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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The term “gentrification” was first coined by Ruth Glass in 1964 to refer to the upgrading of “shabby, modest mews and cottages” in London by middle and upper classes to “elegant, expensive residences…Once this process of ‘gentrification’ starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working-class occupiers are displaced and the whole social character of the district is changed.”¹ Michael Lang later elaborated on Glass’s definition when he described gentrification as “essentially private-capital-induced development in formerly lower income areas that results in a pattern of higher rents and land and house values.”²

Since gentrification is defined as a process which favors the moneyed over the working class, it is easy to understand how the term quickly became emotionally laden and politically charged. The costs are perceived as accruing to the disadvantaged while the benefits are enjoyed by those with influence and money.

As a phenomenon that has occurred in communities worldwide, gentrification needs to be understood and managed because of its economic and social ramifications. In addition to its recognized effects on housing markets, low income residents and business owners, gentrification impacts the economy of the city, its built environment and its historic resources.

As recently as 1970, Manayunk was a working class industrial neighborhood of modest row houses in Philadelphia. Today, Manayunk is an upscale post-industrial neighborhood with appreciated real estate prices and intact 19th century architecture.

Bordered on the south by the Schuylkill River, on the north by steep cliffs, and the west by Wissahickon Creek, it is advantaged both by its natural topography and by its location five miles from the main business district of Philadelphia. The current borders of Manayunk, Census Tract 214, are Leverington Avenue on the west, Manayunk Avenue on the north, Roxborough Avenue on the east, and the Schuylkill River on the south.

[Figure 1]

Manayunk’s quarter century of transformation provides an ideal laboratory for understanding the changing faces of gentrification. What are the causes of gentrification? What are the benefits and costs? Who are the winners and losers? How does gentrification intertwine with historical preservation? While Society Hill is a completed version of a gentrified community, Manayunk is a community still in transition in which to observe these fundamental questions about gentrification.

As a community in the process of gentrifying, Manayunk has not been previously studied. My research is therefore a timely effort to use Manayunk as a context within which to better understand gentrification. I have endeavored to look in a comprehensive manner at the social, cultural, and economic changes that have occurred in this Philadelphia neighborhood over a relatively short time frame. Evaluating both the costs and the benefits here can provide insight for other neighborhoods where gentrification becomes an issue.

My research began with an effort to understand the concept of gentrification theoretically and the several schools of thought concerning its causes and consequences. A growing body of literature in the field shows the complexity of the process and the conflicting attitudes to gentrification’s effects. The theoretical underpinnings of
gentrification became reference points with which to evaluate what happened in Manayunk.

The second step was to evaluate the role of the federal policies that fueled the interest in rehabilitating old neighborhoods throughout the United States. While these broad national initiatives were instrumental in gentrification, the local political context including the involvement of local politicians, zoning regulations and grants had a larger impact on how gentrification unfolded. However, while powerful and interested politicians served to initiate the process, without individual investors, gentrification would not have advanced.

I then focused on Manayunk, beginning with primary research that used sources such as old maps, photographs, and personal historic accounts for information that documented the changes that have occurred as Manayunk gentrified. One goal was to understand the effects of gentrification on the kind of social-cultural-economic community Manayunk was in its industrial and post-industrial phases and to compare them with the present. Through personal interviews with investors, community leaders, store owners, and residents I appreciated the multiple perspectives that these different stakeholders had developed. An examination of census records, reverse phone directories, and newspaper accounts from the early 1970’s when the initial changes were first apparent to the present day provided further insight.

The changes in Manayunk have been notable. Its evolution from an industrial backwater to a unique shopping district has been a continual process. The last few years indicate an uneven progression in its revitalization with an increased number of store
vacancies on one hand but with an increased amount of new residential construction on the other.

Having understood in depth the changes that occurred in Manayunk during gentrification, I then cross reference Manayunk’s experience against the theories of gentrification, so as to understand the forces that drove gentrification in Manayunk and the benefits and costs of this process. In my interviews, some people focused on the benefits that the gentrification brought to Manayunk while others argued that the community has been culturally devitalized in the process. A process of re-evaluation of its identity after the considerable changes since the early 1980’s is not unexpected.

In Chapters Two through Four of this thesis, I describe the general theories and process of gentrification. Chapter Two focuses on causes of gentrification, Chapter Three on costs and benefits and Chapter Four on the relationship of gentrification to historical preservation.

Chapters Five and Six focus on Manayunk itself. Chapter Five presents the history of Manayunk while Chapter Six discusses the actual gentrification of Manayunk.

I conclude in Chapter Seven by applying the theories of gentrification to Manayunk so as to discern the primary drivers of gentrification and the costs and benefits of this gentrification in Manayunk.
CHAPTER TWO: CAUSES OF GENTRIFICATION

Although there is no single factor that tips a community to gentrification, there are several characteristics shared by pre-gentrified areas and there are various theories that attempt to explain what precipitates gentrification in a community. Despite some common attributes, it is accepted that no two communities gentrify at the same rate or in exactly the same way.3

Recognized as a gradual process, gentrification results from a confluence of factors operating together. First and foremost, as Glass’s and Lang’s definition indicates, gentrification occurs in low income neighborhoods. Low income areas around former urban industrial areas have tended to have an especially high rate of gentrification. In some instances, these industrial sites have been demolished for new construction but in many others, old mills and vacant retail spaces have been reborn into condominiums, office complexes, or trendy stores.

Even though a frequent synergy exists between deindustrialization, low income neighborhoods, and gentrification, it is not universal. Since there are deteriorated neighborhoods that continue an inexorable slide into ultimate abandonment and not to revitalization, one must consider other characteristics that contribute to gentrification. A critical factor is the nature of the housing market in the particular city. Urban areas like Boston and San Francisco with strong housing markets are more likely to experience gentrification 4 than cities like Camden or Newark that have weak housing markets.

---

However, even in the same city, one neighborhood such as Manayunk will gentrify but another such as North Philadelphia will remain depressed.

At this point, additional determining factors that lead to gentrification must be considered. Among these are neighborhoods with historical and architectural value.\(^5\) The older housing stock present in historic neighborhoods offers a range of housing options\(^6\) that appeals to a wide variety of tastes and income levels. Often these neighborhoods have a pedestrian orientation and a commercial district with the potential to accommodate the types of unique shops and restaurants that gentrifiers seek.\(^7\)

Since businesses in gentrifying neighborhoods draw customers from surrounding and affluent areas, a location close to the central business district is a contributing factor. Nearby cultural amenities, parks, interesting topography, and urban water front s are further attributes that increase the likelihood of gentrification.\(^8\)

In the remainder of this Chapter, we review the primary theories of gentrification that have been advanced, grouping them under economic theories and demographic theories. In a final section, we consider the role of governmental influence.

**Economic Theories of Gentrification**

Economic theory considers gentrification as basically the result of the economic restructuring that occurred after World War II with the decline in manufacturing and blue collar employment and a simultaneous shift to a service economy.

---


\(^7\) Beauregard, op.cit., p.53.

\(^8\) Ibid., p.37.
As old urban industrial communities deteriorated, capital markets withdrew their financial investment causing more vacancies and a further downward spiral in real estate prices. Once a sufficient discrepancy develops between the value of the land under its current use and its potential rent value, what Neil Smith called “rent gap”, speculators, developers and real estate agents are drawn to these depressed markets by the investment potential.

When capital shifts back into a neighborhood after a period of disinvestment, the resulting restructuring changes its economic and social face. Even though urban change has been a constant phenomenon over periods of history, the restructuring seen today, unlike past times, is evidence of “larger economic and social restructuring of advanced capitalist economies.”

Economic theorists view gentrification as the power of national and international capital markets to control and restructure the “urban frontier.” Used to describe deteriorated sections of the inner city, the “urban frontier” is analogous to the original frontier of the Wild West that was transformed by human labor and ingenuity. Cities, abandoned by industry, capital markets, and the middle class, became as foreboding as an untamed wilderness. The urban frontier, rather than representing a frontier of actual geographical expansion, refers to an area of economic potential waiting to be transformed by capital investment. “Gentrification is a frontier on which fortunes are made.”

However, the restructuring of the urban frontier by real-estate speculators and developers

---

10 Ibid., p.16.
11 Smith, op.cit., p.34.
is often preceded by the initial movement back to the urban frontier by the “pioneers,”¹² those isolated individuals who find the neighborhood an attractive place to live in its pre-gentrified state.

Marxist theorists led by Neil Smith argue that the profits and advantages from the urban frontier accrue to the moneyed classes at the expense of low income residents. No longer protected by the social net of liberal policies, the working class who is displaced from gentrifying neighborhoods bears the financial and social costs. “Class entwined with race…provide the crucial markers of the different fates people experience as a result of historic preservation.”¹³ Smith decried gentrification as unjust no matter what urban revitalization and preservation benefits might accrue from it.

**Demographic Theories of Gentrification**

Demographic and social changes have accompanied the economic transformation of urban neighborhoods. Among the demographic changes seen since Ruth Glass first coined the word gentrification has been the increase in single households, the postponement of marriage and childrearing, the entry of women in the workforce, the increased cohesion of the lesbian/gay community, and the movement of the middle class back to the city.

Sharon Zukin states that “Most mainstream analysts still consider economic restructuring secondary to demographic…”¹⁴ In this view, the proponents of demographic explanations see the social transformation that are “generational, life-style

---

¹² Beauregard, op.cit., p.53.
and life-cycle factors"15 as being more responsible for the creation of gentrified communities than the investment/disinvestment cycles of the economic theorists.

As increasingly common phenomena worldwide since the late 1960’s, these new social patterns have brought with them shifts in consumption and purchasing choices. With no family responsibilities to draw them home after work, the young professional class depends on restaurants and bars for their socializing. Possessing more disposable income than their parents, they spend indulgently on themselves. “Clothes, jewelry, furniture, stereo equipment, vacations, sports equipment, luxury items such as cameras and even automobiles, inter alia, are part of the visual and functional identify of the potential gentrifiers.”16. These tastes distance them from the original residents who cannot afford them. To satisfy the affluent tastes of this upscale class of consumers, a similar mix of lively bars, fancy restaurants, and fashionable boutiques opens in the commercial districts of most gentrifying areas.

Living in an historic urban neighborhood appeals to the newcomers’ sense of taste, lends prestige, and allows them to pursue a different life style than their parents. In addition, gentrifying neighborhoods also provide an affordable way to enter the real estate market and to build equity for future investments. “The combined search for financial security, a desirable location, access to amenities, and involvement with people of similar desires and affluence prepares these individuals to become gentrifiers.”17

15 Ibid.
16 Beauregard., p.44.
17 Ibid.,p.45.
**Governmental Influences**

In addition to economic and demographic factors, governmental actions also play a role in the process of gentrification by defining the “economic and social value of an urban area”.\(^{18}\) Although the government is not a major financial player, governmental policies often serve to enable the process and are generally “a precondition for the participation of lending institutions.”\(^{19}\) On the local level, this could come in the form of grants to the neighborhood for additional improvements, zoning regulations, or tax abatements for rehabilitation or new construction. An investment in basic infrastructure in a neighborhood by a local government can be a seminal strategy to stimulate the interest of influential financial backers.

Various federal initiatives have been instrumental in fostering gentrification as well. Among these was the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 which encouraged preservation of both individual buildings and entire districts. The Main Street Program of the National Trust in 1970 focused on the revitalization of historic downtowns. The Tax Act of 1976 and the 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act further abetted the process by making historic preservation economically attractive, thus enabling the wave of gentrification that occurred in the 1980’s.

Federal mortgage policies, including the deductibility of mortgages on income taxes and the continuance of low interest rates, encourage both home ownership and the activity of developers. Ironically, the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac mortgage initiatives, originally intended to encourage affordable housing, have had the unanticipated

---

\(^{18}\) Zukin, p. 132.
\(^{19}\) Ibid., p.132.
consequence of contributing to gentrification by directing mortgage money into low rent areas increasing its likelihood of gentrifying.\textsuperscript{20}

While many would not consider these governmental actions as a source of discord or inequity, others view them as socially divisive by favoring the middle class and creating “a new urban elite”.\textsuperscript{21} In this view, governmental policies, by using historic preservation as a tool of economic development, encourage gentrification and contribute to the displacement of low-income residents. “The importance attached to rehabilitation cannot be explained solely by economic profits. Rehabilitation and urban conservation legislation also served to define and maintain class boundaries in various ways.”\textsuperscript{22}

The debate continues regarding the relative importance of economic, demographic or governmental drivers of gentrification, with cogent arguments on each side. Gentrification has to be viewed as an inherently complex and “chaotic concept”\textsuperscript{23} with each neighborhood gentrifying in differing ways and at different rates. However, we can identify five key components that are present in varying degrees in all gentrifying neighborhoods.

1. A “rent gap” between the current and potential use of the neighborhood
2. Changing demographic trends
3. An initial movement into the neighborhood by “urban pioneers”
4. Enabling legislation at the local and national level
5. Financial investment by institutions and influential private individuals.

\textsuperscript{20} Kennedy, p.13.
\textsuperscript{21} Zukin, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{22} Jager, Michael, “Class Definition and the Esthetics of Gentrificaion”, in \textit{Gentrification of the City}, p. 91.
\textsuperscript{23} Beauregard, p. 54.
In any given neighborhood, one of the above mentioned agents of gentrification may play a more dominant role than the others. In some neighborhoods, the interplay of these agents may be present, but gentrification does not progress as anticipated. However, I assert that the rate and pattern by which a given neighborhood gentrifies can be understood by carefully examining the strength and impact of each of these five forces for that neighborhood. I return to this theme in Chapter Seven, Conclusion, when I examine the role these five forces in Manayunk.
CHAPTER THREE: CONSEQUENCES OF GENTRIFICATION

Whether gentrification is good for a neighborhood or bad for a neighborhood is the subject of a hot debate laden with social conflict. Historic preservationists and local governments see the advantages while advocates for the lower classes emphasize its negative effects. Without specifying whom or what gentrification affects, one cannot say that it is either a positive or negative force. The original residents and business owners in a gentrified neighborhood, the general public, the city itself, the built and metaphysical environment, and financial backers all experience its consequences in different ways.

Getting to the truth about the consequences of gentrification is further complicated by the fact that research studies in gentrification rarely evaluate the consequences in the same way. The methods used to collect and analyze the data, the stage of gentrification in a particular neighborhood, and the characteristics of the neighborhood where the data is collected affect the results. Some studies gauge gentrification by the number of people displaced, others consider the extent of rehabilitation. Some rely on anecdotal information. Some may look for a certain point of view.

In this Chapter we summarize the major findings of these studies, describing both the social costs of gentrification that have been documented, and the benefits that offset those costs.

Social costs of gentrification

Displacement

The undesirable consequences of gentrification center on the displacement of lower income households resulting from what is perceived as the power of the wealthy
and influential over the disadvantaged. The common perception is that as neighborhoods gentrify, property values, tax bills and rents increase causing displacement of low-income residents who can no longer afford to remain. In other cases, renters are forced out by landlords wishing to improve the property and perhaps convert it to condominiums or a single family residence.

A blue collar worker living in an industrial urban neighborhood that undergoes gentrification suffers two distinct hardships. The first is the loss of his manufacturing job and the challenge in finding a replacement. Unfortunately for many blue collar workers, the disappearance of blue collar jobs coincided with the need for a more highly educated workforce to fill the large increase in the professional and managerial work sectors for which they were not trained.

The second hardship comes from the loss of a familiar neighborhood that was home. The newcomers to their neighborhood hold down professional jobs with significantly higher salaries which serve to contrast the economic and social differences between them. The “importance of gentrification stems partly from fact that it s a highly visual expression of changing social relations…”\textsuperscript{24}

Government, both on the national and local levels, has been criticized for potentially underreporting the number of people displaced because they desire the benefits of gentrification that accrue to cities. Setha Low said, “The process of gentrification has many forms, but the basic theme is one of sociopolitical inequality to control the destiny of a neighborhood or piece of land.”\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{24} Williams, Peter, “Class Constitution” in \textit{Gentrification of the City}, op.cit., p.66.
The exact extent of gentrification caused displacement is unknown as different studies report varying figures and use different metrics of evaluation to quantify the problem. Shill and Nathan \(^{26}\) used a survey of renters who moved out of their neighborhood to find out the number of voluntary vs. involuntary movers. Frank F. DeGiovanni \(^{27}\) measured the number of homes that went from rental to owner as a metric for displacement. Freeman and Braconi\(^{28}\) compared mobility rates between those who live gentrifying neighborhoods and those who live elsewhere in the city.

No matter which study is considered, the reality is that with or without gentrification, some low-income residents will leave their neighborhoods. For many, the opportunity to move to a better neighborhood is a positive and planned for event. For others, entrenched social problems in the neighborhood such as crime and drugs cause them to leave. Natural disasters, prevailing economic conditions, desire for better schools, and family changes such as a marriage or change in family size also provoke moves. Additional property comes on the market from the deaths of elderly residents as well. The U.S. Census Bureau finding that the average person moves once every seven years (implying that 14% of a city moves every year on average) also indicates that population turnover in all neighborhoods is to be expected.

Much of what is reported in the popular press and in many research studies would indicate high levels of displacement caused by gentrification and undue hardship on the lower classes. However, when one looks closer at the results, it is less alarming than


reported. For example, Marcuse cites displacement by gentrification of between 10,000 and 40,000 households over the decade between 1970 to 1980 and another 31,000 to 60,000 displaced by abandonment in New York City.\textsuperscript{29} Therefore, given Marcuse’s results, abandonment is a more serious problem than gentrification. In addition, if we consider that the population of New York during that time period averaged 7,484,000 million inhabitants, a displacement of 10,000 to 40,000 households due to gentrification over a decade is not remarkable.

Legates and Hartman estimate 2.5 million persons are displaced annually in the U.S.\textsuperscript{30} and cite increased racial segregation as a result of gentrification.\textsuperscript{31} For instance, they reported that in Boston’s South End, the blacks had been relocated to Roxbury, a low-income black area.

Shill and Nathan’s study was one of the most thorough and rigorous attempt I found to measure the rate of displacement due to gentrification. They endeavored to contact all families who had moved out of nine gentrifying neighborhoods to administer a survey on the characteristics of their move, including their reason for moving. They received 507 responses to their survey. When asked what the reason for moving was, the highest percentage (30\%) of the respondents indicated that the desire for a better home or neighborhood motivated them. They reported that 23\% out of 507 respondents in were displaced involuntarily because of evictions, rent increases, or change of ownership of the property. As it would be expected, lower income residents were impacted the most. Shill

\textsuperscript{29} Marcuse, Peter, “Abandonment, Gentrification, and Displacement: the Linkages in New York City”, \textit{Gentrification of the City}, p. 163
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., p. 195.
and Nathan’s study also included Boston’s South End and, unlike Legates and Hartman’s findings, they reported no significant difference in the number of white and black displaced households.\textsuperscript{32}

Even though one would expect displaced residents to be unhappy with the forced move, Shill and Nathan found that 67% of the people displaced from the nine neighborhoods that they studied actually preferred their new neighborhood. (LeGates and Hartman also reported that most out movers in five neighborhoods they looked at expressed satisfaction with the move.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, only 33% of 23%, i.e. 7.6% of the 507 survey respondents, were displaced and unhappy with that displacement. A strong affirmation for gentrification came from Shill and Nathan who concluded that “…the benefits of neighborhood reinvestment…outweigh the human costs indicated by our research findings.”\textsuperscript{34}

While the above studies indicate various levels of gentrification induced displacement, contradictory findings were reported in Freeman and Braconi’s well-controlled study done in New York between 1991 and 1999 where the rate of turnover reported in gentrified neighborhoods actually declined. The study stated that poor households residing in one of seven gentrifying neighborhoods were “19% less likely to move than poor households residing elsewhere.”\textsuperscript{35} Freeman & Braconi attributed these findings to improvements in the neighborhood making it more desirable for low-income residents to stay. Safer streets, improved public services, and more job opportunities were

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{32} Shill and Nathan, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{34} Shill and Nathan, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{35} Freeman and Braconi, p. 45.
\end{flushleft}
among the factors cited that made the gentrifying neighborhood attractive. While a very positive finding for gentrification, Freeman & Braconi’s study was conducted at a time when the economy was strong, making housing in improving neighborhoods more affordable for all.

One important factor – whether a household owns or rents - has a large impact on the outcome. Home owners stand to benefit from the increased property values which allow them to sell at a considerable profit and to move elsewhere if they want. Renters, on the other hand, are most likely to suffer financial hardship and displacement as landlords either convert to condominiums or raise rents to reflect higher property values and taxes. The resulting reduction in the supply of low rent dwellings for its workers then becomes a problem for the entire city.

Social Changes

Both Glass’s original definition and Roberta Gratz’s later research recognize gentrification as a phenomenon where the newcomers’ values dramatically alter a neighborhood’s essential character.36 Even if residents of a neighborhood are not displaced, the social changes in the neighborhood that come about when younger, wealthier residents move in can make the neighborhood less friendly and result in alienation for the original residents of a gentrifying neighborhood. The typical gentrifiers, with higher educational levels, expensive recreational activities, and divergent social interests, have little in common with the usually blue collar inhabitants. “One facet of gentrification that is often left unstated is the clash of cultures and lifestyles that must
occur when sizable population groups with widely disparate economic and social backgrounds coexist in close proximity."

The increased interest in the gentrified neighborhood, with the addition of fancy restaurants, lively bars, and up-scale retail establishments, draws tourists into the area, adding yet another new group of newcomers with values and habits that are at odds with the indigenous residents. The very success of restaurants or night spots that helped bring prosperity back to a neighborhood can overwhelm a neighborhood and push out the diversity of stores and services that are needed in a community. In addition, the increased traffic, parking problems, loss of familiar stores and the noise that comes with the nightlife scene further alienate residents from the neighborhood they once knew. “When a family sees its neighborhood changing dramatically, when their friends are leaving, when stores are going out of business and new stores for other clientele are taking their places [and] when changes in public facilities, transportation patterns, support services, are all making the area less livable, then pressure of displacement is already severe….”

For the people who actually leave the neighborhood and even for those who remain, there are emotional repercussions when a familiar place because of its social changes becomes foreign. Setha Low recognized the emotional attachment people have to places and how they are as valuable as loosing the actual physical fabric, “We grieve when we experience the loss of place….The loss of place is not just an architectural loss

---

37 Lang, p.22.
38 Marcuse, p. 157.
but also a cultural and personal loss in terms of what we as a society provide as meaningful environments of human action and expression.”  

The character of a neighborhood and the personal connections that are built up over time are critical components that are often overlooked when a neighborhood gentrifies. Richard Moe, the president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation recognized the value of saving more than the architectural fabric when he wrote, “Preservation of neighborhoods preserves more than buildings. It preserves people in a place, a community.” While the characteristics that are place defining and the personal meaning invested in a community are important, following Moe’s reasoning to its ultimate conclusion would lead to the rejection of any change in the status quo, a charge that is often brought against preservationists.

Benefits of gentrification

Beneficiaries of gentrification are the built environment, the public, the city, and the investors. Historic architecture that might have otherwise been razed is put to a new use. The general public benefits from the aesthetics provided by the historic architecture in the gentrified neighborhood and from a concrete connection to the past that would have otherwise been lost.

Contrary to common belief that low income residents in gentrifying neighborhoods do not benefit from the improvements, Freeman and Braconi’s research indicating that poor residents were less likely to move from gentrifying neighborhoods than non-gentrifying ones, turns up a surprising beneficiary. As indicated earlier, the improved neighborhood with safer, cleaner streets and potentially greater employment

39 Low, p. 67.
opportunities aids the very poor residents that are often reported as disadvantaged from gentrification.

With gentrification driven by the private real-estate market, the revitalization of deteriorated neighborhoods occurs without the need of a great expenditure on the part of the city government. The increased tax base helps the city provide better services including schools, parks, and public transportation. In addition, the city benefits from the increased and improved housing stock, fewer vacancies, fewer abandonments, and more jobs due to the increased economic activity. A greater mix of household incomes develops, resulting in a less dense poor population in the neighborhood, what Kennedy called a “deconcentration of poverty”.  

Many communities are “proving that reinvestment in the historic built environment offers some of the best hope for improving a community’s self-image, increasing civic activism, luring new residents to replace the ones who have left, and bolstering long-term neighborhood stability.” In addition, a “catalyst effect” occurs as owners of properties in neighborhoods adjacent to renovated districts are more likely to make improvements as well. Creating a positive spiral, one renovation leads to another culminating in the phenomenon of gentrification as a neighborhood develops into a more desirable place to live, work, or shop. The newfound vitality, the beneficial economic effects of the renewed area, and its catalytic effect on surrounding areas makes up for the displacement costs associated with gentrification.

41 Lang, p. 36.
42 Kennedy, p. 15.
43 Moe, p. 139.
New business opportunities develop in areas abandoned by the manufacturing industry. Older buildings provide a diversity of space and rental levels not found in new construction and serve as desirable “incubator space” for start-up businesses. In terms of commercial and retail activities, a gentrified downtown offers a unique ambiance that is not found in homogenized malls and suburban office parks and allows a community to capitalize on the distinctive physical and social identity that differentiates it from other places.

As an antidote to the endless sprawl that spreads out from our metropolitan areas, re-using our old neighborhoods makes environmental sense. The community avoids the environmental degradation that comes from disposing of potentially hazardous building debris and it eliminates the financial cost of landfill associated with demolition. The benefit of re-use is compounded by sparing taxpayers the added expense of extending the infrastructure needed for new development out to open space.

In terms of the financial implications of renovation, research done by Listokin, Listokin and Lahr reports that at both the national level and the state level historic rehabilitation of single-family, multifamily homes, nonresidential or civic buildings creates more jobs in the building trades than new construction, results in a higher GDP and brings in higher taxes than new construction. For these reasons they consider renovation a “more potent economic pump primer than is new construction.”

While Listokin credits renovation with the creation of more jobs than new construction and generally a boon to the local economy, work done by Don Rypkema
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states that “...older housing tends to be more affordable.”48 Work done at MIT indicates the same, “Lower cost housing is typically older housing...consequently, renovation is an important tool for increasing affordability that should not be overlooked.”49 This later studies are apparently inconsistent with that of Listokin. If renovation creates more jobs, as Listokin asserts, then renovation will have higher labor costs, and other things being equal, will be more, not less, expensive than new construction. The inconsistency could be resolved if the higher labor costs of renovation were more than offset by the savings in material cost in re-using the material of the old building rather than supplying all new material.

48 Rypkema, p. 72.
CHAPTER FOUR: HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND GENTRIFICATION

Until recently, preservation was considered an “elite sport” undertaken by private individuals with privately raised money. Inspired by lofty goals such as the importance of our heritage, patriotism and civic pride, early preservationists aimed to preserve individual landmarks of high architectural style and associated with notable people and events for the edification of the populace. During the 1950’s, the use of preservation of historic resources as a means of raising property values in an entire neighborhood was beginning to take hold in several cities. With the passage of legislation such as the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, the Tax Act of 1976, and the 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act, preservation gradually became more inclusive and democratic, encompassing entire districts and more vernacular architecture. In this way, it became entwined with the phenomenon of gentrification.

This legislation, which made preservation economically attractive to investors, changed the story of preservation. With economics driving preservation, a new chapter in the history of preservation was written. No longer the domain of “little old ladies in tennis shoes” and aristocratic do-gooders, preservation was more and more promoted by banks, real estate developers, city planners, and public officials who valued preservation for its potential for investment and urban revitalization.

Developers became interested in deteriorated neighborhoods with historic value in order to benefit from the rehabilitation tax credits offered by the government. While not always necessary for preservation activities to occur, the preservation of many buildings
would not have been financially possible without the federal rehabilitation tax credit.\footnote{50}
City officials looked to private investment for rehabilitation of historic areas as a means to reverse decades of urban decline and neglect. They found that the “renewed interest in the older, architecturally rich neighborhoods of our cities has been one of the most positive contributors to urban revitalization throughout the country.”\footnote{51}

Working under this new paradigm, preservation faced both fresh challenges and expanded opportunities pitting its ideals against the exigencies of the market place. Preservationists now recognized that “…all historic buildings – except the most treasured cultural monuments under subsidized stewardship – have to remain economically viable if they are to provide any lasting public benefits.”\footnote{52}

Several strategies that led to rehabilitated districts have demonstrated the effectiveness of the alliance of private investment and public intervention in finding new and profitable uses for historic buildings. Among these were the early successes in several cities in creating a tourist destination around a historic core and in the revitalizing of historic downtowns under the Main Street Program. In addition, large scale community revitalization in places like Society Hill were instrumental in proving that alternatives existed to the wholesale razing of blighted neighborhoods that took place under urban renewal programs.

Since preservation is a visible tool in the economic development arsenal, it became both credited and vilified as the causal agent of gentrification. The reality is, however, that developers and investors who decide to take on a rehabilitation project or
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the gentrifiers who decide to purchase real estate base their decisions on economic rationality. Investors’ goals are profit not preservation or quality of life. The gentrifiers’ search for affordable housing in a suitable location serves as their principal motivation. Their choice to live in an historic neighborhood is the means to “valorize their housing investment….”\textsuperscript{53}

Fortunately, many gentrifiers’ sense of taste which includes the aesthetic qualities of old architecture, whether it is restored “brownstone, red brick or gingerbread houses as well as manufacturing lofts that are converted to residential use”\textsuperscript{54} has encouraged the continued viability of these buildings.

**The Impact of Historic Designation**

Controversy exists concerning the actual effect of historic designation, the fundamental legislative tool of historic preservationists working on an urban scale, on gentrification and property values. As discussed in Chapter Two, there are many causal factors leading to gentrification. Historic value alone or historic designation will not cause gentrification. According to Don Rypkema, it has to also already be a great neighborhood for gentrification to occur. “It is not the historic designation that makes it a great neighborhood.”\textsuperscript{55} However, the historic designation does protect against drastic property fluctuations\textsuperscript{56} Data collected in New York City for a Ph.D dissertation corroborates this view and found that there exists “no direct relationship between
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gentrification and either historic district designation or the drive to create an historic
district…..”57

However, there is no doubt that historic designation coupled with a promising
neighborhood will stimulate the gentrification process and lead to escalating real estate
prices. Establishing aesthetic standards that comes with designation creates a powerful
incentive for further investor interest affording protection that the community will retain
its character in the future.

Critics of preservation argue that designation actually lowers property values by
limiting the options for change and increasing the cost of restoration. “In neighborhoods
where stricter regulations were recently implemented, older properties with heavy
building restrictions tend to sell for less, according to many real estate agents.”58 The
issue for most residents in gentrifying neighborhoods is the perceived added cost of home
repairs and tax burdens that come with living in an historic district. Property rights
activists in many communities have objected to designation and, in many instances, won
their cases as community officials worry about costly lawsuits.

There is also a perception, especially in poorer communities, that historic districts
are a “municipal weapon to gentrify neighborhoods into museums to attract tourist
dollars.”59

Even though, as stated previously, historic designation per se does not bring about
gentrification, a symbiotic relationship between gentrification and preservation does
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exist. The improvement in neighborhoods with historic value does lead to gentrification and gentrification, in turn, encourages the preservation of our built heritage.

**Challenges**

The main tools that preservation has at its disposal in gentrifying communities, historic designation and tax credits for restoration, form the nexus of the primary challenge facing preservationists today – how to reconcile the goal of preserving the historic architecture while accepting the need for change.

As historic preservation has become entwined with community and economic development, the recognition of continued economic and social change as both inevitable and desirable is critical. Communities are not static creations, frozen at one time in the past.

The stylistic expectations of new residents and the economic dictates of developers complicate the preservationists’ ability to maintain and interpret the period of significance. For a former industrial community, the attendant grittiness, poverty, and hardship of the past are not marketable commodities and, as a result of gentrification, the community risks becoming a sanitized and “imaginative reconstruction of the area’s past.”60 By preserving only what is marketable and fashionable, preservation runs the risk of ‘Disneyfication.’ In creating an idealized past, the unique qualities that made a neighborhood interesting in the first place are lost resulting in a homogenization of the past.
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As well as the preservation of the built environment, preservationists face the challenge and responsibility of preserving a community’s unique cultural heritage. Included in this intangible heritage are the community traditions, customs, and the individual memories of the people who lived and worked there. In these ordinary landscapes are stored “important archives of social experience and cultural meaning” that are worthy to record. While the historic architecture is valued by the private investors and developers for its economic value, the intangible heritage without any intrinsic economic value, is often overlooked in the process of gentrification.

A further challenge facing preservationists concerns the public misperceptions and fears of preservation which center on gentrification caused displacement and economic hardship. As noted in Chapter Three, while not always an accurate portrayal, displacement of disadvantaged and disenfranchised lower income residents has become the poster child of the liberal opposition to gentrification while the negative consequences of abandonment resulting from the lack of gentrification have been overlooked. Halting the rehabilitation of our old urban neighborhoods leaves the city in the interminable spiral of continued deterioration.

Fueled by property rights’ activists and articles in the popular press that preservation imposes costly and stringent standards for renovation, opposition has developed to historic designation. Perhaps an overzealous preservation mentality on the part of some in the field that anything old is worthy of saving has added to the opposition. By opposing change indiscriminately, preservation risks losing its credibility as a force in the market place and could become a victim of its own success.

CHAPTER FIVE: HISTORY OF MANAYUNK

Manayunk’s history is comprised of four distinct eras: pre-industrial, industrial, stagnation, and re-birth. As it emerged from a postwar decline, it became an exemplary example of gentrification.

As part of Roxborough Township, Manayunk was one of the original twelve Philadelphia Townships formed from land granted by William Penn around 1680, and event that marks the beginning of Manayunk’s first era. Originally known as Flat Rock and for a brief while, Udorovia, its name was changed in 1824 to Manayunk, from the Indian words “where we go to drink”. It acquired its independence from Roxborough in 1840 and was incorporated into Philadelphia in 1854 as the 21st Ward.

Despite Manayunk’s prime location on the Schuylkill and proximity to the city of Philadelphia, the first European settlers to the area focused their activities on Wissahickon Creek, a smaller and more manageable body of water than the Schuylkill, and thus amenable to the construction of dams providing water power. With its numerous and successful flour mills, the Wissahickon became the main milling area and received grain for processing from farmers as far away as seventy miles. In addition, several coopers and papermakers increased the economic base of the Wissahickon by locating their operations there as well.

During the pre-industrial era, Manayunk languished as a dispersed farming settlement of only 60 inhabitants and eleven houses. One seminal initiative changed the course of Manayunk’s quiescent history and brought it into its industrial era. In 1819, the
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Schuylkill Navigation Company completed digging of the two-mile long Flat Rock Canal in Manayunk. Constructed as part of a major canal system from Reading, in central Pennsylvania, to Philadelphia, the canals were planned to facilitate the transport of coal. By 1825, boats had brought 5,000 tons of coal to Philadelphia and by 1841 it reached a peak of 484,692 tons.64

As part of the Schuylkill Navigation Company’s project, the dam at Flat Rock was built and its power was sold to fledgling industries. Once the dam and canal were completed, the availability of waterpower, the transportation network of the Schuylkill, and the proximity to Philadelphia became strong incentives to locate mills there and helped propel Manayunk to its success as a manufacturing center.

After Captain John Towers built the first mill in 1819 in what is now Manayunk, others quickly followed. By 1828, five large cotton mills and two woolen factories employed 785 people in this burgeoning industrial town.65

The Canal, which revolutionized the community’s economy, became the scene of much of its activity. An early observer of life in Manayunk noted that young boys spent many hours watching boats pass through the locks. “What an inspiration those boats were for the boys and youths, whose highest ambition was to become the owner or captain of one of those boats…” 66

Even though the tow path figures prominently in Manayunk today, it was not part of the original plan. According to Charles Hagner, an early mill owner, “…the method of propelling the boats was by use of oars and poles. The tow path was an after-

thought….”67 A woodcut of the Canal Locks in 1830 [Figure 2] shows this early method of propelling boats thru the locks and, along with the drawing of Eckstein’s paper mill in 1836, documents the architectural style of the mills. Despite the growing number of mills operating by 1840, Manayunk still appeared to have a bucolic charm [Figure 3].

However, its tranquil appearance belied the changes going on. The small cottage industries of coopers, papermakers, and millers who comprised the workers and financial elite in pre-industrial Roxborough were being replaced by immigrant workers, industrial capitalists and large scale manufacturing that comprised Manayunk’s industrial era. The changes in the community were described in 1828 by the editor of the Register of Pennsylvania:

A flourishing and populous village has risen up suddenly and where we but lately paused to survey the simple beauties of the landscape…the eye is arrested by the less romantic operations of a manufacturing community, and the ear filled with the noise of ten thousand spindles.68

Manayunk’s early success earned it the title of the “Lowell of Pennsylvania.” However, the applicability of this title was short lived since there were several crucial factors that set Manayunk apart from Lowell. The corporate founders of the New England community envisioned an enlightened manufacturing center that would not duplicate the ills experienced in the mills of England. Their idealism served a practical purpose as well. With the scarcity of labor in New England, the mills owners needed to make employment in their factories enticing to their prime source of labor, local country girls. Not only did the workers receive board and lodging in a planned community but they were also the beneficiaries of social, literary, and religious activities organized by the
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mill owners. A move to Lowell offered both economic and cultural advantages over the limited possibilities on the farms.⁶⁹

In contrast to the limited labor pool in New England, Philadelphia, as a port city, was flooded early in the 19th century with waves of Irish, German, Italian, and Polish immigrant textile workers looking to improve their lives. The abundant labor supply expanded the poor population not only of Manayunk but of all of Philadelphia. In addition to providing the cheap labor necessary for Manayunk’s manufacturing, they very quickly changed the cultural and demographic profile of Manayunk and created the ethnic neighborhoods that have endured to the present. In 1828 a local manufacturer wrote, “The whole village is a kind of theater, in which hundred of people, composed of different countries are grouped together.”⁷⁰

Both in background and expectations, the Philadelphia mill worker started out on a different footing from the “very lady like” mill workers of Lowell. They brought with them not the high minded ideals of the country girls but the militant labor ideas prevalent in Europe at this time. Moreover, J.J. Borie and Joseph Ripka, the largest of the new industrialists in Manayunk, unlike the early corporate mill owners in Lowell, had no idealist vision of their operations. When faced with declining profits, they announced a 20% wage reduction, provoking a public outcry.⁷¹

From the outset, life was hard for the workers. They put in 11-14 hour days earning $4.33 a week.⁷² Every day the workers had to confront the unhealthy atmosphere
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in the mills along with the ever present danger of accidents from the machines. The mills which transformed this sparsely settled community into a leading textile producer to the nation, was soon to become a strife-ridden environment.

The oppressive working conditions and the early mechanization coupled with the workers’ prior experiences in Europe set the stage in Manayunk for the organization of the first labor unions in the city. Contentious labor relations soon became commonplace in Manayunk. Strikes by the disgruntled workers started as early as the late 1820’s. The clear working class identity that has endured to the present was formed as a result of the strong labor unions, frequent strikes, and the close relationship between work and home. The class conflict present in the 1800’s reappeared in the 20th century within the context of gentrification.

Rather than maintaining its title as the “Lowell of America,” Manayunk unfortunately soon became known as the “Manchester of America”, referring to the negative reputation for dreadful working conditions of that English city. The poor urban family, including women and children, became the backbone of the labor force in industrial Manayunk. The use of child labor, often children as young as nine years of age, caused Philadelphia’s *Mechanics Free Press* to write in 1828 of the working conditions there, “Look at Manayunk…the heart sickens to behold the remorseless system of infant labour obtaining foothold upon our soil!”

Even though the first public school for mill children was initiated in 1824 by the mill owners, their prime motivation for schooling was to instill the correct behavior, morals, and strong work ethic that would make their mills more productive. Out of
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financial necessity, education was only for those who were too young to work.75

Families, dependent on the earnings of their children for support, usually took children out of school by age ten. In 1837, seventy-two percent of the 383 students enrolled in school were under ten years of age.76

As well as wielding economic power, the mill owners gained political power as well. When the Manayunk town council was established in 1824, the factory owners monopolized seats there. J.J. Ripka, who led the charge for Manayunk’s political independence from Roxborough in 1840, became its first burgess. Even though his mills were no model of enlightened labor practices, Charles Hagner, his friend and fellow mill owner described him as “for many years the life and soul of Manayunk…” 77

The spatial organization of the community reflected the economic, political and social divisions there. The mill owners lived in gracious homes at the top of the hill while the workers lived in cramped row houses hugging the steep slopes near the factories. Commercial activities were centered on Main Street while Venice Island, the thin strip of land between the Schuylkill River and the Canal, became the principal site of industrial activity.

A map of Manayunk in 1875 [Figure 5] shows how developed the community had become, spreading out from the mills up onto the hills of Manayunk. While the north side of Main Street was completely built up at this time, the south side remained less congested with milling operations still predominating.
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By 1910, industrial activity had created a congested environment on Venice Island [See Figure 4]. In order to bring workers to the growing number of factories on Venice Island and to connect the mill offices and other milling operations that were located on Main Street, a series of pedestrian bridges were constructed [Figure 5].

As the population increased, reaching 3,175 inhabitants in 1836, the need for workers’ housing grew. By 1830, 200 new homes were added to the community and by 1834, the number of new homes doubled again.

The arrival of the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad in 1842 was another significant milestone that furthered Manayunk’s growth. To counteract the competition from the railroad, the Navigation Company tried lowering the fees charged for use of the canal, but to no avail. By 1844 the railroad carried coal less expensively and more efficiently than the Canal, causing the Canal to gradually fall into disuse. “The days of this romantic means of travel and transportation are gone. No more is heard the tinkle of mule bells; mules do not go fast enough.”

With the help of the railroad, bringing coal to fuel the mills and carrying its finished goods to distant markets, Manayunk continued its growth and industrialization as a stronghold of industry and commerce into the early 20th century. Although Manayunk’s early success came from the production of cotton textiles, it expanded its manufacturing base during the Civil War as it supplied all the wool blankets used by the Union’s soldiers. In the first part of the 20th century, its manufacturing diversified from textiles to
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include paper boxes, soap, chemicals, and iron that were sold throughout the country. These large operations, including Connelly Containers, Namico Soap, and Mrs. Paul Fish Sticks, continued to provide employment to the community until the mid twentieth century.

During its prominent years, Manayunk’s business leaders were proud of its industries, commercial and retail establishments, and civic institutions. The 1909 Carnival Souvenir that the Business Association prepared described Manayunk’s success. “Today Manayunk can boast of its intercounty free bridge, a free circulating library, handsome churches, sound financial institutions, up-to-date stores, well-lighted streets, flourishing manufacturing establishments, an ice-making plant, well-regulated places of drinking…comforts and conveniences the founders of the town never dreamed of…”82 The list of establishments that bought advertising space in the Carnival Souvenir (Appendix A) appears typical for an early Main Street in a working class area of the city.

The same brochure noted that optimism was high concerning the prospects of Manayunk’s future. “With the business men and others interested in the commercial, industrial and moral growth, united, what can bar the progress of dear old Manayunk?”83

However, several factors conspired to diminish Manayunk’s standing as an industrial center. The Schuylkill River and the Canal which propelled it to prominence in the early 19th century became obsolete as sources of power or transportation. By the 1920’s, expansion of existing factories or addition of new manufacturing operations were limited by Manayunk’s location and size. Further impediments to its success came from
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the larger forces of mechanization and the Great Depression of 1929. The allure of cheap labor in the South and the profitability of moving manufacturing operations off-shore were the final blows that caused many of its companies to close or relocate.

Despite its eventual demise as a manufacturing center, Manayunk did play a significant role in the history of manufacturing in the U.S. In 1869, the mill owner, resident, and historian, Charles Hagner, expressed his views of Manayunk, “It always was to me, and I know was looked on by many, as an interesting spot…its population and water power actively employed in its production, adding much to the wealth and comfort of our country.”\textsuperscript{84} His view was furthered 100 years later by the historian Cynthia Shelton who wrote, “…the people of the ‘Manchester of America’ played a vital role in the forming of industrial society.”\textsuperscript{85}

Manayunk slid from its spot as a world recognized industrial center after the 1929 depression and suffered further economic decline during the next three decades. Gradually, as its industries closed or moved elsewhere, Manayunk was left with vacant factories, underused commercial space and few employment possibilities.

With the loss of its manufacturing base, the associated commercial activities located on Main Street departed as well. Jobs were scarce for local residents laid off by Manayunk’s closed factories. A combination of sparse parking, poor public transportation, and rumors of crime hurt the retail establishments. Its banks, supermarket, and movie house left. Its library closed. The plethora of new stores opened on nearby Roxborough’s Ridge Avenue during the 1940’s and 1950’s competed with Main Street and ultimately sealed its fate. An abundance of taprooms was all that kept Main Street
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alive\textsuperscript{86}, as, in an ironic twist of fate, Manayunk once again became “the place we go to
drink” connoted by the Indian meaning of its name.

Into the 70’s, in the practice known as red-lining, banks and lending institutions
stopped writing new mortgages in Manayunk,\textsuperscript{87} causing further deterioration of real
estate prices. The owner of an antique store summed up Manayunk’s situation in 1972.
“It was like a ghost town – just about everything was boarded up. The business district is
zero…”\textsuperscript{88}

One fortunate by product of Manayunk’s lack of prosperity during this period is
that it was overlooked during the urban renewal mania of the 1950’s and 60’s that wiped
out many other historic urban neighborhoods in Philadelphia and elsewhere in the U.S.
As well as remaining intact physically, the community remained stable socially and
culturally. Unlike in other economically deteriorating urban neighborhoods, the residents
of Manayunk did not give up on their community. In an article in the \textit{Sunday Bulletin} in
1971, reporter Ruth Malone wrote, “Manayunk is the place where hardly anyone ever
moves away. When you remark that Manayunk could be the next area of development for
the hordes of the young and socially mobile to move into, a Manayunker will look at you
in honest surprise and ask who on earth would sell their houses.”\textsuperscript{89} In 1975, one half of
families still occupied the same house in which had they lived since 1949.\textsuperscript{90} Many of
them could not imagine living anywhere else.
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Manayunk was more than a collection of old buildings to its long time residents. They had deep roots in community institutions and in their relationships with each other. What mattered to Manyunkers was what Roberta Gratz described as “the social institutions and human relationships that define neighborhoods [and]…form the glue necessary to a sense of community – the extended family of church congregations or social clubs, the trust of the shopkeeper who knows the customers, the information networks formed in public places, school friendships among pupils, and encouragement of teachers who watch a child grow over time.”91 Through the stagnant economic times, they remained well-connected to each other and their urban village. With the skills gained working in Manayunk, many of the residents who lost their jobs when the mills closed were able to find work elsewhere in Philadelphia while continuing to live in Manayunk.

The relative geographic isolation of Manayunk from the rest of Philadelphia helped contribute to a physical sense of unity in the community. Unlike many other urban neighborhoods, Manayunk was not blighted nor was it abandoned by its residents. The strong ethnic neighborhoods, each with its own church and supportive parish schools, cultivated the deep roots that residents put down. Its former industries, which had been the economic backbone of the community, instilled a working class spirit that also contributed to Manyunk’s unique sense of place. In sum, people who lived, worked, prayed, socialized, and were educated in the same self-contained area were bound to be loyal and committed.

The roots of Manayunk’s gentrification were planted in both its history as an urban industrial community and its 20th century deindustrialization. What Manayunk was
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would give way to what Manayunk was to become. Manayunk’s gradual gentrification will be the subject of the next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX: THE GENTRIFICATION OF MANAYUNK

Manayunk underwent a gradual gentrification starting in the early 1970’s as its vacant factories and run down storefronts were transformed into expensive condominiums, fancy restaurants, high priced boutiques, art galleries, and upper end national retail establishments. Similar to other communities around the country that have seen the influx of new residents and revitalized business districts, various factors – economic, geographical, political, and historic – contributed to the change. In the process of revitalization the community changed culturally, economically, and physically. As in many of these communities, historic preservation was a felicitous by-product of the changes, but not the primary catalyst.

Although its evolution from an industrial backwater to a gentrified community with a unique shopping district has been a continual process, the last few years indicate an uneven progression in its revitalization with a growing number of store vacancies on one hand, but with an increased amount of new residential construction on the other. Some people focus on the benefits that gentrification brought to Manayunk while others will argue that the community was culturally devitalized by the process.

Unlike other communities that gentrified, Manayunk was never a slum or a neighborhood plagued by abandoned properties. However, in other ways, it represents a textbook example of a gentrification. Manayunk had all of the characteristics of gentrifying neighborhoods described in Chapter Two. As a former industrial area with depressed real estate prices, its old neighborhoods had the requisite historic and architectural values that appeal to gentrifiers. Located only 5 miles from the central business district of Philadelphia and adjacent to the Schuylkill Expressway, it was also
close to the prosperous areas of Chestnut Hill and the Main Line. The recreational and scenic attraction of its waterfront on the Schuylkill River and the vistas offered by its hilly topography increased its desirability for gentrification. Manayunk, like other gentrified communities, has a definite pedestrian orientation with its row houses within walking distance of its shopping street. In addition, Main Street, with its collection of 19th century stores and mill buildings, was ideally suited for revitalization as an upscale shopping center.

The gentrification of Manayunk was also stimulated by demographic, economic, and cultural changes that were occurring elsewhere. Close to home, the remarkable transformation of Society Hill from a dilapidated neighborhood to one of elegant townhouses was well under way in the 1970’s. The successful rehabilitation of the canal in New Hope invited comparisons with Manayunk. In the 1960’s, a long time resident of Manayunk wrote a letter to a local newspaper that advocated emulating New Hope’s success by creating a picturesque tourist attraction focused on Manayunk’s Canal.92

Others, like Joe Jaworowski, the unofficial “mayor of Manayunk” in the 1970’s and owner of Javie’s Beverage Co., found the comparison with New Hope distasteful. Prescient in his fears, he said, “And how about the people who live here? They’re not going to benefit from your New Hope. What will they do, move people out of here that shed their blood in this town practically.”93

Jaworowski was not opposed to a comeback in Manayunk. However, with a distrust of politicians, he wanted the locals to write their own script and not turn it over to

93 Shatzman, p. 15.
politicians and developers, which became Manayunk’s ultimate fate. While the local residents envisioned recruiting light industry back to Manayunk, outsiders predicated Manayunk’s revitalization on its being another tourist destination. In describing Manayunk, Setha Low wrote, “The demands of the local neighborhood were overlooked in the final planning process because industry was incompatible with gentrified shops and amenities.”94

While Manayunk remained moribund during the 1960’s, the seeds of a new life were emerging in the early 1970’s. Storefronts which were renting for only $100 a month95 aided in a resurgence of some retail activity. Even before the City of Philadelphia invested in canal improvements, word started to spread about the desirability of Manayunk as a place to live. Young artists, “people in search of character”96 were moving into Manayunk, lured by its cheap real estate prices, the interesting neighborhood, and its proximity to Philadelphia.

Since Manayunk remained an intact and cohesive community even throughout the unprofitable years, proprietary feelings were strong when the first stirrings of gentrification were noted. In 1976, Marge DiGiovanni, an activist in the business community said, “We do have an old established community here and this is their Main Street – it’s the only Main Street in Philly – and they don’t want a lot of newcomers here.”97 They rightly feared the consequences of the arrival of people with no commitment to their close, multi-generational community.
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As a possible renaissance for Manayunk was becoming more real, the understanding of gentrification and feelings against it were becoming more pronounced. In 1981, a resident said, “And at first we thought, look this is wonderful [gentrification]. But you examine the social cost, the real destruction in a hot new neighborhood…you ought to think what you’re doing here…is your job just to display people? Is it siccing the rootless new professional class on us?”

Manayunkers were savvy enough to fear “what happens in other urban areas when people have lost control to developers.” Unfortunately, time would show that they were powerless to stop what Peter Williams called the “remorseless march of the invaders.”

**Governmental Initiatives**

While the “urban pioneers” were in the forefront of the gentrification process, without a substantial investment by government in basic infrastructure improvements as a first step followed by serious capital infusion on the part of private investors, Manayunk might have continued to languish economically. As part of a determined strategy to attract tourists to Manayunk, Mayor Frank Rizzo and Councilman Al Pearlman secured the $2 million dollars needed to dredge and spruce up the canal and tow path. A picture that appeared in the Inquirer in 1971 of Mayor Rizzo and Councilman Perelman as they survey Venice Island captures the deterioration. [Figure 7] Investment on Main Street continued with the installation of new sidewalks, Belgian blocks, trees, and the creation of a park overlooking the canal. [Figure 8] The city also spent $125,000.00 for the
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acquisition of property for a parking lot.\textsuperscript{101} These early initiatives of the city of Philadelphia starting in the early 1970’s signaled to investors and developers that Manayunk could be poised for change.

By the time the tow path and canal were completed in 1979, eight antique stores had opened on Main Street. In 1981, the Canal View Inn, a seafood restaurant, opened at 4348 Main and served as the catalyst for the restaurant boom which was soon to follow with the opening of Jamey’s in 1985, Mayor William Green’s U.S. Bar and Grill in 1986, and Jake’s in 1987.\textsuperscript{102} Green, who was Mayor from 1980 to 1984, claims he was not privy to any secret when he bought the Bar & Grill. “Because I was mayor, people figured I knew something they didn’t. I didn’t.”\textsuperscript{103}

Preceding the restaurant boom and the inclusion of Manayunk in the National Register, the city commissioned consultant E.L. Crow, to do a market potential study which became the blueprint for the revival efforts. Completed in 1982, Crow’s study emphasized that “Great care should be taken to preserve and to capitalize on the quaint, historic, ethnic, mill-town character of the district while developing the retail aspects of the District.”\textsuperscript{104}

The report advised returning the storefronts to their original character and creating a Main Street Development Corporation to entice new businesses to the community. It recommended a coordinated theme for the types of stores which would attract a critical mass of shoppers. Among the potential categories that were encouraged to locate on
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Main Street in Crow’s report were hobby/repair/craft shops, household furnishings, restaurants, and antique shops. Crow recognized the desirability of Manayunk’s location near Center City and the wealthy suburbs of the Main Line. Because of the potential for increased tax revenues, Crow understood that it was in the fiscal interest of the city of Philadelphia to assist in Manayunk’s revival. A first step would be for the city to develop a marketing brochure promoting the area.

The *Guide for Investors* that the City developed accentuated the same attributes mentioned in Crow’s study: Manayunk’s proximity to high income areas, the Schuylkill Expressway, its historic character, the recreation potential of the canal and river, and the attractiveness of the area, which they described as “reminiscent of European hill towns.” To stimulate development, the City offered grants for the restoration of building facades and public participation in financing projects. Urban Development Action Grants were provided for commercial and mixed use projects that would contribute to the economic development of Main Street.\(^{105}\)

In 1984, Manayunk’s Main Street from Flat Rock Dam to Shurs Lane, Venice Island and the Canal were listed in the National Register of Historic Places. John Maurer, the owner of the Canal View Inn, said it was the “possibility of the historic designation”\(^{106}\) that prompted him to invest in Manayunk. Others, such as Victor Ostroff, who is the owner of Poland’s Jewelry Store, also attribute the inclusion of Manayunk on the National Register as the linchpin in Manayunk’s revival. Ostroff said, “Things moved very slowly into the ‘80’s. But when we were declared an historic neighborhood, things


started to click.”

Inclusion indicated that the neighborhood was worthy of preservation and the 25 percent tax credit provided by the Economic Recovery Act of 1981 incentivized property owners to rehabilitate their buildings’ facades.

Private investment

Business activity on Main Street has both been a causal agent and symptom of change. As E.L. Crow’s report suggested, a Manayunk Development Corporation was started to encourage new business growth. Kay Sykora, the current Executive Director, came to Manayunk in 1973 and immediately became an advocate of the need to renovate the Canal. Since then, she has been at the forefront of many of the changes that the community has seen.

While many retailers who had been in Manayunk before gentrification have departed, with the assistance of Manayunk Development Corporation, there has been a flurry of new activity and a continuous evolution on Main Street as Manayunk tries to define who it is. Currently, Main Street alone boasts of over twenty-six restaurants and bars, eleven high end clothing boutiques, seven furniture stores, ten beauty salons, six art galleries, and five national retail chains.[See Appendix B] More are located on the small streets off of Main Street.

Even though governmental initiatives were the seminal factors in the early revitalization, gentrification would not have occurred without major private capital investment. Michael Nutter, Councilman for Manayunk since 1991, emphasized the critical role of the private investors when he said, “Manayunk is the greatest commercial
corridor that the government never created.”¹⁰⁸ To some extent Nutter is correct in crediting private money with the gentrification of Manayunk. However, local government money initiated the process and local government has been the ally of the private investors.

More than any other single investor or individual, Dan Neduscin, with both his determined vision and ample supply of cash, has been the force behind Main Street as it exists today. Before investing in Manayunk, Neduscin had recently sold his Mr. Goodbuys stores, a home improvement chain. Along with his partner at Mr.Goodbuys, Steve Erlbaum, he was looking to invest the profits from the sale when he turned to Manayunk. The community was familiar territory to him since his father worked at Pencoyd Steel in Manayunk all his life.

I recently interviewed Mr. Neduscin and asked what caused him to invest in Manayunk. Neduscin responded that it was “geographically great.”¹⁰⁹ Manayunk’s proximity to the river, the expressway and the Main Line showed that the location had great potential. Neduscin stressed that without Main Street, Manayunk would not be the success story it is today. Neduscin called it “an old time street that was conducive to retail shopping.”¹¹⁰ While Neduscin emphasized the importance of the geography of Manayunk and layout of Main Street as critical to his decision to invest there, he said that he was not even aware of the historic designation when he purchased his first buildings, and therefore this played no role in his decision.

¹⁰⁹ Interview with Dan Neduscin on July 5, 2005.
¹¹⁰ Ibid.
In addition to a judicious choice of location, Nedusin attributes his success in Manayunk to his “good relationship with City Hall.”\(^{111}\) In his opinion, both Michael Nutter and Ed Rendell were useful allies in furthering his vision. Former Mayor William Green is a co-investor with Neduscin on several properties.

When Nedusin arrived, thirty buildings were boarded up, prompting him to describe Main Street as a “No Man’s Land.”\(^{112}\) Since buying his first building at 4411 Main Street in 1988 for $100,000.00,\(^{113}\) he has continued to buy property and currently owns fifty buildings, some in partnership with former Mayor Green, and approximately three-hundred apartment units making him the single largest property owner in Manayunk.\(^{114}\) Nick Tuti said, “Neduscin has control of this town.”\(^{115}\)

Not wanting to create another South Street, Neduscin focused on attracting unique businesses that would cater to an upscale clientele over age 25. Nine years after the start of his involvement, the number of restaurants more than doubled going from eight in 1989 to seventeen in 1998. [See Appendix C.1] Thirty-five new retail establishments opened on Main Street in the same period. [See Appendix C.2]

Despite his success in furthering the plan E.L. Crow presented in 1984 for revitalization and his attempts to help the community by creating scholarships for its youngsters, opinions about his effect on Manayunk have been mixed. To accomplish his vision for Main Street, he bought out anyone who did not fit into his plan. Traditionally, Main Street businesses had been family owned mom and pop operations. Those who had

\(^{111}\) Ibid.
\(^{113}\) Klein, Michael, “Main Street’s Main Man”, *Philadelphia Inquirer Magazine*, July 2, 1995, p.10.
\(^{114}\) Ibid.
\(^{115}\) Interview with Nick Tuti on May 23, 2006.
been in business for a long time charge that by dramatically increasing their rents and bringing in new establishments, Neduscin forced them to close. For them, Neduscin’s tactics constituted “economic discrimination.”

Displacement, one of the principal criticisms leveled at gentrification, usually refers to people, but its effects can apply equally to businesses. Considering that out of the thirty-two stores in business on Main Street in 1989, the year after Neduscin started investing, only thirteen remained nine years later, the charge of business displacement in Manayunk seems valid. [See Appendix D]

As well as the increased rents Neduscin charged in the buildings he purchased, local establishments have faced rent competition from retail chain stores that are able and used to paying big rents. Included in the displaced businesses was the beloved Farmers Market at 4120 Main which could not compete with the rent that Restoration Hardware would pay and thus closed. Alberta Vance, who had operated Alberta’s flowers at 4415 Main Street for fifty years, opposed the changes happening around her in the community she loved. Sadly for her, she also became a victim of Manayunk’s revitalization when Starbucks came in 2000 and took over her location.

Opinions vary on the changes in retail activity on Main Street. Obviously, Manayunk’s economic stagnation was halted by the influx of restaurants and boutiques. The resulting increased tax revenue has benefited the city. Historic structures have been preserved through adaptive re-use. Irene Madrak, the Executive Director of North Lights Community Center and a life-time resident, wondered, “What would have happened if
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disinvestment continued?” An elderly resident with whom I spoke said that without
gentrification Manayunk would have become increasingly depressed, not a good
alternative. “Now it’s lively.”

While gentrification brought new life to Main Street’s retail economy, the
residents of Manayunk reportedly did not benefit from the jobs. While former businesses
were locally owned, the new establishments are not. In addition, Irene Madrak said,
“New businesses have not been hiring locally. The residents feel snubbed on Main
Street.”

While providing neither employment nor a place to shop, Main Street has
become increasingly divorced from the lives of long-time residents.

While some are able to focus on the benefits change has brought, many of the
negative outcomes were borne by the businesses that could not afford the increased rents
and were forced to close. Residents complain that the mix of stores on Main Street caters
to trendy tastes and does not deal with basic needs of the residents. These complaints are
valid since there are no longer any of the hardware stores, pharmacies, grocery stores,
variety stores or basic clothing stores that existed on pre-gentrification Main Street.

“Now Main Street is useless for the day-to-day needs of people who live here,” said Jane
Glenn, a past president of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council.

While Main Street continues as a retail district of mainly small, privately owned
shops, there have been some notable shifts in the mix of stores. Table II which shows
Main Street in three critical time periods: 1927 when Manayunk was a thriving industrial
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community, 1969 before gentrification began, and today [Appendix E]. The Table clearly indicates the retail changes on Main Street. Although the 1927 Business Directory showed fourteen different clothing stores, including hatters, ladies dresses, men’s clothing, general clothing, and shoe stores, I would assume that they were of a more basic variety than the current eleven boutique stores that offer specialized, high-priced clothing.

**TABLE I**
Mix of Stores in 1927, 1969, 2006

As well as a dearth of basic stores today, the number of restaurants and bars has exploded, crowding out other uses. The diversity of uses that Jane Jacobs cited as being critical to a community’s well-being has deteriorated drastically on Main Street. In her opinion, too many nightclubs and restaurants destroy the vitality of a neighborhood by
day and its safety by night.\textsuperscript{120} This is exactly the situation on Main Street today where there are twenty-four restaurants and bars which primarily attract night-time clientele. During the week, very few shoppers are walking around.

The graph below was also derived from the Telephone Directories from 1927, 1940, 1969, 1979, and 1989, and the listing of businesses today. The sharp increase in the number of restaurants during the 1927 to 2006 period and the concomitant decline in the number of grocery stores are indicative of the broader demographic and social changes that have accompanied gentrification in Manayunk.

\begin{center}
\textbf{TABLE II}
Restaurants and Food Stores 1927-2006
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{table-ii}
\end{center}

In 1997, Dan Neduscin, along with Councilman Michael Nutter, was instrumental in pushing for a moratorium on new liquor licenses. The moratorium which City Council approved lasted from 1997 to 2002. While done ostensibly to control egregious parking problems and drunkenness, and to halt the addition of new restaurants and nightclubs,

some considered it a way to stifle competition for Neduscin’s burgeoning restaurant empire of Sonoma and Kansas City Prime. Existing restaurants who were seeking approval for a liquor license claimed that their application would not have impacted the constrained parking since their seating capacity would not have increased.\textsuperscript{121} Whatever the reality, the powerful alliance between Neduscin and Nutter does appear to have influenced the course of events in Manayunk.

While some people view Neduscin as a visionary and others see him as a ruthless invader, it is undeniable that his efforts produced a sea change in Manayunk and that his presence and influence there will continue to be felt. As Neduscin sees it, it was his vision that raised Manayunk from commercial obscurity to prosperity. He cannot understand that the natives have not “appreciated what he’s done for their town. It’s a kick in the face…when they yearn for the vacant ghost town Manayunk used to be. Progress spawns change…and one day they’ll have to accept it. There’s a lot more to come.”\textsuperscript{122}

Since Neduscin made this remarks in 1996, more change has indeed come. The combination of the recent high rents for retail space, the large tax increase in 1994, declining sales, the persistent lack of parking, and the vandalism caused by drunk and rowdy youth that populate Main Street after dark, have caused many stores to close. In July, 2006, between Green Lane and Shurs Lane, a distance of ten blocks, there are nineteen vacant store fronts [See Appendix F], an event some are calling the ‘degentrification’ of Main Street.

\textsuperscript{121} Abbott, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., p. 17.
Victor Ostroff, the great-great nephew of the founder of Poland Jewelers at 4347 Main Street, worries that, “The interesting, eclectic stores of the 1980’s and 90’s are leaving. Big stores are the only ones who can afford the rents now. As we become more like Chestnut Hill or Suburban Square, people won’t need to come here.”

In addition to the high rents and lack of unique stores, many of the retailers who have been a presence on Main Street for a long time such as Bernadette Krakovitz, the owner of La Belle Maison at 4340 Main Street, Vic Ostroff, and Gary O. Pelkey, the owner of Owen Patrick Gallery at 4345, fault the large number of restaurants, and the increasingly younger visitors as causes of the business decline.

At 4346 Main Street, Linda Tuti has been running Fairways Collection, a store catering to golf memorabilia, for the last seven years. Having been profitable for the last six years, Ms. Tuti, like other business owners on Main Street, has suffered a drastic downturn in sales since 2004 and faults the increase in restaurants and bars. “In the last ten days, there have been zero sales. Zip. People only come now to eat and drink, not to shop,” she said. Unless business picks up soon, she is planning to close.

While the number of vacancies on Main Street appears indicative of a downturn, Dan Neduscin and Kay Sykora are not alarmed as they see it as part of a predictable cycle in retailing. The momentum that built during the boom period was hard to maintain and a correction was bound to happen.

During Manayunk’s boom period in the 1980’s and 90’s, rents were affordable to the small, eclectic retailers that populated the street. As rents and taxes escalated, a
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greater volume of sales was needed to cover expenses. For many, that has not been happening.

Ms. Tuti at Fairways Collection resents the assessment she has to pay as part of a Special Assessment District to the Manayunk Development Corporation and feels they are not doing anything to help small businesses like hers.\footnote{Ibid.} Echoing her sentiments, Victor Ostroff at Polands Jewelers considers that the leadership in Manayunk is not helpful to the small business owners. Mr. Ostroff said, “The voice of the small business owner is not heard.” According to Mr. Ostroff, those in power are looking to the development of all the new condominiums to solve Main Street’s problems.\footnote{Interview with Mr. Ostroff on May 23, 2006.}

While many residents raised strong objections to the new condominiums being built on Venice Island, Dan Neduscin, the promoter of Main Street, is one who sees the substantial increase of high end residential development as the future key to the success of Main Street businesses.

**Social and Cultural Changes**

With the exception of Loring Aluminum, Richards Apex, and Littlewood Corp., all on Main Street, and Smurfitt Containers still in business on Venice Island, the booming manufacturing and distribution operations of the past are gone. Deindustrialization is essentially complete in Manayunk.

The effects of the deindustrialization of Manayunk and the restructuring of its economic base have rippled through the community. Until the 1970’s, Manayunk was a working class, multi-ethnic community whose social life centered on the family, the
church and the neighborhood. Work centered on the local factories. Since then, it has had to confront myriad changes from loss of jobs to the addition of many newcomers to the once self-contained neighborhood. While change is inevitable in any community, gentrifying communities experience change more acutely since their social, cultural, economic, and physical make-up undergoes a more extensive make-over. This has certainly been the case in Manayunk.

The influx of new residents who are younger, better educated, and have higher incomes has altered the face of Manayunk. Unlike the blue-collar workers of past decades, the in-movers are ambitious and upwardly mobile professionals. According to data from the U.S. Census Bureau shown below in Table III, the percentage of residents with a college degree and those whose occupation is listed as management has increased every year since 1970. The median salary has shown a similar increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College degree</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management, Professional</strong></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Income</strong></td>
<td>$9,452</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$50,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

127 U.S. Census Bureau Statistics for Census Tract 214.
As a result of gentrification, Manayunk has deteriorated as a multi-generational family based community. From 1980 to 1990, the number of families in Manayunk’s Zip Code 19127 declined from 1,818 to 1,444. In 2005, a life-time resident reported that “Only four out of the thirty families we knew are left. Now it’s all rentals and singles.”\textsuperscript{128} Recently, John Yodsnukis, a resident of Wild Street for 58 years, told me that out of fifteen families on his street only two are left. Some have died and have been replaced by “youngsters,” he said.\textsuperscript{129} Other neighbors, citing parking problems and changes in the neighborhood as the specific reasons, moved away. Irene Madrak concurred. “It is not the Manayunk I grew up in.”\textsuperscript{130} Along with Mr. Yodsnukis, she cited the changing neighborhood as a reason people are moving away.

Real estate prices have risen significantly since gentrification began. In the fourteen years between 1985 and 1999, the sale prices of single family homes doubled and the median sale price rose from $61,250.00 to $115,500.00 in the years 1997-2002, a 53\% jump in prices.\textsuperscript{131} A row house at 193 Conarroe Street [Figure 9] that sold in June, 1998 for $96,500.00 sold again four years later for $152,500.00 at an increase of 63\%.\textsuperscript{132}

Sales activity has accelerated in Manayunk since 1992. Jennifer Devlin, an Associate at Prudential, Fox & Roach Realtors, extracted past sales data from the Multiple Listing Service and found that in the four years between 1/1/1992 and 12/31/1995, a total of 178 residential listings were sold, while in the last four years
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between 1/1/2002 to 12/31/2005, 579 properties changed hands. These figures would indicate a less stable community than existed in Manayunk’s past when residents rarely sold their homes.

The escalating real estate prices have spawned an increase in absentee landowners. Of the fourteen investors who as of 2000 owned 200 rental properties in Manayunk, only four live within Philadelphia. The rest come from other parts of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. In the period 1990 to 1998 there was a 300% increase in the percentage of homes sold to non-occupant investors in Manayunk. A study done by North Light Community Center corroborated this view in their finding that “the growth of rental properties in Manayunk was a major concern” and cited the “gentrification of Manayunk” as the main force behind the loss of owner occupancy.

In the 1980 Census, 75% of homes in Manayunk were owner occupied. In contrast, the 2000 Census showed the figure of owner-occupied residences dropping to 66%. The metamorphosis of Manayunk from a neighborhood of owner-occupied residences to renter-occupied residences as a result of gentrification contrasts with the findings in Frank DeGiovanni’s research mentioned earlier. Unlike Manayunk, the gentrifying neighborhoods he looked at went from renter to owner-occupied single family
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residences as gentrification progressed. In the process, the typical neighborhood is upgraded as owners take more pride in their neighborhood than renters.

The ramifications of this increase in rental properties in Manayunk are noteworthy. Absentee landlords purchase homes that had been previously owned and inhabited by one family and then rent them to four to five college students. Neither the landlord nor the renters show any civic involvement in the community. Unlike the traditional population of Manayunk who lived and died in Manayunk, the newcomers represent a transient population only planning to stay a few years.

Long time residents, frustrated by the trash left out on the street, noise, and lack of parking, are moving away. Kevin Smith, the Manayunk Neighborhood Council President, said, “Landlords don’t take care of a building the way an owner occupied home does.” In addition, long term residents resent the “frat house” atmosphere that has permeated the family community.

Among the most poorly rated items in the Opinion Survey done by Philadelphia City Planning Commission in 1997 were the concerns about nuisance behavior (vandalism, drunkenness, urination) and parking problems, both exacerbated by the influx of renters and college students. Dan Neduscin, the foremost investor of real estate in Manayunk, worries, too, that the frat house atmosphere is a threat to the tony Main Street he has strived to create.

Even though the sale prices of single family homes show large increases in value, residents worry that the increase in rentals could presage a decline in property values.
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Likewise, the increase in rentals which has driven families away from Manayunk also threatens to further weaken community institutions such as the churches, parochial schools, and civic associations that have been the backbone of life in Manayunk. In the mid-1960’s, 3,325 children attended one of five parish schools. By last year, the number of students had dwindled to 890, forcing three of the schools to close. This year St. John’s was also consolidated into the only remaining parish school, Holy Family. The loss of the Catholic schools and their possible conversion to condominiums will accelerate the decline in community cohesion.

As the small town character of Manayunk changed, the views of the older long-term residents are that the Quality of Life has deteriorated. In the 1997 Philadelphia City Planning Commission Opinion Survey cited earlier, the newer and younger residents voiced a more positive view of Quality of Life. These results were not surprising, since higher value was placed on neighborliness, the sense of community, and the convenience to places of worship by long time residents than on newcomers.

Ana Tuti, a barber at 4344 Main Street for the last 50 years, bemoans what has happened to Manayunk. After many attempts at smashing her barber pole by marauding youth, her only recourse was to encase it in a metal fencing. Ana and her son Nick, who works with her, criticize the city for not caring about the community that Manayunk once
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was. Having lived in the apartment above her barber shop for a long time, she admitted she still “loves Manayunk but doesn’t like what it has become.”

While the economic revitalization of Main Street proved Crow’s plan a success, the results have undermined the community’s cultural core and its sense of who it is. By turning Manayunk into a glitzy shopping and transient mecca, what made it real and interesting to the first gentrifiers, has been lost.

Historic Preservation

While gentrification had a negative impact on the social and cultural community, it has helped preserve the historic built environment on Main Street as well as the homes that climb up the hill perpendicular to Main Street. The lure of investing in a potentially upcoming and hot area resulted in the restoration of Main Street’s many 19th century buildings which had suffered from many years of neglect. Its inclusion on the National Register conferred legitimacy on its historic attributes. While it is not designated as a local historic district in Philadelphia, it is considered a Special Control District under the Property and Maintenance Code of the City of Philadelphia, which does provide protection by precluding demolition and necessitating reviews by the city’s Historic Commission for any exterior changes. If the Historic Commission rejects a proposal, it then goes to the Board of Building Standard Review. John Gallery, the Director of the Preservation Alliance, said that there is a “deficiency in the ordinance” and recognized
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that it is “highly unusual.” According to Kay Sykora, the Special Control District status that exists is “flawed and would not stand up in court” if anyone did challenge it. Further protection is provided by Philadelphia Bill # 1861 which extends design control to all signage on Main Street.

The buildings on Main Street include early mill structures dating to the first half of the 19th century and small commercial and residential buildings of the second half of the 19th century. Many are unique examples of their types in Philadelphia and are clearly worthy of preservation. Fortunately, many of these buildings have been adapted for new uses.

The south side of Main Street, nearest to the Canal and Venice Island, was the home to several large milling operations in the past and also to the offices of the mills located on Venice Island. The oldest mill at 4120 Main Street, which has been converted into retail space for Pompanoosnuc Mills, a specialty national furniture maker, dates from 1822. The former Blantyre Mill at 4268-72 Main Street [Figure 10] which dates to 1847 has been renovated to accommodate market rate apartments. The former Dexter Mill at 4100 Main [Figure 11], built circa 1850, serves as space to various small businesses.

4236 Main Street [Figure 12], a three-story brick building, was built in the late 1800’s and occupied for many years by the Philadelphia Gas Works. It was purchased by Venturi Associates in 1980 for $75,000 for use as their offices. The former Manayunk Trust Company [Figure 13] while currently vacant has been well maintained inside and out and is considered the most elegant building on Main Street.
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The north side of Main Street typically functioned in the past for commercial and mixed commercial and residential uses. Today it is devoted primarily to retail and restaurant activities. While the U.S. Bar & Grill [Figure 14], Kildare’s Pub at 4417 [Figure 15], and Il Tartuffo at 4341 Main Street [Figure 16] maintained the traditional 19th century facades, Jake’s Restaurant at 4365 Main Street [Figure 17] opted for an innovative overlay to its façade. At 4313 Main sits a three-story stone building, the old Masonic Hall [Figure 18] which dates from circa 1859, and presently is used as retail space by Banana Republic.

In addition to the extant large mill structures is the eclectic variety of housing in Manayunk, ranging from the simple stucco hillside row houses [Figure 19] on Conorroe Street to the elaborate Italianate stone free standing home at 325 Green Street [Figure 20]. One block off Main Street at 104-06 Levering Street are the oldest residences extant in Manayunk [Figure 21]. Constructed in the Federal Style, they date to circa 1840. The first floor is used as commercial space while the second and third stories are used as residences. At 4040-48 Main Street [Figure 22] sits a group of attached homes that were constructed circa 1860. Presently, the City of Philadelphia has indicated that three of them (4040, 4042, and 4048) are structurally unsound and in danger of collapse. Unless immediate remediation work is undertaken, the city has posted its intent to demolish them.

Even though Main Street does represent a considerable preservation effort in its totality, there are several sites which mar the architectural integrity of the street. Among these are Richards Apex at 4202 Main and several infill sites such as that occupied by Pottery Barn [Figure 23], and Platypus [Figure 24]. The old Empress Theatre at 4441
Main, while currently an eyesore and occupied by Loring Aluminum Building Products, could take advantage of some of the old detail that remains to be more historically accurate and appropriate to the streetscape [Figure 25].

**Venice Island**

Venice Island is the new frontier of gentrification in Manayunk. A total of around 1,000 residential units have either been added or are in the development phase on both Venice Island and parts of Manayunk. This surge in residential construction, including condominium complexes at the old Namico Soap Factory, the Connelly Container and Arroyo Grille sites on Venice Island, Neduscin’s 68 unit Knob Hill, the 59 unit Watermill condo and 60 unit Bridge Five, while envisioned as a boon for Main Street businesses, will further advance the gentrification process and erode the cherished sense of neighborliness by bringing more newcomers to this once closely knit community.

While much of the vernacular architecture of Main Street and the hillside residences of Manayunk represent a remarkably intact built environment of the 19th and early 20th century, very little has been preserved on Venice Island that would indicate its role as the lifeblood of Manayunk or as a manufacturing center in the United States. With the exception of one old former textile mill on the Namico site [Figure 26] that is being incorporated into the Venice Loft development, and the tattered remains of the old Ripka mill between Gay and Levering Streets [Figure 27], other vestiges of the old mill structures on Venice Island, once a thick mass of four to five story factories, have been demolished to make way for new development. The only other reference to its former status is the mural rendition of its industrial past [Figure 28].
Several city enactments have abetted the gentrification process in Manayunk by encouraging high-end residential development. The first, which began in 1997, is the offer of ten-year tax abatements to any developer who either improves existing commercial and industrial properties or constructs new residential units in the city.

The second initiative was City Council Bill #990760 which was passed in 1999 despite strenuous objections from residents and civic associations to upgrade the zoning on flood prone Venice Island from industrial to residential to allow for condominium developments. While upgrading in zoning from industrial to residential is usually considered an improvement in a neighborhood, community opposition to the proposed development was strong. In an interview in November, 2005, about the condominium development on Venice Island, the current president of the Manayunk Civic Association Kevin Smith said “I hate it with a passion. First of all, it’s in a floodway. Passive recreation would be the best use. Condos destroy the land, radically change look of Manayunk…don’t contribute to the community. It will just change the character of Manayunk”. 149 Kay Smith, the president of the Manayunk Development Corporation, and Dan Neduscin were two who spoke in favor of the change in zoning.

The concern about flooding on Venice Island is hardly a new concern. An early historian described the building of the first mill in Manayunk, saying that Captain Towers was, “a daring and venturesome man, and the very one to commence building a mill at Manayunk; for, from the fear of freshets so universally prevailing at that time no other was willing to run the risk…”150 From 1822 to 1999, eighteen damaging floods hit

---

149 Interview with Kevin Smith.
150 Hagner, p.61.
Venice Island and Manayunk. A newspaper clipping shows the extent of a flood in 1919 on Venice Island. [Figure 26] Jamie Kolkler, an architect at Venturi, Scott, Brown, said that the because of the danger of flooding, development on Venice Island was “unforeseen trouble”. Nick Tuti said, “The city is not acting responsibly. All they want is to make more money.”

The loss of control that many feel about the changes going on in Manayunk is behind the protests against the development on Venice Island. Taken over by investors and ruled by Philadelphia politicians, the local community feels left out of the gentrification process. As the last phase of the gentrification process, Venice Island has become a symbol to many residents of what has gone wrong in gentrification.

152 Interview with Jamie Kolkler on November 2, 2005.
153 Interview on May 23, 2006.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS

Manayunk proved to be the ideal laboratory that I anticipated when I began my research into gentrification. It fit many of the theories that I surveyed in chapters two to four, especially proving that gentrification is a “chaotic concept” with each neighborhood gentrifying in its own way, at its own rate, and with a mix of positive and negative effects.

While it was never a slum or suffered from abandonment as many other gentrifying communities, it was a dying industrial neighborhood economically. Although Philadelphia overall has not had the same strong housing market that has been present in cities where gentrification is most likely to occur (like Boston and San Francisco), Manayunk had many of the other attributes that lead to gentrification. Its location near the central business district of Philadelphia, the Schuylkill Expressway, and the waterfront of the Schuylkill River were determinant factors in its revitalization. Its interesting topography, pedestrian orientation, proximity to affluent suburbs, and intact 19th and early 20th century architecture also contributed to its attractiveness to gentrifiers and investors.

Perhaps most importantly, because Manayunk was in economic decline, it exhibited the real estate rent gap that Neil Smith has described as a prime determinant of future gentrification. Along with the rent gap, Manayunk had the predictable interplay between the other key agents of gentrification - enabling legislation at the local and national level, private investment, the influence of key individuals, and changing demographic trends.
Among the demographic trends that I analyzed in chapter two which impacted Manayunk were the increase in the number of single households, the postponement of marriage and childrearing, and the movement of the middle class back to the city. The movement back to the city was started by the “urban pioneers”, those first adventurous people to settle in an undiscovered city neighborhood. In Manayunk they were Margaret and Peter Schnore\(^{154}\), two artists from upstate New York, who were in search of cheap housing in an interesting part of the city.

Initially, gentrification was a government driven process with the City of Philadelphia investing in basic infrastructure improvements such as cleaning up the Canal and refurbishing the tow path. The impact of enabling legislation, both at the federal and local level on Manayunk, is not clear cut, While Manayunk’s designation as a National Historic District in 1984 was a motivating factor for some retailers, it was not recognized as a deciding factor for all. Dan Neduscin, the largest private investor, along with several other retailers with whom I spoke said that the designation made no difference in their desire to invest or locate there.

On the local level, the legislative context is cumbersome. Manayunk is not a local historic district but is considered a Special Control District. Any alterations, demolitions, or additions have to be considered by the Historic Commission. However, the standards are determined by the Property and Maintenance Code established most recently in June, 1996. Since the restrictions are more stringent than those imposed on local historic districts, there are doubts that they could stand up in court. Although to date there have not been any challenges to decisions, a challenge is certain to be presented eventually in

\(^{154}\) Malone, p. 13.
the courts. Many of the inappropriate additions or renovations on Main Street happened prior to that date.

After the City had started work refurbishing the Canal and a newspaper article about the Schnores appeared in 1971, several antique dealers opened on Main Street. Once the gentrification process was under way, large investors such as Dan Neduscin, Realen Realty, Carl Dranoff, and the many absentee landlords of the residential properties furthered the gentrification process by adding new construction and bringing in a new class of ownership to Manayunk

Many of the consequences of gentrification in Manayunk are typical of what has happened to other communities that have gentrified. Both residential and business properties were renovated at private expense. Real estate prices appreciated considerably with the city benefiting from the resulting increase in property taxes. While the goal of the city was urban modernization and the goal of the investors was financial profit, preservation of Manayunk’s historic fabric was the felicitous by-product.

Gentrification has brought considerable social changes in the make-up of this once blue collar neighborhood as new residents who are younger, more affluent, and better educated have moved in. The inevitable friction that develops when two groups with different socio-economic values live in the same neighborhood has caused some divisions in the community about what happens on Main Street and on Venice Island.

The criticism leveled at gentrification comes from the reported displacement of low-income residents due to increased rents or conversion of rental properties to single family residences. As such, gentrification is viewed as the power of the haves over the
have-nots. However, in Manayunk forced displacement because of increased costs of living was not the most common reason that caused residents to leave.

Instead, many moved away voluntarily, either to benefit from their appreciated property value or because the character of the neighborhood had changed so much as to no longer be desirable. With the increase in the incidences of drunkenness, vandalism, and lack of concern about the appearance of the neighborhood, quality of life had deteriorated for many long-standing residents and influenced their decision to leave. Fortunately, greatly increased property values facilitated the change.

A prime factor contributing to the changing character of this neighborhood was the increase in the number of rental units. As word spread that Manayunk was a “hot” area, investors from outside Manayunk and beyond the Philadelphia area, started buying property with the express purpose of using them as rental units. These properties, in turn, have been rented primarily to groups of college students who do not care for the neighborhood the way a resident-owner would or participate in its institutions. With this change from an owner-occupied to renter-occupied area, the former stability and cohesion of the community has deteriorated, giving rise to concern that property values could decline as it becomes home to transients. Unfortunately, rather than having gentrification strengthen and stabilize the community as usually happens, it has diminished the vitality it once had as a strong family based community.

While residents were not by and large displaced for the usual reasons in the gentrification in Manayunk, locally owned businesses were. The increased rents charged to retailers and the accompanying huge increase in property taxes resulted in the displacement of many of the original store owners. The rate of turnover in businesses has
accelerated again recently as their profitability has declined dramatically. Retailers complain that people are not coming to shop and attribute this to the decline in unique shops and increase in restaurant only patrons. Presently there are nineteen vacant stores in the ten block stretch from Green Lane to Shurs Lane.

The gentrification of Manayunk illustrates the connection today between preservation and development. The variety of its historic architecture has been well preserved by means of private investment and governmental actions. Main Street was revitalized and became economically successful. However, the very success of Main Street helped to undermine the identity of the community and its unique sense of place.

Gentrification, as a significant force in communities world-wide for over fifty years, has been and will continue to be a valuable tool for community revitalization and a sensible alternative to urban renewal. Many of the new successes and failures in preservation will occur in gentrifying neighborhoods since a large concentration of older buildings exist in our urban areas. The ability to reconcile what can be the opposing goals of preservation and development will determine the future of many such urban neighborhoods as Manayunk. Without development, they lose the future. Without preservation they lose the past.
Manayunk Section of Philadelphia, Census Tract 214
Available at http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/MapItDrawServlet?context=AdvSearch&geo-id=1400
Figure 2
Canal Locks at Manayunk, woodcut from a drawing by Breton, 1830. Courtesy of the Free Library of Philadelphia.

Figure 3
Lithograph of Manayunk, J.T. Bowen, 1840.
Manayunk, 1875
Figure 5

Photograph of Canal, looking west from bridge, 1910.
Courtesy of Historical Society, Campbell Collection, vol.27.

Figure 6

Manayunk Canal, bridge to S. Schofield Son & Company Eagle Mills.
The Schuylkill Navigation History: A Photographic History, by Harry L. Rinker, p.86.
Figure 7

Mayor attends demolition on Venice Island, photo.
Courtesy of Free Library of Philadelphia.

Figure 8

Park on Main Street
Figure 9

193 Conarroe Street
Figure 10

4268-72 Main Street, former Blantyre Mills

Figure 11

4100 Main Street, former Dexter Mills
Figure 12

4236 Main Street, former Philadelphia Gas Works

Figure 13

4340 Main Street, former Manayunk Trust
Figure 14

U.S. Hotel Bar & Grill

4439 Main Street
Figure 15

4417 Main Street
Figure 16

4341 Main Street
Figure 17

4365 Main Street
Figure 18

4313 Main Street, former Masonic Hall
Row houses on Conaroe Street
Figure 20

325 Green Street
Figure 21

104-06 Levering Street
Figure 22

4040-48 Main Street

Figure 23

4230 Main Street
Figure 26

Former Namico Factory, Venice Island

Figure 27

Former Ripka Mill, Venice Island
Figure 28

Murals on Venice Island

Figure 29

Venice Island, February 2, 1915.
Courtesy of Historical Society of Philadelphia, Campbell Collection, Vol.27.
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Appendix A
1909 Main Street Businesses Listed in Manayunk Carnival Souvenir

Retail
4417 Hurst, Confectioners
4237 Forster, Shoes
4376 Pollock, Butter, Eggs
4221 Bernat, Bakery
4241 Barr, Gents Furnishing
4163 Woerner, Cigars
4369 Manayunk Optical
4421 Felin, Groceries
4048 Kubiensi, Liquors
4349 Tappen, Hatter
4335 Shanefield, Shoes
4255 Tiedler, Druggist
4403 Morris, Groceries
4113 McManus, Oysters
4347 Poland Jewelers
4449 Davis Hardware
4405 Baer, Shoes

Restaurants
4350 Sloans Café & Restaurant

Service
4342 Miller, Insurance & Real Estate
4416 Strickland, Horse Shoes
4388 Bisch, Tailor
4217 Manayunk Finance
4370 Keely, Real Estate
4371 Bowker, Real Estate
4370 Poleman, Paper Hanging

Manufacturing and Distribution
4445 Birkmire, Monumental Marble & Granite
4373 Kehoe, Moving & Hauling
4435 Klauder Feed & Coal Co
4050 Wilson-Childs Wagon Manufacturer
4348 Gallati, Brush Manufacturer
## Appendix B
### 2006 Listing of Establishments on Main Street

#### Retail
- 4460 Africa on Main
- 4444 Main Street Music
- 4443 Artesano Gallery
- 4442 Bias
- 4440 Furniture Workshop
- 4407 Eyeglass Works
- 4403 Lifestyle
- 4390 Public Image
- 4367 Chico's
- 43xx Belle Maison
- 4346 Fore
- 4361 Sweet Violet
- 4358 Tag
- 4358 Fiore Fashion
- 4357 Pat Kin's Boutique
- 4351 Pacific Rim
- 4349 Gary Mann Designs
- 4347 Poland Jewelers
- 4346 Fairways Collection
- 4345 Owen/Patrick Gallery
- 4339 Bendi
- 4337 Martin Pulli Jewelers
- 4333 Silk Road Express
- 4329 Events in Style
- 4327 Manayunk Design Group
- 4325 Latitudes
- 4322 Doring Gifts & Handcrafts
- 4323 Cadence Cyles
- 4320 Sports Works
- 4321 Maternity
- 4312 Orbit
- 4303 Huhlmans
- 4300 Banana Republic
- 4255 Wild Orchid
- 4249 Nicole Miller
- 4241 Angelo & Josephine
- 4233 Maidie Franklin
- 4230 Restoration Hardware
- 4230 Pottery Barn
- 4221 Platypus
- 4163 Total Living
- 4159 Human Zoom
- 4161 Interior Works
- 4131 Ligne Roset
- 4120 Pompanoosuc Mills
- 4050 Somnia
- 4001 TransAmerican Office Furniture

#### Restaurants
- 4452 Mom's Bake at Home Pizza
- 4441 Il Tartuffo
- 4439 U.S. Bar and Grill
- 4425 An Indian Affair
- 4421 Tonic on Main
- 4417 Kildare's Irish Pub
- 4417 Derek's
- 4415 Starbucks
- 4384 Zesty's Restaurant
- 4371 Chabea
- 4365 Jake's
- 4360 La Colombe
- 4356 Ben & Jerry
- 4348 Hikaru
- 4326 Bar
- 4311 Bucks County Coffee
- 4301 Flat Rock Salon
- 4266 Winnie's Le Bus
- 4258 Bella Trattoria
- 4247 Fish Tank
- 4245 Bayou Bar & Grill
- 4243 Fountain of Juice
- 4139 Sapphire
- 4200 Thomas'
- 4120 Manayunk Brewery & Restaurant
- 4111 Mike's Pizza
Service
4450 Main Street Clairvoyant
4436 Christie's Nails
4430 Art & Science
4423 Tallarico Barber
4410 Nob Hill Condos
4409 Dranoff Properties
4405 Beans Beauty Store & Salon
4390 Agile Cat
4360 Salon l'Etoile
4344 Barber
4340 Miracle Centers
4331 Main Street Animal Clinic
4320 Charter School Services
4320 Annodyne Interactive
4319 Patricia Gorman Associates
4312 Hudson United Bank
4237 Christie's Nails
4236 Venturi Scott Brown
4205 Diadem
4167 Glow
4151 Sweat
4109 McGovern

Manufacturers and Distribution
4045 G.J. Littlewood
4202 Richards Apex
4441 Loring Aluminum Building Products
## Appendix C.1 Retail Establishments in 1989 and in 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1989 Retail</th>
<th>1998 Retail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4001 Delaware Valley Office Furniture</td>
<td>4001 AAA Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001 Transamerica Office Furniture</td>
<td>4001 Delaware Valley Office Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050 Gevurtz Furniture</td>
<td>4001 Transamerica Office Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050 Somnia</td>
<td>4050 Gevurtz Office Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4219 Geri DiBiase Photo</td>
<td>4151 Metropolis Bicycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4228 Angelo Imports</td>
<td>4169 Kiln Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4239 Best Friends</td>
<td>4205 Mainly Sportswear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4237 Winslows Stained Glass</td>
<td>4225 Worn Yesterday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4247 River Locke Antiques</td>
<td>4226 Discoveries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4249 The Lace Shop</td>
<td>4227 Shurbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4311 Almost Antiques</td>
<td>4228 Her Better Leather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4320 Cathy Rush Sportswear</td>
<td>4229 Changing Plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4321 Kody Lighting</td>
<td>4231 Mineralistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4323 Two by Four</td>
<td>4232 Maidie Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4324 Latitudes Craft Gallery</td>
<td>4251 Baskets of Joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4329 Best Friends</td>
<td>4321 Home Grown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4347 Polands Jewelers</td>
<td>4323 Two by Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4367 Rose's Pharmacy</td>
<td>4325 Latitudes Craft Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373 Turtledove</td>
<td>4332 Pyramid Contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4388 Arizona Trading</td>
<td>4335 Mainly Cigars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4401 The Emporium</td>
<td>4337 Tumbleweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4405 Beans Beauty Supply</td>
<td>4339 Fitness Wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4407 The Eyeglass Works</td>
<td>4340 Majolie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4415 Alberta's Flowers</td>
<td>4343 Next Contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4419 Needle Niche</td>
<td>4347 Poland Jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4453 State Liquor Store</td>
<td>4349 Mann Gary Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4456 Lottiers Flowers</td>
<td>4351 Pacific Rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4458 Arcturus Gems &amp; Jewelry</td>
<td>4359 DeMaio Antiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4461 Riverside Cycles</td>
<td>4363 Artiste en Fleurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4371 Kamikaze for Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4373 Turtledove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4386 Timeworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4388 Idas Treasure &amp; Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4390 Public Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4401 Charles Tiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4405 Beans Beauty Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4407 Eyeglass Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4409 Neo Deco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4410 Mainly Shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4415 Alberta's Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4419 indigo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4429 Performance Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4430 Wear it Again Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4444 Main Street Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4221 DiBiase Studio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C.2 Restaurants in 1989 and in 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1989 Restaurants</th>
<th>1998 Restaurants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4328 Sip &amp; Steaks</td>
<td>4141 Vega Grill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4341 Chews Family Chinese Restaurant</td>
<td>4201 Thomas'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4350 Canal View</td>
<td>4217 Riverside Pizza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4365 Jake's</td>
<td>4245 Bayou Bar &amp; Grill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4417 Jamey's</td>
<td>4247 Mainly Desserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4439 U.S. Bar &amp; Grill</td>
<td>4328 Pitchers Pub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4452 Mom's Pizza</td>
<td>4328 Sip &amp; Steaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4460 Pasta Delthia</td>
<td>4348 Hikaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4365 Jakes Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4382 Café Zesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4386 Main Street Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4411 Sonoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4417 Kansas City Prime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4421 Volare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4425 Kodiak Cafè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4427 Grasshopper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4439 US Bar &amp; Grill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4452 Mom's Bake at Home Pizza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D Retail Establishments from 1989 that were present in 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4001</td>
<td>Delaware Valley Office Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001</td>
<td>Transamerica Office Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050</td>
<td>Gevurta Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050</td>
<td>Somnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4219</td>
<td>Geri DiBiase Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4323</td>
<td>Two by Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4324</td>
<td>Latitudes Craft Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4429</td>
<td>Performance Kitchens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4347</td>
<td>Polands Jewelers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373</td>
<td>Turtledove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4405</td>
<td>Beans Beauty Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4407</td>
<td>The Eyeglass Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4415</td>
<td>Alberta's Flowers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Establishments on Main Street in 1927

Manufacturing and Distribution
4015 United Gas Improvement Co
4048 Hrobak's Bottling
4100 Krook Carpet Yarn
4101 Littlewood Bleach Works
4101 Platt Bros. Yarn
4101 Sykes Carpet Yarns
4101 Littlewood Bleach Works
4101 Platt Bros. Yarn
4201 Schuylkill Navigation Company
4219 Lichten's Leather & Shoe Findings
4224 Manayunk Wagon Works
4241 Decker Harness Maker
4250 Imperial Textiles
4250 Kenny Boxes
4250 Lund Textiles
4250 Standard Shipping Box Co.

Retail
4026 Main Street Garage
4167 Hendzel
4178 Bertz Tire Shop
4207 Lefkovitch Grocers
4208 Chinici
4210 Aiello Grocers
4215 Manayunk Pharmacy
4220 Clark Barber
4225 Burgess
4227 Orliner
4228 Di Mauro Grocers
4239 Forster
4235 Creskoff Jewelers
4245 Bucko
4249 Mark
4249 Proctor
4250 Brofman Meats
4254 Weiss
4255 Fiedler Drugs
4258 McArdle Billiards
4259 Orliner Furniture
4266 Jacoby Shoes
4268 Schwartz Dresses
4307 Parisian Dress Shop
4309 McCarron Undertaker
4311 Graski, saloon
4325 Chappell Paints
4326 Rosenfeld Dry Goods
4327 Ost Variety
4329 Parris Meats
4330 Quality Fish Market
4331 Haeblerin Bros. Food
4333 Schofield & Bradshaw Dry Goods
4335 Fashion Boot Store
4335 Sarapin Shoes
4337 Galanter- Clothing
4340 Manayunk Trust Company
4343 NE Reif - Dry Goods
4344 Curcio Garage
4345 Maurer Hardware
4347 Poland Jewelers
4349 Milne, Hatter
4351 LeBright, Undertaker
4353 Cavanaugh Cigars
4359 Gorenstein Dry Goods
4359 Snyderman Dry Goods
4363 Brandeis Department Store
4364 Forster Department Store
4367 Banham Cigars
4367 Manayunk Garage
4373 Brofman's Mens Clothing
4373 Dave's Clothing
4376 Denardo, Tailors
4380 George Shoe Shine
4384 Seager Photographer
4388 Little Jewelers
4401 Kerkeslager, Hatter
4405 Baer Shoes
4402 Römer, Cobbler
4406 Cigar Factory
4407 R & C Music Shop
4409 Welsh Miss, Needlework
4411 Gartman Furniture
4412 Manayunk Review
Establishments in 1969

Retail
4322  Sponheimer Ceramic & Candle Studio
4323  Westbrook Variety
4325  Bayne's Trains
4327  Ost. Louis Variety Store
4331  Main St Cold Cuts
4341  Main Drug Store
4343  Maurer Hardware
4346  Betty’s Thrift Shop
4347  Poland’s Jewelers
4357  Chick & Jim beer
4367  Rose’s Drugstore
4382  Manayunk Market
4402  Stan’s Furniture
4410  Knopf Beer
4415  Alberta's Flower Shop
4417  Joe’s Stop & Shop
4432  DiGiovanni Furniture
4433  Haber Bros. Kitchens
4453  State Liquor Store

Services
4217  Mayer W., elec. contractors
4266  Decker J., Upholsterer
4320  O’Connor, James, Barber
4321  Miller, DDS
4324  Curcio Garage
4337  Helen’s Hair Styles
4352  Manayunk Saving & Loan
4359  Lipschutz, Optometrist
4422  Tip Top Auto Repair
4430  Auto Radiator Service
4248  Frank’s Billiard Room
4363  Atlantis Diving Center
4441  Kaleidoscope Theater
4386  Conshohocken Recorder
4386  InterCounty Publishing
4386  Manayunk Review
4386  The Review
4386  Valley Forge Sentinel
4412  Reichert, Printers

Manufacturers and Distributors
4018  Abbot Wiping Cloth Co.
4050  Data Press Inc.
4074  Edwards Engineering
4100  Littlewood & Son Dye Works Corp.
4100  Acme Wire Machine Co.
4100  Baar Products Co
4120  Krook Robert Inc. Carpet Yarn
4150  Ameray Corp
4150  Tenaco Corp
4162  Jefferson Electric Corp
4169  Miller Plumbing Supply
4178  Allied Oil & Chemical Corp
4178  Woodway Manufacturing Co
4178  Glenn Killian Color Co
4232  Howards Glass Works
4236  Textile Fiber Processors
4247  Wood Manufacturing Co
4319  Jetronic Industries Inc
4319  Delta Coils
4334  Fire Retarding Corp
4340  Acme Fire Hazard Removers
4368  Connelly Containers
4369  Diversified Vending
4380  Yale Industries Inc.
4413  Andrien Auto Parts
4458  Advance Transformer
4461  Container Corp of America

Restaurants
4365  Bluestein Bagel Bakery
4390  Ideal Lunch
4457  Mom’s Pizza bakery
4439  D G’s Bar
4105  Serbin’s Luncheonette
4361  Lou’s Luncheonette
### Appendix F: Vacancies on Main Street, July 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working class.................................................................1, 9, 35, 38, 41, 58
Zoning regulations.............................................................3, 11