared to assume full ownership at the end of this period. During this three-year period, the lease purchaser is only required to pay an administrative fee and the first month’s lease payment, giving them an opportunity to build credit. At the end of this period, the lease purchaser assumes the unpaid principal balance of the mortgage and buys the home. Another important aspect of this program is that lease purchasers are not required to make a down payment on their home. This extends the opportunity for homeownership to households who may be capable of making a monthly mortgage payment but lack the capital to make the initial down payment.

Infrastructure was another primary focus of this neighborhood action plan, which included expanded sidewalks, gutters, drainage, and adequate lighting to improve the appearance and accessibility of the neighborhood. North Riverside also lacked public spaces such as parks or a community center. This plan proposed development of both.

**Conclusions**

In reviewing best practices in mid-small town redevelopment efforts, a few patterns become clear. The most successful redevelopment strategies undertake an integrated approach that addresses three areas: housing, infrastructure, and business interests. These plans are innovative, and take advantage of the assets that already exist in the community. Developers who are able to make use of CDBG, Brownfield, and other federal funding sources to rehabilitate properties can expand and maintain affordable, adequate housing. It is especially important to stabilize residential neighborhoods and central business districts by promoting ownership and investment in these areas. An underlying theme in all of the successful revitalization efforts is community involvement, whether in the form of business owners or homeowners. Finding ways to encourage people to become active members in their community and providing opportunities to become community stakeholders to those who have previously lacked such means are vitally important aspects of all of these plans. Infrastructure improvements are equally important in these endeavors because they facilitate both accessibility and aesthetic appeal of the residential and commercial districts.

Future redevelopment and revitalization efforts should especially take note of the strategies that have been employed in the North Carolina cities of Asheville, Hendersonville, and Jacksonville. Each city had its own reasons for falling into decline and each plan had its own strengths. Asheville and Hendersonville heavily emphasized the work of local business owners and encouraged these economic stakeholders to invest in their own core city areas as a way to improve conditions. The neighborhood action plan in Jacksonville heavily tackled the issues related to deteriorating housing stock. The Main Street approach offers a useful framework as well, especially when incorporated in such a way that capitalizes on the assets of each individual community and highlights the unique, historical character of a region. Revitalization efforts in High Point may do well to blend the strengths of these planning strategies in a way that would maximize impact.
Market Segmentation Methods

Each home and neighborhood in the United States possesses a set of economic, spatial and sociocultural values. Homes are unique economic commodities. They are stationary, durable, heterogeneous by nature, price-negotiable in many cases, and subject to changes in value over time. Thus, identifying, valuing and predicting patterns of market segmentation, along future prices within larger housing markets are complex endeavors. The simplest factors that might affect home prices include qualities like the number of bathrooms, square-footage, lot size, date of construction, and kitchen modernity. Spatial factors include proximity to efficient public transit, good schools, workplaces, and neighborhood amenities. Sociocultural factors include variables such as the ethno-racial character of neighborhoods and consumer preferences. Lastly, economic variables include factors such as median household income, levels of employment, and the dynamics of governmental and planning policies.

The following literature review broadly outlines prevailing theoretical models and methods for defining and understanding housing submarkets and neighborhoods and how urban planning might better address residential segmentation. It also outlines recent literature on effective policies and practices for urban renewal planning. Furthermore, it describes principles of new urbanism, the challenges of urban revitalization in American cities and how those challenges might be successfully addressed.

Theories and Methods

Earlier studies recognized the need to define submarkets of housing stock within specific geographic boundaries, such as zip codes or Census tracts. These fairly arbitrary boundaries are somewhat useful as starting points in housing market segmentation studies, but these are often too large in scale, exhibit high degrees of intra-variability and do not take into account social, spatial and economic variables that influence home values. More recently, research has demonstrated better means for understanding the housing attributes, spatial factors, social dynamics, economic practices and policies that shape neighborhood submarkets.

Islam and Asami (2009) offer a broad review of recent trends in housing market segmentation research, including how submarkets are defined in the literature, methods for evaluating housing market segmentation, and principal research findings. First and foremost, they make clear there is no current consensus among scholars regarding “either the definition of or the methodology of housing submarket delineation.” They then present their review in two major sections, one concerning conceptualizations of housing market segmentation and a second which outlines prevailing methodologies for analyzing
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housing markets. This is followed by a conclusion and suggestions for future research endeavors and directions.

Islam and Asami (2009) sort contemporary concepts of housing submarkets into two broad categories, characterized as either topographic (spatial) or quality (structurally) based. More recent conceptions combine elements of the two. Topographic definitions include bounded geographic spaces at various levels of aggregation (municipality, zip code, census tract, neighborhood, etc.) examined alone or in a nested, hierarchical fashion. Topographic definitions may also take into account spatial proximity factors, such as neighborhood amenities, places of work, transit hubs, and related features. Qualitative definitions primarily consider the characteristics of housing stock within or across spatial boundaries and delineate groups of similar stock into market segments. These definitions often employ hedonic (multiple intrinsic attributes) pricing models. Recent authors have proposed and investigated mixed definitions whereby submarkets are identified by both topographic and qualitative factors, along with others (e.g. economic and sociocultural forces). In many cases, these have produced more accurate price prediction models.

Underlying these main conceptualizations exist several important inter-related dynamics that influence how submarkets develop and how they might be better understood. These include the processes of neoclassical (rational choice) economic theory, localized disequilibrium theory (supply/demand imbalances), and behavioral/cultural dynamics. The latter includes the influences of income, racial and ethnic segregation on submarket segmentation. Most recently, advances in GIS technology have made available methods of spatial and combined analysis that have previously been nearly impossible. Prevailing methods of investigating and modeling housing market segmentation generally focus on one or more of these dynamics, alone or in statistical combination. More recent studies, including those reviewed herein, have employed a mixed methodology of these techniques for examining their influence on the character, definitions and evaluations of housing submarkets.

In closing, Islam and Asami (2009) argue that consumer needs, especially related to variations in socioeconomic status, need to be much more closely investigated and included in market segmentation studies of all kinds. This is especially true for persons living in the developing world, and among socioeconomically disadvantaged populations globally who generally lack access to the rich sources of information wealthier populations in more developed nations enjoy.
Goodman and Thibodeau (1998) conducted one of the earliest and most widely cited housing studies that employed a mixed methodology, including derived (versus pre-defined) data attributes. Their analysis of the Dallas, Texas metropolitan housing market employed a hierarchical, nested structure of multiple housing submarkets within a hedonic pricing model. They argue that traditional supply/demand analyses of housing submarkets fall short in understanding and explaining home values. The quality of local schools within the metropolitan area was tested as a spatial-proximity predictor of home values. Submarkets were delineated according to school district boundaries. Their study was limited to single-family home types and examined home sales transaction data over a two-year period, from 1995 to 1997.

Goodman and Thibodeau (1998) acknowledge the uniqueness of housing as an economic commodity: “In traditional economic models, the unit prices of goods that consumers purchase will be constant because both buyers and sellers are mobile... Contemporary housing market models recognize that although capital is mobile, once [a house] is built, it is built.” They then describe historical methods used in stratifying submarkets for analysis, which have typically focused on ad hoc features of researcher-defined expectations of spatial, economic and sociocultural variables. The failings of this practice, they contend, are that submarkets “are imposed rather than modeled” (125) and that the importance of “the nesting of these factors” (125) has typically been neglected.

To address these shortcomings, they developed a combined linear hierarchy model (homes nested in neighborhoods, neighborhoods nested in school districts, school districts nested in municipalities, etc.) for estimating home prices in the Dallas metro area. The analysis included 32 variables regarding home structural characteristics and two variables for school district test score averages (one for Dallas City and one for Dallas County). 28,939 home sale transactions were analyzed and the site of each address was geocoded by longitude/latitude. These locations were then assigned to a base of 289 elementary school districts in which each is located. Goodman and Thibodeau’s (1998) results suggested that the quality of school performance within each district is a stronger and more accurate predictor of market segmentation than housing characteristics alone. Their results also allowed for hierarchical identification and nesting of housing submarkets within larger market segments, aggregated according to similar characteristics. Goodman and Thibodeau (1998) conclude their article by suggesting avenues for potential future research employing their model, including the capacity to test different variables to investigate different types of real estate markets, including multi-family dwellings, commercial and retail submarkets.

“In traditional economic models, the unit prices of goods that consumers purchase will be constant because both buyers and sellers are mobile... Contemporary housing market models recognize that although capital is mobile, once [a house] is built, it is built.”

Goodman and Thibodeau 1998
In their later article, Goodman and Thibodeau (2003) build on their previous research with hierarchical modeling and spatial proximity to services and amenities, in attempts to refine the accuracy of hedonic predictions in housing submarkets. Again, they rest their examination on the basic assumption that “all homes within a spatially concentrated area share amenities associated with the property’s location” (182). Using the same data set as their 1998 study, they stratified potential submarkets according to a broader array of spatial classes, including zip code, census tract and municipal boundaries, among others. Additionally, they compared four statistical modeling methods for submarket analysis: no spatial disaggregation, zip codes as submarkets, census tracts as submarkets, and Goodman-Thibodeau (school district) technique demonstrated in their previous research.

The results demonstrated that the smaller the spatial submarket analyzed, the more accurate the hedonic predictions for home price. In successive order, each nested layer of geographic size, from aspatial, to zip code, to census tract, to school zone, yielded a more accurate average price prediction (along with a smaller standard deviation), than larger scales. Additionally, the smaller the scale of examination yielded what the authors believe is a more accurate estimation of the true nature of housing submarkets in the Dallas area. According to their multivariate analysis, 90 discrete housing submarkets were identified. This level of spatial and price accuracy, they contend, would especially be of benefit to property tax valuation systems and risk estimation in mortgage backed securities lending.

Chen et al. (2009) pursue a somewhat different perspective on the analysis of housing submarkets. They acknowledge the research of Goodman and Thibodeau (1998, 2003) as unique in the literature on housing studies, pointing out as they do that most housing submarket studies have employed fairly arbitrary measures of limited value and predictive accuracy. They also specifically point out that most housing submarket studies have not taken into account urban economic theory. Chen et al. (2009) contend that rational choice theory provides a suitable basis for understanding housing market segmentation in urban areas, especially when also considering the importance of local governance differences which might influence housing market dynamics. Their central objective was to “test the hypothesis of Tiebout\(^1\) theory that individual choice sorts homebuyers into optimal housing submarkets through the equilibrium of provisions of local public goods, given their tastes and preferences” (169).

They test this hypothesis by completing and comparing several types of hedonic modeling methods: “two statistical clustering methods, three predefined geographical delineations, a method that combines statistical clustering and predefined areas, and a random segmentation method” (170). Each modeling method employed 39 discrete variables, including home structural characteristics, sales transaction prices, neighborhood qualities, urban planning factors, school districts, and distance to local amenities, all in Knox County, Tennessee. These models were applied to (1) a large, single housing market assumption, (2) spatially disaggregated housing submarkets which were determined either by (a) arbitrary geographic boundaries or (b) derived from \textit{a priori} information gleaned local real estate agents. The results support the findings of Goodman and Thibodeau (2003), that spatial disaggregation to

smaller, bounded neighborhood submarkets affords more precise identification of these markets and greater accuracy in hedonic price prediction within each. The combination of expert analysis from real estate agents with school performance data and spatial clustering methods produced the most accurate modeling results.

As a result of these findings, Chen et al. (2009) note that the accuracy of submarket boundaries derived from a priori information and knowledge support Tiebout’s rational choice assumptions regarding the nature of housing submarkets and illustrate, in broad fashion, how local government and economic policies influence these same submarkets.

Fotheringham et al. (2015) set out to define and test a novel hedonic pricing model for analyzing and predicting the parameters of housing submarkets and home prices. Citing strong evidence of both spatially dependent (autocorrelated) and spatially non-dependent (heterogeneous) influences in housing submarkets, they set out to develop a combined statistical method including both a multivariate spatial modeling component, geographically weighted regression (GWR), and a time series (TS) forecasting technique. They dub this hybrid hedonic pricing model GWR-TS. The specific goals of their analysis included 1) exploring and modeling the spatial and temporal dynamics of house prices and related factors, and 2) applying these understandings to predictive price models.

Fotheringham et al. (2015) used an existing set of house price data from the London metropolitan area gathered over an eighteen-year period, from 1980-1998. The dependent variables analyzed using a sample set of 1,000 observations and included 18 home structural characteristics, two neighborhood demographic factors and one locational variable. The results of their analysis were then compared to the observed data and compared to the results of an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression test using the same data. As the authors hypothesized, the GWR-TS model was more accurate than OLS alone at predicting home prices in multiple spatial submarkets over time, especially at the local scale. In conclusion, Fotheringham et al. (2015) suggest that their model may benefit from further testing against other spatiotemporal hedonic pricing models.

In this unique study of housing market dynamics in the United States, Ling et al. (2015) proposed investigating the effects of buyer, builder and consumer sentiment on home price persistence/volatility. They posit, based on preliminary research by other authors, that the short-term stability or volatility of house prices is influenced, at least in part, by the general optimism or pessimism of these key actors. They define sentiment as “a misguided belief about the growth in housing prices, the risk of house price appreciation, or both, that cannot be justified by the current economic information set available to housing market participants” (88).

Given the dramatic cycles of housing boom and bust periods from the early 1990s to the present, the authors hypothesize that examining sentiment variables might provide additional explanation for observed broad-scale volatility, in addition to traditional economic and policy factors.
Ling et al. (2015) employed vector autoregression models (VAR) to measure the relationships between short-term home price movements when correlated with buyer (demand), builder (supply), and lender (credit availability) sentiments about the current and near-future states of the overall housing market. According to the authors, VAR models have been widely employed in econometric and financial research and are particularly useful for assessing multivariate time series data, as well as market forecasting. They gathered their sentiment data by administering a survey of direct sentiment measures to each of the three test groups. Each survey was based on existing survey tools previously validated and employed by other institutions, including the University of Michigan (consumer), Wells Fargo and the National Association of Home Builders (builders), and the Federal Reserve Board (lenders). In addition to survey data, variables such as employment levels, industrial output, oil prices, and other econometric indicators were included in regression models. These data were then correlated with short-term and intermediate term movements in home prices, derived and aggregated from sales data in 16 MSAs across the U.S.

The results demonstrated a significant short-term and persistent longer-term relationship (up to five years) between the sentiments of all three test groups and home price data. This was especially true when sentiment data were combined with fundamental market and policy data. Ling et al. (2015) contend that their research might help better predict housing bubbles and slumps in the future, but call for additional study at smaller geospatial and economic scales to affirm the reliability of their methods.

Policy and Practice

Applying current theoretical concepts in developing effective strategies for urban renewal and revitalization requires a shift in thinking on the nature of urban centers in the 21st Century. The character of American cities has changed dramatically during the transition from an industrial to post-industrial economy that has occurred during the last 50 years. The large-scale effects of shifts in America’s major manufacturing hubs in the Northeast and Upper Midwest were not initially felt in the American South. It was later, especially during the late 1990s and early 21st century that mid-size, manufacturing based cities like High Point began to experience the sorts of social and economic dynamic shifts that had been occurring elsewhere. As a result, there is a greater richness of urban revitalization policy and practice information available, a selection of which is presented as follows.

Working with housing markets in the UK, Jones et al. (2005) set out to examine the importance of economic factors in defining submarkets, and understand the dynamics of intra-market and trans-market migration. One important goal of their research included identifying the means by which urban
planners can better understand the nature of housing submarkets and improve the effectiveness of planning efforts in fostering social equity. Although urban planning in the UK is generally more centralized than in the US, they argue that their research efforts have implications for urban planners in many locales.

Jones et al. (2005) acknowledge that complex barriers to conducting detailed housing submarket research have only begun to be addressed. Newer hedonic pricing and forecast models, along with statistical clustering analysis and combined modeling methods have only come into use in recent years and are still undergoing significant refinement. They seek to add to evolving conceptual understandings of housing submarkets and “generate greater insight into the workings of local land and property markets” (216). Jones et al. (2005) recognize that planning is not a panacea for housing segmentation problems and that planning is influenced by inherent market influences, but advocate for a greater planning role in helping create housing where all persons can have a home that they can afford.

Their data was gathered from sales transactions, employment patterns, policy structures, population changes and neighborhood migration for the period 1983-1997 in Glasgow, Scotland. They employed statistical clustering methods and nested, hierarchical models to discern boundaries of housing submarkets. Accordingly, six larger scale geographical submarkets were identified. They then examined net internal and trans-market migration data between these submarkets for the same period, taking into account differences in local property taxation policy and different home price ranges. Their results demonstrated that although migration between housing submarkets does occur, the large majority of movers remained within the submarket boundaries the researchers identified.

According to these results, the authors argue that neighborhood stratification is a strong factor reinforcing social and economic divisions. Additionally, Jones et al. (2005) call for changes to basic urban planning activities so they might better address barriers to spatial and economic mobility and mitigate the effects of unbalanced supply/demand dynamics in housing submarkets across multiple price strata. For instance, government subsidies might be steered to areas with the most demand for housing but where the supply is tightly limited by economic constraints. Jones et al. (2005) conclude by proposing their methodology as useful tool for examining housing market segmentation at a variety of spatial and economic scales in urban areas.

Meen and Andrew (2004) address in greater depth the points laid out by Jones et al. (2005) regarding neighborhood segregation in their study of housing markets in London and the UK. Although London may be a unique, global city, it provides a useful case study of what market segmentation looks like in a large, spatially complex urban area, along with what fiscal tools and policy measures might be employed to reduce housing submarket segregation.

The central questions of their research address the role of government policies in slowing and reversing suburban sprawl, encouraging inner city growth and revitalization, and their ability to facilitate more integrated communities. They note that in the United States, dispersal policies have been implemented more widely than in the UK. That is, programs that assist low-income earners with housing have focused
SUCCESSFUL REVITALIZATION EFFORTS REQUIRE CROSS-DEPARTMENTAL AND CROSS-DISCIPLINARY COOPERATION BETWEEN ZONING, PLANNING AND CODE ENFORCEMENT, POLITICAL LEADERSHIP, BUSINESS LEADERSHIP AND STAKEHOLDERS WITHIN THE COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS AFFECTED.

Meen and Andrew (2004) outline the major philosophies and practices employed in urban growth policy structures, with a stress on the New Urbanism movement. These include three domains: 1) Planning policies that focus on urban rehabilitation of housing stock, redevelopment of brownfield sites, and balancing redevelopment efforts with the demands of the housing marketplace; 2) “area-based policies” which focus on physical neighborhood improvements and promotion, resident education and empowerment, and economic/industry recruitment; and 3) fiscal incentives used to attract business and industry to depressed areas, e.g. tax incentives and public service fee discounts(735). They then crouch within these understandings of local housing market dynamics an analysis of self-organization models in housing submarkets, discrete (rational) choice theory, the role of younger households in neighborhood improvement, the effects of short-term land tenure (high property turnover rates), and household migration patterns in and between submarkets.

The results of their overall analysis suggest several important implications for urban planning policy. Middle and upper income households are those that most closely align with traditional rational choice theory models. Ostensibly, their financial means allow them the flexibility to choose the residential areas that most suit their tastes and desires. These areas are predominantly suburban and exurban, and the potential to recruit these households back into urban cores is likely very limited. In contrast, younger households are more likely to be interested in living in urban centers. Therefore, Meen and Andrews (2004) argue that planning efforts aimed at retaining young, high-skilled households in urban cores. They acknowledge that aspects of spatial segregation and submarket segmentation differ between the United States and United Kingdom. In the former, segregation studies focus heavily on race and ethnicity as dominant factors influencing residential segmentation. In the UK and Europe, racial segregation has historically been less of a driving force in residential segregation. Thus, their study focuses on economic and income segregation specifically while recognizing that economic segregation is closely aligned with racial and ethnic segregation in both America and the UK.

Meen and Andrew (2004) address the question of whether either of these approaches is more effective than the other. They also focus on identifying the most effective means of attracting high-skilled households away from suburbs and back into city...
submarkets may be of benefit in urban revitalization efforts. Furthermore, these authors propose that self-organization processes are strongly influential in housing submarket delineation and that to balance these influences, urban planning policy may be most effective in fostering neighborhood integration by focusing on physical amenity provision, educational improvements and transit infrastructure development in urban cores. Lastly, Meen and Andrews (2004) offer evidence that fiscal incentives used to attract and keep high-skilled labor households into urban centers may be equally, if not more effective than fiscal incentives used to attract business and industry to economically constrained areas.

The neighborhoods Bates (2006) refers to in the title of her article are those defined primarily by traditional planning and administrative criteria. The central premise of her research was to determine if these pre-defined notions of neighborhood boundaries actually match those of housing submarkets identified according to a statistical set of economic, structural, geographic and sociodemographic criteria. Specifically, she set out to identify and evaluate the precision and potential impact of targeted neighborhood revitalization funds and efforts the city of Philadelphia was distributing according to traditional neighborhood definitions.

Before presenting her data and findings, Bates (2006) summarizes the methodologies for assessing and analyzing housing submarkets that have evolved in recent years, including the broadening field of factors understood to influence market dynamics described by other authors herein. Similarly to Jones et al. (2005), she calls specific attention to the need for better understanding how submarkets might be connected and how "... the overall effects of a policy depend on interconnections within segments... even if they are not spatially contiguous"(6).

Bates (2006) conducted an eight point factor analysis of housing and neighborhood characteristics in Philadelphia using an index of 31 such factors. She also included a hedonic pricing regression model that employed eight property-specific characteristics. Her analysis allowed for descriptive clustering of submarkets along a six-point scale, from the most distressed neighborhoods to the most highly valued and desirable. Once all submarket variables were analyzed and compared to the boundaries of city’s targeted neighborhood program districts, Bates (2006) found a significant mismatch. This supports her original contention and suggests that "... plans for the redevelopment of housing should use the geography of submarkets to define policy target and effect areas" (15).

Alan Mallach (2012) of the Brookings Institution Metropolitan Policy Program has, in many ways, emerged as a leading thinker on the most effective components of urban renewal in the 21st century. In this forty-seven page policy statement, Mallach lays out a blueprint for thoughtful and carefully planned demolition of abandoned structures in blighted urban areas, noting that it is an unpleasant but necessary component of renewal in blighted areas of American cities. He points out that abandoned spaces pose significant social and economic costs among urban neighborhoods and that careful planning at the urban and metropolitan levels can make the most of targeted redevelopment efforts. He acknowledges that demolitions are expensive and time-consuming to complete, but when combined
with comprehensive planning efforts, instead of being carried out on a piece-meal basis, a greater balance between cost-benefit ratios can be attained.

For each of these larger concepts he provides detailed steps that cities can take in carrying out effective demolitions plans. He also provides suggestions for procuring state, federal and private financial support for carrying out targeted demolitions. And, importantly, he stresses that successful revitalization efforts require cross-departmental and cross-disciplinary cooperation between zoning, planning and code enforcement, political leadership, business leadership and stakeholders within the communities and neighborhoods affected. In this second Mallach article, he addresses the larger perspective issues of addressing sustainability, equity and ideas on the character of thriving post-industrial cities in 21st century America. Published in the St. Louis University Public Law Review, the piece focuses on St. Louis as a case study, but features elements that are nearly universal to most urban renewal efforts in cities across the U.S. Optimistically, he notes that some cities are experiencing at least some degree of renewal since the late 1990s, even if in “pockets” (139) of revival. Examining components of these spatial, social and economic pockets of revival, among other principles, Mallach presents a conception of what a healthy and thriving city might look like in the 21st century and guiding tenets to achieve urban success.

Mallach defines a city as: a composite of economic resources and jobs; social and demographic links among its populations; a physical, spatial entity encompassing neighborhoods and environments; and a political entity. His point in doing so is stressing that “any effort to formulate a strategy for a sustainable city needs to take all four dimensions into account[;]” including “the knotty issues of justice which cuts across all the city’s many dimensions” (141). He then details information and facets of each of these four dimensions and how they are intricately connected in any modern urban area, along with suggestions for making healthy cities more sustainable over the long-run. On this point, he includes a direct and emphatic statement about controversial underpinnings of what the engines of healthy cities are, quoted in whole here: (158)

Although the neoliberal paradigm is widely favored by both private and public sector policy makers in twenty-first century America, it is not the only framework through which one can look at a city. It is a perspective that privileges individual, free market activity over all other activities, and fails to recognize the many complex ways in which the different sectors of a city, or a society, are interconnected. It attributes little or no value to core principles such as democracy, opportunity, and social cohesion that have long been part of the American tradition. I would argue that a city that does not promote these principles, by both word and deed, is failing its residents in important respects, and cannot claim the title of a sustainable city.

New Urbanism & Urban Renewal

Although the tenets of new urbanism have been touched on in some of the work reviewed herein, Bohl (2000) presents a concise and informative summary of the new urbanism ‘movement’ in the following reviewed monograph. He stresses themes similar to those of Mallach, but presents summaries of the
New Urbanism

Focus on Reviving Historic Architectural Principles Which Were Common Before the Growth of Automobile Transit - Deconstructing Mammoth Public Spaces into a Mix of Human-Scale Public and Private Spaces, and Fostering Mixed Land Uses.

specific components of what modern American cities can become when the principles of new urbanism are applied to short- and long-term development and revitalization efforts.

Although Bohl’s (2000) review is a bit dated in 2015, the information he presents offers a solid foundation for understanding the principles of the New Urbanism movement and how they might address inequities in housing market segmentation, development and revitalization, the needs of low-income populations, and urban planning policies and practices. Bohl (2000) contends that New Urbanism has evolved to become the most powerful force in building and planning since the Modernist movement. And, although “not a panacea,” New Urbanism planning and design principles afford many opportunities, especially when “integrated within the larger array of economic, social, and community development programs attempting to revitalize and improve the quality of life” in urban neighborhoods (761).

Bohl notes that New Urbanist design principles are being incorporated into a multitude of various agendas, including environmentalism, historic preservation, and smart growth strategies, among others. Importantly, regarding housing, these design principles have been adopted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development across many programs. At its heart, according to Bohl (2000), the New Urbanism movement aims to revive “traditional” urban forms, limit suburban sprawl and reverse inner-city decline. The movement advocates for the benefits of high-density, mixed-use, pedestrian-friendly, and transit-efficient development. It also relies heavily on containing urban growth and preserving rural spaces.

Also, New Urbanism planning and design practices can be tailored to a variety of spatial scales, from small urban neighborhoods to regional development schemes. Yet, the core of Bohl’s (2000) paper outlines how these principles might be applied and are being applied to address inner-city decline and improve homes and neighborhoods among low-income, urban residents. These focus on reviving historic architectural principles which were common before the growth of automobile transit - deconstructing mammoth public spaces into a mix of human-scale public and private spaces, and fostering mixed land uses. Methods for accomplishing these design goals include “incremental rehabilitation and infill of public housing” to replace the public housing high-rises and ghettos that arose from well-intentioned public housing efforts of the 1960s and 1970s; tailoring design solutions to the characteristics and needs of individual neighborhoods and localities, instead of employing a blanket design model; including public participation in the planning and design process, instead of implementing
top-down approaches; and fostering inner-city economic and job opportunities by planning for and incentivizing neighborhood-based commercial design and development.

Bohl (2000) also addresses the criticisms of New Urbanism and suggests ways in which its philosophies and principles might be improved upon in the near future. He takes care to point out the movement is not a “housing program... economic development program” or “…a social service program” (792), but that the design and planning principles of New Urbanism complement the best of these effectively.

Conclusions

As this review demonstrates, comprehensive housing market segmentation analysis involves consideration of a wide variety of economic, sociocultural, geographic and structural variables. Multiple statistical models exist for evaluating and predicting price movements and for identifying trouble spots in urban areas which might benefit from targeted redevelopment efforts and public investment. However, High Point, just as any other specific urban area studied among the research reviewed here, is a unique city with unique needs, strengths and weaknesses. Many of the models and general suggestions from experts like Mallach regarding urban renewal efforts are easily adaptable to the unique qualities of the High Point core city area, but determining the optimum strategies that might garner the greatest return on investment and effort will require careful planning and tailoring of solutions.

Several steps are clearly indicated as high-priority actions. Public and municipal government entities must take an active role in understanding and monitoring the dynamics of housing markets, including population migration and inter-city mobility, along with property value movements. This requires regular collection, monitoring and updating multiple points of data across multiple agencies and offices. High Point, like many other North Carolina and American cities has experienced continual suburbanization and increasing sprawl in recent decades of deindustrialization. As a result, efforts to build a healthier, more robust and sustainable High Point should include incentives to attract young renters and homebuyers back into the city core area, coupled with investments in mixed commercial land uses, environmental and neighborhood amenities, green spaces, improved walkability and integrated, multi-modal systems of public transit.

Perhaps, most importantly, building a better High Point cannot rely solely on market forces. As this review demonstrates and has been witnessed for decades in High Point, this leads to racially and ethnically segregated communities, enclaves of well-heeled suburbanites and spatial pockets of extreme poverty with near complete lack of access to social and economic opportunities. Building public-private partnerships, developing proactive, flexible, equity-focused and adaptable zoning and planning plans at the municipal level, and targeting scarce public resources effectively will be key in long-term efforts to build and maintain a thriving High Point.
Secondary Data Analysis

The data collected in the parcel assessment was matched with current data from the City of High Point (lists of condemned, vacant, and nuisance buildings, crime data, public services data, etc.) as well as information on community economic, demographic, and social conditions. ArcGIS was used to produce maps showing the Core City overlaid with geospatial data from various sources including:

- National Sources: American Housing Survey, Decennial Census, American Community Survey, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA), US Postal Service, ESRI data, HUD Tools, etc.
- Local Jurisdictional Sources: Guilford County tax records, Foreclosures (registrar of deeds), Crime data, Housing code enforcement data, Utility shut-offs, etc.

Univariate and bivariate descriptive statistics were also generated using SPSS and are reported in the High Point Study Area

- Washington Terrace (CT 136.01)
- North Central Neighborhoods (CT: 136.02)
- Washington Drive/ Washington Terrace (CT 138)
- Emerywood (CT: 137)
- East Central (CT: 139)
- West English/ West End (CT: 140)
- Blair Park/ Macedonia (CT: 142)
- Highland Mill Village/ Kendall Avenue/Southside (CT: 143)
- Oak Hill (CT: 145.01)
Demographics

Population Summary
The average number of persons per square mile among all High Point Core City Census block groups is 964. A small majority of all block groups have fewer than 964 persons. The most populous block group is 140.02 with an estimated population of 2,199. The least populated block group is 138.08 with only 431 persons. The three most populous block groups are 136.11, 139.04 and 140.02. The three least populous block groups are 137.02, 143.01 and 138.03. The total population for all block groups in the core city area is 30,848.

Population Change 2010-2013
In sum, the 32 census block groups which make up the High Point core city experienced a small net loss of their population between 2010 and 2013 – 644 persons. This reflects an overall population loss of approximately 2.5%. Block group 136.12 lost the most population in terms of raw numbers – 426 individuals. Block group 143.01 lost the most population in terms of total percentage – 39%. Block group 137.01 grew by the largest share – 38% and block group 136.21 gained the largest net number of persons – 418. The picture of overall block group population change suggests slight fluctuations across all core city block groups, with no substantial evidence of large outflows/influxes of residents. Nonetheless, a small number individual block groups, including those mentioned, have experienced large population swings in recent years.

FIGURE 20 - POPULATION CHANGE
Population Density 2012
Core city Census block groups display a wide range of population densities, ranging from a low of 300 persons per square mile in block group 145.11 to a high of 9,646 persons per square mile in block group 138.04. The average density across all block groups is approximately 3,190 persons per square mile, but this number is skewed a bit because of a few very densely populated block groups, including 136.12, 139.04 and 139.02. Almost two-thirds of block groups feature a population density lower than the mean. In addition to 145.11, less densely populated block groups include 145.12 and 143.01.

Race and Ethnicity
White, non-Hispanic residents
In the core city area of High Point, the mean percentage of White, non-Hispanic residents was 49.2%. The median percentage of White, non-Hispanic residents was 47.7%. Block group 138.03 had the smallest percentage of White, non-Hispanic residents (0%). Block group 137.04 had the largest percentage of White, non-Hispanic residents (96%).
Non-White Residents
In the core city area of High Point, the mean percentage of non-white residents was 50.8%. The median percentage was 52.3%. Block group 137.04 had the smallest percentage of non-White residents (4%). Block group 138.03 had the largest percentage of non-White residents; estimated to be 100% African-American. Block group 138.02 had the second-largest percentage of non-white residents, at 90%.

African-American Residents
The mean percentage of African-American residents was 49.3% and the median was 48.2%. Block group 137.02 had zero African-American residents, according to Census data, while block group 138.03 was 100% African-American. This racial category had the greatest percentage range. The racial African-American category was found to have the largest range of values when compared to other racial and ethnic population categories.

Native American Residents
The core city area of High Point possesses a very small Native American population, most located in one Census block group – 140.02 (2.2%). The mean percentage of Native American residents was .15% across all neighborhoods and the median percentage was zero. Of the 32 block groups, only five have a Native American resident percentage greater than zero. These include 137.01, 137.03, 138.05 and 139.02, all with less than 1% Native American residents.

Asian Residents
The mean percentage of Asian residents was 3.7%. The median of the same was 2.4%. Of the 32 block groups, 14 have no estimated Asian residents. Block group 143.04, at 16%, has the greatest percentage of Asian residents. Block group 143.02, at 15%, and block group 139.04, at 14%, have the next highest concentrations of Asian residents.

Foreign-Born Residents
The percentages of foreign-born residents in each core city Census block group were generalized from tract level data estimates provided by the American Community Survey 2009-2013 (ACS). The mean estimated percent of foreign born residents for all Census block groups is 11.8%. The median value is 12.1%. Values range from a low of 4% in Census tract 137 to a high of 18% in Census tract 143. The average of foreign born residents living in Guilford County as a whole is approximately 9.7%, according to the same ACS data. Thus, the average estimates for Asian residents in the core city areas of High Point are moderately higher than those for the entire county.
Age demographics vary quite a bit across the High Point core city project area. CHCS analyzed American Community Survey 2009-2013 data regarding the percentages of residents aged 18 years or less and the percentages of those aged 65 years or older. The mean percentage of residents 18 years old or younger across all core city Census block groups is approximately 24.7%. The median for the same is approximately 24.1%. Averages range from a low of 5% in block group 143.4 to a high of 51% in block group 143.2. Block groups that are home to much higher than average percentages of minors include 139.4 (47%) and 138.1 (47%). Census block groups 138.4 (40%) and 139.1 (40%) also feature high rates of resident minors. Census block groups with lower than average percentages of minors include 137.5 (6%), 136.12 (7%) and 138.3 (8%).

The mean percentage of residents 65 years old or older across all core city block groups is approximately 13.5%. The median percentage is approximately 11.2%. The mean percentage in this case is skewed slightly because of one Census block group in particular that is home to a much larger percentage of older residents than any other block group in the core city area, 137.5 (40%). Block group 138.3 also features a much higher than average percentage of older residents (32%), along with block group 145.11, which is also home to an above average population of older citizens (27%). Several block groups feature much lower than average percentages of older residents, including 143.2 (1%), 138.4 (2%), 142.4 (3%) and 143.1 (5%).

**Figure 24 - Percent of Households with Persons 65 or Over**
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The mean percentage of residents 65 years old or older across all core city block groups is approximately 13.5%. The median percentage is approximately 11.2%. The mean percentage in this case is skewed slightly because of one Census block group in particular that is home to a much larger percentage of older residents than any other block group in the core city area, 137.5 (40%). Block group 138.3 also features a much higher than average percentage of older residents (32%), along with block group 145.11, which is also home to an above average population of older citizens (27%). Several block groups feature much lower than average percentages of older residents, including 143.2 (1%), 138.4 (2%), 142.4 (3%) and 143.1 (5%).
FIGURE 25 - MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Socioeconomic

Median Income
The average median household income for all of Guilford County is approximately $45,400 according to American Community Survey 2009-2013 data. The mean household income across all High Point core city Census block groups is $29,770. The average median household income is much lower, $23,000. This approximately half of that for Guilford County as a whole. Generally, the median household income measure is considered a more accurate reflection of true household income than mean estimated household income because of small numbers of residents and communities with exceptionally higher than average household incomes. This is true for the High Point core city block groups. Block group 137.4 features an estimated median household income of $108,750, far above the next highest Census block group, 137.3 ($60,400). Thus the income estimates for 137.4 artificially skew the mean upward. Overall, only seven of the 32 block groups in High Point’s core city exceed the county-wide median household income average. In addition to 137.4 and 137.3 already mentions, these include 137.2 ($60,250), 137.5 ($51,667), 136.23 ($49,306), 137.1 ($46,875) and 136.24 ($46,860).

For the remaining 25 block groups falling below the Guilford County income median, the numbers range from a low of $9,006 to a high of $39,728. Three census block groups in particular feature extremely low estimated median income levels: 143.2 ($9,006), 139.1 ($9,307) and 139.2 ($9,330). These and eight additional block groups feature median annual household incomes below $20,000, accounting for one-third of High Point’s core city communities. These strongly influence the much lower than average median household income estimate for the entire core city.
Educational Attainment
Less than High School Education
Among the population aged 25 and older, the mean percentage of residents who had achieved less than high school educational attainment is approximately 29%; the median for the same is 28.3%. The block groups located in census tract 137 have more educated residents than any other tract. The lowest rates of less than high school educational attainment range from 1% in 137.01 and 137.04 to 16% in 137.05. Block group 143.01, at 63%, had the highest percentage of residents who have not finished high school or GED equivalency. The “less than high school” level of educational attainment had the greatest percentage range (1% to 63%) of all the educational attainment variables across all core city areas.

FIGURE 26 - EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
High School Completion/GED Equivalency

Among core city populations aged 25 and older, the mean percentage of residents who have completed high school or GED equivalency is 31.6%. The median value for the same was 30.7%. Again, the lowest values for this variable were among residents of Census tract 137. The lowest percentage of residents with only high school or GED attainment reside in block group 137.02 (4%). Block group 143.04 had the greatest percentage of residents who had only achieved high school or GED educational attainment (60%).

Completion of Some College or a Two-Year Degree

Among the population aged 25 and older, the mean percentage of residents who had achieved some college level education or a two year degree is 26%. The median for the same is 26.8%. Block group 143.04 had the smallest percentage of residents who had reached this level of educational attainment (4%). Block group 136.01.2 had the largest percentage of residents who had reached this level of educational attainment (51%).
Four Year Degree Completion

Among the population aged 25 and older, the mean percentage of residents who have achieved a four-year degree is 10.2%. The median percentage median for the same was 5.6%. The substantial difference between mean and median values for this variable indicates that a few census block groups which have substantially higher concentrations of residents with four year degrees are skewing the mean value higher. A total of four census block groups (138.02, 138.04, 143.01 and 145.01.1) have a zero estimated percentage of residents who have attained a four-year degree. Block group 137.01 had the highest percentage of residents who have completed a four-year degree (48%).

Post-Graduate/Professional School Educational Attainment

Among the population aged 25 and older, the mean percentage of residents who had achieved post-graduate or professional school educational attainment was 3.8%. The median for the same is estimated at zero. As is the case for those with 4-year degree, this substantial difference in mean and median values results from the large number of neighborhoods that are estimated to be home to no persons who have completed post-graduate education. Seventeen census block groups (more than half) have no residents estimated to have attained post-graduate level educational attainment. Block group 137.04 has the highest percentage of residents who have attained any post-graduate education (35%).

Property Crimes 2011-2014

CHCS used High Point City data from 2011 to 2014 to compute the percent of parcels where property crimes occurred by census block group in the Core City area. Within each of five census block groups (138.5, 139.2, 140.1, 142.2 and 143.2) more than 53% of parcels had experienced property crimes. Of these, four are located in the centermost areas of the core city.

In ten census block groups (13602.1, 13602.4, 138.1, 139.4, 140.2, 142.4, 142.3, 143.3, 143.4, and 14501.1) property crimes had been reported for 40.01% to 53.6% of the parcels. In nine census block groups (13601.2, 13602.2, 13602.3, 137.1, 137.2, 137.5, 138.2, 139.3 and 142.1) between 30.21% and 40% of parcels had experienced property crime.

Among block groups 137.3, 138.4, 143.1 and 14501.2, property crimes affected between 22.84% and 30.2% of all parcels. Property crimes were the least prevalent among block groups 13601.1, 137.4, 138.3 and 139.1, occurring in less than 22.84% of the parcels. Of the block groups with the lowest percentages of property crimes per parcel, three are located suburban edges of the Core City. Notably, the fourth block group with the lowest rate of property crime per parcel (139.1) is located in the heart of the core city area and is bounded by two high crime areas to the north and south, 138.5 and 139.2, respectively.
FIGURE 28 - PROPERTY CRIMES

FIGURE 29 - VIOLENT CRIMES
Violent Crimes
CHCS used High Point City Data from 2011 to 2014 to compute the percentages of parcels where violent crimes occurred, delineated by core city block groups. The highest rates of violent crime were reported in census block groups 139.4 and 142.2, where rates exceeded 31.8% violent crimes per parcel. These parcels are located in central western and southeastern sections of the core city. In twelve census block groups, a little over one-third of all Core City neighborhoods (13602.1, 13602.4, 138.4, 138.5, 139.1, 139.2, 140.1, 142.3, 142.4, 143.2, 143.3 and 143.4), violent crimes per parcel occurred ranged from 16% and 31.8%. In seven census block groups (137.1, 137.3, 138.2, 139.3, 140.2, 142.1, and 14501.1) violent crimes per parcel ranged from 9.42% to 15.9%. Among communities with the lowest rates of violent crimes per parcel (13601.1, 13601.2, 13602.2, 13602.3, 137.2, 138.3, 143.1 and 14501.2), values ranged between 0.81% and 9.41%. Two block groups had less than 0.8% reported violent crimes per parcel (137.4 and 137.5), both located in western suburbs of the core city.

Housing
Housing Units
According to data from the American Community Survey 2009-2013 the mean number of housing units per block group across the core city is 462.28. The median number for the same is 356.5 per census block group. This fairly large difference in the mean and median values suggests that there are a few census block groups with much higher numbers of housing units that are skewing the numbers upward. This is likely because of five block groups with the highest density housing units, each containing more than 536 units: 136.02.1, 137.1, 138.5, 139.1 and 140.2. Block group 140.2 has the greatest overall number of housing units, at 964. Block group 136.01.2 contains the least number of overall housing units, at 145.
Vacant Properties
Data regarding housing vacancy rates in the core city were derived from the American Community Survey 2009-2013. Three census block groups (13602.2, 13602.4 and 137.5) have the lowest vacancy rates of all core city block groups (4.3%). Eight block groups have moderately low vacancy rates, ranging from 4.3 to 11.6%. These include 13601.2, 137.3, 137.4, 142.2, 142.4, 143.2, 14501.1, and 14501.2. In block groups 13601.1, 13602.1, 13602.3, 137.1, 138.1, 138.2, 138.3, 138.4, 139.2, 140.2, and 143.3, vacancy rates ranged between 11.61% and 17.4%. Higher vacancy rates are present block groups 137.2, 138.5, 139.1, 139.3, 139.4, 140.1, 142.1, 142.3 and 143.3, ranging from approximately 17.4% to nearly 32%. Block group 143.1 has the greatest vacancy rate, at 49%. The lowest concentrations of vacant properties are located in the central northwestern quadrant of the Core City area. The largest concentrations of vacant housing units are located roughly along a circular periphery of block groups surrounding the central core city.
Figure 31 - Median Age of Housing

Housing Age
According to CHCS computed data from the American Community Survey 2009-2013, the mean age of housing stock in the High Point core city area is approximately 57.4 years. The oldest homes are found in the central northwestern quadrant of the core city, block groups 13602.3, 137.1 and 137.4, averaging more than 68 years old. The next oldest homes, averaging between 60 and 68 years old, are found in block groups 13602.2, 137.2, 137.5, 138.4, 138.5, 140.1, and 143.1. In eleven census block groups (approximately one-third of the core city) comprising 13601.1, 13601.2, 13602.1, 138.1, 138.2, 138.3, 140.2, 142.1, 142.3, 142.3 and 14501.2, the median age of housing units was between 53 and 60 years. In block groups 13602.4, 137.3, 139.2, 139.3, 142.2, 143.4 and 14501.1, the median age of housing units was between 46 and 53 years. Block groups 139.1, 139.4, 143.2, and 143.3 have the youngest average of housing stock, aged between 41 and 46 years. The youngest median housing ages are concentrated along the southern border of Washington Drive through the center of the Core City.
FIGURE 32 - OWNER-_OCCUPIED HOUSING

Owner-Occupied Properties

Data on owner-occupied residential properties was gleaned from the American Community Survey 2009-2013. The overall average for the core city was just over 352 owner occupied units per block group and an average owner occupancy rate of approximately 41.1%. The lowest rates of owner occupied units were found in five block groups: 139.1, 139.4, 142.4, 143.2 and 143.1, each with rates of less than 13.8%. Among the next highest tier of owner occupancy, 13602.1, 138.1, 139.2, 143.3, 14501.1 and 14501.2 all had rates between 13.8% and 26.9%. Block groups 13602.4, 138.5, 140.1, 140.2, 142.2 and 142.3 had owner occupancy rates between 27% and 42.8%. The higher owner occupancy rates occurred among block groups 13601.1, 13601.2, 13602.2, 13602.3, 138.2, 138.3, 138.4, 142.1 and 143.4, averaging between 42.8% and 59.1%. Six block groups, all located in the northwest quadrant of the core city, with the exception of one (139.3 in the east central area), had greater than 59.1% owner occupancy rates. The other five block groups include 137.1, 137.2, 137.3, 137.4 and 137.5. The census block groups with the lowest rates of owner-occupancy are concentrated in the center of the Core City area along the southern side of Washington Drive.
**Figure 33 - Renter-Occupied Housing**

**Rental Properties**
According to CHCS computed data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2009-2013 American Community Survey, the mean percent of properties in the core city that are renter occupied is 58.78%. The median percent of the same is 57.95%. The four block groups with the lowest percentage of renter-occupied properties are all in census tract 137, which conversely all have high rates of owner occupancy. Block group 137.4 has the lowest rate of rental occupancy (2%). Of all 32 census block groups that comprise the core city area, 23 of them (approximately 72%) have a renter-occupancy rates greater than 50%. Census block group 143.2 has the maximum rate of renter occupied properties, at 99%.
Home Values

**FIGURE 34 - AVERAGE TAX VALUE OF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL PARCEL**

Average tax value of single-family residential parcels

The mean tax value of single-family residential parcels in the core city in 2014 as calculated by the Guilford County Tax Assessor was $65,588. The median value for the same was $46,981. As is the case with other property related variables reviewed herein, the mean tax value is much higher than the median tax value due to small clusters of homes in the northwest quadrant of the core city area with substantially higher values. Thus, the true average tax value for single family residences is most likely closer to the median value than the mean. The lowest average tax values of single-family residential parcels were mostly concentrated in eastern and central portions of core city south of Washington Drive. The six block groups that fell within the lowest range (between $22,374 and $34,969) include 136.01.1, 139.2, 139.3, 139.4, 143.1 and 143.2. The lowest average tax value, $22,374, was found in census block group 136.12. The highest single family residence tax values were evident in census tract 137. No other block group outside of census tract 137 had tax values for single-family residential parcels above $68,797. Census block group 137.4 had the maximum average value of single-family residential parcels, at $273,371.
The mean tax value of all residential parcels in 2014 as calculated by the Guilford County Tax Assessor was $64,640 in the core City. The median for the same was $47,886, reflecting both the skewing effect of highly valuable properties concentrated in a few core city northwestern block groups and the influence of higher-valued multi-family residential properties. Census block group 139.2 had the lowest average tax value of all residential parcels, at $20,354. Census block group 137.4 had the highest average tax value of residential parcels at $273,224. Outside of Census tract 137, the highest tax assessed value was $94,637 found in block groups outside of this census tract. Block groups 136.12 ($23,458), 139.3 ($25,186) and 138.4 ($30,422) had the lowest overall residential property tax values in the core city after block group 139.2. Other highly valued residential properties were located in block groups 137.1 ($201,888) and 137.2 (157,123).
Average tax value of all parcels in 2014

The mean tax value of all parcels located in the core city in 2014, as calculated by the Guilford County Tax Assessor was $134,005. The median average tax value of all parcels was $94,630. Here again, a small number of very highly valued properties are skewing the mean, thus the median estimate is more likely to reflect more accurate tax valuations. Break ranges include four census tracts (13601.2, 138.4, 139.3 and 143.3) with average tax values between $21,633 and $37,935. The second class included ten block groups (13601.1, 13602.2, 13602.2, 138.1, 138.2, 138.3, 139.4, 142.1, 142.2 and 142.3) all ranging between $37,936 and $65,546 average tax value. Seven block groups (13602.3, 13602.4, 137.3, 140.1, 140.2, 143.1 and 143.4) fell into the central range with average tax values between $65,547 and $118,967. More highly valued parcels were found in seven block groups (137.1, 137.2, 137.4, 137.5, 138.5, 142.4 and 14501.2) with an average range of values between $118,968 and $289,572, and all located within the inner suburbs of the city core, with the exception of 14501.2. Three of the highest valued block groups (139.1, 139.2, and 143.2) are all located in the heart of the city core; one block group (14501.1) is located in the heavily industrialized southern portion of the core city area. Values for these four neighborhoods equaled or exceeded $280,752 per parcel.
Average tax value of non-residential parcels, 2014

According to 2014 Guilford County tax assessments, the mean tax value of non-residential parcels in the core city was $330,276 in the core city area. The median average tax value of non-residential parcels was $214,401. Here again is evidence of the skewing effect of a view very highly valued non-residential parcels. In block group 138.3 the average tax value of non-residential parcels was $0, indicating that all parcels located in this community are residential parcels. Census block group 139.2, at $1,833,020, had the highest average tax value of all the block groups in the core city area.
Average Rent
CHCS computed data from the American Community Survey 2009-2013 to determine the median contract rent rates among block groups in core city. Two census block groups (137.3 and 137.4) had too few rental property transactions to determine a valid mean and were not included in calculations for the overall median and mean rates. The mean city core rent was $648.50 monthly and the median for the same was $692 monthly. Block groups 138.4 ($239) and 139.1 ($249) had the lowest estimated monthly rents. Nine census block groups (137.1, 138.1, 138.5, 139.2, 139.4, 143.2, 143.3, 143.4, and 14501.1) had median rents ranging from $290 and $546. Among five block groups in the central range (137.2, 140.1, 142.3, 143.1, and 14501.2), the median rent averaged between $547 and $696. In the upper categories, 12 census block groups (a little more than one-third of the core city) averaged rents between $697 and $806. These included 13601.1, 13602.1, 13602.2, 13602.3, 13602.4, 137.5, 138.2, 139.3, 140.2, 142.1, 142.2, and 142.4. The highest median rents were found in block group 138.3 ($950) and 136.12 ($1,071).
Housing Tenure

**FIGURE 39 - PERCENT MOVED**

**Population Mobility**

According to American Community Survey 2009-2013 data, the mean percentage of the population that moved in the last year was 22.49% in the core city area. The median percentage of the same was 20.88% in the core city area. In six of the thirty-two census block groups, one third or more of the population moved in the last year. Census block group 139.2 (46%), had the highest percentage of residents who moved in the last year. Census block group 137.2 (2%) had the lowest percentage of residents who moved in the last year.
FIGURE 40 - AVERAGE HOMEOWNER TENURE

Housing Tenure

Average length of homeowner residency (tenure) was derived from the American Community Survey 2009-2013 data. The shortest lengths of homeowner tenure occurred in nine census block groups (13601.1, 13602.1, 137.2, 137.3, 138.3, 140.1, 142.3, 143.2, and 143.4) where the average was than twelve years. The lowest length of average homeowner tenure was found in block group 140.1 (9 years). In the middle ranges, ten census block groups, 13601.2, 13602.4, 13602.3, 137.1, 137.4, 137.5, 138.2, 140.2, 142.1, and 143.1, the average homeowner tenure was between 12 and 19 years. Following this category, block groups 13602.2, 139.1, 139.3, 142.2, and 14501.1 had average homeowner tenure rates between 19 and 27 years. At the upper tier of values, four census block groups (138.4, 138.5, 139.4, and 14501.2) had average homeowner tenure greater than 27 years. Block group 145.11 had the greatest length of homeowner tenure, at 42 years. In the remaining four census block groups, 138.1, 139.2, 142.4, and 143.3, those with high rates of rental properties, there were too few records to accurately calculate an average of homeowner tenure.
FIGURE 41 - AVERAGE RENTER TENURE

Rental Tenure
CHCS used the American Community Survey 2009-2013 data to compute the average renter tenure per census block group in the core city. Overall, the ranges for rental tenure averages were fairly narrow. The mean period of rental tenure was 6.22 years and the median was 6.0 years. Block groups 138.1, 140.1, and 142.3 all had rental tenure rate averages of less than four years. In 13601.1, 137.5, 139.4, 142.2, and 14501.1, the average renter tenure was between four and five years. In 138.5, 140.2, 142.1, and 143.2, the average renter tenure was between five and six years. In 13601.2, 13602.1, 139.2, 143.1, 143.3, and 14501.2, the average renter tenure was between six and seven years. In 13602.2, 13602.3, 13602.4, 137.2, and 139.1, the average renter tenure was greater than seven years. In the remaining nine census block groups, 137.1, 137.3, 137.4, 138.2, 138.3, 138.4, 139.3, 142.4, and 143.4, all areas with high rates of home ownership, there were too few data points on rentals and tenure to determine a reliable mean or median.
Foreclosures
According to data collected by the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, in High Point core city the lowest foreclosure rates (less than 4.1%), were found in census tracts 137 and 145.01. Census tract 136.02 had the second lowest average foreclosure rate, between 4.1% and 5.6%. Census tracts 140 and 142 foreclosure rates between 5.7% and 7.5%. Census tract 138 had a foreclosure rate estimated between 7.6% and 8.1%. Census tracts 139 and 143 had the highest foreclosure rates of all core city tracts, with averages greater than 8.1%.
FIGURE 43 - DELINQUENT TAX BILLS

Tax Delinquency
CHCS employed data from 2014 Guilford County Tax Assessor records to compute the percentage of parcels with delinquent tax bills per core city block group. Both the mean and the median rate of delinquent taxes per parcel by block group was 7.6%. The lowest rates of property tax delinquency were found in block groups, 137.1, 137.2, 137.3, 137.4, 137.5, and 13601.2, with rates between 0.51% and 2.3%. Block groups 13601.1, 13602.1, 13602.3, 13602.4, 140.1, 140.2, 143.4, 14501.1, and 14501.2, average delinquency rates between 2.31% and 6%. Among the middle tier block groups 13602.2, 138.2, 138.3, 138.5, 142.1, 142.4, 143.1, and 143.2, averaged between 6.1% and 9.9% of parcels with delinquent tax bills. In the next highest category, seven census block groups, 138.1, 139.2, 139.3, 139.4, 142.2, 142.3, and 143.3, averaged between 10% and 13.4% delinquent tax bills per parcel. Block groups 138.4 and 139.1 had the greatest percentages of per parcel delinquent tax bills, at 13.4%. The greatest rates of tax delinquency are concentrated in the census block groups in the eastern and northeastern block groups of the core city area. 138.4 had the highest rate of property tax delinquency (21%) and block group 137.4 had the lowest rate (0.1%).
**Figure 44 - Home Loans Originated**

**Home Mortgages**

The Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council's (FFIEC) Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) Loan Application Report (LAR) data was queried for the total number of loans originated within a given area (limited to Census Tracts). Loans originated was considered instead of loans applied for as there may be a large discrepancy in some areas over the number of mortgage seekers versus those who actually receive a loan and close on a home. Thus, loan originations are a good indicator of strong and weak real estate markets. Census Tract 137, located in the northwest quadrant of the core city had the highest volume loan originations, followed by 140 and 136. Eastern and southern tracts in High Point (139, 142, 143 and 145) had the lowest number of originations, along with several in the central portions of the core city.
FIGURE 45 – PARCELS WITHOUT UTILITY BILLS (HIGHER VACANCY RATES)

Without Utility Bills
Using data collected by the City of High Point, CHCS computed the percent of parcels without utility bills since 2013 - an indicator of home or structural vacancy. Block groups 136.01.2, 137.1, 137.2, 137.4 and 138.3 all had less than 3% of the parcels without utility bills since 2013. Almost all census block groups forming the northern perimeter of the core city had 5.2% of parcels or less with no utility bills issued since 2013. A large cluster of inner suburban block groups had moderate levels of parcels with no utility bills since 2013, including most of Census tract 142, along with portions of 136, 139 and 143. The highest concentrations of parcels without utility bills (approximately 12.8% to 17.9%) were found in the central eastern portions of the core city area, including census block groups 139.1, 139.2 and 139.3.
Secured by Code Enforcement

CHCS used High Point City Data to compute the percent of properties per block group with code violations that have required securing. In this Core City area of High Point, 20 out of the 32 census block groups have no properties with code violations requiring securing. Block groups 138.5, 139.1, 139.4, and 142.4 have the highest percentage of properties with secured code violations, at greater than .63%. Census block groups 139.2 and 143.2 have between .37% and .63% of properties with secured code violations. Block groups 139.3, 140.1, 140.2 have somewhat lower rates of secured violations, averaging between .29% and .36% of properties. Block groups 142.3, 143.1, and 143.1, have smaller percentages of secured code violations, ranging between a low of .001% to .28% of properties. All 12 of the census block groups that do have properties with code violations that have been secured are either centrally located in the core city area or border Washington Drive to the north or south.
FIGURE 47 – PERCENT DEMOLITION (VACANT LOTS)

Demolished by Code Enforcement
CHCS used High Point City Data from 2012 to 2014 to compute the percent of parcels that contain demolished properties per census block group. In the Core City area of High Point, 20 out of the 32 census block groups have no parcels containing demolished properties. Census block groups 138.4, 139.1, and 139.2, have the greatest percent of parcels that contain demolished properties, between .38% and 1.12%. Block groups 138.5, 139.3, 140.1 and 142.4 follow, averaging between .26% and .37% of parcels that contain demolished properties. Block groups with lower percentages of demolished properties include block groups 138.2 and 139.4, averaging between .20% and .25% per parcel. The lowest rate of demolished properties were noted in block groups, 13602.1, 142.1 and 143.1, with averages between .001% and .19% per parcel.
Nuisance Properties
Data on the percentages of nuisance cases reported per Census block group in the core city were analyzed using High Point city data from 2011 to 2014. Block groups 13602.4, 137.2, 137.4, 137.5, 143.4, and 14501.2 had a low rate of reported nuisance cases, less than .46% of parcels. From there, block groups 13601.1, 13601.2, 137.1, 137.3, 138.3, and 14501.1 experienced between .47% and .95% of parcels with nuisance case reports. Following, block groups 13602.1, 13602.2, 13602.3, 138.2, 139.2, 140.1, 140.2, 142.2, 142.4, 143.1, and 143.3 had between .96% and 1.90% of parcels with nuisance case reports. Percentages of nuisance case reports increase somewhat from there with block groups 138.1, 138.4, 138.5, and 142.1 experiencing between 1.91% and 3.37% of cases per parcel. Block groups 139.1, 139.3, 139.4, 142.3, and 143.2 had the highest rate of nuisance case reports per parcel, averaging greater than 3.37%. These five block groups are located largely on the southern border of Washington.
New Building Permits
Higher numbers of building permit issuance are generally considered reliable gauges of growth in urban areas. CHCS used High Point city data collected between 2011 to 2014, to compute the percent of parcels where building permits were issued. Among the lowest block groups with issued building permits were 138.1, 138.2, 138.3, 138.4, 142.1, 142.2, and 14501.2, in which building permits were issued for less than 3.23% of parcels. Block groups 13601.1, 137.3, 137.4, 139.3, 139.4, 140.2, 142.3, 143.1 and 143.4 saw somewhat higher numbers of building permits issued per parcel, between 3.23% and 8.35%. Among 13602.2, 13602.3, 137.2, 137.5, 139.2, 142.4, and 143.3, building permits were issued for between 8.36% and 14.2% of parcels. In 13602.1, 13602.4, 137.1, 140.1, and 14501.1, building permits were issued for between 14.3% and 25.7% of parcels. At the higher end, among block groups 13601.2, 138.5, 139.1, and 143.2, building permits were issued for greater than 25.7% of parcels. In general, the lowest percentages of building permits per parcel were issued among Census block groups along the outskirts of the core city, while the highest percentage of permits per parcel were issued among all in Census block groups located mostly in the in the central block groups of the core city area.
Environment, Community & Health

Figure 50 – Medical Access

Health Care Access
Reliable access to health care facilities within reasonable travel distances is a major indicator of life-quality in any urban area. A standard spatial transit measure employed to estimate ready access to a wide range of services in urban areas is a 0.25 mile walkable buffer. Accordingly, many residents of High Point’s core city block groups do not have ready access to general health, oral health and mental health care services, among others. A variety of services are clustered around High Point Regional Health System facilities located in the central, western portions of the core city. These are generally focused in Census tracts 136 and 137, with another small cluster located in Census tract 140. Residents in the entire northeast quadrant of the core city possess no walkable access to health care facilities within the standard 0.25 mile buffer. The same is true for residents living in central eastern and southern portions of the core city. Thus, large portions of residents in the core city area lack reasonable and ready access to health care services.
Figure 51 – Pre 1960s Structures (Higher Probability of Lead Paint)

**Lead**

Using data collected by the Environmental Protection Agency Environmental Justice Index (EJScreen), CHCS computed the percent of housing units built before 1960 per census block group as a benchmark indicator to estimate the risk of lead paint exposure in dwellings. The oldest housing units are located in block group 137.1 and 13602.2. These are adjacent to block groups (13602.3, 137.2, 1374, 137.5, 138.5 and 142.4) where housing ages are slightly younger. Overall, the oldest housing stock tends to be concentrated in the central northwest portion of the core city. Newer housing units tend to be clustered among block groups just south of Washington, southern block groups and those in the extreme northeast area of the core city. In block groups 13602.2 and 137.1, greater than 81% of housing units were built before 1960. In six block groups (13602.3, 137.2, 137.4, 137.5, 138.5 and 142.4) between 68% and 81% of housing units were built before 1960. Between 59% and 67% of housing units were built before 1960 in block groups 13601.2, 13602.1, 138.2, 138.4, 140.1, 143.1, and 14501.2. In two census block groups, 138.3 and 140.2, between 50% and 58% of housing units were built before 1960. In seven census block groups (13601.1, 137.3, 139.3, 142.1, 142.3, 143.4, and 14501.1) between 38% and 49% of housing units were built before 1960. Among block groups with lower housing stock ages, 138.1, 139.2, 142.2 and 143.3 have an average range between 29% and 37% of housing units were built before 1960. The youngest housing stock is located in block groups 13602.4, 139.1, 139.4 and 143.2, where less than 29% of housing units were built before 1960.
Air Quality
Using data by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Environmental Justice reporting program (EJScreen), CHCS mapped Census block groups according to risks for exposure to specific air pollutants, ground-level ozone and 2.5 micron particulate matter. The EPA indexes are derived by correlating the risk of atmospheric pollutants and their intensity/prevalence in relation to socioeconomic and demographic factors such as spatial concentrations of racial and ethnic populations, poverty, young children, older adults and other factors.

FIGURE 52 – OZONE EXPOSURE INDEX

Ground Level Ozone
Census block group 139.4 features the highest risk of exposure to excess ground level ozone, ranking above the 95th percentile index average for all block groups among the core city area. Following this, block groups 138.5, 139.2 and 142.3 rank at or above the 90th percentile index score for ozone exposure. Only three block groups score below the 50th percentile (mean) and are all located on the western edges of the core city: 137.1, 137.4 and 137.5.
Particulate Matter
Exposure index rankings for airborne micro particulate matter nearly match exactly those for ground level ozone exposure risk, with the exception of Census block group 143.3 located in central High Point, which scored slightly lower on the risk of exposure to particulate matter scale. Otherwise, block group 139.4 again features the highest risk of exposure to excess ground level ozone, ranking above the 95th percentile for all block groups among the core city area. Following this, block groups 138.5, 139.2 and 142.3 rank at or above the 90th percentile index score for ozone exposure. As is the case with ozone exposure, the same three block groups score below the 50th percentile (or mean) and are all located on the western edges of the core city: 137.1, 137.4 and 137.5.

FIGURE 53 – PARTICULATE MATTER INDEX
**Food Deserts**

Food deserts have become much more widely known as a significant community-level factor that negatively impacts the health of many urban residents. CHCS used data from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to map the census tracts that are identified as food deserts in the Core City area of High Point. These are defined as regions where the majority of residents are low income (living at or below the poverty level) and who have low spatial access to food markets (residing more than one mile from a grocery store). There is a stark geographic difference between the census tracts that are identified as food deserts and those that are not. All four census tracts south of Washington Drive, 139, 142, 143 and 145.01, are classified as food deserts according to these criteria. All tracts located north of Washington Drive, 136.01, 136.02, 137, 138 and 140 do not meet USDA criteria for food deserts.
Transportation

FIGURE 55 – PERCENT COMMUTING BY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Public Transit
Reliable, efficient and adequate public intermodal transportation is a major indicator of life-quality in urban areas. Using American Community Survey 2009-2012 data, CHCS computed the percent of workers commuting by public transportation according to census block group residence. The residents of the central-most census block groups in the core city are the most frequent users of public transportation for commuting purposes. In block groups 138.5 and 143.2 greater than 15.3% of workers commute by public transportation. The remaining picture of public transportation use for commuting is somewhat scattered across other block groups in the core city. In block groups 138.4, 139.2 and 143.3, between 11.3% and 15.3% of workers commute by public transportation. Many residents in the core city are very infrequent or non-users of public transportation, these include 14 of 32 block groups.
Commuting by Walking or Bicycle
Using data gathered from the American Community Survey 2009-2013, CHCS computed the percent of workers commuting by walking or bicycling per census block group. In 15 out of 32 of the census block groups in the core city (nearly 50%), less than .7% of workers commute by walking or bicycle. The northwestern quadrant of the core city exhibits the lowest overall concentrations of workers who commute by walking or bicycle, but the same is true of many other block groups in the core city. Block groups 13601.1, 13601.2, 139.3, 142.4, and 143.4 have the highest percentages of persons who commute by walking or bicycling in the core city, than 6.38% of workers.
Parcel Assessments

A remote visual inspection of 15,156 properties was completed in August and September of 2015 using Loveland Technologies Site Control Software. Images for this assessment were from Google maps and dated from late 2014 and early 2015. Maps of each of the nine Census Tracts in the High Point Study Area are available online via the following links:

1. Washington Terrace (CT 136.01)
2. North Central Neighborhoods (CT: 136.02)
3. Washington Drive/ Washington Terrace (CT 138)
4. Emerywood (CT: 137)
5. East Central (CT: 139)
6. West English/ West End (CT: 140)
7. Blair Park/ Macedonia (CT: 142)
8. Highland Mill Village/ Kendall Avenue/Southside (CT: 143)
9. Oak Hill (CT: 145.01)

FIGURE 60 - EXAMPLE OF LOVELAND SITE CONTROL VIEW OF BLAIR PARK AND MACEDONIA
FIGURE 61 - SCREEN SHOT FROM SITE CONTROL ASSESSMENT

The questionnaire complete Motor City Mapping survey is available in the Appendices to this document. Briefly, the following items were documented for each parcel:

1. **Is there a structure on the parcel?**
2. **What is the structure’s use?**
3. **What kind of residential structure?**
4. **Does the structure have any signs of deterioration or damage?**
5. **Is the structure fire damaged?**
6. **Is the structure open to trespass?**
7. **Does the structure appear to be occupied?**
Vacant Lots

Of the total parcels surveyed (n=15,156), 81.3% had a structure on the parcel leaving nearly one-in five lots vacant. Almost half of parcels without structures were vacant lots, at 48.0% (1,358). Unmaintained vacant lots, 28.8% of vacant parcels surveyed, present an issue for code enforcement, public health, crime, and property devaluation. Minor litter was observed during surveys of 14.2% (402) of parcels, and 3.6% (103) indicated some trash. A few parcels (11) were noted as having dumping.

Attached lots made up an additional 21.5% (608) of these parcels, and 14.5% (410) were parking lots. Land use for remaining parcels without structures included open land at 6.9% (194), forest at 5.5% (156), parks at 1.3% (37), gardens at 0.4% (10) and agricultural at 0.1% (3). An additional 55 parcels, comprising 1.9% of those without structures, did not appear to fit the previous categories and were designated as other land use.

Vacant lots are missed opportunities for tax revenue as without improvement, they are valued much less. In the Core City of High Point, 1,425.42 acres total were vacant. The combined tax value of these vacant lots is currently $99,448,500 (excluding publicly owned and non-taxed land). Yet, vacant lots may be seen as an opportunity for public investment (e.g. parks, urban gardens, etc.) or could be “banked” for use by private development.
FIGURE 63 - EXAMPLE OF VACANT LOT IN SOUTHSIDE
Structures

Surveyors were asked to determine the use of the structure. Whenever necessary, tax records were checked to confirm use. Most structures in the Core City were designated as residential (83.4%), followed by commercial (8.4%), industrial (4.7%), and institutional 2.8% (349) institutional, 0.6% (79) as other, and) as residential. Only two structures were classed as mixed use. Of residential parcels, 1% (118) were apartments, 2.7% (335) were multi-family residences, 76.9% (9,409) were single-family residences, and 3.4% (415) were townhouses or condominiums. In the commercial class, .2% (19) of buildings were convenience stores, .1% (8) were for entertainment, .7% (90) were gas or service stations, 1.1% (135) were offices, .1% (18) were recreational, .6% (59) were restaurants, 3% (364) were retail establishments, and .1% (11) were small markets. There were only two bars, one liquor store, and one grocery (other) store. In the institutional class, .2% (22) of the buildings were governmental, .8% (98) were hospitals or health clinics, .1% (7) were for public safety, .1% (17) were counted as other institutional, 1.1% (129) were religious establishments, and .5% (58) were schools. In the industrial class, 1.7% (208) of the buildings were for manufacturing, 2.7% (329) were warehouses, and .4% (43) were other industrial structures. Finally, 2.2% (264) of the buildings did not fit into any of the preceding categories and were simply labeled other.

Figure 64 - Example of Unoccupied Home
FIGURE 65 - TYPES OF STRUCTURE
Occupancy of Structures

When surveying to determine occupancy, 90.3% (11,131) appeared to be occupied and 4.6% (573) appeared to be vacant. Unoccupied properties had a combined taxable value $40,254,325. Many of these homes are also tax delinquent.

Condition of Structures

Structures were rated on a four point scale from Good to Suggesting Demolition. Structures rated as “Good” showed no obvious repairs needed. Structures rated “Fair” needed minor repairs such as to repair missing shingles, paint, siding, etc. A structure rated as “Poor” needs major repairs. For example, windows and doors might be broken or boarded up or non-load-bearing elements like awnings, porches collapsed. Structures noted as “Suggest Demolition” were visibly damaged beyond repair or renovation. Structural damage could include collapse of roof, walls, foundation and the building was deemed uninhabitable.

Figure 66 - Rating of Structures
Out of total structures surveyed (n=12,323), 70.9% (8,737) were reported to show no signs of deterioration or damage and 29.1% (3,586) were reported as showing signs of deterioration or damage. Most structures were rated as good (72.8%) while 21.7% (2,674) were rated as fair, and 5.2% (643) were rated as poor. For .3% (31) of this sample, the surveyor suggested demolition for the structure. Damaged properties are opportunities through targeted code enforcement, rehabilitation and reuse, or demolition and redevelopment. The current tax value for properties shown having some level of damage was $201,950,500 taxable value. Improvements to the condition of these properties could increase taxable value.
FIGURE 68 - EXAMPLE OF STRUCTURE NEEDING SOME IMPROVEMENTS
**Fire Damage**

Out of the structures reported to have signs of deterioration or damage (3,586), 95.1% showed no signs of fire damage. Of the remaining 4.9% that did show signs have fire damage, 3.1% (110) structures had superficial damage, 1.2% (43) had moderate damage, and .6% (22) had major damage. Only one structure had collapsed due to fire damage.

**Figure 69 – Degree of Fire Damage**

**Figure 70 - Example Of Major Fire Damage**
Market Segmentation -
Neighborhood Summaries

Market segmentation is a process of analysis that divides an area by natural geographic bounds as well as by demographic, social, economic, political, and cultural divisions. In building the index, we followed the market segmentation method developed by Alan Mallach (senior fellow at the Center for Community Progress) and used in both the Newark, NJ and Youngstown, OH studies. We then added additional correlated socio-demographic, labor force, housing condition, parcel status and additional measures of market stability. The analysis relied on data at the individual, neighborhood, and community levels. For example, resident-level demographic data such as age, race, national-origin, educational background was matched with parcel-level and neighborhood information such as housing market characteristics (housing sales volume, price trends, investor vs. owner occupied purchasing), foreclosures, vacancy and abandonment, delinquent taxes, code violations, housing stock condition and condemnations. Finally, neighborhood factors such as crime, transience, zoning, single-family vs. multi-family, supermarket access, social vulnerability, and opportunity indices were added. Pearson’s Correlations were computed using all variables from the compiled data. Variables with no statistically significant correlations were removed. Multiple measure of same underlying concept were tested, those with least fit were removed. Reliability analysis (Chronbach’s α) performed with each step. To account for different scales, all variables were converted to z-scores. Z-scores were then converted to a 5 point scale: 1) stable; 2) functional; 3) constrained; 4) weak; and 5) extremely weak. The 17 measures were added together to create a summative index with scores ranging from 17 (Stable) to 85 (extremely weak).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESRIMedian_Value2012</td>
<td>MEDIAN VALUE (DOLLARS) ESRI projection based on 2010 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant_Lot</td>
<td>Vacant Lots Percent with No Structure on Parcel CHCS Remote Assessment 2014 images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_SUBSTANDARD</td>
<td>Substandard CHCS Remote Assessment 2014 images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_OWNER_OCCUPIED2013</td>
<td>Percent Owner Occupied CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_Moved_Last_Year_2013</td>
<td>Mobility CHCS Computed from Geographical Mobility in The Past Year For Current Residence--Metropolitan Statistical Area Level In The United States 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_MORTGAGES_OwnerOCC2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent with mortgages U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey Owner-occupied housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans_Originated_2014</td>
<td>Loan Originations CHCS Computed at Tract level Divided by number of block groups HMDA 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_DELINQUENT</td>
<td>Percent Tax Delinquent Properties CHCS Computed - Guilford County Tax Assessor 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calls_for_service_1000</td>
<td>Police Calls for Violent Crimes per 1000 residents (HPPD data 2014 and Census 2010 population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_NON_WHITE</td>
<td>Non-White Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_FOREIGN_BORN_TRACT_2013</td>
<td>Foreign Born Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_FOUR_YEAR_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Four Year Degree Educational Attainment For The Population 25 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_PCT_18under_2013</td>
<td>18 and under CHCS Computed from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_PCT_65ove_2013</td>
<td>65 and over CHCS Computed from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN_HH_INCOME_2013</td>
<td>Median Household Income U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_POVERTY_2013</td>
<td>Percent income below poverty rate last 12 months Computed from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_FOOD_STAMPS_2013</td>
<td>Public Support CHCS Computed Food Stamps/Snap in The Past 12 Months from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 - Variables Used in Market Segmentation Index**
Stable markets

Functioning markets

Constrained markets

Weak markets

Extremely weak markets

**Figure 71 - Market Segmentation of Core City**
Stable Neighborhoods

Census Tract 137 BG 4

Segmentation Score = 24 Stable MAP LINK

This neighborhood is located in the far central western quadrant of High Point’s Core City in the area of the Country Club. In addition to the Country Club, High Point Friends School and High Point Regional Hospital are possible community assets. Mass transit is limited to Route 10: North Main Street about 1 mile away and Route 14: Westchester Drive about ½ a mile away. This neighborhood is very stable and has few substandard or vacant properties. Relative to nearby neighborhoods, this block group features much higher average income levels, median home values and levels of educational attainment.

There is an estimated population of 615 individuals and a density of approximately 1,411 persons per square mile. The community is almost exclusively White-(96%) with a small minority of African Americans (4%). Few (4%) residents are foreign born. The area has a low population of dependent minors aged 18 years and under (13%). It has a slightly above average proportion of residents aged 65 years or older (21%). The population decreased 5% between 2010 (650) and 2013 (615).
Figure 73 - New Construction Infill (top), Empty lot (middle), Modest Homes in Eastern Portion of Neighborhood (Below)
The neighborhood contains a total of 388 parcels, of which 381 (98.2%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 6% were observed as possibly vacant according to visual assessments conducted in 2015. The neighborhood contains 278 total housing units, of which 251 are occupied, corresponding to an average vacancy rate of about 10% in 2013. The median home value was estimated at approximately $225,595 (ESRI 2012) though there are houses on the market currently above the $1million level. Nearly all residences (97.7%) are owner occupied; approximately 2.3% are rentals. The average period of residency for individuals is approximately 14 years for homeowners. Approximately 20% of residents moved during any given 12-month period.

Median household income is estimated at $108,750. The area has a relatively low unemployment rate (6%) and no poverty or eligibility for public assistance. Nearly a third (29%) of residents does not participate in the labor force. Only about 1% of residents are estimated to have less than a high school education while 9% have completed high school level/GED education. Approximately 47% have completed a four year degree and a large percentage of residents (35%) have completed post-graduate education.

**Recommendations**

This neighborhood needs little more than continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. High Point Country Club dominates much of the acreage as do a few large homes with 5-15 acre parcels. A few vacant lots scattered about the neighborhood present opportunities for limited infill. The area lacks racial/ethnic and social class diversity. High property values and little available land limit the possibilities for income stratification.
Census Tract 137 BG 5

Segmentation Score = 26 Stable MAP LINK

Located in the central northwestern quadrant of High Point’s Core City area, this neighborhood is less affluent than the Country Club area just to the west. High Point Friends School and High Point Regional Hospital as well as the Academy at Central, High Point Central and Ferndale Middle School are possible community assets. Mass transit is limited to Route 10: North Main Street about ½ a mile away and Route 14: Westchester Drive about ½ a mile away. The area is only slightly more diverse that the Country Club area. The eastern-most portion of the neighborhood is commercial.

The area has an estimated population of 732 individuals and density of approximately 2,659 persons per square mile. The community is predominantly White (89%) with a small minority of African Americans (10%) and 2% of residents identify as Hispanic. An estimated 4% of residents are foreign born. The population is, on average, much older than contiguous block groups in the core city. Persons aged 65 or older living in this neighborhood comprise 45% of all residents, while only 13% are aged 18 years or less, which is well below other core city neighborhood averages. Between 2010 (915) and 2013 (732), the population decreased by 20%.
Figure 75 - Empty Lots and Substandard Homes in Census Tract 137 BG 5 Present Opportunity
Median household income in the neighborhood is estimated at $51,667. Poverty was low at 11% as was the unemployment rate at 7%. About 6.0% of residents are estimated to be eligible for public assistance. Less than half (45%) of the neighborhood’s residents are in the labor force. Among residents 16% have less than a high school education and 26% have completed high school or GED. Eighteen percent have completed some college or a two-year degree. Approximately 36% have completed a four year degree and 4% are estimated to have post-graduate degrees.

The median home value was estimated at $137,250 (ESRI 2012). Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $731 monthly. The neighborhood contains a total of 493 parcels, of which 348 (70.6%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 10% were observed vacant. The neighborhood contains 296 total housing units, of which 290 are occupied for a vacancy rate of about 2.0% in 2013. A majority of residences (86.5%) are owner occupied. The average period of residency is 10 years for homeowners and 5 years for renters. Approximately 10% of residents moved within the last year. Approximately 20% of structures appeared substandard.

Recommendations
This neighborhood is stable. It needs continued code enforcement, active neighborhood associations, and in the eastern and southern ends, possible targeted rehabilitation of some properties. There are a few vacant lots and substandard structures scattered about the neighborhood presenting some opportunity for infill. Due to lower property values, more rental, and more availability of properties, may present an opportunity for targeted racial/ethnic and social class diversification.
Census Tract 137 BG 1

Segmentation Score = 27 Stable MAP LINK

FIGURE 76 - MARKET SEGMENTATION RESULTS CENSUS TRACT 137 BG 1

This neighborhood is stable. It is located in the central northwest quadrant of High Point’s Core City area. Saint Mary’s Episcopal Church is a possible community asset. Mass transit is limited to Route 10: North Main Street about ½ to ¾ of a mile away on Main Street. The area is somewhat more diverse that the surrounding Census Tract. The eastern-most portion of the neighborhood is commercial along Main Street.

There is an estimated population of 1,404 individuals and density of approximately 3,163 persons per square mile in this neighborhood. The community is somewhat more diverse than others in the Census tract: 88% White, 11% African-American, and about 1% Native American. An estimated 4% of residents are foreign born. A little over one-fifth of the population (22%) are dependent minors aged 18 years and under and 11% of residents are 65 years or older. The neighborhood has seen a large increase in overall population between 2010 (1,016) and 2013 (1,404), approximately +38%.

The median home value was estimated at approximately $198,171 (ESRI 2012). A majority of residences (71.2%) are owner occupied. Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $538 monthly. The neighborhood
Figure 79 - Empty Lots and Packaged Real-estate Present Investment Opportunities

Figure 79 - Properties from the 1920s Needing Rehabilitation
contains 514 total parcels, of which 477 (92.8%) are residential lots. Of all lots, a low proportion of approximately 4% were observed as possibly vacant according to visual assessments. The neighborhood contains 724 total housing units, of which 631 are occupied, corresponding to an average vacancy rate of about 12.9% in 2013. The average period of residency for individuals in 137 BG 1 is approximately 23 years for homeowners. Approximately 32% of residents moved during any given 12-month period during the last few years, which correlates with the relatively large increase in population. Approximately 10% of structures appeared substandard according to remote visual assessment.

Median household income is estimated at $46,875. The area has a relatively low rate of poverty (10%) and unemployment (3.0%), especially when compared to other neighborhoods in High Point. An estimated 13% of residents are eligible for public assistance. More than a third (35%) of neighborhood residents does not participate in the labor force. Most have completed some college or a two-year degree (34%) or have completed a four year degree (48%). Approximately 11% have postgraduate educations. Relative to adjacent neighborhoods, residents are more educated.

Recommendations
This neighborhood needs continued code enforcement, active neighborhood associations, and targeted rehabilitation of properties and vacant lots especially to the east near Main Street. Property values are quite high, but a vacancy rate of 12% and availability of a few empty lots may present an opportunity for targeted racial/ethnic and social class diversification. Some homes may qualify for historic preservation status.
This neighborhood is stable. It is located in the northwest quadrant of High Point’s Core City area, just north of the Country Club and extending east to Main Street. Hillcrest Manor Condominiums in the middle of the neighborhood is partially responsible for increased density, while maintaining higher property values. Mass transit is limited to Route 10: North Main Street about ½ to ¾ of a mile away on Main Street.

The estimated population was 509 individuals with a density of approximately 2,866 persons per square mile. The community is 23% non-white. An estimated 4% of residents are foreign born. Hispanic residents comprise 23% of the neighborhood. There was a decrease of about 30% in the population between 2010 (725) and 2013 (509). About a quarter of the population (25%) were dependent minors aged 18 years or younger and another quarter (26%) was aged 65 years or older.
Figure 81 - Available Housing Stock Ranges Substantially from under $70k to more than $1.5 Million
The median home value was estimated at approximately $132,200 (ESRI 2012). Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $688 monthly. The neighborhood contains a total of 486 parcels, of which 415 (85.4%) are residential lots. A relatively low proportion (6%) were observed vacant. The neighborhood contains 315 total housing units, of which 241 are occupied, corresponding to a high average vacancy rate of about 23.5% in 2013. Approximately 15% of structures appeared substandard according to remote visual assessment. A majority of residences (80.6%) are owner occupied. The average period of residency is approximately 10 years for homeowners and 8 years for renters. Approximately 2% of residents moved in the last 12-months.

Median household income is estimated at $60,250. A quarter (26%) of residents does not participate in the labor force. The poverty rate is 15% and an estimated 17% of residents are eligible for public assistance. Eleven percent of residents have not completed high school. Four percent have completed only high school/GED educational attainment. Thirty-one percent have completed some college or a two-year degree, and approximately 25% have completed a four year degree. A high proportion of residents (29%) completed post-graduate level education.

**Recommendations**

There are very few empty lots, but the vacancy rate is relatively high. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. Property values are moderate overall, but range broadly. Modest housing on the north and east sections of the neighborhood are generally well-maintained. The high vacancy rate of 23% and availability of some empty lots may present an opportunity for further diversification.
Census Tract 137 BG 3

**Segmentation Score = 32 Stable MAP LINK**

Located in the farthest northwest corner of High Point’s Core City area, community assets include Primitive Baptist Church, High Point Swim Club, Lebanon Methodist Church, and Westchester Baptist Church. This neighborhood is stable. The eastern portion along Main St. is commercial. Mass transit is limited to Route 10: North Main Street about \(\frac{1}{2}\) of a mile away on Main Street. The neighborhood is more diverse and affordable than others in the Census Tract, while still being close to amenities.

There is an estimated population of 758 individuals and density of approximately 2,443 persons per square mile. The population decreased 9.0% between 2010 (835) and 2013 (758). The community is 72% White with 23% African Americans and 13% who consider themselves of another race. An estimated 4% of residents are foreign born and 7.0% of residents identify as Hispanic. Nearly a quarter (24%) are dependent minors aged 18 years and under and 18% are aged 65 years or older.
Figure 83 - Empty Lots and Substandard Homes in Census Tract 137 BG 3
The median home value was estimated at approximately $137,250 (ESRI 2012). A large majority of residences (89.86%) are owner occupied; approximately 10.2% are rentals. The neighborhood contains a total of 424 parcels, of which 367 (86.6%) are residential lots. Of all lots, 11% were observed vacant and 22% of structures appeared substandard. The neighborhood contains 310 total housing units, of which 281 are occupied, for a vacancy rate of about 9% in 2013. The average period of residency is approximately 13 years for homeowners. Approximately 20% of residents moved during a 12-month period.

Median household income is estimated at $60,406. The poverty rate is 13% and the neighborhood has a relative high unemployment rate of 15%. An estimated 13% of residents are eligible for public assistance. A majority of neighborhood’s residents (54%) are not participants in the labor force. Among this community’s residents 11% have not completed high school level education; 36% have obtained high school level/GED education. Twenty-seven percent have completed some college or a two-year degree, and approximately 21% have completed a four year degree. A small proportion of residents (5%) have completed post-graduate level education.

**Recommendations**

This is a stable neighborhood partially due to the high rate of owner occupancy. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. There may be opportunity in the existence of some empty lots along Westchester, on Overbrook Ct., Whitehall St., Long St. and a few others scattered in the area. Substandard homes are scattered in the west and north of the neighborhood; however, there is a cluster of substandard housing in the east along Idol Street and southeast along State Ave.
This neighborhood, located east of Main and south of Eastchester Dr., is much more diverse than the other stable neighborhoods to the west in Census Tract 137. The neighborhood is commercial along Main and Eastchester with easy access to Harris Teeter Supermarket within \( \frac{1}{2} \) a mile. Mass transit is limited to Route 10: North Main Street. Johnson Street Global Studies School is an asset. Eastchester Village Condominiums increases the density in the area while also providing affordability.

This area has an estimated population of 1,171 individuals and a density of approximately 3,128 persons per square mile. The population increased by 10% between 2010 (1,069) and 2013 (1,171). The community is ethnically diverse: 48% White, 23% African-American, 24% Other Race, 6% Multiracial. Nearly a third (30%) identify as Hispanic and 12% of residents are foreign born. More than a quarter (27%) are dependent minors aged 18 years and under and 11% of residents are aged 65 years or older.
Figure 85 – Older Homes Needing Rehab (top), Code Enforcement (Middle), and Some Empty Lots (bottom)
The median home value was approximately $76,136 (ESRI 2012). Median rent was estimated at $761 monthly. The neighborhood has 510 housing units, of which 488 are occupied for an average vacancy rate of about 15%. The neighborhood contains 538 total parcels, of which 502 (93.3%) are residential lots. Of all lots, 9% were observed vacant. More than half (58.6%) of residences are rentals. Approximately 7% of structures appeared substandard. The average period of residency for individuals is approximately 23 years for homeowners and 12 years for renters. Approximately 9% of residents moved in the last year.

Median household income is estimated at $46,860 and there is a high rate of poverty 25% and unemployment (12%). An estimated 12% of residents are eligible for public assistance. More than a quarter (26%) of neighborhood residents are not participants in the labor force. Nearly one-fifth (19%) of residents did not graduate High School while 37% have obtained a high school education or a GED. Nearly a third (29%) have completed some college and approximately 9% have completed a four year degree and 6% post-graduate level education.

**Recommendations**

The neighborhood is ranked as stable due to long tenures for both renters and home owners, low vacancy rates, and low percentage of homes identified as substandard. Scattered empty lots and substandard homes present some opportunity. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. Because of affordability and the fact that over half the homes are rental, the neighborhood could easily slip in score to functional or even constrained. Home-buyer programs are encouraged. Property values are very moderate overall (many in the $40k range), though availability is very limited. At the time of this report, there were only three homes for sale in the neighborhood.
Census Tract 136.02 BG 3

Segmentation Score = 36 Stable **MAP LINK**

**FIGURE 86 - MARKET SEGMENTATION RESULTS CENSUS TRACT 136.02 BG 3**

This neighborhood is located in the northwest of the City Core to the east of Main St. and north of Montlieu. Bus Route 13: Montlieu Avenue, Route 10: North Main Street, and Route 25: Jamestown-GTCC are nearby. Parkside Park, Assembly of Christ Church, Saint George Greek Orthodox Church, First Presbyterian Church, and Lexington Avenue Baptist Church are possible community assets.

The neighborhood has a population of 957 individuals and density of approximately 3,566 persons per square mile. The population in the area decreased 17% between 2010 (1159) and 2013 (957). The community is diverse: 50% White, 42% African-American, 8% Asian, and 1% Hispanic. An estimated 12% of residents are foreign born. Just under a quarter of the population (23%) are dependent minors aged 18 years and under and 12% are aged 65 years or older.

The median home value was estimated at approximately $88,527 (ESRI 2012). Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $751 monthly. There are 640 total parcels, of which 537 (83.9%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 9% were observed vacant. The neighborhood has 428 total housing units, of which
Figure 87 - Examples of Vacant and Available Lots

Figure 88 - Example of Home Needing Rehab and One Recently Updated
are occupied, for a vacancy rate of 12.4%. About 7% of structures appeared substandard. A majority of residences (59.1%) are owner occupied. The average period of residency is approximately 14 years for homeowners and 8 years for renters. Approximately 19% of residents moved during any given 12-month period during the last few years.

Median household income is estimated at $49,306. The poverty rate was 19%, 15% were unemployed, and 29% of residents do not participate in the labor force. Nearly a quarter (24%) of residents are eligible for public assistance. More than a fifth (22%) of residents did not complete high school. Just over a quarter have a HS diploma or GED, and 30% have completed some college or a two-year degree. Approximately 18% have completed a four year degree, while just 2% have a post-graduate level education.

Recommendations
The neighborhood is ranked as stable due to long tenure of owners, relatively low vacancy rates, and low percentage of homes identified as substandard. Property values are moderate. Scattered empty lots and substandard homes present some opportunity for improvement and back fill. There is a possible infill opportunity on a larger scale in the contiguous vacant lots between Hamilton and Johnson Street. The area needs continued code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. Home-repair programs are encouraged.
Functioning
Census Tract 136.02 BG 2

Segmentation Score = 38 Functioning MAP LINK

This neighborhood in north central High Point, surrounds Armstrong Park (a great community asset). Kirkman Park Elementary is just to the east. The neighborhood is functioning overall. Property values are moderate. Housing values around the park are high and stable with little to no substandard homes noted; however, in the northern part of the neighborhood there are vacant lots, homes with very low valuation (as low as $10k). There is a Food Lion within .75 miles of the neighborhood. There are several choices of bus routes: Route 10: North Main Street, 13: Montlieu Avenue, Route 15: Eastchester Drive, and Route 25: Jamestown-GTCC.

This neighborhood has a population of 751 individuals and density of approximately 4,259 persons per square mile. The community is multi-racial and multi-ethnic with: 52% White, 42% African-American, 8% Hispanic, and 7% of other races. An estimated 12% of residents are foreign born. Dependent minors aged 18 years and under make up 31% of the total population. An average of 14% of residents are aged 65 years or older. The community experienced a 7.0% drop in overall population between 2010 (758) and 2013 (751).
Figure 90 - Derelict Commercial Building, Substandard Housing, Empty Lots, and Potential Park or Urban Garden
The median home value was estimated at $111,940. The neighborhood had 371 total parcels, of which 355 (97%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 13% were observed vacant. Nearly half (46.6%) of residences are rental; approximately 53.4% are owner occupied. Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $731 monthly. Residency is approximately 17 years for homeowners and 8 years for renters. Few (4%) moved during the last year. Approximately 8% of structures are substandard.

Median household income is $39,728. While poverty is 18%, the unemployment rate is lower than average (3%). An estimated 28% of residents are eligible for public assistance. Twenty-nine percent of residents are not participants in the labor force. Among residents, 16% have not completed high school education; 26% have completed high school or GED equivalency. Thirty-four percent have completed some college and 15% have completed a four year degree while 9% of residents have post-graduate level education.

Recommendations

Empty lots and substandard homes are concentrated in the northern portion of the block group. Stabilization of this area should be a priority. There are 5 contiguous empty lots (four owned by Coggins JE LLC) at the end of Howard Place in the middle of the block group, presenting an opportunity for high density in-fill. High Point University has recently acquired 5 lots on Centennial. Clear plans for High Point University’s growth into the very stable area east of Armstrong Park should be discussed. There is a cluster of vacant property in the north of the neighborhood on Guilford and Howard. The City of High Point owns lots surrounding a water tower that could be used for urban gardening or other community use. Low valued and substandard homes along Putnam should be targeted for rehab and owner-occupied low-income buyer programs.
Census Tract 136.01 BG 2
Segmentation Score = 39 Functioning MAP LINK

This neighborhood is located in a small portion of the central northern region of the High Point Core City area next to the campus of High Point University. The Greenway along Ferris Ave., McCain Park, and Kirkman Park Elementary are community assets. There is a Food Lion within .75 miles of the neighborhood. Bus routes 13: Montlieu Avenue, Route 15: Eastchester Drive, and Route 25: Jamestown-GTCC pass through. This neighborhood is functioning and has almost no substandard houses; however a large number of vacant properties (owned by HPU), considerable population decline, and high poverty are impacting the neighborhood.

This neighborhood is home to 889 residents and has a density of 6,767 persons per square mile. The community is African American (56%) and 43% White. Three percent of residents identify as Hispanic and 8% are foreign born. Approximately 7% of residents are under 18 years old and about 6.0% are
Figure 92 - Vacant Lots owned by HPU, Homes owned By HPU, Recent Construction by HPU
aged over 65 years. The population declined 32% between 2010 (1,315) and 2013 (889).

The median home value was estimated at $89,205 in 2012. The neighborhood contains a total of 144 parcels, 99 of which are residential lots (68.8%). The area has lost 34% of its housing units in the last three years. Of all lots, 25% were observed a vacant. Most of these vacant parcels are owned by High Point University. A slight majority (52.8%) of residences are rental. Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $1,071 monthly. The average period of residency for individuals is approximately 10 years for homeowners and 7 years for renters. An estimated 29% of residents moved during the last year.

Median household income is estimated at $30,750. Half (50%) of residents live in poverty. The census block group qualifies as a Census-defined Racial/ethnic Concentration of Poverty (RECAP). A majority of residents are not participants in the labor force (70%) and the average unemployment rate for those is 18%. Approximately 18% of residents in this neighborhood are eligible for public assistance programs. Approximately 22% of residents have not completed high school; 22% have completed high school or GED equivalency. A little over half of residents (51%) have obtained some college education or a two-year degree and 5.0% have obtained a four-year degree.

**Recommendations**

As a functioning market, this neighborhood needs targeted code enforcement and community action plans focused maintaining the character of the Sherwood Place community. The ethno-racial diversity, modest home values, and long tenure of residents are strengths continued expansion of High Point University may be an issue as it changes the character of the neighborhood and impacts property values. Coordination and planning between the City and University are vital.
Located in the central northeastern quadrant of High Point’s Core City area, to the east of High Point University campus, the neighborhood includes several important community assets to build upon: High Point Greenway Pilot Project, the Montlieu Academy of Technology, and the Montlieu Elementary School. The neighborhood is within one mile of the Save-a-Lot Discount Supermarket on Lexington and Montlieu. Two bus routes are available to this area: Route 13: Montlieu Avenue and Route 25: Jamestown-GTCC.

This community has a population of 1,752 individuals and a density of approximately 3,882 persons per square mile. The community is multiracial: 47% White, 19% African-American, 3% Asian and 4% Hispanic. An estimated 8% of residents are foreign born. This neighborhood is home to lower than average populations of both seniors aged over 65 years (7.0%), and dependent minors aged 18 and
Figure 94 - Vacant Housing and Code Enforcement Issues
under (18.0%). There was negligible population change between 2010 (1,777) and 2013 (1,752).

The median home value was estimated at approximately $76,862 in 2012. The neighborhood contains 551 total parcels, of which 507 (92.0%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 11% were observed vacant and 3% of structures appeared substandard according to remote visual assessments conducted in 2015. The neighborhood contains 411 total housing units, of which 346 are occupied, translating to an average vacancy rate of about 16% in 2013. Just over half (54.1%) of residences are rental. The average period of residency for individuals is 18 years for homeowners and 10 years for renters. An estimated 41% of residents moved during the last year.

Median household income is estimated at low $31,635. The area has a high rate of poverty (32%) and high rates of unemployment (23%). An estimated 30% of residents are eligible for public assistance and 49% of neighborhood residents are not participants in the labor force. More than a quarter (28%) of residents did no complete high school. Thirty-eight percent have a diploma or GED while a fifth (19%) have completed some. Only 11% have completed a four year degree and 4% have a post-graduate degree.

**Recommendations**

As a functioning market, this neighborhood needs targeted code enforcement and community action plans focused on the few vacant or substandard properties as well as strategic home beautification identified in the housing assessments. The high vacancy rate may need addressing. Trails Crossing Condos in the center of the block group provides a high density and modest priced options for owner occupancy. The ethno-racial diversity, modest home values, and long tenure of residents are strengths, but high poverty and unemployment will lead to decline as properties are not maintained and owner-occupancy declines.
This neighborhood is located in the central north portion of High Point’s Core City area. The northeast most section of the neighborhood (above Hartley Dr) is dominated by High Point University and Wesleyan Christian Academy. Kirkman Park Elementary, Church of God Prophecy, and Life Lexington Church could be community assets to build upon. The neighborhood is within .75 miles of the Food Lion on Lexington and Centennial. Three bus routes are available to this area: Route 13: Montlieu Avenue, Route 15: Eastchester Drive, and Route 25: Jamestown-GTCC.

The neighborhood’s population is 1,570 individuals and density of approximately 3,214 persons per square mile. The community is multi-racial and multi-ethnic: 36% White, 52% African-American, 13% Hispanic, and 8% Asian. Approximately 5% of the population identifies as other or mixed race. An estimated 12% of residents are foreign born. The area experienced growth between 2010 (1,152) and 2013 (1,570), approximately +36%. The neighborhood has over a quarter of residents who are dependent minors aged 18 and under (27%) and 17% who are seniors aged over 65 years.
Figure 96 - Vacant Buildings & Code Enforcement Overgrown Vegetation, Junk Cars
The median home value was estimated at approximately $78,920. The neighborhood contains 556 total parcels, of which 526 (94.6%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 9% were observed vacant and 7% of structures appeared substandard. The neighborhood contains 683 total housing units, of which 564 are occupied, for a vacancy rate of 17.5%. A large majority (73.1%) of residences are rented; approximately 27% are owner occupied. Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $731 monthly. The average period of residency is approximately 10 years for homeowners and 7 years for renters. An estimated 14% of residents moved during the last 12 months.

Median household income in estimated at $29,792. There is a high rate of poverty (33%). Unemployment is 12% and 44% of residents are not participants in the labor force. A fifth (19%) are eligible for public assistance. Nearly a third (29%) have less than a high school level. Just over a third (36%) have completed high school while 26% have completed some college and 9% have completed a four year degree.

Recommendations

As a functioning market, this neighborhood needs targeted code enforcement and community action plans focused on the vacant or substandard properties and strategic home beautification identified in the housing assessments. The ethno-racial diversity, modest home values, and long tenure of residents are strengths. There are 11 vacant wooded lots along the south side of E Hartley Drive that create a buffer for the neighborhood from the high traffic road and High Point University, but they may also present an opportunity for infill. In the south of this block group there are more homes with substandard conditions. The high rental rate also may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.
Census Tract 140 BG 2

Segmentation Score = 46 Functioning MAP LINK

Comprising the West English neighborhood and located in the central western portion of the core city. Floral Garden Cemetery dominates the center of the neighborhood, West English Street along the eastern boundary is highly industrial (Engineered Polymer Solutions Inc, Valspar, Lilly Co, Etc.). In the south there is mixed industrial and residential with Piedmont Chemical Industries next to residential homes. The western boundary is Westchester Rd. with Westchester Village Senior Living, Hospice, and Nursing Home taking a large amount of the area. Community assets include: West End Park, Green Street Baptist Church, First Wesleyan Church, and Oak Hill Friends Church. The southern portion of the neighborhood is within ½ a miles of the Food Lion on Westchester and Burton, but the northern area is more than a mile away and only served by a small convenience store (Terry’s Discount Grocery). Two bus routes are available to this area: Route 14: Westchester Drive and Route 19: English Road

The neighborhood’s population is 2,199 individuals and population density of approximately 2,051 persons per square mile. The community is multi-racial and multi-ethnic: 60% White, 25% African-American, 12% Asian, and 8% Hispanic. Approximately 2.2% of residents identify as Native American. Approximately 5% of the population identifies as other or mixed race. An estimated 18% of residents are
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Figure 98 - Substandard and Vacant Housing in Census Tract 140 BG 2
foreign born. The area experienced moderate growth (11%) between 2010 (1,986) and 2013 (2,199). Approximately one quarter of residents are dependent minors aged 18 and under and 23% are seniors aged over 65 years.

The median home value was estimated at approximately $86,950. The neighborhood contains 1,051 total parcels, of which 742 (71%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 18% were observed vacant and 22% of structures appeared substandard. The neighborhood contains 964 total housing units, of which 804 are occupied. The vacancy rate is approximately 17%. A majority (63%) of residences are rented; approximately 37% are owner occupied. Median rent was estimated at $806 monthly. The average period of residency is 13 years for homeowners and 6 years for renters. About 14% of residents moved during the last year.

Median household income is estimated at $26,206, with a high rate of poverty (37%) and relatively high unemployment (18%). An estimated 25% of residents are eligible for public assistance and 51% are not participants in the labor force. Nearly a third (29%) of residents have not completed high school; 31% have completed high school or GED equivalency while 29% have completed some college. About 8% have completed a four year degree and 3% of residents have completed post-graduation education.

**Recommendations**

This neighborhood needs considerable focus on the high number of vacant and substandard properties. Home repair programs should be encouraged. Likewise, the highly industrial south and east of the neighborhood present concerns for health and safety as well as value of residential properties. Strategic long-range planning should be considered. The high rental rate and high poverty rate also may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.
Census Tract 138 BG 3

Segmentation Score = 38 Functioning [MAP LINK]

This neighborhood is located in a small portion of the northeastern quadrant of High Point’s Core City area, south of Montlieu Ave. Community assets include New Bethel Baptist Church, Montlieu Ave United Methodist Church, Memorial United Methodist Church, and Gospel Feast Tabernacle Cathedral of Praise Church. Bus routes in the neighborhood include Route 13: Montlieu Avenue and Route 17: Washington Drive which loops through the middle of the residential areas. Sav-A-Lot Grocery store is within ¾ of a mile of the entire neighborhood.

The neighborhood’s population is 431 individuals and population density of approximately 3,882 persons per square mile. The community is estimated to be 100% African American. An estimated 12% of residents are foreign born. The neighborhood witnessed a 30% decrease in overall population between 2010 (620) and 2013 (431). Approximately 8% of residents are dependent minors aged 18 and under and 32% are seniors aged over 65 years.
Figure 100 - Large Vacant Lot on Montlieu

Figure 101 - Substandard Homes in Census Tract 138 BG 3
The median home value was estimated at approximately $78,333 (ESRI 2012). The neighborhood contains a total of 331 parcels, of which 328 (99.1%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 5% were observed vacant and 36% were substandard according to visual assessments conducted in 2015. The neighborhood contains 269 total housing units, of which 222 are occupied, corresponding to an average vacancy rate of about 17% in 2013. Just over half (53.8%) are rentals; approximately 46.2% are owner-occupied. Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $950 monthly. The average period of residency is approximately 32 years for homeowners. Approximately 26% of residents moved during the last year.

Median household income is estimated at $26,346. The community has both high rates of poverty (29%) and high unemployment (21%). About 21.0% of residents are estimated to be eligible for public assistance. Fifty-two percent of the neighborhood’s residents are not participants in the labor force. Among residents, 28% have not completed high school; 54% have completed high school education or GED equivalency. About 17% have completed some college and only 2% have completed a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

Many of the homes are rated as fair, needing mostly cosmetic work. There are a few scattered vacant lots and homes in poor condition. Home repair programs or “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. There is a 7 acres of vacant land off Montlieu Ave owned by New Bethel Baptist Church that could be a potential development site. The lack of ethnoracial diversity is concerning. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, poverty, and population decrease may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.
Constrained Census Tract 142 BG 2

Segmentation Score = 50 Constrained [MAP LINK]

**Figure 102 - Market Segmentation Results Census Tract 142 BG 2**

This census block group contains the Blair Park neighborhood surrounded by the Blair Park Golf Course. Body of Christ Christian Church may be a community asset. There are no supermarkets within 1 mile. Mass transit is limited to Route 11: South Main Street and Route 20: Kearns Avenue about ¼ to ½ of a mile away. The neighborhood home values are modest and a high percentage of homes are in fair to poor condition. There was a relatively high number of police calls for violent crime, with 8.25 police calls per 1000 residents.

The neighborhood’s population is 752 individuals and population density of approximately 2,043 persons per square mile. This population is white and African-American (60% and 38%, respectively). An estimated 13% of residents are foreign born. The neighborhood had a 2% decrease in population between 2010 (769) and 2013 (752). A quarter (25%) of residents are under 18 years old and only 8% are over 65.
Figure 103 - Substandard Homes in Census Tract 142 BG 2

Figure 104 - Sherwood Village, Surrounded by Blair Park Golf Course
The ESRI median home value for 2012 was $73,165 and the median rent was $747. The neighborhood contains a total of 393 parcels, of which 374 (95%) are residential lots. Approximately half of housing units are substandard (51%) and one in ten properties (10.94%) were tax delinquent in 2015. More than half (57%) of properties are rentals. The neighborhood contains 301 total housing units, of which 280 are occupied, corresponding to an average vacancy rate of about 7% in 2013. The average period of residency is approximately 27 years for homeowners and 5 years for renters. Approximately 20% of residents moved during the last year.

The median household income was $27,125 with 30% of the population’s income below the poverty rate and 38% of the population eligible for food stamps. The unemployment rate was at 29%. Forty-four percent of the neighborhood’s residents are not participants in the labor force. Among residents, 29% have not completed high school; 31% have completed high school education or GED equivalency. About 29% have completed some college and only 8% have completed a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

The fact that the neighborhood is surrounded by a public golf course could be a major asset, but recently homes have been selling in the $20k to $50k range to investor buyers. Half of the homes are rated as fair or poor. Home repair programs or “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. Most of the housing stock is 1940s and 50s and needs updating. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, high poverty, and unemployment may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.
Segmentation Score = 52 Constrained MAP LINK

This census block group comprises the West End neighborhood just south of Ferndale and extending east, then north to Main Street. Retail, industrial, office space and furniture market showrooms are on the east and north of the neighborhood. High Point Central High School, The Academy at Central, and Ferndale Middle School, English Road Baptist Church, and Dean B Pruette Scale School are community assets. Mass transit passing through the neighborhood includes Route 14: Westchester Drive and Route 19: English Road as well as easy access to Amtrak. There was a high rate of police calls for violent crimes, with 9.59 calls per 1000 residents.

The neighborhood’s population is 1064 individuals and population density of approximately 2,882 persons per square mile. This population is white (51%) and African-American (26%). An estimated 29% are Hispanic and 18% are foreign born. The neighborhood had a 3% decrease in population between 2010 (1093) and 2013 (1064). A quarter (27%) of residents are under 18 years old and only 7% are over 65.
Figure 106 - Several Contiguous Vacant Lots in Census Tract 140 BG 1
There are 632 parcels, of which 408 (65%) are residential lots. The median property value was $109,459 (ESRI 2012); inflated due to industrial and retail lots. Median residential values in 2013 were estimated at $64,000 (ASC). Median rent was estimated at $624 monthly. Of 479 housing units, 359 are occupied for an average vacancy rate of about 25%. More than half (68%) of residences are rentals. Approximately 30% of structures appeared substandard. The average period of residency was 9 years for homeowners and 4 years for renters; 13% of residents moved in the last year.

Median household income is estimated at $21,691 and there is a high rate of poverty (50%) and unemployment (9%). An estimated 50% of residents are eligible for public assistance. Two-fifths (42%) of residents are not in the labor force. Almost half (45%) of residents did not graduate High School, while 29% had a high school education or a GED. Nearly a fifth (19%) have completed some college and approximately 6% have completed a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

The neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to short tenures for both renters and homeowners, high vacancy rates, and high percentage of homes identified as substandard. Scattered empty lots and homes in poor condition present opportunity. The area needs strategic investment. Empty lots across from High Point Central (owned by GCS) and a vacant block on Edgeworth and Campbell (owned by Share of North Carolina Inc.) may present development opportunities. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, high poverty, and unemployment may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.
Census Tract 143 BG 4

Segmentation Score = 52 Constrained MAP LINK

This census block group includes the Kendall Avenue neighborhood and the southern end of Highland Mill Village. West of S. Main behind Vann York Nissan and extending west along W. market Center Dr. to W. Green Dr. The far west on Green is vacant industrial and retail, in the center of the block group is light industrial along Surrett Dr. and continuing along College to the east until it becomes retail along S. Main St. Four pockets of residential neighborhoods are found between industrial areas and empty lots. Highland United Methodist, Cloverdale Baptist Church, and First Pentecostal Holiness Church are potential assets along with Richland Creek and land owned by Southwest Renewal Foundation. Three bus routes are available to this area: Route 11: South Main Street, Route 12: West Green Drive, and Route 21: Industrial Park Flyer. The closest supermarket is more than a mile away. There was also a high rate of police calls for violent crimes, with 10.19 calls per 1000 residents.

This community has a population of 520 individuals and a density of approximately 1,885 persons per square mile. The population of this census block group decreased by 25% between 2010 and 2013. Less than half of that population was white alone (47%), and a bit over a quarter of the population identify...
as African-American (29%) and 16% Asian. About 29% of residents identified as Hispanic. Very few residents are under 18 years old (5%) and only 12% are over 65.

The median parcel value was estimated at approximately $84,756 in 2012. The neighborhood contains 319 total parcels, of which 222 (70%) are residential. There were 320 total housing units, of which 272 were occupied, translating to an average vacancy rate of about 15% in 2013. A third (33%) of structures appeared substandard according to remote visual assessments. Just over half (54%) of residences are rental. The average period of residency for individuals is 18 years for homeowners. An estimated 25% of residents moved during the last year.

Median household income is estimated at a very low $18,354, poverty is only 16% and unemployment is 18%. An estimated 25% of residents are eligible for public assistance and 37% of neighborhood residents are not participants in the labor force. More than a quarter (28%) of residents did no complete high school. More than half (60%) have a diploma or GED while a fifth (4%) have completed some college. Only 5% have completed a four year degree and 3% have a postgraduate degree.

Recommendations
The neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to population decrease, vacancy and substandard parcels, low incomes, and high crime. Many contiguous empty lots present opportunity for land banking or land trusts. The area needs strategic investment. Vacant industrial should be reclaimed, demolished or rehabbed as potential housing. Owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.
This census block group includes the southern end of the Oak Hill neighborhood. Most of the north west of the neighborhood is dominated by industrial and warehouse buildings which continue south along Old Thomasville Rd in the west. Likewise the eastern portion along Prospect St. is industrial. Vacant lots in these areas are zoned industrial. Interspersed between vacant industrial lots are pockets of residential dwellings many identified as substandard. Two bus routes are available to this area: Route 14: Westchester Drive and Route 19: English Road. The closest supermarket is about ½ mile for residences in the north of the neighborhood, but over a mile for those in the south.

This community has a population of 694 individuals and a very low density of approximately 866 persons per square mile. The community is multiracial: 66% White, 19% African-American, 5% Asian and 11% other. An estimated 37% are Hispanic and 16% of residents are foreign born. The population of this census block group increased by 12% between 2010 and 2013. More than a third (34%) are under 18 years old and only 9% are over 65.
Figure 110 - Mixed Industrial and Residential
The median parcel value was estimated at approximately $85,156 in 2012, driven up by industrial lots. Average residential tax value was just over $40k. The neighborhood contains 442 total parcels, of which 251 (57%) are residential. There were 239 total housing units, of which 206 were occupied, for a vacancy rate of about 14%. About 39% of structures appeared substandard. Just over three-quarter (77%) of residences are rental. The residency is 25 years for homeowners and 7 years for renters. An estimated 11% of residents moved during the last year.

Median household income is a low $26,518, poverty is 28% and unemployment is a very high 23%. An estimated 40% of residents are eligible for public assistance and 31% of neighborhood residents are not participants in the labor force. Nearly half (49%) of residents did not complete high school. A third (33%) have a diploma or GED while less than a fifth (16%) have completed some college. Only 3% have completed a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

The neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to high rental rates, high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant lots, low incomes, and high poverty. The long tenure of homeowners provides some potential stability, though less than a quarter of homes are owner-occupied. Owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs. Many contiguous empty lots in the south present opportunity for industrial development. The area needs strategic investment and planning and consideration should be given to moving from mixed residential-industrial to all industrial. In the north, a pocket of 5.6 acres owned by Guilford County is found off Chase Ave and could have residential or recreational potential. Industrial development in this area should be discouraged as housing is more concentrated.
Located in the central northern portion of the northeastern quadrant of High Point’s Core City area, most of the north west of the neighborhood is dominated by Oakwood Cemetery, while N. Main cuts from southeast to Northwest along the western boundary of the neighborhood. This strip, eight blocks long and three blocks deep, is nearly all occupied by retail and office space (furniture market). Penn-Griffin School-The Arts, New Beginning Full Gospel, First United Methodist Church, and Immaculate Heart of Mary Chapel Parish and School are potential community assets. High Point university recently acquired the 42 lots and homes between Barbee and Willow and have designated the area for Health Sciences (parcel information for original owners is still showing in County GIS and tax records). There is a high rate of observed vacant and unmaintained vacant lots. Superior Foods or Food Lion are within one mile of the neighborhood. Route 10: North Main Street, Route 13: Montlieu Avenue, Route 15: Eastchester Drive, Route 17: Washington Drive, and Route 25: Jamestown-GTCC all pass through the neighborhood. The area had 7.68 calls for violent crimes per 1000 residents, above the city-wide average.
There are estimated 1,498 individuals and a population density of approximately 3,163 persons per square mile. Twelve percent of residents are dependent minors aged 18 years and under while one-fifth (20%) of residents are 65 years or older. The community is racially and ethnically diverse. 54% of residents are African American and 30% are White. Approximately 2% identify as multi-racial, while 8% identify as some other race. Asian persons comprise 6% of community residents and 15% identify as Hispanic. An estimated 12% of residents in this neighborhood are foreign born. The population has declined 15% between 2010 (1,762) and 2013 (1,498).

The median value was estimated at approximately $85,938 (ESRI 2012), though mean residential tax values are under $50k. The neighborhood contains a total of 895 parcels, of which 578 (64.6%) are residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 24% were observed vacant and 29%, appeared substandard according to visual assessments conducted in 2015.

Figure 112 - Many Vacant Homes in Census Tract 138 BG 5
The neighborhood contains 834 total housing units, of which 653 are occupied, corresponding to an average vacancy rate of about 22% in 2013. A majority (62%) of units are rentals. Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $458 monthly. Average tenure of residency for homeowners is 35 years and 6 years for renters. Approximately 18% of residents moved during any given 12-month period.

Median household income is quite low, estimated at $15,273. There is a corresponding high rate of poverty (39%) and high unemployment (36%). Approximately 38.0% are estimated to qualify for public assistance. Half (49%) of the neighborhood’s residents do not participate in the labor force. Two-fifths (40%) have not completed a high school level education and 38% have completed only high school education/GED equivalency. An estimated 22% of residents have completed some college, and 5% have a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

The neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to high rental rates, high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant lots, extremely low incomes, and high poverty. The very long tenure of homeowners provides some potential stability, though just over a third of homes are owner-occupied. Owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs. The area needs strategic investment and planning and consideration. More than 30 empty lots (many contiguous) are readily available for infill. Continued expansion of High Point University may be an issue as it changes the character of the neighborhood and impacts property values.
This census block group is part of the East Central neighborhood. A sizable amount of vacant wooded land is found along the I 74/ US 311 eastern boundary of this neighborhood. There are about a dozen residential lots and homes scattered among manufacturing and warehouse building (zoned industrial) in the north east of the block group. Greenhill Cemetery occupies about 8 acres in the northwest of the neighborhood. Friendly Baptist Church, Greater New Hope Baptist Church, Calvary Covenant Fellowship are potential community assets. Superior Foods is a just over a mile away from the neighborhood. Bus Route 16: Leonard Avenue and Route 18: East Green Drive serve the neighborhood. The area had 7.68 calls for violent crimes per 1000 residents, above the city-wide average.

The neighborhood’s population is 823 individuals and population density of approximately 2,035 persons per square mile. The community is estimated to be 7% white and 76% African American. An estimated 12% of residents are foreign born and 13% identify as Hispanic. The neighborhood had a 4% increase in overall population between 2010 (791) and 2013 (823). Approximately 14% of residents are dependent minors aged 18 and under and 10% are seniors over 65 years.
Figure 114 - Substandard, Vacant, and Fire Damage in Census Tract 139 BG 3
The median home value was estimated at approximately $74,148, but a residential tax value of $25k on average. The neighborhood has 549 total parcels, of which 470 (86%) are residential. The neighborhood contains 362 total housing units; 274 are estimated to be occupied. The vacancy rate is 24%. A third (33%) of structures appeared substandard. A third (32%) of residences are rented. Median rent was estimated at $761 monthly. The average residency is 23 years for homeowners. About 17% of residents moved during the last year.

Median household income is estimated at $22,500, with high poverty (33%) and very high unemployment (47%). An estimated 41% are eligible for public assistance and 44% are not in the labor force. A quarter (25%) of residents have not completed high school. More than half (55%) have completed high school/GED, while 19% have some college and only 1% a four year degree.

Recommendations

The neighborhood is ranked as constrained due to high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant lots, low incomes, high poverty, and very high unemployment. The very long tenure of homeowners and high rate of owner-occupancy are stabilizing factors. Homeowner repair and assistance programs should be considered. More than 30 empty lots (many contiguous) are readily available for owner-occupied infill. High density, New Urbanist development along Brentwood St may be possible and should include a supermarket or other food resource. Code enforcement needs to address vacant and unsecured properties as well as fire damaged units.
Weak

Census Tract 142 BG 3

Segmentation Score = 54 Weak MAP LINK

Figure 115 - Market Segmentation Results Census Tract 142 BG 3

This census block group makes up the southwestern region of the Macedonia neighborhood. Parcels along the western boundary on S. Main are industrial and manufacturing. Along the south, the neighborhood includes part of the Blair Park Golf Course. Bus Route 20: Kearns Avenue and Route 10: North Main Street are easily accessible. There are no supermarkets within one mile. Wesley Memorial United Methodist Church, Macedonia Park, Macedonia Family Resource, Full Gospel Miracle Chapel, and Solid Rock Baptist Church are possible assets. With an 81% nonwhite population and 57% of the residents’ incomes falling below the poverty line, this block group was identified as a Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty (RECAP).

The neighborhood’s population is 1131 individuals and population density of approximately 3,072 persons per square mile. More than half (57%) of the population is African-American. This area also had a relatively high concentration of Asian (15%) and Hispanic (18%) residents as compared with to the rest
of the population of the city of High Point. The neighborhood had a 13% increase in population between 2010 (1002) and 2013 (1131). Over a third (36%) of residents are under 18 years old, but only 8% are over 65.

The ESRI median value for 2012 was $86,328. The neighborhood contains a total of 492 parcels, of which 423 (86%) are residential lots. More than a third (35%), however, were identified as substandard. Over half (57.2%) of the properties were rentals, with median rent in 2013 of $696. The neighborhood contains 495 total housing units, of which 347 are occupied, corresponding to an average vacancy rate of about 30% in 2013. According to U.S. Census data, the vacancy rate increased from 10% between 2010 and 2013. The average period of residency is approximately 11 years for homeowners and 4 years for renters. Approximately 15% of residents moved during the last year.

*Figure 116 - Old versus New Housing Stock in Census Tract 142 BG 3*
The median household income was $22,306 with 57% of the population’s income below the poverty rate and 54% of the population eligible for food stamps. The unemployment rate was at 16%. Over a third (35%) of the neighborhood’s residents are not in the labor force. Among residents, 35% have not completed high school; 48% have completed high school education or GED equivalency. About 15% have completed some college and only 2% have completed a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the short residential tenure. With 35% of homes having visible issues from the street, a home repair program and “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. There are many building opportunities. For example, the 15 contiguous light industrial lots along Park St. and Wheeler Ave end in four multi-family lots at the end of Wheeler. Potentially this entire block could become multifamily or high density infill. An additional 15 contiguous empty lots or more are found between E Kerns Ave and Lake Ave with access via Blair Ave. There are additional contiguous empty lots along Grace St., Pershing St. and Richlands. Easy access to the Blair Park Golf Course could help with marketing and resale value of new or updated homes. A recent 2006 subdivision along Macedonia Way is showing property valuations up to 3 times the average for the rest of the neighborhood indicating market potential.
Census Tract 142 BG 1

Segmentation Score = 55 Weak MAP LINK

This census block group makes up the eastern half of the Macedonia neighborhood. This neighborhood is just east of Blair Pak Golf Course and bounded by I-74/US 311 on the east. Industrial and light manufacturing can be found in the northeast and southeast of the neighborhood. The closest bus is Route 18: East Green Drive. There are no supermarkets within one mile. Community assets include Living Water Baptist Church, Oak Grove Baptist Church, Brentwood Park, also the planned community center in the former Brentwood elementary school now owned by Williams Memorial Christian Methodist Episcopal Church on a 6.7 acre lot in the center of the neighborhood.

The neighborhood’s population is 812 individuals and population density of approximately 2,517 persons per square mile. This census block group had a majority nonwhite population (78%), predominately African-American (68%). An estimated 13% of residents are foreign born and 8% are Hispanic. The neighborhood had a 20% decrease in population between 2010 (1011) and 2013 (812). A fifth (20%) of residents are under 18 years old and 16% are over 65.
Figure 118 - Examples of Substandard Homes in Census Tract 142 BG 1

Figure 119 - Recently Updated Home
The median home value for 2012 was $70,385, though average residential tax values are $43,194. The neighborhood contains a total of 528 parcels, of which 453 (86%) are residential lots. Nearly half (45%) of housing units are substandard. The neighborhood had 437 total housing units, of which 298 are occupied, for a vacancy rate of about 30% in 2013. According to U.S. Census data the vacancy rate almost doubled from 16.67% in 2010 to 31.81% in 2013. Almost half (47%) of properties are rentals. The median rent was $784. The average period of residency is approximately 17 years for homeowners and 6 years for renters. Approximately 13% of residents moved during the last year.

The median household income in 2013 was $23,500; 32% of the population’s income fell below the poverty rate. The unemployment rate was high at 45%, and 43% of residents were not in the labor force. More than a third (37%) of this population relied on food stamps in the last 12 months. Just over a third (37%) had less than a high school level education and 36% had completed high school/GED. The remaining population had some college (25%) or a four year degree (3%).

Recommendations
Again, the public golf course to the west could be a major asset along with Brentwood Park and the planned community center. Yet, nearly half (45%) of the homes are rated as fair or poor. Housing stock ranges from 1920s to late 1990s, need updating. Home repair programs and “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, high poverty, and unemployment may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs. There are more than 20 vacant residential lots, some contiguous, that could be used for affordable housing.
**Census Tract 138 BG 2**

**Segmentation Score = 56 Weak [MAP LINK]**

\[ \text{FIGURE 120 - MARKET SEGMENTATION RESULTS CENSUS TRACT 138 BG 2} \]

Located in the central northwestern quadrant of High Point’s Core City area. East of High Point University along North College Drive with a small section extending to the west of College and south of Montlieu. Washington Terrace Park & Community Center and Parkview Village Elementary Expressive Arts take a large amount of the acreage on the Southeast of the neighborhood and may be good community assets. Temple of Prayer Praise, Kings Chapel Church, True Standard Holiness Church, and United House-Prayer for All are other possible assets. Bus Route 13: Montlieu Avenue and Route 17: Washington Drive pass through the neighborhood.

This census block has an estimated population of 702 individuals, with a population density of approximately 2,805 persons per square mile. The population decreased approximately 4% between 2010 and 2013. The community is non-White (90%) with 86% African American and 4% Asian. Only 4% of residents are foreign born. A fifth (22%) of residents are dependent minors age 18 and younger; 8% of residents are 65 and older. More than a fifth (22%) moved in the last year.
Figure 121 - Vacant Church Recently Demolished

Figure 122 – New Housing to Replace Previous Substandard Units
The median parcel value was estimated at approximately $73,349 in 2012. Of 413 parcels in the block, 377 (91%) are residential lots. The neighborhood contains 352 housing units, of which about 17% are vacant and 46% of structures were rated as substandard. More than half of residences (52%) are rental with a median rent of $781. Homeowners have been in place on average for 12 years.

Median household income is $21,071. A high percentage of residents (37%) are living in poverty, and unemployment is at 21%. About 38% of residents are eligible for public assistance, and 52% are not participants in the labor force. Among neighborhood residents, 29% have not completed high school and half (50%) have completed high school diploma or GED. A fifth (21%) have completed some college or a two-year degree.

Recommendations

The neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high substandard property levels, a substantial amount of vacant homes and lots, low incomes, and high poverty. Moderate home values in the north end are being pulled lower due to conditions of homes in south and west. The area needs strategic investment and planning and consideration. Contiguous empty lots at Washington and College, as well as College and Graves, present potential. New construction replacing severely distressed properties such as that along Brooks Ave should be considered in other areas. The ten dilapidated multi-family units along Saunders Place should be considered for rehabilitation. High Point University is encroaching upon the residential areas just west of College Dr.
Located in a geographically very small portion of the northeastern quadrant of High Point’s Core City area, west of College and north of Washington. The neighborhood is dominated by 200 units of the aging Daniel Brooks Homes (already slated for redevelopment) and Daniel Brooks Annex. The neighborhood qualifies as a Census-defined Racial/ethnic Concentration of Poverty. Bus Route 13: Montlieu Avenue and Route 17: Washington Drive pass through the neighborhood. Penn-Griffin School-The Arts just to the west may be a community asset. Superior Foods is within half a mile. There were 8.7 calls for emergency services per 1000 residents in 2014.

This census block is occupied by 621 individuals, with a population density of approximately 9,646 people per square mile, the highest of all neighborhoods in the study. The population remained relatively stable between 2010 and 2013 (with less than a 1% change in population size). The community is racially and ethnically diverse: 65% of residents are African American and 8% are White. 24% identify as multi-racial and 4% as Asian. About 13% are Hispanic and 12% are foreign born. Less than a tenth
(8%) of residents are dependent minors aged 18 years and under, and only 2% are aged 65 years or older.

Figure 124 - Example of Housing Stock in 138 BG 4 (Duplex)

Figure 125 - Daniel Brooks Homes (built 1942)
Of the 92 parcels in this neighborhood, 74 (80.4%) are residential lots; 27% of all lots were observed vacant. Of 294 housing units, 255 are occupied, with a vacancy rate of about 13%. Note, the census block contains a public housing complex. The median home value was estimated at approximately $82,143 (ESRI 2012). The vast majority of residences (95.3%) are rentals; approximately 4.7% are owner-occupied. Median rent in 2013 was estimated at $244 monthly due to the high percentage of public housing. More than a quarter (28%) of structures were rated substandard. Average tenure is 4 years and 45% moved within the last year.

Median household income is low, at $14,647; the poverty rate is 62%. Three-fourths (75%) of residents are estimated to be eligible for public assistance, and unemployment is high at 40%. Of all neighborhood residents, 47% are not participants in the labor force. Two-fifths (38%) have not completed high school education and 15% have completed high school/GED equivalency education. An estimated 47% have completed some college, but there are no four-year degrees or higher reported.

**Recommendations**

The neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high substandard property levels, vacant lots, extremely low incomes, high poverty, and very high unemployment. The very short tenure of residents and high rate turn-over are destabilizing factors. The presence of a large public housing complex will severely impact market viability of other homes (rental or owner-occupied) in the neighborhood. Scheduled redevelopment of the Daniel Brooks public housing community may present a unique opportunity to redevelop the entire neighborhood.
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**FIGURE 126 - MARKET SEGMENTATION RESULTS CENSUS TRACT 142 BG 3**

Census block group 143 BG 3 consists of the Southside neighborhood. The neighborhood is retail and commercial lots along S. Main St and residential to the west. Some of the lots in the south are industrial. The neighborhood includes the nine story, 106 unit Astor Dowdy Towers operated by the High Point Housing Authority for elderly and disabled residents. Goldston Park and the Church of God of Prophecy are potential assets. This census block group was identified as a racially/ethnically concentrated area of poverty. The area is a food desert with no supermarkets within 1 mile.

This census block has an estimated population of 805 individuals, with a population density of approximately 4,670 persons per square mile. The population decreased approximately 7% between 2010 and 2013. The community is 41% of the population was white-alone, 47% African-American, 5% Asian and 19% Hispanic. About a fifth (18%) of residents are foreign born. A fifth (21%) of residents are dependent minors age 18 and younger; 12% of residents are 65 and older. More than a fifth (11%) moved in the last year.
Figure 127 - Public Housing and Substandard Homes in Census Tract 143 BG 3
The median parcel value was estimated at approximately $85,714 in 2012, most likely pushed up by commercial properties. Of 392 parcels in the block, 318 (81%) are residential lots. The neighborhood contains 536 housing units, of which about 28% are vacant and 37% of structures were rated as substandard. More than half of residences (81%) are rental with a median rent of $332. Homeowners have been in place on average for 11 years and renters for 7 years.

The median household income was $13,841 and 56% of residents lived below the poverty line. More than half (56%) of residents relied on food stamps. This census block group has a 24% unemployment rate, and 46% of the population is not in the labor force. More than half (58%) have less than a high school education, 15% have a high school diploma or GED, and 21% have some college education. Very few (1%) have a four-year degree.

Recommendations
This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the relatively short residential tenure. There are many building opportunities on scattered vacant properties comprising nearly a fourth of all parcels. Close proximity to downtown and to industrial and commercial jobs could make it an attractive neighborhood for younger home seekers. Plans from Southwest Renewal include this neighborhood along a proposed greenway.
The Oak Hill neighborhood is included in the Census block group 145.01 BG 1. This neighborhood is in the far south of the city and is bisected by I-85/US 70. It is largely industrial with just a few pockets of residential neighborhoods. The few existing homes were built between the 1920s to 1960s. Bus Route 12: West Green Drive and Route 21: Industrial Park Flyer pass through the neighborhood. There are currently no homes for sale in the area and recent residential sales This area had a moderate level of police calls for violent crimes, 4.53 per 1,000 residents.

This census block is occupied by 684 individuals, with a population density of approximately 300 people per square mile, the lowest of all neighborhoods in the study. The population remained relatively stable between 2010 and 2013. The community is racially and ethnically diverse: was 63% white, 17% African American, 5% Asian, 12% Hispanic, and 16% foreign born. More than a quarter (27%) of the population was 65 or older and only 15% of the population was 18 and younger.
Figure 129- Pockets of Residential Areas between Industrial and Commercial Properties
The median value was estimated $73,182 in 2012. Of 867 parcels in the block, only 255 (29%) are residential lots; the area is more of an industrial park than residential. The neighborhood contains 362 housing units, of which 19% were rated as substandard. According to the Census, the vacancy rate decreased from 16% in 2010 to 11.6% in 2013. More than three quarters of residences (77%) are rental with a median rent of $525. Homeowner tenure is 42 years on average, renters 5 years.

The median household income in 2013 was $18,750, with 22% of the population having an income below the poverty rate. A quarter (24%) of the population has relied on food stamps in the last 12 months. The unemployment rate for the eligible workforce is 20%, while 48% of the residents in this census block group are not in the labor force at all. Half (50%) of the population has attained a high school diploma or equivalent, yet 22% have less than high school educational attainment. The remaining 28% have some college education.

Recommendations
This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to very low incomes, high poverty, high percentages of vacant parcels, low density and high transience among renters. There are many building opportunities on scattered vacant properties comprising nearly a third of all parcels; however, we advise that residential development not be a priority. Rather, the area should be allowed, or encouraged, to become all industrial. Existing housing quality should continue to be monitored by code enforcement. Current residents would be better served in affordable housing to the north in another higher-density neighborhood. Easy access to the highways and proximity to downtown could make it an attractive area for a large manufacturer.
This census block group is part of the East Central neighborhood south of MLK Jr Dr. and east of College and known as Burns Hill. Carson Stout Homes, a 116 unit High Point Housing Authority public housing community and Brentwood Crossing, a 135 unit Section 8 assisted housing complex, increase the density in the neighborhood. Christ the King Church, Word of Reconciliation Church, Miracle Temple Holiness Church, Baldwin's Chapel Seventh Day Church, Greater St Matthew's, Maranatha Fellowship, Windley St. Park and the Boys & Girls Club of America are potential assets. Bus Route 16: Leonard Avenue, Route 17: Washington Drive, and Route 18: East Green Drive cut through the area. This census block group was also identified as a Racially and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty. There was a moderate rate of police calls for violent crimes, 5.56 calls per 1000 residents.

This census block is occupied by 2050 individuals, with a population density of approximately 6,010 people per square mile; the population increased 15% between 2010 and 2013. The population is 97% nonwhite. A majority (69%) of residents is African American, 3% are White, and 10% are “other.” Nearly
Figure 131 - Vacant Commercial, Housing Authority, and Vacant/Secured Duplexes
14% identify as Asian and about 11% are Hispanic while 12% are foreign born. Nearly half of the population (47%) was 18 and younger, but only 7% were 65 or older.

Median parcel value was estimated at approximately $78,824 in 2012. Of 437 parcels in the block, 403 (92%) are residential lots. The neighborhood contains 816 housing units, of which about 25% are vacant and 24% of structures were rated as substandard. According to U.S. Census data, the vacancy rate increased some from 18% in 2010 to 25% in 2013. More than three quarters of residences (87%) are rental with a median rent of $478. More than a tenth (11%) was tax delinquent. Homeowners have been in place on average for 25 years and renters for 5 years. More than a quarter (285) moved in the last year.

The median household income in 2013 was $15,433. The unemployment rate was 38% and 47% were not in the labor force, while 63% of the population had received food stamps in the last 12 months. A high percentage has not completed high school (41%). Nearly a quarter (23%) completed high school or GED, while 29% have some college, and 6 percent a university degree.

Recommendations
This neighborhood is ranked as weak due to very high poverty, relatively high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high volatility. There are a number of scattered vacant parcels and poor condition houses in the southwest and north east of the neighborhood. Several wooded lots along Lamb or on Hoover present opportunities. The presence of nearby public housing will impact home values and may perpetuate the very high rental rate.
Extremely Weak
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Figure 132 - Market Segmentations Results Census Tract 139 BG 2

This census block group is part of the East Central neighborhood. The western extension of this block group is retail (market showrooms), governmental, and public housing; to the east it is residential. The four story, 101 unit elderly/disabled Morehead Court Apartments and 150 apartment Elm Towers are a public housing communities of the Housing Authority. Baldwin’s Chapel Seventh Day, St Stephen AME Zion Church, Greater New Hope Baptist Church, Life Changing International Church, Olga Ave Church of Christ, as well as Walnut St. Park and Evans Street Park are assets. Routes 16: Leonard Avenue, 18: East Green Drive, and 20: Kears Avenue serve the area. Superior Foods is within one mile of the area. There was also a moderately high crime rate, with 6.33 calls to the police for violent crime per 1000 residents.

There are approximately 1185 residents with a population density of 5437, making this region denser than the surrounding block groups. The majority of this population was nonwhite (77%), with a majority of African-American residents (76%) and some Hispanic (13%). Approximately 12% were foreign-born. The area is 22% minors aged 18 and under and 8% seniors 65 and older.
The neighborhood has 475 total parcels, of which 388 (81.68%) are residential lots. There are 503 housing units, of which 431 were occupied for a vacancy rate of 14%. The overall population decreased by 8% between 2010 and 2013. The median home value was $76,471 (ESRI 2012). The majority of housing units were renter-occupied (75%). Nearly half (46%) of residents moved in any given 12-month period.

Median household income was one of the lowest in the city core, estimated at $9,330; three-fourths (73%) fell below the poverty rate. The unemployment rate was 17%. This high poverty rate coupled with the high concentration of minority populations qualifies this block group as a Racial and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty. More than half of the population (58%) was not in the labor force. Approximately 62% of the population relied on food stamps. More than a third of residents (40%) have less than a high school education. Approximately 29% have completed high school, 22% have completed some college and 9% have a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to very high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. The significant amount of vacant parcels so close to downtown should present opportunity for urban high-density infill if other problems can be address (crime, resources and amenities). Along Smith St, Walnut St. and Whiteoak St. alone there are 40 empty residential lots Very few owner-occupied properties have been bought in recent years. Large scale investment and long-term planning will be needed to create a stable housing market.
Census Tract 138 BG 1
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Figure 135 - Market Segmentations Results Census Tract 138 BG 1

Census block group 138 BG 1 is located in the far northeastern quadrant of High Point’s Core City area. A 21 Acre tract of land is owned by Guilford County along I-74/ US 311. It was formerly The Evergreens nursing home and was demolished recently leaving a large empty tract (See “Vandal-damaged Guilford-owned building set for demolition”). Another 18 acres along the highway is set aside as a land trust. The Housing Authority also has the J. C. Morgan Courts with 94 housing units in the Five Points area of the neighborhood. Gospel Feast Tabernacle Cathedral of Praise, Restoration Temple of Deliverance, Memorial United Methodist Church, as well as Five Points Park and Brockett Street Park are assets to the community. Route 13: Montlieu Avenue, Route 17: Washington Drive, and Route 25: Jamestown-GTCC buses serve the area. Sav-A-Lot on Greensboro Rd is just within one mile of the neighborhood.

This high poverty rate coupled with the high concentration of minority populations qualifies this block group as a Racial and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty.
Figure 136 - J C Morgan Courts

Figure 137 - Vacant Boarded Homes in Five Points
There are approximately 904 residents with a population density of 3,145 per square mile. The population is African American (88%), White (12%) and Hispanic (8%). An estimated 12% of residents are foreign born. There is a high proportion of dependent minors aged 18 and under (40%). About 15% are aged 65 years and older. The population decreased by 6% between 2010 and 2013.

The neighborhood has 328 parcels, of which 305 (84.8%) are residential. There 361 total housing units, of which 314 are occupied for an average vacancy rate of approximately 13%. Visual assessment shows 44% of houses are substandard. The median home value was estimated at approximately $76,471 (ESRI 2012). A majority of residences (76.3%) are rentals. The average period of residency was 19 years for homeowners and three years for renters. Approximately 21% moved in the last year.

Median household income was estimated at $16,284, more than half (54%) of incomes were below the poverty rate. The unemployment rate was 42% and roughly 44% of residents were not in the labor force. Approximately 37% of residents received food stamps. About one-third (31%) have less than a high school level education and 23% have completed high school. Approximately 44% has completed some college but only 2% have a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. The significant amount of vacant acreage owned by the County could present opportunity. The existence of the public housing impacts housing prices. Vacant lot infill and rehab of substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy to stabilize the neighborhood.
Census Tract 142 BG 4

Segmentation Score = 63 Extremely Weak [MAP LINK]

The census block group makes up the southeastern corner of downtown and the western region of the Macedonia neighborhood. The high poverty rate coupled and high concentration of minority populations qualifies this block group as a Racial and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty. The western boundary along S. Main is retail (market showrooms), office and governmental, GTCC and auto sales; to the south and east it is residential. The newly constructed 200 unit Park Terrace Apartments (LIHTC and public housing) is in the center of the neighborhood. Trinity Holiness Outreach and Gethsemane Baptist Church are possible community assets. The eastern residential portion is more than a mile from a supermarket. Route 18: East Green Drive and Route 20: Kearns Avenue buses pass through the area.

There were approximately 965 residents with a population density of 1,885 people per square mile. The majority of the population was African-American (95%), with a small minority of White (4%) and
Figure 139 - Park Terrace Apartments (LIHTC and Public Assistance)

Figure 140 - Substandard Home in Macedonia.
Figure 141 - Many Empty Lots Available in Census Tract 142 BG 4
Hispanic (3%) residents. Approximately 13% were foreign-born. Nearly a third were dependent minors (31%) while a very small percentage were seniors aged 65 and older (3%). The population increased by 34% between 2010 and 2013.

This neighborhood contains 596 parcels; 362 (61%) were classified as residential lots. There were 341 total housing units and 319 of these units were occupied (average vacancy rate of 6.5%). The median home value was $84,756 (ESRI 2012). Housing units were almost entirely renter-occupied (95.8%), with only a small percentage (4.2%) of owner-occupied housing. Approximately 37% of residents moved in the last 12-months.

The median household income was $22,315 in 2013. Approximately 44% had an income below the poverty rate. The unemployment rate was 42% and 12% were not in the labor force. Approximately 55% of residents received food stamps. A minority of the adult population (16%) had less than high school education. Less than half (40%) had a high school level or the equivalent, and approximately 43% had completed some college. Only 1% had obtained a four-year degree.

**Recommendations**

This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard, high rental rate and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. Vacant lots owned by the City could present opportunity. The existence of the public housing usually impacts housing prices, but the new Park Terrace Apartments are aesthetically well designed and offer both affordable and subsidized units. Development of additional mixed-income ‘villages’ may be possible; especially if owner-occupied units are included. Vacant lot infill and rehab of substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy since 96% of current units are rental.
Census Tract 143 BG 1
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Figure 142 - Market Segmentations Results Census Tract 143 BG 1

This census block group includes the northern region of the Oak Hill neighborhood, the eastern edge of the Southside neighborhood and the northern edge of Highland Mill Village. This area is industrial mixed with some residential from the 1910s to 1950s. Harvell Park, Richland Creek (future greenway), Oak Hill Elementary, Ward Street United Methodist Church, Foothills Church of Christ, Shaw University Education Center are a few of the community assets. Bus Route 12: West Green Drive is the only to pass through the area. A high poverty rate coupled with the high concentration of minority populations qualifies this block group as a Racial and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty. There is access to a supermarket within 1 mile only for the residential area in the westernmost portion of this area.

There were approximately 443 residents with a density of 1,043 people per square mile. More than half (60%) of the population was non-white, with 25% African-American and 27% identifying their race as other. There was a particularly high (43%) Hispanic population. Approximately 18% or residents were
Figure 143 - Examples of Older Vacant Homes in the Area
foreign born. A relatively high percentage of residents (37%) were dependents aged 18 and under, while a small minority (5%) of residents were aged 65 and older. The population decreased by 39% between 2010 and 2013.

There were 732 parcels but only 368 (50.27%) of these were residential lots. The total number of housing units was 324, of which 166 were occupied for a vacancy rate of 49%. The median value was $85,938 (ESRI 2012). However, residential tax values are under $35k. A large majority of properties (88%) were rentals. Roughly 45% of residents moved in any given 12-month period in the last few years.

The median household income was extremely low at $15,806 in 2013. Approximately 70% had an income below the poverty level. The unemployment rate was 18% and 22% were not in the labor force. Approximately 48% of residents received food stamps. More than half of the adult residents (63%) had not completed high school and only 25% had completed high school or its equivalent. Few (12%) had completed some college or a two year degree.

Recommendations
This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to very high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels, high rental rate, as well as high mobility. Vacant parcels could present opportunity, such as 17 contiguous vacant lots found along Cassell St. and others scattered throughout the neighborhood. Large empty industrial lots are found on Potts Ave. SW Renewal plans include a greenway to pass through the area. There are many building opportunities; however, we advise that residential development be very selective due to the large amount of industry. Existing housing quality should continue to be monitored by code enforcement.
Census Tract 143 BG 2
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Figure 144 - Market Segmentations Results Census Tract 143 BG 2

This census block group makes up the southern region of downtown and northernmost section of the Southside neighborhood. The high poverty rate coupled with a high concentration of minority populations qualifies this block group as a Racial and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty. The area is in a food desert with very no larger grocery stores within one mile. The section along MLK Jr is entirely commercial or industrial; the area in the east along S. Main is largely commercial Fairview Elementary School, Boys & Girls Club of America, Southside Park, Calvary Baptist Church, and Church of the Living God are potential community assets. New Gate Garden Apartments helps to increase density somewhat. Bus Route 11: South Main Street, Route 12: West Green Drive, Route 19: English Road, and Route 20: Kearns Avenue pass through the area. There is a high rate of crime (9.58 calls per 1000 people).

There were approximately 783 residents with a density of 1,284 people per square mile. The population was largely nonwhite, with 87% African-American, 4% Asian, and 18% foreign born. Just over half (51%)
Figure 145 - Substandard Older Homes

Figure 146 - New Construction Replacing Substandard and Vacant Homes
of residents were dependents aged 18 and under. An incredibly small minority (1%) of residents were aged 65 and older.

The total number of parcels was 567, of which 188 (33.16%) were residential lots. Of all lots, approximately 10% were observed to be vacant from remote external assessments conducted in 2015. There were 310 total housing units and 279 of these housing units were occupied. This corresponds to an average vacancy rate of 10%. The median home value was $76,471 (ESRI 2012). The population increased by 4% between 2010 (755) and 2013 (783). Nearly all of the properties here (98.8%) were renter-occupied. Approximately 22% of residents had moved in any 12-month period.

Median household income was $9,006 in 2013. Approximately 87% were living below the poverty level and 83% received food stamps. The unemployment rate was 23% and 37% of residents were not in the labor force. Almost half (46%) of adult residents had achieved less than a high school level educational attainment. Approximately 23% had received their high school diploma, 18% had completed some college, and 13% had a four year degree.

Recommendations
This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. The significant amount of vacant parcels could present opportunity. Vacant lot infill such as found on Tryon and rehab of substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy to stabilize the neighborhood. Encouraging mixed-income development to balance extreme poverty should also be a goal. Proximity to downtown could be a factor, but care not to balance against gentrification is essential.
Census Tract 139 BG 1
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This census block group is part of the East Central neighborhood in High Point’s Core City area. This neighborhood is commercial (Market Showplace) on the west side, Spring Valley Apartments and Newgate Garden Apartments in the middle, and a small residential area to the south. The 60 unit Housing Authority Beamon Courts Apartments are on the north of the neighborhood. High Point Police Department, Centennial Station, Nathaniel S Morehead Rec Center, Mt Vernon Baptist Church are potential assets for the community. Route 13: Montlieu Avenue, Route 16: Leonard Avenue, Route 18: East Green Drive, and Route 20: Kearns Avenue are available. Superior Foods is within one mile. The high poverty rate coupled with the high concentration of minority populations qualifies this block group as a Racial and Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty. There was a high crime rate, with roughly 10.53 calls to the police for violent crime per 1,000 residents.
There were approximately 674 residents with a population density of 3,402 people per square mile. This population was largely African-American (87%) and White alone (5%). About 18% were foreign born. More than a third (37%) were dependents aged 18 and under, and 9% were aged 65 and older.

There were 128 parcels, of which 93 (73%) were residential lots. The total number of housing units was 338 and 265 of these were occupied. This corresponds to an average vacancy rate of 21.6%. The median value was $75,000. The majority of properties (86.2%) were renter-occupied. Approximately 22% of residents moved within a given 12-year.

The median income was $9,307 in 2013. Approximately 85% were living below the poverty level and 78% had received food stamps. The unemployment rate was 16% and more than half (51%) of residents were not in the labor force. About one third of adult residents (31%) had achieved less than a high school level education. Just over a third (36%) had completed high school or its equivalent and slightly less (30%) had some college. Only 3% of residents had a four year degree.

**Recommendations**

This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to very high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels, high rental rate, as well as high mobility. Vacant parcels could present opportunity. More than 30 of the 80 or so parcels in the residential area are empty. There are many building opportunities; however, we advise that residential development be very intentional with the goal of whole-sale redevelopment of the area between Commerce and Granby.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Summary of Findings

In our content analysis, we found that over the last fifty years, the City of High Point has conducted studies, devised plans, and developed projects to improve and restore declining housing stock and blighted neighborhoods. Since the 1960s, there has been concern regarding vacant and substandard housing. Yet, problems remain. Funding the actual implementation of plans has been a continuous issue. Sometimes funds have been allocated and never utilized. Code enforcement has been suggested in the past as a way to tackle the issue. Many plans have outlined the need for demolitions of structures (residential, commercial, and/or industrial) that are unsuitable for rehabilitation. Demolition, rehabilitation and redevelopment are costly for property owners, developers, and investors alike. Shifting the cost to the City would be a major burden for all. Adequate funding and resources are required for targeted stabilization and code enforcement while exploring long-term funding/financing opportunities. Most previous plans failed at implementation due to cost limitations. It will be vital to leverage private investment with federal and state funds to support affordable, mixed use, high density development. Strategic data-driven planning and prioritization is clearly needed to drive funding choices, enhance code enforcement efforts, and to identify potential properties for demolition, rehabilitation, and redevelopment.

Our comprehensive housing market segmentation analysis for the City of High Point involved the collection and analysis of economic, sociocultural, geographic and structural variables related to housing market stability. We have found the City Core area to have a total population of approximately 30,848 individuals and 14,788 properties. The area was about half White, non-Hispanic residents (49.2%), and half African-American (49.3%). The mean estimated percent of foreign born residents for all Census block groups was 11.8%. The owner-occupancy rate was 41.1% and renter occupancy 58.8%. The tax value of single-family residential parcels in the core city in 2014 as calculated by the Guilford County Tax Assessor was $65,588 (mean value). About 7.6% of parcels are tax delinquent. Increased home ownership rates should be encouraged while also stabilizing existing renter. The City of High Point should also aggressively pursues delinquent accounts; especially among landlords.

A remote visual inspection of 15,156 properties was completed by CHCS in 2015. Of the parcels surveyed, 81.3% had a structure on the parcel leaving nearly one-in-five lots vacant. The combined tax value of these vacant unimproved lots is currently $99,448,500 (excluding publicly owned and non-
taxed land). When surveying to determine occupancy, 90.3% appeared to be occupied and 4.6% appeared to be vacant. Unoccupied properties had a combined taxable value $40,254,325. Many of these homes are also tax delinquent. Tax liens could be placed on vacant delinquent properties and used to force landlords to improve or forfeit the property; unoccupied homes and vacant lots pose potential risks for health and safety as well as being unproductive for the local economy.

Out of total structures surveyed, 70.9% were reported to show no signs of deterioration or damage yet 29.1% were reported as showing signs of deterioration or damage. Of these damaged properties, 110 structures had superficial fire damage, 43 had moderate fire damage, and 22 had major fire damage. The current tax value for properties shown having some level of damage was $201,950,500 taxable value. Improvements to the condition of these properties could increase taxable value of the parcel directly, but also indirectly the values of all neighboring parcels.

Multiple statistical models exist for evaluating and predicting price movements and for identifying trouble spots in urban areas which might benefit from targeted redevelopment efforts and public investment. Multifactor market prioritization maps and tables have been created for this project and presented in the preceding chapters. A Geographic Information System (GIS) has been created for each layer of data. Nine Census Tract parcel assessment maps in the High Point Study Area are available online. This parcel-level assessment data collected by CHCS may be used to identify individual opportunities: contiguous vacant lots, vacant buildings, moderate-severe fire damage, and housing with ratings of poor or demolition. Missing is a baseline assessment of all affordable housing stock broken down by affordability (80 percent Area Median Income and below, 50 percent AMI and below, and 30 percent AMI and below). It will be very important to update the remote data with on the ground, in-person housing stock assessments, updated on a routine time-table, and including current rent or housing value. Additional layers of data should be considered as they become available: foreclosures, current market values, live police and fire data, etc. A public ‘data dashboard’ for visualization should be considered. A property scoring matrix may also be used to prioritize investments.

Our market segmentation maps demonstrate target investment areas and opportunities. Using the Market Segmentation Model this report has clearly identified neighborhood as: Stable, Functional, Constrained, Weak, and Very Weak. Each of these designations comes with an associated development strategy which will help to maximize the return on investment and ensure more properties become stable in their long term value as well as enhance the quality of a neighborhood. A recommended approach for long-term improvement of housing is the prioritization of investment of limited resources into strategic stabilization of neighborhoods with housing markets that are considered functioning or constrained, while concurrently seeking additional economic and technical assistance to systematically redevelop weak and extremely weak neighborhoods.

It is important to examine opportunities identified in each neighborhood and rank order them based on the score for the neighborhood. Focus on the short term should be on Functional and Constrained
neighborhoods with mid-range (3-5 year) planning and funding developed to tackle Weak and Very Weak areas. **The “low-hanging fruit” such as: vacant lot maintenance, modest external repairs and painting, sale of empty side-lots to neighbors, and pursuing vacant and abandoned housing through tax liens and other mechanisms may prove to have the greatest return on investments.** These measures have been shown to assist in stabilizing property values in “functioning” and “constrained” areas in many cities. **Strategic demolition of vacant building, acquisition of vacant parcels, and consolidation of multi-parcel packages for redevelopment (land-banking) in the “weak” and “extremely weak” neighborhoods could be used a precursor to more costly redevelopment.** These strategies of prepping an area for reinvestment may help in attracting investors and make their participation easier to secure.

**TABLE 2 - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enhance data driven planning practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fund code enforcement, targeted stabilization programs, as well as personnel for long-range planning and grant writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop rigorous code enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify potential properties for demolition, rehabilitation, and redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increased home ownership rates/ stabilize existing renters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pursue delinquent tax accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tax liens could on vacant properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improvements to the condition of vacant and abandoned houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conduct in-person housing stock assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Develop additional layers of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Create public ‘data dashboard’ for visualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Stabilize functioning and constrained markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Seek economic and technical assistance for weak and extremely weak neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pursue “low-hanging fruit” identified in this report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prep weak and extremely weak neighborhoods for future investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighborhood Market Segmentation Recommendations**

**Stable Neighborhoods**

*Census Tract 137 Block Group 4:* Code enforcement and active neighborhood associations. High property values and little available land limit the possibilities for income stratification.

*Census Tract 137 Block Group 5:* Targeted rehabilitation of some properties, vacant lots and substandard structures scattered about the neighborhood presenting some opportunity for infill.
Census Tract 137 Block Group 1: Targeted rehabilitation of properties and vacant lots especially to the east near Main Street. A vacancy rate of 12% and availability of a few empty lots may present an opportunity for targeted racial/ethnic and social class diversification.

Census Tract 137 Block Group 2: The high vacancy rate of 23% and availability of some empty lots may present an opportunity for further diversification.

Census Tract 137 Block Group 3: High rate of owner occupancy. Empty lots along Westchester, on Overbrook Ct., Whitehall St., Long St. and a few others scattered in the area. Substandard homes are scattered in the west and north of the neighborhood; however, there is a cluster of substandard housing in the east along Idol Street and southeast along State Ave.

Census Tract 136.2 Block Group 4: Because of affordability and the fact that over half the homes are rental, the neighborhood could easily slip in score to functional or even constrained. Home-buyer programs are encouraged.

Census Tract 136.2 Block Group 3: There is a possible infill opportunity on a larger scale in the contiguous vacant lots between Hamilton and Johnson Street.

Functioning Neighborhoods

Census Tract 136.2 Block Group 2: Empty lots and substandard homes are concentrated in the northern portion of the block group. Stabilization of this area should be a priority.

Census Tract 136.1 Block Group 2: Community action plans focused maintaining the character of the Sherwood Place community. The ethno-racial diversity, modest home values, and long tenure of residents are strengths continued expansion of High Point University may be an issue as it changes the character of the neighborhood and impacts property values.

Census Tract 136.1 Block Group 1: Community action plans focused on the few vacant or substandard properties as well as strategic home beautification identified in the housing assessments. The high vacancy rate may need addressing. High poverty and unemployment may lead to decline as properties are not maintained and owner-occupancy declines.

Census Tract 136.2 Block Group 1: In the south of this block group there are more homes with substandard conditions. The high rental rate also may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

Census Tract 140 Block Group 2: This neighborhood needs considerable focus on the high number of vacant and substandard properties. The high rental rate and high poverty rate also may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

Census Tract 138 Block Group 3: Many of the homes are rated as fair, needing mostly cosmetic work. Home repair programs or “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. There is a 7 acres of vacant land off Montlieu Ave owned by New Bethel Baptist Church that could be a potential development site.
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Constrained Neighborhoods

*Census Tract 142 Block Group 2:* The fact that the neighborhood is surrounded by a public golf course could be a major asset. The high rental rate, high vacancy rate, high poverty, and unemployment may lead to instability; owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs.

*Census Tract 140 Block Group 1:* The area needs strategic investment. Empty lots across from High Point Central (owned by GCS) and a vacant block on Edgeworth and Campbell (owned by Share of North Carolina Inc.) may present development opportunities.

*Census Tract 143 Block Group 4:* Many contiguous empty lots present opportunity for land banking or land trusts. The area needs strategic investment. Vacant industrial lots should be reclaimed, demolished or rehabbed as potential housing.

*Census Tract 145.1 Block Group 2:* Less than a quarter of homes are owner-occupied. In the north, a pocket of 5.6 acres owned by Guilford County is found off Chase Ave and could have residential or recreational potential. Industrial development in this area should be discouraged as housing is more concentrated.

*Census Tract 138 Block Group 5:* Just over a third of homes are owner-occupied. Owner-occupancy should be encouraged with home-buyer assistance programs. More than 30 empty lots (many contiguous) are readily available for infill.

*Census Tract 139 Block Group 3:* The very long tenure of homeowners and high rate of owner-occupancy are stabilizing factors. More than 30 empty lots (many contiguous) are readily available for owner-occupied infill. High density, New Urbanist development along Brentwood St may be possible and should include a supermarket or other food resource. Code enforcement needs to address vacant and unsecured properties as well as fire damaged units.

Weak Neighborhoods

*Census Tract 142 Block Group 3:* With 35% of homes having visible issues from the street, home repair programs and “clean up the neighborhood” events may be useful. There are many building opportunities. For example, the 15 contiguous light industrial lots along Park St. and Wheeler Ave end in four multi-family lots at the end of Wheeler. Potentially this entire block could become multifamily or high density infill.

*Census Tract 142 Block Group 1:* Nearly half (45%) of the homes are rated as fair or poor. Housing stock ranges from 1920s to late 1990s, need updating. There are more than 20 vacant residential lots, some contiguous, that could be used for affordable housing.

*Census Tract 138 Block Group 2:* The area needs strategic investment and planning and consideration. Contiguous empty lots at Washington and College, as well as College and Graves, present potential. New Construction replacing severely distressed properties such as that along...
Brooks Ave should be considered in other areas. The ten dilapidated multi-family units along Saunders Place should be considered for rehabilitation.

**Census Tract 138 Block Group 4:** The very short tenure of residents and high rate turn-over are destabilizing factors. The presence of a large public housing complex will severely impact market viability of other homes (rental or owner-occupied) in the neighborhood. Scheduled redevelopment of the Daniel Brooks public housing community may present a unique opportunity to redevelop the entire neighborhood.

**Census Tract 143 Block Group 3:** There are many building opportunities on scattered vacant properties comprising nearly a fourth of all parcels. Close proximity to downtown and to industrial and commercial jobs could make it an attractive neighborhood for younger home seekers. Plans from Southwest Renewal include this neighborhood along a proposed greenway.

**Census Tract 145.1 Block Group 1:** There are many building opportunities on scattered vacant properties comprising nearly a third of all parcels; however, we advise that residential development not be a priority. Rather, the area should be allowed, or encouraged, to become all industrial. Existing housing quality should continue to be monitored by code enforcement. Easy access to the highways and proximity to downtown could make it an attractive area for a large manufacturer.

**Census Tract 139 Block Group 4:** There are a number of scattered vacant parcels and poor condition houses in the southwest and north east of the neighborhood. Several wooded lots along Lamb or on Hoover present opportunities. The presence of nearby public housing will impact home values and may perpetuate the very high rental rate.

**Extremely Weak**

**Census Tract 139 Block Group 2:** The significant amount of vacant parcels so close to downtown should present opportunity for urban high-density infill if other problems can be address (crime, resources and amenities). Along Smith St, Walnut St. and Whiteoak St. alone there are 40 empty residential lots. Very few owner-occupied properties have been bought in recent years. Large scale investment and long-term planning will be needed to create a stable housing market.

**Census Tract 138 Block Group 1:** This neighborhood is ranked as extremely weak due to high poverty, high percentages of substandard and vacant parcels as well as the high mobility. The significant amount of vacant acreage owned by the County could present opportunity. The existence of the public housing impacts housing prices. Vacant lot infill and rehab of substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy to stabilize the neighborhood.

**Census Tract 142 Block Group 4:** The existence of the public housing usually impacts housing prices, but the new Park Terrace Apartments are aesthetically well designed and offer both affordable and subsidized units. Development of additional mixed-income ‘villages’ may be possible; especially if owner-occupied units are included. Vacant lot infill and rehab of
substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy since 96% of
current units are rental.

*Census Tract 143 Block Group 1:* Vacant parcels could present opportunity, such as 17 contiguous
vacant lots found along Cassell St. and others scattered throughout the neighborhood. Large
empty industrial lots are found on Potts Ave. SW Renewal plans include a greenway to pass
through the area. There are many building opportunities; however, we advise that residential
development be very selective due to the large amount of industry.

*Census Tract 143 Block Group 2:* Vacant lot infill such as found on Tryon and rehab of
substandard housing should be accomplished with a goal of owner-occupancy to stabilize the
neighborhood. Encouraging mixed-income development to balance extreme poverty should also
be a goal. Proximity to downtown could be a factor, but care not to balance against gentrification
is essential.

*Census Tract 139 Block Group 1:* More than 30 of the 80 or so parcels in the residential area are
empty. There are many building opportunities; however, we advise that residential development
be very intentional with the goal of whole-sale redevelopment of the area between Commerce
and Granby.

**Limitations - Gentrification**

Many of the poorest neighborhoods in High Point have only limited access to amenities such as good
schools, health care, or affordable and affordable nutritious foods. Access to retail shopping and high
quality child care is also quite limited in most of these areas. Combined with the relative lack of
extensive public transit systems, persons living in such areas are greatly disadvantaged. Concentrated
poverty itself becomes a significant impediment to fair housing choice because those living in such
areas must spend far more time and money in order to purchase groceries or medicine, find
opportunities for entertainment, place their children in daycare while working and travel to
workplaces far from their neighborhoods. By means of inclusionary zoning codes and mixed-income
housing developments, new or rehabilitated affordable housing in areas of high opportunity, located
near good schools, and with access to mass transit should be a priority.

At the same time, efforts to build a healthier, more robust and sustainable High Point should include
incentives to attract young renters and homebuyers back into the city core area, coupled with
investments in mixed commercial land uses, environmental and neighborhood amenities, green
spaces, improved walkability and integrated, multi-modal systems of public transit. Perhaps, most
importantly, building a better High Point cannot rely solely on market forces. Building public-private
partnerships, developing proactive, flexible, equity-focused and adaptable zoning and planning plans
at the municipal level, and targeting scarce public resources effectively will be key in long-term efforts
to build and maintain a thriving High Point.
However, redevelopment may have its consequences. When an area that has been traditionally low-rent or has low-property values is in close proximity to higher paying jobs (a new technology hub or innovation incubator), the resulting “rent gap” between what the landlord has been getting from low-income tenants versus the potential rent from high-income tenants will inevitable decrease the supply of affordable housing in a housing market. Also, new development without requirements for the provision of affordable units, may result in a similar circumstance. Demolition, rehabilitation and redevelopment should be conducted in a manner that encourages housing affordability and is mindful of populations that will be vulnerable to displacement will be essential. **Redevelopment without gentrification, especially in heavily blighted areas, will require community input and investment in planning decisions, “no net loss” policies, and consideration of arrangements that will eventually allow for inclusionary housing.**

Protections against displacement should be constantly considered. Kalima Rose, Senior Associate at PolicyLink, in her article "Combating Gentrification Through Equitable Development," explains:

"The very best time to start dealing with displacement is at the beginning of community revitalization efforts. Most communities, however, begin to focus on displacement when the elders, the disabled and those with the most limited incomes start facing eviction or when the indigenous businesses and service organizations can no longer afford rent in the neighborhood. An assessment will usually involve community mapping efforts that identify renter-to-homeowner rates, vacancy and abandonment rates, affordability indexes (rent or mortgage as percentage of household income) and spatial analyses of race and poverty. The assessment should, of course, be tailored to the specific situation."

**The Cost of the Status Quo**

The presence of vacant, abandoned and substandard properties correlates with an increase in crime rates, increases in negative health outcomes, and even increased mental health issues. Homeowners surrounded by vacant properties report a lower quality of life that may manifest in many ways, such as social fragmentation, isolation, and loss of aesthetic appeal. Childhood asthma, lead exposure, and cancers have also been shown to be possible negative effects of living in proximity to vacant lots, boarded homes, and high-density traffic areas, and in substandard housing. Vacant lots and abandoned homes have a high direct cost on the City in terms of resources and services: police, fire department, code enforcement, legal systems, etc. **Un-renovated occupied properties and vacant lots generate little in tax revenue. Having vacant or abandoned homes in the vicinity will also suppress neighborhood market values, further limiting resources for the City as tax values plunge in a whole community.**

It has been demonstrated in many studies that sufficient safe and affordable housing (fewer evictions, more employment, fewer missed days at work or school, fewer hospitalizations, households having more income available for food/child care/transportation, etc.). In a 2013 report, HousingWorks Austin argued that an investment of $55 million for development of affordable housing would yield a
return of over $800 million to the city and its residents. Some of this return on investment was in the form of jobs and income created by the housing and planning development as well as the supplies purchases and contracts created. However, $473 million of this estimated return on investment was based on savings associated with healthcare and other governmental support services. The increase of affordable housing allowed residents’ income to carry further and fund more of their day to day needs, with less burden on the governmental and general taxpayer (HousingWorks 2013). Recent academic studies support this finding, as well. In separate 2015 studies, both Reeve et al (2015) and Brumberg et al (2015) found that savings associated with health costs, particularly for high-risk patients, resulting from affordable and safe housing exceeded the initial investment. The Colorado Division of Housing provides further support in finding that each year on average, tenants of affordable units in Colorado save $2,460. These savings that can be used for health insurance premiums, more nutritious food, or in an array of other resources (Hart 2003). In considering the social return on investment, SVT Group, NeighborWorks America, and Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future estimated that for each $1 invested in green, affordable housing projects there would be $10 of social value to society. By considering reduced health care bills as well as energy consumption and carbon emissions, the return on investment is positive and diversified (Olsen 2011).

There is evidence too that there is a substantial costs to communities due to homelessness. Homelessness often results when cost-burdened families find themselves unable to pay for housing when calamities occur – loss of an income, medical bills, an exorbitant utility bill, etc. The economic costs of homelessness for a community are often categorized as the result of incarceration and police services, hospitalizations and medical care, and emergency shelter management. Diamond and Schnee (1991) found amongst men in their study that criminal justice services were the most frequently ‘accessed’ by and resulted in approximately 75% of the costs attributable to homelessness. The average public safety cost per individual experiencing homelessness was over $14,000 per year, mostly due to overnight jail (Diamond and Schnee 1991). The greater costs of medical care for those experiencing homelessness is influenced by factors such as irregular access to care and treatment, and environmental issues which may be detrimental to health, both resulting in more severe health concerns and the need for more expensive health care services. Salit, Kuhn, Hartz, Vu, and Mosso (1998) found that patients who were homeless remained hospitalized for 36% longer (4.1 days) than those who were not homeless, at a cost difference of $2,414 on average. Further, they noted that most of these patients facing homelessness the majority “were hospitalized for conditions for which hospitalization is often preventable” (Salit et al. 1998:1738). Costs related to emergency sheltering of those experiencing homelessness are also much greater than those related to permanent housing. While short-term sheltering is remain necessary to provide support for those in crisis, such services is often utilized on a long term basis. Spellman, Khadduri, Sokol, and Leopold (2010) found that emergency shelter for families came at a cost that was generally equal to or greater than that of providing other forms of housing.

Clearly housing is a central issue to the future of economic development in City of High Point. Affordable housing choice is imperative. Continued dis-investment in weak and extremely weak
markets will further exacerbate the “concentration effect” of poverty and, as demonstrated above, cost the City and its residents more in indirect costs associated with substandard housing, negative health outcomes, and homelessness. Strategic investment in safe, fair, and affordable housing, when guided by good data and proven best practices, has been shown to stabilize property values, improve tax revenue, reduce transportation and health costs, improve life chances and improve quality of life.
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Appendices
A. Motor City Mapping Survey Template

From Loveland Technologies

Is there a structure on the site?

Yes: A structure is a permanent building located on the site. This includes houses, garages, buildings - anything built on a foundation.

No: If the site is empty or has temporary structures, like trailers, temporary sheds, or mobile homes, then it does not have a structure on site.

Is the structure occupied?

Occupied: The structure shows visible activity and consistent use or maintenance. Common characteristics are: porch furniture, a well-kept lawn, good landscaping, fences, cars in the driveway, a maintained garden, or a play area.

Unoccupied: Common characteristics are: neglected facades, eviction notices, empty interiors, substantial physical or structural damages, extensive security measures, uncut or tall grass, weeds, scrub trees, trash or debris accumulated over time, or accumulated flyers on the porch or door.

Partially occupied: One or more units in a multi-unit dwelling are occupied, while others are clearly vacant.

Possibly Unoccupied: The property displays characteristics from both categories above, making it difficult to assess whether there is consistent use or maintenance.

What is this site used for?

Residential: Includes single-family homes, duplexes, apartment buildings, senior living facilities, condominiums, and row houses.

Commercial: Includes properties used for retail, office, entertainment, hotels, parking, and other services.

Mixed-use Residential / Commercial: Includes multi-level structures where the ground level supports commercial uses like retail, while the top levels support residential uses like apartments, condominiums, lofts, etc.

Industrial: Includes properties used for manufacturing, storage areas, warehousing, junk yards, landfill operations, and waste disposal sites.

Institutional: Includes all public and religious buildings, including churches, schools, government offices, libraries, permanent park structures, and hospitals.

Unknown: The use of the property cannot be determined from looking at the outside alone.

How many residential units?

Garage or Shed: A detached garage or shed which is the only structure on the parcel.

Single Family: A house designed for occupancy for one family and has only one address number.

Multi-Family: A single building designed for occupancy for one to three families with multiple addresses.

Apartments: Individual or multiple buildings designed for occupancy by 4 or more families.

What type of residences?

Single Family: A house designed for occupancy for one family and has only one address number.

Multi-Family: A single building designed for occupancy for one to three families with multiple addresses.

Apartments: Individual or multiple buildings designed for occupancy by 4 or more families.
What type of commercial occupant(s)?

Restaurant / Bar: Stand-alone eateries and drinking establishments

Grocery: Stand-alone stores where people can buy food. Sale of food may not be the primary purpose of the business. Includes liquor stores.

Retail: Stores that sell items to the general public.

Service: Businesses that provide a service to the general public, including banks, hair salons, tattoo parlors, auto repair shops

Offices: Businesses that provide services or office spaces for individual or multiple tenants.

Entertainment: Structures whose sole purpose is to provide entertainment.

Multi-occupant: A building housing multiple commercial business, but no residential units. Strip malls.

Other: For when you’re unsure about what the commercial building is being used for.

What type of industrial occupant(s)?

Industrial: Manufacturing and production plants that generally don’t do business with the public.

Warehouses: Buildings that store goods, but don’t produce them. Indicators include large loading docks and signage indicating warehouse use. May be multi-story.

Multi-Occupant: Multi-occupant industrial buildings have multiple tenants or companies, and are sometimes located in industrial parks.

Other: For when you’re unsure about what the industrial building is being used for.

What type of institutional occupant(s)?

Schools: Any building whose primary purpose is that of education.

Religious: Any building whose primary purpose is religious in nature. This includes a wide gamut of buildings from cathedrals down to storefronts. Primarily places of worship, but also buildings where religious services are offered.

Public Safety: Primarily police and fire stations. Does not include private security firms.

Health: Hospitals, health centers, medical clinics. Any place where medical services are offered, including doctor’s offices.

Recreation: Different from a park in that it has a permanent structure on it for the purpose of recreation.

Government: Government buildings are offices through which the local, state, and federal government operate out of. Includes libraries.

Non Profit / Charity: Organizations providing services to the needy, including soup kitchens, homeless shelters

Other: For when you’re unsure about what the institutional building is being used for.

What is the condition of the structure?

Good: No obvious repairs needed.

Fair: Needs minor repairs. Windows and doors intact, but roof may be missing shingles, exterior elements may be sagging, paint / siding missing, graffiti.

Poor: Needs major repairs. Windows and doors are broken or boarded up. Light fire damage that can be repaired. Non-load-bearing elements like awnings, porches collapsed. Holes in roof.
**Suggest Demolition:** No longer shaped like a building. Damaged beyond practical repair or renovation. Structural damage including collapse of roof, walls, foundation. Uninhabitable.

**Is the structure fire damaged?**

Yes: Indications of fire in or around the structure that caused visible damage, from as small as melted siding to buildings that have burned down to the ground.

**What is the level of fire damage?**

Minor: Visible damage to the building that is superficial or repairable, and does not render the building uninhabitable. Includes soot marks around doorways and windows.

Major: Significant damage to the building that would be costly to repair and makes it uninhabitable. Major may include holes in the roof, but once there is any sort of structural collapse, the damage level is considered collapsed.

Collapsed: Fire that has caused partial or total structural collapse, making it no longer building-shaped. This includes buildings that have burned down to the foundation. Walls may still be standing, but parts or all of the roof have caved in.

**Is the building secure or open to trespass?**

Secured: A building is secured when all windows or doors are intact or secured. This includes occupied buildings with original windows / doors, and buildings that may be vacant but are not open to trespass.

Open to Trespass: If a building has missing windows, doors or is otherwise open and accessible to scrappers, squatters, or vandals, it is open to trespass.

**What is the site used for?**

Vacant Lot: A lot that is not being used..

Parking Lot: Lot used for parking, can be paved or unpaved. Does not include cars on lawns.

Park: A lot that is clearly designated or has some permanent indicator of park use such as playground equipment and trails.

Garden: Land being used for agricultural purposes, includes personal gardens and larger farms.

Other: For when you’re unsure about what the lot is being used for.

Attached Lot: A lot adjacent to or in between occupied houses that is clearly maintained or used as an extension of an existing property. Attached Lots are not considered vacant lots because they are in use.

**Is the lot maintained?**

Yes: A lot is maintained when the lot shows sign of care and maintenance, regardless of what is physically on the lot. Grassy lots are mowed with some regularity and paved lots show signs of consistent care.

No: Characteristics of an unmaintained lot include tall grass, overgrown trees or bushes, weeds in the cracks of pavement, and so on.

**Is there dumping on the site?**

Yes: A building or vacant lot is considered to have dumping when debris has been purposely left or placed on the property. This does not include litter or debris from a recent fire or ongoing demolition.
B. Data Tables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total_Housing_Units2010</td>
<td>Total Housing Units Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied_Housing_Units2010</td>
<td>Occupied Housing Units Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant_Housing_Units2010</td>
<td>Vacant Housing Units Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL_HOUSING_UNITS2013</td>
<td>Total Housing Units (estimated) U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied_Housing_Units2013</td>
<td>Occupied Housing Units U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant_Housing_Units2013</td>
<td>Vacant Housing Units U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY_RATE2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Vacant Housing divided by total Housing Units U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_RENTALS2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent Rental U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_OWNER_OCCUPIED2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent Owner Occupied U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_MORTGAGES_OwnerOCC2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent with mortgages U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey Owner-occupied housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_TENUREHH_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_TENURE_Homeowners_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_TENURE_Renters_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK_GROUP</td>
<td>Total_Housing_Units2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_RENTALS2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent Rental U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_OWNER_OCCUPIED2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent Owner Occupied U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_MORTGAGES_OwnerOCC2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent with mortgages U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey Owner-occupied housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_TENUREHH_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_TENURE_Homeowners_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_TENURE_Renters_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Column</td>
<td>2nd Column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>CHCS from Census 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL_PARCELS</td>
<td>Total Number or Parcels Guilford County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels_Tax_Delinquent</td>
<td>Total number of Tax Delinquent Properties Guilford County Tax Assessor 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_DELINQUENT</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - Percent Tax Delinquent Properties Guilford County Tax Assesor 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant_Deed</td>
<td>Total number of Vacant Properties Guilford County Tax Assesor 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res_Parcel</td>
<td>Number of Residential parcels Guilford County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc_Resident</td>
<td>Percent Residential Guilford County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN_HOUSING_AGE2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed - U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_SUBSTANDARD</td>
<td>CHCS Remote Assessment 2014 images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_FIREDAMAGE</td>
<td>CHCS Remote Assessment 2014 images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed_vacant</td>
<td>CHCS Remote Assessment 2014 images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant_Lot</td>
<td>Vacant Lots Percent with No Structure on Parcel CHCS Remote Assessment 2014 images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls_For_Service</td>
<td>City of HP Records on Police Calls Regarding Reports of Violent Crime per 1000 residents by CBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOCK</td>
<td>TOTAL PARCELS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_RES_TAX_VALUE</td>
<td>Average Tax Value of Residential Parcels Guilford County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_SFR_TAX_VALUE</td>
<td>Average Tax Value of SFR Parcel Guilford County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_NonRES_TAX_VALUE</td>
<td>Average Tax Value of None-residential Parcel Guilford County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE_TAX_VALUE</td>
<td>Average Tax Value of all Parcel Guilford County Tax Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN_HOME_VALUE2000</td>
<td>Median Value (Dollars) For Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units Census 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRIMedian_Value2012</td>
<td>MEDIAN VALUE (DOLLARS) ESRI projection based on 2010 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median_Value2013</td>
<td>MEDIAN VALUE (DOLLARS) U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN_RENT2000</td>
<td>Median Gross Rent (Dollars) For Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent Census 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN_RENT2013</td>
<td>Median Gross Rent (Dollars) For Renter-occupied housing units paying cash rent 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans_Originated_2014</td>
<td>CHCS Computed at Tract level Divided by number of block groups HMDA 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BLOCK

AVERAGE_
RES_VALUE

AVERAGE_SFR_
TAX_VALUE

AVERAGE_
NonRES
TAXVALUE

AVERAGE_
TAX_VALUE

MEDIAN_
HOME
VALUE2000

ESRIMedian
_Value2012

Median
_Value2013

MEDIAN_
RENT2000

MEDIAN_
RENT2013

Loans_
Originated
_2014

136.11

$47,539.84

$47,210.37

$19,134.15

$45,167.33

$59,900

$76,862

$78,600

$591

$779

3.00

136.12

$23,458.59

$22,373.86

$25,574.19

$21,633.33

$76,700

$89,205

$107,100

$911

$1,071

3.00

136.21

$51,506.27

$51,957.34

$117,248.15

$54,327.34

$64,000

$78,919

$77,600

$515

$731

9.00

136.22

$57,482.82

$58,471.06

$4,800.00

$55,191.37

$83,200

$111,940

$130,300

$550

$775

9.00

136.23

$68,912.48

$68,795.70

$237,894.73

$99,838.40

$81,800

$88,527

$89,200

$538

$751

9.00

136.24

$55,540.44

$55,155.01

$818,017.65

$104,703.53

$67,300

$76,136

$86,800

$521

$761

9.00

137.1

$201,888.47

$223,706.83

$313,541.67

$209,496.50

$91,700

$198,171

$240,400

$437

$538

16.80

137.2

$157,122.89

$183,441.19

$235,386.99

$169,068.83

$116,200

$132,203

$124,500

$588

$688

16.80

137.3

$94,635.69

$94,161.28

$275,991.23

$118,967.22

$169,100

$137,250

$150,500

$0

$0

16.80

137.4

$273,223.88

$273,371.32

$793,966.67

$280,572.42

$87,800

$225,595

$251,800

$0

$0

16.80

137.5

$123,388.79

$121,391.49

$387,910.79

$203,253.18

$156,700

$137,250

$141,400

$606

$731

16.80

138.1

$37,834.17

$39,273.06

$92,365.96

$45,489.02

$65,900

$68,396

$74,300

$413

$539

2.20

138.2

$43,819.10

$47,035.76

$10,483.33

$40,913.32

$56,800

$73,349

$73,200

$406

$781

2.20

138.3

$53,047.26

$54,841.64

$0.00

$52,566.47

$46,400

$78,333

$73,600

$559

$950

2.20

138.4

$30,421.62

$40,422.45

$8,816.67

$26,194.57

$57,800

$82,143

$0

$239

$244

2.20

138.5

$49,038.75

$46,927.13

$397,977.89

$162,427.82

$54,500

$85,938

$86,700

$344

$458

2.20

139.1

$72,073.12

$31,064.81

$1,746,829.41

$516,057.81

$55,700

$75,000

$0

$249

$289

2.75

139.2

$20,353.87

$23,251.44

$1,833,020.24

$340,588.84

$40,000

$76,471

$66,800

$363

$491

2.75

139.3

$25,186.38

$29,913.78

$63,590.79

$30,392.53

$31,600

$74,148

$65,000

$441

$761

2.75

139.4

$44,354.09

$38,834.06

$21,900.00

$42,486.50

$54,500

$78,824

$59,400

$348

$478

2.75

140.1

$64,484.31

$64,901.12

$201,161.30

$113,154.75

$78,700

$109,459

$64,000

$401

$624

11.50

140.2

$60,751.21

$66,988.63

$227,641.00

$107,964.13

$57,700

$86,950

$71,300

$597

$806

11.50

142.1

$39,478.81

$43,194.39

$83,146.67

$45,681.63

$49,300

$70,385

$72,000

$545

$784

2.75

142.2

$46,612.30

$47,738.69

$197,944.44

$53,450.38

$46,400

$73,165

$57,600

$576

$747

2.75

142.3

$34,556.50

$42,986.27

$275,296.88

$65,545.53

$44,300

$86,328

$78,500

$431

$696

2.75

142.4

$40,109.94

$36,609.88

$387,272.45

$164,967.03

$10,000

$84,756

$0

$412

$761

2.75

143.1

$34,088.32

$37,685.57

$151,711.57

$89,423.12

$43,600

$85,938

$55,400

$399

$649

1.25

143.2

$53,050.27

$41,156.50

$607,046.99

$414,388.42

$58,900

$76,471

$0

$295

$546

1.25

143.3

$32,943.40

$32,871.84

$62,348.53

$37,934.95

$40,500

$85,714

$33,900

$310

$332

1.25

143.4

$43,212.61

$34,968.66

$189,489.36

$86,033.54

$44,600

$84,756

$92,900

$308

$520

1.25

145.11

$48,232.94

$53,145.33

$453,484.50

$328,686.37

$65,000

$73,182

$67,500

$384

$525

0.50

145.12

$40,138.25

$44,964.58

$327,835.29

$161,594.80

$56,700

$85,156

$75,000

$438

$649

0.50
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BlockGroup</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP_2000</td>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION U.S. Census Bureau 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_2010</td>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION U.S. Census Bureau 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL_POPULATION_2013</td>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_CHANGE_2010_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Census 2010 ACS 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_CHANGE_PRCT_2000_2010</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Census 2000 Census 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_CHANGE_PRCT_2010_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Census 2010 ACS 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_Moved_Last_Year_2013</td>
<td>CCHS Computed from Geographical Mobility in The Past Year For Current Residence--Metropolitan Statistical Area Level In The United States 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_DENSITY_2012</td>
<td>2012 USA Population Density ESRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>1,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>1,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>1,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>1,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>1,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>1,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>1,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>1,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BlockGroup</td>
<td>CHCS from Census 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_WHITE_ALONE_2013</td>
<td>White Percent CHCS Computed U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_NON_WHITE</td>
<td>Non-White Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_AA_2013</td>
<td>African American Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_NATIVE_2013</td>
<td>Native American Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_ASIAN_2013</td>
<td>Asian Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_PI_2013</td>
<td>Pacific Islander Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_OTHER_RACE_2013</td>
<td>Other race Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_2_RACES_2013</td>
<td>Two or more races Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_HISPANIC_2013</td>
<td>Hispanic Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_FOREIGN_BORN_TRACT_2013</td>
<td>Foreign Born Percent CHCS U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Poverty and Labor Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BlockGroup</th>
<th>CHCS from Census 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP_PCT_18under_2013</td>
<td>Percent 18 and under CHCS Computed from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_PCT_65ove_2013</td>
<td>Percent 65 and over CHCS Computed from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN_HH_INCOME_2013</td>
<td>Median Household Income U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_POVERTY_2013</td>
<td>Percent income below poverty rate last 12 months Computed from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOYMENT_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Unemploye from Employment Status For The Population 16 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not_in_Labor_force_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Not in Labor from Force Employment Status For The Population 16 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_FOOD_STAMPS_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Receipt of Food Stamps/Snap in The Past 12 Months from U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECAP</td>
<td>CHCS COMPUTED - RCAP/ECAPs must have a non-white population of 50 percent or more &amp; 40 percent or more of individuals living at or below the poverty line - ACS 2013 DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BlockGroup</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCT_NO_DIPLOMA_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Less than High School Educational Attainment For The Population 25 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_HS_GED_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed High School or GED Educational Attainment For The Population 25 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_SOME_COLLEGE_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Some college Educational Attainment For The Population 25 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_FOUR_YEAR_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Four Year Degree Educational Attainment For The Population 25 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCT_GRAD_PROF_2013</td>
<td>CHCS Computed Post-Graduate Educational Attainment For The Population 25 Years And Over U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pearson's Correlation Matrix for Variables Included in Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MED VALUE</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Subst</th>
<th>Occup</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>mortg</th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Delinqunt</th>
<th>Crimes</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
<th>Foreign Born</th>
<th>4Year Degr</th>
<th>18 &amp; under</th>
<th>65 &amp; over</th>
<th>Med Incom</th>
<th>below poverty</th>
<th>Food Stamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED VALUE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.454*</td>
<td>-.441</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>-.646</td>
<td>-.656</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>-.543</td>
<td>-.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lots</td>
<td>-.454</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>-.692</td>
<td>-.392</td>
<td>-.739</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>-.551</td>
<td>-.526</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>-.438</td>
<td>-.647</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>-.441</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>-.503</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>-.574</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.543</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>-.692</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>-.507</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>-.508</td>
<td>-.757</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>-.550</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>-.764</td>
<td>-.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.366</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.413</td>
<td>-.349</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent mortgages</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-.739</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>-.366</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>-.599</td>
<td>-.654</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-.594</td>
<td>-.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Origination</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-.621</td>
<td>-.503</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>-.606</td>
<td>-.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Delinquent</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>.521</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>-.507</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>-.413</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>-.652</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>-.425</td>
<td>-.668</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crimes</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>-.477</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>-.646</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>-.508</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>-.599</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>-.648</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
<td>-.656</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>-.757</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.654</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.736</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>-.695</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Year Degree</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>-.526</td>
<td>-.574</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>-.652</td>
<td>-.303</td>
<td>-.648</td>
<td>-.736</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>-.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and under</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>-.550</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.554</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>-.438</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>-.413</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>-.425</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.362</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>-.554</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>-.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>-.647</td>
<td>-.543</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>-.349</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>-.668</td>
<td>-.477</td>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>-.695</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.735</td>
<td>-.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty rate</td>
<td>-.543</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>-.764</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>-.606</td>
<td>-.594</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>-.575</td>
<td>-.735</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>-.520</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>-.709</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>-.651</td>
<td>-.627</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>-.578</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>-.637</td>
<td>-.740</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
### Market Segmentation Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block group</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Constrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.11</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Extremely Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Extremely Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Extremely Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Extremely Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Extremely Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Extremely Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Parcel Data

#### Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>structure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2831</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>12325</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15156</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the structure's use?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed_use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential</td>
<td>10278</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12323</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Open to Trespass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the structure open to trespass?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secure</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>11627</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dumping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is there any trash or dumping on the property?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumping</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trash</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>11627</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Building Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apartment</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convenience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entertainment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grocery (other)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multi_occupant</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multifamily</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offices</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other industrial</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other institutional</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public_safety</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant (chain)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant (fast food)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant (other)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant (sit_down)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retail</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single_family</td>
<td>9409</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small_market</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>townhouse_condo</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warehouse</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12242</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>999</td>
<td>2971</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Condition

Rate the overall condition of the structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>2674</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>8977</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest_demo</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12325</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>999</th>
<th>2888</th>
<th>19.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Damage

Does the structure have any signs of deterioration or damage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>8737</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12323</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fire Damage

Is the structure fire damaged?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collapsed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>3410</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superficial</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3586</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Occupancy

Does the structure appear to be occupied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupied</td>
<td>11131</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12325</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Missing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>999</th>
<th>2888</th>
<th>19.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vacant Lot Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached_lot</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forest</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garden</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open_land</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>park</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking_lot</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant_lot</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2831</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vacant Lot Maintained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintained</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dna</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintained</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmaintained</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2831</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vacant Lot Dumping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dumping</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumping</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litter</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trash</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsure</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2831</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>address</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>Fire Damage</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799986977</td>
<td>1408 W Green Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800462114</td>
<td>716 Washington St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800461579</td>
<td>222 Hobson St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7709196711</td>
<td>406 W Willis Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799780238</td>
<td>301 Prospect St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7709196986</td>
<td>822 Hilltop St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7709193674</td>
<td>416 W Willis Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800178173</td>
<td>315 Monroe Pl</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800179115</td>
<td>317 Monroe Pl</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800378030</td>
<td>306 Fourth St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800369393</td>
<td>627 Washington St</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799770130</td>
<td>514 Prospect St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7709096803</td>
<td>703 Tryon Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799674819</td>
<td>1620 W Ward Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7801239375</td>
<td>1306 Forrest St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7801712018</td>
<td>903 Circle Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7801926815</td>
<td>1400 Darden St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7801149598</td>
<td>706 708 Eastchester Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799229718</td>
<td>630 Old Thomasville Rd</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6891837350</td>
<td>1805 Welborn St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800936759</td>
<td>1808 Franklin Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7801115880</td>
<td>725 Bridges Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Major Status</td>
<td>Sub Status</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621 N Hamilton St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513 W Ward Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 W Ward Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206 E Kivett Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Woodbury St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225 W Ward Ave</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 Underhill St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901 Martin St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736 Washington St</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830 Hilltop St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>905 E Lexington Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511 N Centennial St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 Berkley St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007 Tabor St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613 E Lexington Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703 Bridges Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Johnson St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 Manley St</td>
<td>industrial</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315 Starr Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108 Dartmouth Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509 Ellwood Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Park St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311 Potts Ave</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029 Montlieu Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408 Berkley St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2401 Clifton St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114 W English Rd</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Park St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1308 Potts Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>Suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Suggest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008 Crafton St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1222 Redding Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1230 Tank Ct</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 Underhill St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409 411 Underhill St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412 W Willis Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1618 W Ward Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Hobson St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410 W Willis Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1414 Welborn St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706 Old Thomasville Rd</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613 Bridges Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301 Dorris Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801 B Old Thomasville Rd</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>collapsed</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel</td>
<td>address</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800457098</td>
<td>302 Park St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799860342</td>
<td>1311 Potts Ave</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890903078</td>
<td>332 Ennis St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800371587</td>
<td>408 Vine St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799986977</td>
<td>1408 W Green Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7801702769</td>
<td>1029 Montlieu Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799212680</td>
<td>408 Berkley St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799312559</td>
<td>801 B Old Thomasville Rd</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799553567</td>
<td>2401 Clifton St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799558455</td>
<td>2404 Van Buren St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890837893</td>
<td>1100 Campbell St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890837263</td>
<td>1114 W English Rd</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800457098</td>
<td>302 Park St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890829628</td>
<td>117 Briggs Pl</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890816826</td>
<td>1509 W English Rd</td>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800203505</td>
<td>208 Vail Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890811997</td>
<td>303 Phillips Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890824822</td>
<td>1205 Bradshaw St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6890833126</td>
<td>303 Kennedy Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7709184802</td>
<td>1012 Cassell St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800529181</td>
<td>906 Newlin Pl</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799861537</td>
<td>1308 Potts Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799863505</td>
<td>1008 Crafton St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799990217</td>
<td>1222 Redding Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799897017</td>
<td>1230 Tank Ct</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6799865381</td>
<td>1229 Potts Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800733024</td>
<td>1308 Ragan Ave</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>boarded</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800931158</td>
<td>2002 E Green Dr</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>secure</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800587551</td>
<td>501 Underhill St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7800987436</td>
<td>409 411 Underhill St</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>open_to_trespass</td>
<td>suggest demo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Explanation of ESRI 2012 Median Home Value Estimates

There are many possible ways to predict market values of homes: appraisals, replacement cost calculations, and comparative market analyses (CMA). In single-family private real estate transactions a comparative market analysis (CMA) often computed using comparable, recently-sold properties in the same or similar neighborhood. CMAs are only valid and reliable for the day upon which they are computed. While Zillow, Trulia, and other sources calculate real-time cost estimates based on this method, their data is unavailable to researchers.

County tax appraisals in North Carolina are conducted every eight years to set the assessed value of homes for the purposes of determining the *ad valorem* property taxes. While Guilford County re-assesses parcel values every five years, the estimates do not always reflect true-market values and in fact were off slightly to begin with in 2012 due to the slow recovery from the recession.\(^1\) Comparison of assessed values in low-income neighborhoods shows homes are over-valued: “assessment rates tend to be both higher and more variable for lower-priced properties.”\(^2\) This trend has long been noted in the literature.\(^3\)

In this project, we decided to use ESRI median home value estimates for 2012. ESRI’s dataset is based in *U.S. Census Block Group spatial scales* (at the finest scale of detail). Estimates for smaller scales (larger areas) of geography are also available but were not used in the CHCS calculations for median home values in the High Point Core City as their generality would not accurately reflect the most precise estimations. The estimates were obtained by calculating median values for *owner occupied properties only*. Thus, commercial, industrial and other types of property valuations are not included in the median home value calculations. Additionally, the estimates will be more reliable than tax-parcel data estimates and averaged American Community Survey or Census 2010 data since vacant properties (which are extremely tricky to value, especially in neighborhoods with low rates of property sales during the Great Recession) are excluded. Lastly, the values of lease-based multi-family dwellings are also excluded, preventing any upward bias/skew in the data that would result from much more highly valued non-owner occupied properties such as apartment complexes, retirement communities, etc.

---

### Demographics

- #1: Population Density
- #2: Change in Population, 2010-2013
- #3: Percent White Alone
- #4: Percent African-American
- #5: Percent Non-White
- #6: Percent Asian-American
- #7: Percent Native-American
- #8: Percent another Race
- #9: Percent 2+ Races
- #10: Percent Hispanic
- #11: Percent Foreign-Born
- #12: Percent Under 18
- #13: Percent Over 65

### Socioeconomic Characteristics

- #14: Median HH Income
- #15: Educational Attainment
- #16: Percent of Population without HS Diploma
- #17: Percent of Population with a HS Diploma
- #18: Percent of Population with Some College
- #19: Percent of Population with a Bachelor’s Degree
- #20: Percent of Population with a Graduate Degree
- #21: Percent of Labor Force Unemployed
- #22: Percent of Households using Food Stamps

### Housing

- #23: Total Housing Units
- #24: Average Tax Values of all Parcels
- #25: Average Tax Value of Residential Parcels
- #26: Average Tax Value of SF Residential Parcels
- #27: Average Tax Value of Non-Residential Parcels
- #28: Median Contract Rent
- #29: Average Homeowner Tenure
- #30: Average Renter Tenure
- #31: Median Age of Housing Unit
- #32: Percent of Housing Units that are Vacant
- #33: Percent of Properties Renter-Occupied
- #34: Percent of Properties Owner-Occupied
- #35: Percent of Population Moved within the Past Year
- #36: Number of Home Loans Originated
- #37: Foreclosure Rate
- #38: Percent of Parcels without Utility Bills
- #39: Percent of Parcels where a Permit was Issued
- #40: Percent of Properties Secured Code Violations
- #41: Percent Living Below Poverty Level
- #42: Percent of Nuisance Cases 2011-2014
- #43: Percent Demolished Properties 2012-2014
- #44: Percent of Parcels with Delinquent Tax Bills
- #45: Violent Crime Rate
- #46: Property Crime Rate
- #47: Amenities
- #48: Food Deserts

### Transportation

- #49: Average Commute Time
- #50: Percent of Commuting by Walking or Biking
- #51: Percent Commuting by Public Transit
- #52: Bus Routes

### Environment & Health

- #53: Particulate Matter 2.5 EJ Index
- #54: Ozone Exposure
- #55: Medical Facilities
- #56: Lead Paint Indicator
- #57: Environmental Hazards Exposure Index
City of High Point
Percent of Population that was White Alone, 2013

Legend
Pct. White
- Less than 22.6
- 22.6 to 40.7
- 40.8 to 51.8
- 51.9 to 72
- Greater than 72
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2006-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Population that was African-American, 2013

Legend
Pct. African-American
Less than 18.9
19 to 38
38.1 to 56.8
56.9 to 79.8
Greater than 79.8
Census Tract Boundaries
Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2005-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Population that was Another Race, 2013

Legend
Pct. Other Race
- Less than 0.8
- 0.8 to 4
- 4.1 to 8.5
- 8.6 to 13
- Greater than 13
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2006-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Population that was Two or More Races, 2013

Legend
Pct. 2+ Races
- Less than 0.5
- 0.6 to 1.5
- 1.6 to 4.5
- 4.6 to 7.6
- Greater than 7.6
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Population that was Hispanic, 2013

Legend
Pct. Hispanic
- Less than 3.8
- 3.8 to 8.4
- 8.5 to 15.1
- 15.2 to 22.9
- Greater than 22.9

Census Tract Boundaries
Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
Socioeconomic Characteristics
City of High Point
Educational Attainment

Legend
Educational Attainment
- No HS Diploma
- High School/GED
- Some College
- Bachelor's
- Graduate/Professional
- Block Group Boundaries
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed From 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Population without a High School Diploma

Legend
Pct. No Diploma
- Less than 10.8
- 10.8 to 24.6
- 24.61 to 34.5
- 34.51 to 48.5
- Greater than 48.5
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed From 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Population with a High School Diploma or GED

Legend

Pct. High School/GED
- Less than 15.4
- 15.4 to 25.9
- 26 to 33.1
- 33.2 to 40.2
- Greater than 40.2

Census Tract Boundaries
Rocks

Source: CHCS Computed From 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Civilian Labor Force Unemployed

Legend
Pct. Unemployed
- Less than 7.1
- 7.1 to 12.4
- 12.41 to 18.1
- 18.2 to 28.7
- Greater than 28.7
Census Tract Boundaries
Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2006-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Households using Food Stamps

Legend
Food Stamp Usage
- Less than 12.8
- 12.81 to 30.1
- 30.1 to 40.9
- 40.91 to 63.3
- Greater than 63.3
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Average Tax Value of Non-Residential Parcels, 2014

Legend
Avg. Non-Residential Tax Value
- Less than $117,248
- $117,249 to $275,991
- $275,992 to $453,485
- $453,486 to $818,018
- Greater than $818,018
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: Guilford County Tax Assessor
City of High Point
Median Contract Rent

Legend
Median Rent
- Less than $289
- $290 to $546
- $547 to $696
- $697 to $806
- Greater than $806
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Housing Units that are Vacant, 2013

Legend
Pct. Vacant
- Less than 4.3
- 4.3 to 11.6
- 11.61 to 17.4
- 17.41 to 31.8
- Greater than 31.8
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Properties that are Renter-Occupied

Legend
Pct. Renter-Occupied
- Less than 19.4
- 19.4 to 40.9
- 41 to 62.8
- 62.81 to 80.6
- Greater than 80.6
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Properties that are Owner-Occupied

Legend
Pct. Owner-Occupied

- Less than 13.8
- 13.8 to 26.0
- 27 to 42.8
- 42.81 to 59.1
- Greater than 59.1
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Population that Moved within the Past Year

Legend
Pct. Moved

- Less than 4.4
- 4.5 to 15.4
- 15.5 to 22
- 22.1 to 32.4
- Greater than 32.4

Census Tract Boundaries
Rocks

Source: American Community Survey 2009-2013
City of High Point
Percent of Parcels Where
No Utility Bills Have Been Issued
Since 2013

Legend
Percent No Bills
less than 3
3.01 to 5.2
5.21 to 8.7
8.71 to 12.8
12.81 to 17.9
Census Tract Boundaries
Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from High Point City Data
City of High Point
Percent of Properties with Secured Code Violations, 2011-2014

Legend
Pct. Secured
- 0 (No code violations)
- 0.001 to 0.28
- 0.29 to 0.37
- 0.38 to 0.63
- Greater than 0.63

Source: CHCS Computed from High Point, NC Data
City of High Point
Percent of Population Living Below the Poverty Level

Legend
Pct. Poverty
- Less than 12.5
- 12.5 to 24.7
- 24.71 to 44
- 44.1 to 61.7
- Greater than 61.7

Source: CHCS Complied from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Parcels with Nuisance Cases, 2011 to 2014

Legend
Pct. Nuisances
- Less than 0.46
- 0.46 to 0.95
- 0.96 to 1.9
- 1.91 to 3.37
- Greater than 3.37
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from High Point, NC Data
City of High Point
Percent of Parcels with Demolished Properties, 2012-2014

Legend
Pct. Demolished
- 0
- 0.001 to 0.19
- 0.20 to 0.25
- 0.26 to 0.37
- Greater than 0.38

Census Tract Boundaries
Rods

Source: CHCS Computed from High Point, NC Data
City of High Point
Property Crime Rate per 100 Population

Legend
Crime Rate Per 100
- Less than 10.89
- 10.89 to 17.29
- 17.3 to 29.11
- 29.12 to 45.37
- Greater than 45.37
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from High Point Police Department data
City of High Point
Locations of Neighborhood Amenities

Legend
Type of Amenity
- Arts
- Attraction
- Grocery Store
- Library
- Museum
- Park
- Pharmacy
- Restaurant
- Fast-Food Restaurant
- Retail
- Services
- Sports Facility

Source: Google
City of High Point

Food Deserts

* A food desert is defined as a low-income community with a poverty rate of 20% or greater or a median family income at/below 80% of the area family income AND the community qualifies as low-access based on the determination that at least 500 persons or 33% of the tract's population live greater than one mile from a grocery store.

Legend

- **Food Desert/Census Tract Boundaries**
  - not Low Income or Low Access
  - Low Income and Low Access (Food Desert)
  - Block Group Boundaries
  - Roads

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture
Transportation
City of High Point
Average Commute Time to Work

Legend
Avg. Commute Time
- Less than 16 minutes
- 16 to 18.1 minutes
- 18.11 to 19.7 minutes
- 19.71 to 23.4 minutes
- Greater than 23.4 minutes
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Roads

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
Percent of Workers Commuting by Public Transportation

Legend
Pct. Transit Commuters
- Less than 0.42
- 0.42 to 3
- 3.1 to 10.9
- 11 to 15.3
- Greater than 15.3

Source: CHCS Computed from 2009-2013 American Community Survey
City of High Point
All Bus Routes
1/4 Mile Service Area

Legend
- Census Tract Boundaries
- Block Group Boundaries
- Local Bus Routes
- Quarter-mile walkable distance
- Roads

Source: High Point, NC GIS

Note: 1/4 mile walkable distance is generally the standard used when analyzing accessibility to transit. As can be seen from this map, areas in the central part of the core city have higher access to transit than areas in the northwest and southeast.
City of High Point
Lead Paint Indicator:
Percent of Housing Units Built Before 1960

Legend
Pct. of Units Built Before 1960
- Less than 29
- 29 to 37
- 38 to 49
- 50 to 58
- 59 to 67
- 68 to 81
- Greater than 81

Census Tract Boundaries
Roads

Source: Environmental Protection Agency