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We believe that everyone should have a decent place in which to live and raise their children ... a goal which most Americans have achieved and take for granted.

statement by the Edgemont Community Council, Durham Morning Herald, July 6, 1966.

We must make sure that every family in America lives in a home of dignity and a neighborhood of pride and a community of opportunity and a city of promise and hope.

Lyndon Baines Johnson
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About The Paper

The two sections of this study are both inter-related and independent. The first section surveys the housing situation for Durham County, based partly on a report by Morton Hoffman and Company entitled *Housing Needs of Low- and Moderate-Income Households in Durham, 1967-1975*, plus the author's own investigations and interviews. In this section is also included a discussion of housing as a political and controversial issue, and the political involvements of housing interests. The second section, which like the first may be read separately, views the role which Duke University has played in Durham housing.

The primary motivation for the author is a desire to influence the kind of impact which Duke has in the area of housing. The paper is an attempt to indicate both the seriousness of Durham's problem and the involvement of Duke in it -- and it is here that the two sections correlate. In making a case for more sensitivity to the problem on the part of the University, the author hopes to show that Duke is already heavily participating -- the question is whether it will exert a progressive force. The recommendations at the end of the second section are meant to help point the way towards such a redirection of policy -- a policy which takes into account community interests as well as institutional interests. If universities fail to exhibit conscience in their activities, they can hardly expect their students to do so.
Introduction: Housing

A few weeks ago, Newsweek reported that the United States is in the midst of the worst housing shortage in twenty years. The national vacancy rate is predicted to have dropped to a critically low 2.4 per cent, while building costs and rents are sky-rocketing. Middle-class house-hunters are faced with very high interest rates, huge down-payments, and land prices which have more than tripled since 1950. The Housing Act of 1968 was designed to provide some relief for the poor, but it is "becoming bogged down in indecision and uncertainty."¹

Last year, the Kerner Commission—finding housing needs critical—recommended "provision of 600,000 low and moderate-income housing units next year, and six million over the next five years."² According to Newsweek, the nation's 65 million dwellings must be doubled in the next 25 years.

Low-income families were found by the Kerner Commission to be suffering most acutely from the housing shortage. Many simply cannot pay the rents necessary for decent housing. Racial discrimination is an important factor. While 8 per cent of all whites occupied substandard housing in 1960, 25 per cent of non-white central-city residents lived in such dwellings. Discrimination is further felt in higher rents, housing-code enforcement, and other areas. Even so, two-thirds of the nation's substandard units were occupied by whites in 1960.³
Section I: THE DURHAM HOUSING PROBLEM
Introduction: Durham

Durham has provided resources for making a number of people rich. Among the early group of Durham rich were Washington and James Duke, who mechanized the tobacco industry and built a powerful monopoly. They were also a part of another industry which has brought wealth to Durham citizens: cotton. The mills were originally built to manufacture bags for tobacco and later branched out into other areas. More recently, Durham has "produced" some of America's first black millionaires through North Carolina Mutual, the largest black-owned insurance company in the world, Mechanics and Farmers Bank, and Mutual Savings and Loan.

Despite these financial successes, the city suffers from "absentee ownership and absentee top management"—since many firms have grown and moved their headquarters to large industrial centers. City figures show that exclusive of the universities, out-of-state ownership and control account for over 80% of local industrial employment. Out-of-town and out-of-state business and clergy dominate the Board of Trustees of the area's largest employer--Duke University (including Duke Hospital). In addition, outside groups own a significant portion of the downtown retail establishments, and more than 95 per cent of the commercial banking interests are headquartered elsewhere. While the rich have often moved on, the poor remain here—and behind.

The economy of Durham has grown in the 1960's with the expansion of research, educational institution, government, and hospitals. Employment by these segments increased over 50 percent.
between 1960 and 1967, encompassing one-third of the total labor force of Durham County by 1967, and is expected to increase another 50 percent by 1975. Manufacturing during the same period showed slight growth in employment (though not in its share of wages) and is expected to continue about the same.\textsuperscript{7}

While the population of Durham County increased by only 10 per cent in the 1950's, the early 1960's saw a much greater growth—over 18 per cent between 1960 and 1967, reaching a total by July 1, 1967 of 132,300. The projections predict quite an increase. Population of both the city and the county is expected to rise by over 23 per cent by 1975: 119,400 and 163,600 respectively. The percentage of non-white population has been decreasing slightly. From 33.3 per cent in 1950 to 31 per cent in 1967, it is projected to be about 30 per cent in 1975.\textsuperscript{8}

Durham has not experienced such fast growth since the early part of this century, and the economic implications are unclear. Business interests have benefitted from the slower pace of the last three or four decades. Durham has historically attracted untrained workers from farms and maintained excess labor supplies, which have contributed to low wages. One study indicates that the business interests have been active in discouraging new investors.\textsuperscript{9} Poor and working-class residents have not been among the beneficiaries of these policies and conditions.

As are all cities, Durham is faced with many problems, many of them related to poverty. In the decade of the 1960's more attention than ever before has been focused on America's poor.
Although the United States is the richest nation in the world, many of its citizens live in poverty. Michael Harrington estimated in 1962 that one-fourth of the population lived below a decent standard of living. While he used $4000 per year as the dividing line for poverty families, a 1964 study for the North Carolina Fund chose $3000 as the measure of "hard-core poverty" in North Carolina--preferring the lower figure because of the state's rural nature and lower costs. This study showed that 37.2 per cent of the state's residents have incomes below $3000 per year (50.6 per cent made less than $4000 in 1959).

Durham actually ranks high in North Carolina with only 25.6 per cent of its residents having incomes below $3000 in 1960. Yet, with a medium income of $4876 the city has many people living on the critical edge of poverty; and these figures must be measured against the higher costs of urban living.

Recently, the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics undertook a detailed study of living costs in 39 cities across the nation. It indicates the relatively high prices of this vicinity. (Since the study is based on 1967 figures, present costs are actually some 7 to 7½ per cent higher than the quoted numbers indicate.) Durham falls in the last half of the list--the cost of maintaining a four-member family with a high standard of living here is only 81 per cent of the cost in New York City and 77 per cent of the cost in Honolulu (see Table I). However, for Durham's poor, the story is different. Living at a low standard of living here costs 94 per cent of what it costs in New York and 81 per cent of what it costs to live in Honolulu, where shipping costs raise the
It's no secret that city life is expensive these days, but last week the government spelled out just how expensive it can be. In Washington, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released detailed figures on what it costs to maintain a low, a modest but adequate and a relatively high standard of living in 39 cities across the nation.

Working from a mountain of figures compiled in 1967, the bureau’s statisticians applied detailed price information to a mythical standard family composed of a 38-year-old breadwinner, his wife of fifteen years (and full-time housewife), a 13-year-old son and an 8-year-old daughter.

At the lowest level, the family lives in rented quarters, owns an eight-year-old car, gets a good portion of its protein from dried beans and has a minuscule recreation allowance. The cost of living such a life is uniformly higher than the official poverty level of $3,335. But the new figure, explains a BLS aide, is still a budget for “a self-respecting family.” At the upper level, in contrast, 95 per cent of the families own their homes and 60 per cent are buying new cars.

Honolulu turned out to be the most expensive surveyed place to live—principally because shipping costs escalate prices. On the national average, the income required to support the BLS’s three standards of living came to $5,918, $9,076 and $13,050 as of 1967. Since then, inflation has fattened the figures by 7 to 7.5 per cent, with costs on the low-budget scale rising most sharply.

### TABLE I: Cost of Living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>$7,216</td>
<td>$10,502</td>
<td>$16,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>9,977</td>
<td>14,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>9,737</td>
<td>14,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>13,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco-Oakland</td>
<td>6,571</td>
<td>9,774</td>
<td>14,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>6,093</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td>14,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>5,104</td>
<td>9,544</td>
<td>13,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>6,520</td>
<td>9,550</td>
<td>13,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis-St. Paul</td>
<td>6,053</td>
<td>9,399</td>
<td>13,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Rapids, Iowa</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>9,358</td>
<td>13,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>6,104</td>
<td>9,334</td>
<td>13,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>6,305</td>
<td>9,326</td>
<td>13,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign-Urbana, Ill.</td>
<td>6,237</td>
<td>9,257</td>
<td>13,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>9,262</td>
<td>12,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>6,124</td>
<td>9,232</td>
<td>13,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>9,273</td>
<td>13,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Maine</td>
<td>5,591</td>
<td>9,105</td>
<td>12,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>9,140</td>
<td>12,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>6,032</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>13,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>5,905</td>
<td>9,630</td>
<td>13,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>5,883</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>13,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td>8,331</td>
<td>12,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay, Wis.</td>
<td>5,797</td>
<td>8,955</td>
<td>12,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Mo.</td>
<td>5,677</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>12,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster, Pa.</td>
<td>5,652</td>
<td>8,820</td>
<td>12,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kans.</td>
<td>5,726</td>
<td>8,907</td>
<td>12,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield, Calif.</td>
<td>5,729</td>
<td>8,522</td>
<td>12,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>5,902</td>
<td>8,926</td>
<td>12,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>5,871</td>
<td>8,884</td>
<td>12,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>8,065</td>
<td>12,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, N.C.</td>
<td>5,570</td>
<td>8,065</td>
<td>12,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>5,586</td>
<td>8,365</td>
<td>12,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>5,597</td>
<td>8,323</td>
<td>11,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>8,438</td>
<td>12,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>5,637</td>
<td>8,345</td>
<td>12,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>12,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>8,301</td>
<td>11,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, Fla.</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>8,227</td>
<td>12,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>11,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Newsweek, March 31, 1969*
prices of everything considerably. In short, it only costs $450 more per year to maintain a low standard of living in New York than in Durham. These prices hit very hard on low-income persons, since North Carolina is tied with Mississippi for last place in average industrial wages (although it ranks 13th in industrial production). New industries in the state are not helping, since two-thirds of the new industrial jobs between 1960 and 1965 (75,000 total) paid lower than the North Carolina average industrial wage, $1.82 an hour.

One factor which is contributing heavily to this situation is housing shortages and costs. While housing is a problem which is effecting all segments of the Durham population, it impinges most heavily on low-income persons. An official city report in 1968 described the housing situation as "tight." Making this analysis more clear, an exhaustive housing study completed that same year predicts a shortage by 1975 of 4600 to 5200 units.

The purpose of this section is to explore the recent history of housing in Durham, to determine the present conditions, and to propose a few possible remedies.
Durham Housing Conditions in the 60's

The 1960 Census provides a good point of departure for examination of Durham housing in the 1960's. Table II illustrates succinctly the 1960 condition; a detailed description from the Morton Hoffman study appears in that report. Briefly, of the 32,994 housing units in Durham County in 1960, 29.0 of them were substandard—7,612 of these 9,554 were classified as unsound, the remainder lacked plumbing facilities. Renter-

* A standard house is defined in this paper as one in sound condition with all plumbing facilities; a substandard unit is anything else. Other definitions are as follows:

The Census defines a "housing unit" as "A house, an apartment or other group of rooms, or a single room ... when it is occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters, that is when the occupants do not live and eat with any other persons in the structure and there is either (1) direct access from the outside or through a common hall, or (2) a kitchen or cooking equipment for the exclusive use of the occupants of the unit. The occupants of a housing unit may be a family or other group of persons, or a person living alone." For more information, refer to the Introduction in the census volumes cited.

Unsound and/or lacking plumbing facilities. This category combines two kinds of information on the quality of the housing units: the general condition as estimated by the individual census enumerator and the plumbing facilities. The census enumerator classified the housing unit into one of three categories: (1) sound, (2) deteriorating, and (3) dilapidated. The plumbing facilities which were looked at were: water supply, toilet facilities, and bathing facilities. To be considered as having all plumbing facilities the housing unit had to have hot and cold water inside the structure, and a flush toilet and bathtub (or shower) inside the structure for the exclusive use of the occupants of the unit. To get the figures in the tables, the number of housing units (both occupied and unoccupied) which were sound with all plumbing facilities was subtracted from the total number of housing units (both occupied and unoccupied). Therefore, a housing unit might be classified as sound by the enumerator yet lack some plumbing facility and thus fall into the category. Similarly, a housing unit may fall into the category if its plumbing was adequate but the structure itself had been
occupied units accounted for 49 per cent of the total and 56.5 dwellings in the city. Over 14 per cent of the units in the county and in the city were classified as overcrowded. The age of Durham’s houses is another negative factor, since 51.1 of the 1960 occupied units were built before 1939 (see Table A-2 in Appendix of Morton Hoffman Report).

Changes in the housing situation since 1960 resulted from new building, demolitions, and vacancy increases. Tables III and IV reveal the picture as of 1967. (More detailed information is again available in Hoffman). New construction (as reflected by building permits) continually increased during this period. The annual number of permits issued between 1960 and 1964 averaged 1,011; the number jumped to 1,698 for 1965-66, with a record high of 1,794 in 1965. For 1967, the last year included in the Morton Hoffman survey, 1,780 permits were issued for residential building. As shown in Table V, building in 1968 topped the 1965 figure; and the rate for 1969 is even higher for the first four months.

Urban renewal has been and continues to be the largest demolisher of houses; highway construction and other public and private actions have also contributed. In all, approximately 3000-plus dwelling units have been demolished in Durham County classified as either “deteriorating” or “dilapidated.” For any further information on this category, one should refer to the Introduction of the census volumes cited above.

An overcrowded occupied housing unit is defined as one with an average of 1.01 persons or more per room. This does not take into consideration the size of the rooms.

Source: A Profile of Community Problems: Durham, Table V.
(definition of terms on preceding page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>North Carolina</th>
<th>Durham County</th>
<th>Durham City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Housing Units, occ. and unocc.</td>
<td>58,326</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsound condition and/or Lacking plumbing facilities</td>
<td>15,168</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>567,909</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of occupied housing units</td>
<td>53,023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded units</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>207,234</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of unoccupied dwellings (per cent is unocc./total # occ. &amp; unocc.)</td>
<td>5,342</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>118,242</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TABLE II:** Housing, 1960
from January, 1960, through April, 1969, according to the best information available to this author.

Morton Hoffman report shows that the vacancy rate more than doubled between 1950 and 1960 (see Hoffman, p56); but even so, the 1960 figure was low. They estimate that by 1967 the rate had dropped slightly, with the vacant units totally 1,350. However, only 650 units were classified as available vacancies—the rest being seasonal or vacational units or dwellings not for rent or sale by the owner. Considering the present housing situation in Durham, the author suggests that the vacancy rate has at best remained the same—probably no more than 750 units are presently vacant and available. Even though building has increased substantially; over 85% of the available vacant units in 1967 were renter-occupiable dwellings, for example—and it is this type of housing that is most sought by Duke undergraduates living off-campus, whose numbers have more than tripled in the last two years.

Presently, according to the Morton Hoffman figures and the 1968-69 statistics set forth above, the author estimates there are approximately 41,500 units of housing in Durham County. The figure for the city is estimated at over 31,000.

In keeping with the national pattern, Durham's poorer residents are hard-hit by housing problems. Federal standards set 25 per cent as maximum of income which any person or family should have to pay for shelter.15 Higher payments mean less money for other essentials. Table VI shows that the 1960 medium rent-income ratio for Durham County was 22 per cent. But over
### TABLE III: Housing, 1967

**DURHAM COUNTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units built from 1960-67</th>
<th>1-family</th>
<th>2-family</th>
<th>Multi-family</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>6228 (cnty)</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2761</td>
<td>9429</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>10,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(city)</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>2431</td>
<td>4444</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>5,244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vacant, 1967 | 351 | 154  | 505       | 145   | 650  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demolished</th>
<th>Owner-occupied</th>
<th>Renter-occupied</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Construction</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public-private acts</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Causes</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED 1967 HOUSING SUPPLY:** 39,400

- **a/** Comprised of 244 Duke student housing units and 556 public housing units
- **b/** Based on building permits
- **c/** The first two figures come from a Durham Postal Vacancy survey; the last one is an estimate by Morton Hoffman experts.
- **d/** An estimate by Morton Hoffman from data supplied by the Durham Redevelopment Commission.

TABLE IV.

CONDITION AND PLUMBING FACILITIES
OF THE OCCUPIED HOUSING SUPPLY
DURHAM COUNTY
1960 AND ESTIMATED 1967

Substandard = Dilapidated Or
Lacking Facilities

Morton Hoffman And Company
Urban And Economic Consultants
Chart I, following p. 57

Note: Use of terms in this chart differs slightly from the way
the author uses them: deficient here is used in the way
substandard is used in this paper.
TABLE V: Housing: (1968 - April, 1969)

DURHAM COUNTY

A. Building Permits Issued by the City of Durham and Durham County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>One-family</th>
<th>Two-family</th>
<th>Multi-family</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(thru April)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>359</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(thru April)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>817</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1968 Total</strong></td>
<td>916</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1969 Total</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td>2658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Supplied to author by Building Inspection offices of Durham County and the City of Durham

B. Housing Units Demolished in Durham County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Renewal project #</th>
<th>R-16</th>
<th>R-17</th>
<th>R-26</th>
<th>R-41</th>
<th>R-52</th>
<th>R-54</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All demolitions</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>(929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Residential</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # units residential</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highway Construction b/ (4 different projects, approx=) 200

Other Demolitions:
- Duke University c/ (for new construction plus old houses in poor shape) 55
- Natural causes d/ 90

**TOTAL Units**: 1020
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1968</th>
<th></th>
<th>1969</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>817</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td>1217</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 Total</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
<td>768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1321</td>
<td></td>
<td>2658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Supplied to author by Building Inspection offices of Durham County and the City of Durham

B. Housing Units Demolished in Durham County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Renewal</th>
<th>R-16</th>
<th>R-17</th>
<th>R-26</th>
<th>R-41</th>
<th>R-52</th>
<th>R-54</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>project #</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(929)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All demolitions</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Residential</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # units</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highway Construction (4 different projects, approx=) 200

Other Demolitions:
- Duke University (for new construction plus old houses in poor shape) 55
- Natural causes 90
- Public-private acts

TOTAL Units 1020

---

a/ Interview with Turner Gray, Redevelopment Commission. The percentages are his estimates.

b/ Interview with Mr. Thacker, State Highway Commission. The figures represent a rough estimate by the author based on information from the interview.

c/ Estimate by the author based on his research. Refer to paper on Duke housing.

d/ No new figures for these categories are available. The author estimates that the 1968-69 numbers are about the same as the yearly averages for 1960-67, and this is substantiated by remarks of Redevelopment Commission officials.
40 percent of Durham renters paid at least 25 per cent of their incomes for housing, and one-fourth paid over 35 per cent. The greatest burden fell on households with annual incomes of less than $3000. Eighty-three per cent of those making less than $2000 per year spent over 35 per cent of their incomes for shelter, with 25 per cent of those making $2000 to $2999 spending the same amount.

1960 census figures reveal the close relation of poor housing to income and race. Four of the city's twenty census tracts had medium incomes at the $3000 poverty level, and 60 per cent of the units in these areas were substandard. For the nine tracts whose medium income was below the city level of $4673, over 40 per cent of the units fell below standards. Low- and moderate-income households occupy disproportionately renter housing (72 per cent), and even a higher percentage (83.6) of renter units classified as substandard. Striking differences are evident along racial lines, as well as economic: 78.9 per cent (still 1960) of non-white housing qualified as substandard, as compared to 27.6 for whites. Age is greater in both non-white and renter-occupied units, over 65 per cent for both built before 1939 (51.1 is the city-wide figure); for non-white renter-occupied housing the figure is 72.8. The figures below sum it up:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LOW INCOME</th>
<th>(see Table VII for limits)</th>
<th>MODERATE INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>the percentage of persons</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at these income levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>living in substandard units</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or having a rent/income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ratio greater than 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Morton Hoffman, Chart 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Under</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Less than 10%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>12.2%</th>
<th>15.0%</th>
<th>16.0%</th>
<th>22.3%</th>
<th>28.6%</th>
<th>35.9%</th>
<th>43.2%</th>
<th>50.5%</th>
<th>57.8%</th>
<th>65.1%</th>
<th>72.4%</th>
<th>79.7%</th>
<th>87.0%</th>
<th>94.3%</th>
<th>100.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,960</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,980</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,990</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,024</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.29%</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1960

DURHAM COUNTY

BY 1959 HOUSEHOLD INCOME

RENT-INCOME RATIO OF RENTER HOUSEHOLDS

Source: U.S. Census of Housing, Metropolitan Housing Study.
Makeshift Efforts Towards Improvement
for Low- and Moderate-Income Households

Durham's housing problems have demanded some response from community leaders. Most of the improvement efforts which have been made to date are directed towards low- and moderate-income persons. (The limits used by this author for the terms "low- and moderate-income households" are illustrated in Table VII.) The measures thus far used or offered by governmental agencies for relief of housing problems include public housing, housing-code enforcement, rehabilitation of substandard units, and various financial assistance programs. In addition, a few private ventures have been attempted.

The City of Durham is presently operating 1529 units of public housing, counting the E. Main street project to be completed by Fall (see Table VIII). Over 60 per cent of them are two-bedroom or less, even though 35-40 per cent of the applications in early 1968 were for three bedrooms or more. In its recent construction, the Housing Authority has planned more larger units. However, in two recent acquisitions--D. U. student housing and Morreene Road Apartments, built originally for Duke students--the authority picked up 336 units of efficiencies and one- and two-bedrooms. The medium number of bedrooms is 2.1.

Income limits for regular admission to public housing correspond to the 1967 low-income figures in Table VII. Limits for continued occupancy, as well as admission limits for households displaced by government action are $4,125 for one or two persons,
TABLE VII

CUT-OFF POINT FOR LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS
BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE
DURHAM COUNTY
ESTIMATED 1960 AND 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Household</th>
<th>Low Income 1960</th>
<th>Moderate Income 1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>$3,100</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Persons in Household</th>
<th>Low Income 1967</th>
<th>Moderate Income 1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>5,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Estimated by Morton Hoffman and Company.
Table 25, p. 61.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year Open</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 or more</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-1 Few Gardens</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-2 McDougald Terrace</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-3 McDougald Terrace</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-4 Gary Street*</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-5 Fayetteville Street</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-7 Cornwallis Street</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-13 Morreene Rd</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-14 D.U. Married Students Hsg</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-16 Hoover Rd **</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC 13-6 E. Main St *</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PER CENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>36.20.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* for elderly only
** to be occupied by Fall

Two more projects are under construction: a 107-unit building on Liberty Street and a 77-unit one on Club Boulevard.

Source: Durham Housing Authority; Morton Hoffman charts 32 & 36.
$4,500 for three or four, and $4,875 for five or more. Because of the unavailability of housing; no one is forced to leave until they can find other living quarters.

Public housing units are not adequate to meet community need, according to Morton Hoffman. In 1968, the average waiting period for admission was two and one-half years, although households displaced by government action can usually obtain a space in a few months.

Rents have been a constant subject of contention. Morton Hoffman reports that between 1964 and 1966 medium income of tenants decreased slightly while the rents continued to rise. The Housing Committee for preparing the Model Cities program suggests that public housing rents are "excessive."

Recently, the Durham NAACP charged the Housing Authority with discrimination in handling applications for the new E. Main Street project--charges denied by Director Carvio Oldham. Oldham himself has been the center of controversy for several years, with leaders from all segments of the black community supporting demands for his dismissal. Further details about complaints will be given in another section of this paper.

Two projects recently have been sponsored by non-profit groups directed at aiding moderate- (and higher) income families. The Lincoln Park Apartments, sponsored by the Lincoln Hospital Foundation, Inc., provides 150 units for moderate-income households, with rents ranging from $60 for one bedroom to $74 for three.
Another non-profit group--Durham Homes, Inc.--is sponsoring the construction and sale (at cost) of single-family dwellings at approximately $15,000 each. The group, spearheaded by such persons as Mary Seamans and Floyd Fletcher, is cooperating with the United Organizations for Community Improvement to make at least half the units available for moderate-income families. Construction of the first group is expected to be completed in two or three weeks.  

Both these programs are benefiting from Federal financial assistance. The primary assistance to home-buyers in Unity Village (the site for Durham Homes) is the regular FHA loan. Lincoln Park was built with below-market-interest rate loans made possible through Section 221(d)(3) of Federal legislation. (More details about various government-assistance programs are given in another section.) A Raleigh developer has just announced plans to initiate another 221(d)(e) project in Durham.  

Urban Renewal programs have been criticized throughout the country for destroying more than improving. Eugene Hampton, a black citizen with a lengthy record of involvement in housing problems, gave this description of Durham's program:

Durham is perhaps the epitome of the adage, "Urban Renewal is Negro Removal." A decent home in a suitable environment for every American family: In Durham that goal didn't just get lost in the shuffle, it wasn't there to start with.

He goes on to delineate how Urban Renewal has doubled the number of families in excess of the housing supply. There are presently
two programs underway in Durham which seek to reverse the de-
struction by rehabilitating existing houses.

The North Carolina College project encompasses an area of 492 units, of which nearly 350 are slated for improvements and 140 for demolition. As of April, 1969, 197 units had been re-
habilitated—either brought up to city code standards or Federal standards, which are higher (and cost more for rehabilitation). The program is being administered by the Redevelopment Commission, which seeks to act as a liaison between home-owners (three-fourths of the units are owner-occupied) and Federal assistance agencies.

Walltown Code Enforcement Project is city-administered. Through a grant from the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the program has placed in the area six full-time workers (inspectors, clerk, etc.) and three neighborhood aids. By April 30, 1969, 44 units had been brought up to city code. Write-ups, giving the present condition and outlining the needed improvements, had been completed for 174 houses.

Financing for both these projects comes primarily from two Federal programs: Section 312 loans and Section 115 grants. (Section II provides additional information about these and other government programs.) Home-owners can obtain loans from HUD for up to $10,000 at 3 per cent interest, payable over 20 years. For persons with incomes under $3000, direct grants are available for up to $3000. Grants for the two projects have been averaging about $2500—slightly higher for N. C. C. and less for Walltown. Mr. Holmes reports that no monies have been available
from HUD for several months and will not be again until July 1. The Walltown project is aimed towards bringing the houses up to city code standards, although they encourage owners to make additional improvements. The average cost runs about $5000. In the N. C. C. project, costs are somewhat higher, since the improvements are intended to raise the houses to Federal minimums. As Mr. Holmes points out, the city code is actually very low.

The Housing Code of the City of Durham seems to offer one important means of upgrading Durham housing, but this author has found little evidence that it has. The full code is presented in Appendix IV; the following summary is an explanation of the code and its operation given by City Inspector John Parham:

When a house has been inspected and does not meet the standards of the Housing Code, a notice is sent to the owner enumerating the repairs which are needed and giving a specific period of time in which those repairs are to be made (the length of time is left to the discretion of the inspector). At the expiration of that time, the house is re-inspected, a notice of hearing before the Building Inspector is sent. After the hearing, a final order is written with a second time limit set for the completion of the repairs. At the expiration of this period, if the repairs still have not been made, Parham sends a report to the Public Works Committee, which is composed of one-half the City Council members, for its consideration to the City Council. Three alternatives are available: 1) a grant of an additional amount if the city feels the owner is attempting to bring the house or houses up to standard, 2) a decision to have the city repair the house or houses and charge the owner for the repairs, or 3) a recommendation that the house or houses be declared unfit for human habitation and an order issued to vacate and close them. Parham stated that the second alternative has never been used by the city and probably won't be used. Apparently there is some legal problem involved since no clarification of the
In its Model Cities Application to HUD, the city describes code enforcement as a very controversial problem. Tenants call for immediate and complete improvements, while landlords seek time extensions and complain about expense. After improvements are finally made, the tenant may come to regret it, since owners generally use the repairs as excuse to disproportionately raise rents. But repairs are not frequent, for as Parham admits, sending final notices and Public Works Committee action do not always occur. In response to a great deal of pressure building up around housing issues, Mayor Wense Grabarek pledged the city to action in 1966:

There is a shortage of suitable low rent housing in Durham at the present. Thursday, the public works committee called the land owners in and gave them 60 days in which to comply with the code rather than close the houses down and worsen the situation.

We are doing every thing we can to bring all the houses in Durham up to standard. We have hired extra inspectors to help speed up the inspection process.

As has been shown, the present conditions do not reflect this intensified action by the city. Several of the efforts described in this section are positive ones, but the problem requires more concentrated and generalized attack.
Note: Final approval came in June, 1969 for a low-cost housing project backed by a non-profit corporation to be composed of the congregations of five Durham churches: St. Luke's Episcopal, Ebenezer Baptist, Society of Friends, Unitarian-Universalist Fellowship, and Church of the Immaculate Conception (Roman Catholic). This effort will be financed with federal assistance and may provide a model of the types of non-governmental programs required to relieve the present crisis.
Housing as a Political Issue

Housing has provided a frequent arena for political controversy and confrontation, particularly in the last four years. Its prominence is closely related to increased political activism among blacks—particularly among poor blacks. The Durham Committee on Negro Affairs—active since 1935 and dominated by wealthier blacks—was successful by the mid-1950’s in obtaining such improvements as street paving, shells and parks, primarily for the middle class Negro areas; and they joined with white liberals to win approval for the first public housing venture.

With the exception of infrequent and mild protest about housing discrimination, the issue remained fairly dormant until picked up by newly-formed neighborhood organizations of poor blacks in the mid-1960’s.

One of the first specific issues to arise centered around the Durham Housing Authority’s attempt to oust Mrs. Joyce Thorpe from McDougald Terraces. While no reason was given for the action, she felt it came as a direct result of her election two days earlier as president of the new tenants council. Her case drew attention throughout the black community and intensified interest in housing problems. (After a long series of legal battles, her eviction was finally overruled by the U. S. Supreme Court in 1968.)

The Edgemont Community was the scene of the next major controversy. Here, activity began first among a white council, which had been formed by a Vista worker. Abe Greenberg, owner
of 43 houses in the neighborhood, formed the center of the controversy. Soon after he purchased the last 21 of these units in September, 1965, and raised the rents substantially—the neighborhood council complained to him and to the City Council about the conditions of their houses. After increased pressure, the city declared the houses substandard, but no improvements were made.

High rents and influx of blacks sent many of the whites off to other areas. In April, 1966, the issue was revived by a now-black community council. The residents compiled a list of needed repairs and renewed complaints to the City Council, even going to the meetings as did their predecessors. Finally, they began picketing Greenberg. Greenberg came under a great deal of pressure from city leaders who wanted to keep the city quiet, and in June (1966) he promised repairs within 90 days. At the conclusion of this period—having done almost nothing, Greenberg asked the City Council for an extension of 60 days. The Council's acceptance of this delay seemed to deflate the energies of the residents, who took no further action.

Other community councils were being formed in black neighborhoods, and the next summer code-enforcement was again expressed as a concern. About 150 persons from these councils appeared at the July 17 City Council meeting to promote enforcement. At the same meeting, another group of blacks—home-owners and mostly employees of North Carolina College—came to protest the rezoning of their neighborhood for construction of a public housing project.
The poor blacks joined forces with them to oppose creation of a public-housing ghetto (all the projects to date had been located in that same section of the city).

This Bacon Street controversy soon became tied in with another public-housing issue: the purchase of Damar Court Apartments on Morreene Road for public housing and the subsequent sale of nearby Duke Married Student Housing for the same purpose. After a summer of great tension and even a few days of National Guard occupation, the Bacon Street project was finally dropped. The purchases of the other two apartment complexes broke the pattern of "ghettoization." However, Duke's avowed altruistic motives have since come under suspicion, as the financial advantages have become more clear. (This topic is further explored in the section on Duke.) In any case, the Married Student Housing sale eliminated a potentially-interesting experiment in co-existence for poor and middle-class persons.

One outcome of the "hot summer" was a series of grievances presented by black representatives to local officials. Demands closely related to housing issues were prominent on the list:

**Public Housing:**

1. Appoint more Negroes and several tenants to the Housing Authority.
2. Dismiss Carvie Oldham (DHA director).
3. Revise public housing utility allowance and end "excess utility bills."
4. Frequent meetings of tenants and the DHA Director.

**Other Housing Issues:**

1. Fully enforce housing code.
2. Appoint poor to Redevelopment Commission.
3. End relocation in substandard housing of families displaced by Urban Renewal.
4. Adopt special housing tribunal rent withholding law, licensing of landlords, and landlords.
The Bacon Street and Damar Court decisions represented the only major victories for the blacks, and these came after long battles involving many resources. In addition, the city agreed to the frequent meetings (later rescinded in 1968), closed a few substandard houses, and added some street lights and stop signs.

Most of the issues were left unanswered, and they were again raised in July, 1968, with the initiation of the Selective Buying campaign by the Black Solidarity Committee, a coalition group composed of all segments of Durham's black community. They summarized their housing demands in a hand-out pamphlet:

**PRIVATE HOUSING**

Our city must provide decent safe and sanitary housing by adopting stricter Housing Code enforcement plan including the right for tenants to withhold rent while violations exist, a resolution in support of rent control and immediate destruction of condemned houses. Single family homes for low-income people must also be constructed.

**PUBLIC HOUSING**

Durham must move to relieve the conditions under which Public Housing tenants are forced to life. A Black Executive Director of Public Housing is a necessity along with a complete review and evaluation of personnel practices and the institution of all Federal Programs available to improve Public Housing. Larger bedroom units must be constructed.

With the suspension of the boycott in February, several committees—including one on housing—were formed, composed of businessmen and black representatives. Little has changed with regard to city action over the last few years.
Numerous factors contribute to the housing shortage here, and many of them are nation wide ones like inflation and racial discrimination. Yet, decision-makers are greatly at fault for lack of planning and failure to promote necessary improvement measures. It is the contention of this author that two characteristics of Durham officials help explain the reasons for this inaction: first, they are predominately businessmen, leaving poor and working-class citizens almost no members on City Council and other policy groups; and second, many of these officials are involved in real estate or other housing-related business. This section is intended to provide insights into Durham decision-making as it relates to housing. It is a conjectural analysis by the author, supported by observations of several persons closely involved in the city's recent history — such as Lawrence Kelly and Skip Bridges, Operation Breakthrough officials; John Strange, political scientist, formerly at Duke University and the North Carolina Fund; and Harry Boyte, ACT Community Organizer. The author also had helpful discussions with Dr. Jack J. Preiss, Duke sociologist and former Durham City Councilman, and William Pursell, North Carolina Low Income Housing Development Corporation official and past director of Operation Breakthrough. None of these persons necessarily share the authors conclusions.

Durham officials who might be called poor or working-class
are rare, if existant at all. Every member of the present City Council is listed in the Durham City Directory as an officer of a company except for C.E. Boulware, a North Carolina Central University professor, and Paul Alford, a confection stand operator.

The major economic forces in a community -- with whose money comes political power -- are generally the large industries and the banks. As is shown in the Introduction, almost all Durham industries and banks are absentee-owned; and thus they take little active interest in local politics. Duke University, being the area's largest employer and a major purchaser, also qualifies as a significant economic force; and it too refrains from frequent direct and open political activity. City politics are very often dominated by the major economic interests of an area, but this absentee ownership in Durham leaves somewhat of a void. This void has been filled by local businessmen, many involved in housing-related concerns, and they govern with the generally silent assent of larger economic institutions.

Seven members of the present City Council are employed in industries closely linked with housing: Tom Hunt, president of Hunt Construction Company; Mrs. R.O. Everett, whose family owns Poplar Apartments and several other large real estate tracts; Vance Fisher, secretary of Garland Woodcraft Co.; Allan Aldridge, president of Aldridge Realty and Insurance Co.; William T. Coman, vice-president of Coman Lumber Co.; Walter Biggs, president of Home Savings and Loan Assoc.; John Stewart, president of Mutual Savings and Loan Assoc. Others likely own real estate.
This fairly unusual situation is not new to Durham; six councilmen in 1965 and nine in 1967 had direct or indirect connections with these industries. The breakdown for the 1967 Council (quoting Dr. Strange) is as follows:

one lawyer who owns two apartment complexes as well as other real estate, two savings and loan presidents, one banker, one broker, one builder, two members associated with building supply concerns (one the president) and one insurance salesman. In addition the mayor's wife's family has extensive real estate interests in Durham.34

In a Fall, 1968, guest column in the Durham Morning Herald, Councilman J. J. Preiss (recently defeated for re-election) said that improvement programs have been undermined by "poor planning, denial of facts, and narrow self-interest."35 He went on to call for new sensitivity for housing problems and concluded:

The relationships among all the public agencies involved in housing should be thoroughly reviewed by the City Council in terms of possible re-organization of structures and responsibilities. . . . As a public official, I do not believe that governing bodies can, or should try, to delegate their responsibilities for policy leadership to other groups. . . . The heart of any progress is in the hands of the elected representatives of the people. I do not feel that we have, as yet, provided enough of that leadership.36

This vested interest crosses racial lines. The large black banking-investment-insurance group in Durham are large real estate holders. While they have sometimes sought such changes like the end to discrimination, these men have not supported sweeping code enforcement and other far-reaching measures. In the Bacon Street controversy, Asa Spaulding--millionaire and past president of North Carolina Mutual--spoke to the City Council in support of
the black demand to spread public housing across the city, but this did not threaten black real estate interests and would push integration forward. On the other hand, some observers feel that the compromise which black leaders negotiated to end the Greenberg-Edgemont controversy (see page 24) served to protect owners of "slum" housing and failed to accomplish much for the Edgemont residents; few significant repairs were made for the homes involved. Had Greenberg been forced to make large improvements, other substandard landlords (which included several blacks) would have likely come under similar pressure.

Besides the businessmen holding elected positions, other men involved in housing-related businesses seem to have substantial influence. The Nello Teer company seems to wield a great deal of influence. Abe Greenberg, whose style and startling financial growth have left him somewhat outside the "in-group establishment," is nevertheless a power not to be ignored. The recent formation of Teer and Greenberg, Ltd., bringing together these two powerful interests, will likely have a significant impact on Durham housing. Such large projects as the proposed Quail Ridge apartments on Highway 15-501 and Cornwallis Road may loosen up the tight market, profiting the Teer and Greenberg group at the expense of other realtors and construction firms.

In sum, no suggestion is made here of a conspiracy. To see real estate interests of decision-makers as the only reason for
Durham's housing problem, or to suppose that a city council of poor people would alleviate the crisis, are, of course, over-simplifications. There are times when better housing is initiated by, and benefits those in business. The implication is merely that significant attack on housing problems in Durham -- with a view towards helping the poor, who are most oppressed -- runs counter to the long-range self interest of housing-connected businessmen, who are so prominent in the City's political life and who presently benefit financially from a tight housing situation and high rents. The recent defeat of Dr. Preiss -- the most consistent and outspoken supporter of housing reforms -- and his replacement by another businessman, serves to strengthen their impact. And until some counter-veiling power can be exerted, as through the combined efforts of poor and working-class blacks and whites, the situation will likely continue.
Conclusion

The Morton Hoffman projections for Durham Housing are not rosy:

In conclusion, it is emphasized that the consultant views the provision of 4,600 to 5,200 low- and moderate-income units by 1975 in Durham County as conservative in relation to need, and achievable.37

They recommend the construction of 1,700 to 2,050 units—or 37-39 per cent of the projection—underway by 1970. Available statistics indicate Durham is presently falling far short of this goal. They also recommend rehabilitation of 200 to 250 units by 1970—a figure which is possible under the present programs. But they also recommend much larger programs for 1970-75. Since no applications seem underway presently, this goal seems totally unlikely to be reached.

A few bright spots are evident. Federally, some—if hardly enough—assistance is available; and the new fair housing section of the 1968 Civil Rights Act should loosen up the situation a little. Two provisions passed by the North Carolina legislature within the last two weeks also offer some hope. (The only information available thus far on these bills are short newspaper accounts.) The Durham Herald on May 16, reported the passage of a bill "which would allow Durham to provide financial assistance to those who are required to be relocated by municipal or governmental action." An even more significant measure is the $200 million program for low-income housing. The Herald described it in this way (May 21):
The bill would create the North Carolina Housing Corporation and empower it to issue up to $200 million in revenue bonds with which to make home purchase loans to low-income families.

Still, the housing picture for Durham appears gloomy for the years ahead. In light of the power-structure analysis, significant action on the part of city (or county) government seems unlikely. Private citizen groups hold the key to future improvement.
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Section II: DUKE UNIVERSITY AND HOUSING
Preface to Section II

The material in this section is based largely on the original research of the author. The information about Duke's property comes from the tax records of Durham County. The recommendations are developed from material in the Hoffman Report plus the particular laws themselves.

Several persons have provided valuable assistance. Mr. Gerhard Henricksen, (University Vice-President and Treasurer) and Mr. Larry Smith (Director of Housing) have been very patient with my questions and have provided much information. The survey of off-campus undergraduate living was carried out primarily by the efforts of Marcia Killacky, Peg O'Reilly, and Carolyn Prescott. Dr. Thomas Rainey made this whole study possible, and Joseph Martin provided many hours of work and advice.

The study was initiated through the YM-YWCA Community Concerns Committee, the chairmen for which during the time of this study have been James Riley, Peg O'Reilly, Henry Walker, and Nancy King.

Introduction

Duke University is a powerful force in Durham, even if it seeks to follow a "neutral" course. The University has not the choice of whether to become involved in local matters—of expending all its resources for "purely educational" ends; the only issue is what kind of influence the University will exert.

As the area's largest employer, Duke practically sets the pattern for wages. Duke's historically low pay scale helped to keep Durham's average wage small; and when the University granted significant raises to its employees last Spring, workers throughout the vicinity benefitted. Because of its interest in providing new research opportunities for university personnel (which would help in recruiting new faculty), Duke helped override the opposition of conservative local businessmen and enable the creation of Research Triangle Park. Thus, Duke's decisions about internal affairs may often have large repercussions in the community.

The emphasis in this paper is on Duke's policies which affect the Durham housing situation, as well as future actions the University might take to help alleviate the critical problems outlined in Section I.
Duke as a Durham Landowner

Duke has been a landowner (in addition to campus territory) as long as it has been a university, for over thirty years acquiring property primarily through donations and bequeathals of individuals. In 1964, the University became much more deeply involved in housing with the acquisition of over 150 lots from Erwin Mills (part of Burlington Industries). Including approximately 135-140 housing units, this property had an assessed value of $605,985 at that time. (Residential property in Durham is assessed at 75% of its value.) It more than quadrupled the University's property (excluding the two campuses and Duke Forest). Appendix I contains a listing of these properties and their values.

Duke's land is concentrated in two primary areas: (a) north of East Campus bordered by Buchanan Street and Sedgefield Street, Markham Street and Green Street; and (b) Campus Drive north to Erwin Road from Anderson to Oregon Street and including all the streets between them. Not all the land in these areas is owned by the University, but Mr. Henricksen attempts to buy it as it comes on the market. In addition to these properties, Duke owns some land close to Campus Drive on such streets as Faber, Power, Wilkerson, Gattis, Thaxton, and Maxwell. (c) (See the map.)

a. Behind East

Many houses in the area behind East Campus are not University owned. As they come on the market, according to Mr. G. C. Henricksen who is Vice-President and Treasurer, Duke attempts to buy them. Some of the residents have promised to will their
Mr. Henricksen explains that the University likes to have these houses for its students and faculty: "for example, when we have a visiting professor, it's nice to have these houses for him to use; also, some of our new faculty like to live in these houses the first year while they look for a place." He says he knows of no planned institutional use for this property.

The policy with regard to these properties is to try to keep them "in the family, so-to-speak." The only non-Duke personnel living in these units are original tenants from the time of Duke's purchases.

b. Between the campuses

Most of this land came from the Erwin Mills purchase. Some of the property in this area had been sold by the Mill to its employees, and Duke is buying it as it comes on the market. After acquiring the property, Duke continued to charge the same rents that the Mill had charged. According to Mr. Henricksen, these are very low since they were considered part of employee benefits by the Mill. Whenever the original tenant moves out, the rent is raised for the next renter.

The University prefers to use its houses for institutional purposes. Presumably, one reason is that they do not have to pay taxes on such property. Four dwelling units are being used for offices and six for storage.

The Master Plan for University expansion projects includes several buildings in this area. Married Student Housing is the
only project planned any time soon. Originally, it was planned
for the Bynum and Vance Street area but the typology of that
area forced the University to move the housing unit up to Erwin
Road.

Construction on the unit was scheduled to begin in the
summer of 1968. In December of 1967, according to Mr. Henrick-
sen, the University gave six-months notice to the residents. The
University is required by terms of the acquisition to give six-
months notice; they also notify the U. S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development (HUD).

The tenants were out of the area by June, 1968. However,
the University was unable to begin construction because their
loan with HUD fell through. Even so, the University tore down
29 units in early summer. Mr. Henricksen says the demolition
was carried out before the loan fell through.

Yet, with construction due to begin in the summer, it seems
likely that word about the loan was received by June; and if
the University had been more sensitive to the housing problem
it probably could have preserved those dwellings until the Married
Student Housing can be built, which may be several years.

Many of the houses in this area (both those from the Erwin
purchase and those later purchased) lack central heating, with
substandard plumbing and/or electrical wiring. Therefore, the
University is faced with costly repairs or demolition. Since
demolition costs the University nothing—they offer the wood
and lumber to whomever will clear the land—that is the path
they usually follow.
Duke owns property on Powe, Faber, Thaxton, Gattis, Maxwell, among others. It is in these areas that much demolition has been done. The new expressway is scheduled to run along Thaxton, thus taking some of the University’s land. In exchange, the state has given Duke some other land in the immediate vicinity. Duke has been in continual negotiation with the State in attempts to save its land and effect the most practical solution.

Concerning the numerous demolitions in this area, Mr. Henricksen says that most of the houses—the majority of which came to Duke through gifts or along with other purchases—were in very poor shape when the University took them over. One exception is in the 1000 block on Maxwell Street. Here and on the connecting block of Ferrell Alley, thirteen units have been demolished—and all by Duke. At least part of these were torn down to make way for a warehouse, according to Mr. Henricksen; but it was and likely never will be built, since the University now has some storage units on Buchanan Street. Three fairly sound looking houses border on this demolition. On the other side of these lonely three is another huge area of demolished houses—until recently also Duke property, until the University traded it with the State. Because of the expressway, Duke got some more properties in the next block on Thaxton (see map).
Duke as Landlord

The University does not generally deal directly with many of its tenants, since most of Duke's properties are handled by Southland Associates. According to the Memorandum prepared by Housing Director Larry Smith for a faculty committee, Southland manages the lands not specifically designated for institutional purpose; other lands are handled by the University or Housing Management.

Southland Associates—like other Durham realtors—has a history of racial discrimination. After the Civil Rights Act became applicable to the University, President Knight in the Fall of 1967 announced that all persons registering property with the Housing Office must sign a pledge of non-discrimination in housing matters. In addition, Mr. Smith reports that he obtained verbal assurance from Southland that they would manage their properties without regard to race, religion or nationality. When asked if a formal agreement was signed between the University and Southland, Mr. Smith replied negatively; "I keep a close watch on them, though." Mr. Smith said that to insure the enforcement of University policy, he wrote a Memorandum in November, 1967, outlining the policy; and in 1968 he prepared a paper on discrimination and University property for Vice President Huestis. He refused to release these documents to the author, claiming that his grammar might be incorrect.

Despite these assurances and inspections, Southland continued to discriminate in 1968. In one case involving a black
University employee, the agency refused to rent to him until heavy pressure was exerted by the University. Now Southland is itself covered by Federal legislation, and they seem to have resigned themselves to compliance.

Of the tenants the author talked with (in the Erwin area only), much discontent was expressed towards Southland—more by students than others. A University re-evaluation of its relation with the agency could serve a useful function.

One past policy of the University which deserves continuation is the use of property on Wilkerson Street for construction of a neighborhood park. A group of residents from an ACT community council asked permission for use of the land on which to construct the facility—a request granted by Duke with the only stipulations being that the land be used only for recreation and that it be returned to the University upon request. (ACT is a Durham organization of poor and working class whites who are seeking to improve their conditions.) The residents have constructed two structures and provided gym-type equipment for recreation.
Married Student Housing Controversy, 1967

Duke's sale of its Married Student Housing on Morreene Road and its involvement in the related Bacon Street controversy represent clear illustrations of the University's involvement in the economic and political life of Durham.

A sketch of the events surrounding these matters is given in Section I and will not be repeated here. The purpose of this section is to point-out the University's involvement in community affairs.

In a speech to the Academic Council on September 27, 1967, Vice-President Ashmore presented seven reasons for the University's offer to sell:

1. A heightened realization of the human distress which exists in the community;

2. The conviction that the concentration of public housing in one quadrant of the city was not a sound pattern for the future development of the community in which our University exists;

3. The adjacent property, including our own married student housing apartments and the homes on Newell Street which have been valuable for graduate students, automatically and immediately became less useful to the University, less marketable, and less valuable;

4. Our married students housing had not been located on the most advantageous site from the point of view of the University;

5. The urgency of the need for the proposed Bacon Street housing project had been documented for us, and it was the opinion of significant leadership in the community that our offer of the married students housing would enhance the likelihood that this project could be made acceptable to those who had opposed it previously;
6. Certain members of the faculty, in the area of the social sciences, had expressed to us their conviction that public housing need not follow its traditional pattern. It was their belief that members of the University community, acting as individuals on a voluntary basis, and acting in concert with representatives of the inhabitants of public housing, might gain important knowledge of the dynamics of a public housing community, and might even be able to establish a model community which could provide national leadership in the breaking of the cycle of poverty;

7. Explorations with a major insurance company on other projects led us to believe that it would be economically feasible to dispose of our present married students housing and construct new ones without loss to the University's financial position, and with the possibility of some gain in housing units and in finance.3

Reasons one and two are generally recognized views of all segments of the community. However, since Damar Courts (across the street from Duke housing) had already been bought by the Housing Authority and since the close neighborhood there is fairly small, the acquisition of Duke's housing would virtually create another such concentration; proximity of students and public housing tenants, on the other hand, offered the potential for an exciting attempt to bridge racial and economic distinctions, possibly even "a model community which could provide national leadership in breaking the cycle of poverty"--as Mr. Ashmore says in his sixth point. It is unclear to this student why such an experiment could be better effected by moving students out of the area.

In an open campus discussion on November 2, 1967\textsuperscript{4}--attended by the author--Mr. Ashmore made a statement to the effect that
Duke graduate students would not likely want to live across the street from public housing. When challenged on this point, he replied that at least this would be true of the students Duke would hope to attract in future years. A poll conducted later that year by the YM-YWMA found no students in the Moreene Road housing opposed to living near public housing.

The fifth reason given by Ashmore is an important one. As was shown in Section 1, quite a large segment of the community opposed the Bacon Street project. Since the black leaders appeared unanimous in the opposition, one might question whom Mr. Ashmore includes in "significant leadership in the community." In announcing Duke's offer of sale, President Knight stated that the University hoped "fervently that opposition to (Bacon Street) will be dropped." The Bacon Street area involved in this issue was at that time owned by Durham Investment Corporation, which had filed a rezoning request to make possible the public housing construction. According to the Financial Statement of the University for 1966-67, Duke held $9000 in bonds and 600 shares of stock in that company. Durham Investment had already developed DIDCO Industrial Park next to the proposed housing site; Vice-President Huestis sits on the DIDCO board.

No suggestion is made that the University endorsed the Bacon Street project to protect its financial investments; such is unlikely. In fact, when Mr. Huestis was asked about the matter, he expressed surprise to learn of Duke's investment in the company. Mr. Henricksen handles investments, and he attested to no knowledge
of the company's involvement in the Bacon Street controversy.

One thing all this indicates is that the University's contacts are limited to a small, if powerful, segment of the community. (Dr. Knight has more recently tried to broaden these contacts.) Mr. Ashmore's designation of "significant leaders" makes this clear. It is not a matter of University officials choosing to support Bacon Street after hearing all sides, they seem to have unquestioningly accepted the position of prominent political leaders. They even failed to hear the advice of the University's most involved faculty member--Councilman Jack Preiss.

In the discussion mentioned above, Mr. Ashmore clearly showed much less knowledge of Durham affairs than most of the twelve or so students present. Here, Duke entered into Durham affairs very definitely--and without the proper perusal of facts.

Mr. Ashmore's other points (3, 4, and 7) indicate the importance of self-interest in this decision. Duke feared a loss in property value. Such losses occur because when blacks move into a neighborhood, landowners panic (out of fear or hate) and quickly sell their property; Duke's action merely accelerated this trend and set a fine example for others. Mr. Ashmore also mentions the poor location; in the open discussion he explained that when the units were built, Duke thought that students wanted very cheap residences; but since then demand had shifted to more comfortable units; and the University feared a decrease in demand for these units. Such seems unlikely in light of the then and continuing shortage; the waiting list has always been very
As he goes on to point out, the University stood to break even or even profit from the sale, while also unloading some poorly-located and under-constructed units.

At that time, The Durham Housing Authority was operating one project for elderly with 50 efficiencies and one-bedroom units. Only four of the 106 units in the E. Main Street project (under construction) contained more than one bedroom, and the newly acquired Darriar courts consisted of 102 two-bedroom units. Since 37 per cent of the applicants were in need of three bedrooms or more, the greatest public housing need at the time was for larger units. Unfortunately for prospective tenants, all 224 units of the Married Student Housing had two or less bedrooms.

Thus, the value to the community (or at least to the disadvantaged segments) of Duke's offer are highly doubtful; while the benefits reaped by Duke are clear.
Faculty-Student Impact on Housing

A direct outgrowth of Duke's presence in Durham is the influx of several thousand students and faculty, who must of course find places to live. This group is almost entirely brought into the city by the University, in contrast to the non-academic staff made up largely of area residents. As University enrollment grows, further strain is placed on the housing situation.

University figures show this increase in faculty size since 1950, totalling 418:

1950-51  548
1961-62  654
1968-69  966

Projected growth promises substantial increases in faculty size.

The University has developed housing sites in its property located along Highway 751 -- the Duke Homesites -- which have been made available to faculty, and this has helped off-set the impact of faculty on the rest of the housing market. However, only about 350 families reside there now, which means another 600+ have sought living facilities elsewhere.

Faculty housing and the Duke Homesites in particular have provided one of the few occasions for direct political pressure by the University, as it has sought to protect the interests of faculty living there. The most recent example came in a letter
to city officials from Dr. Woodhall, Chancellor pro tem, declaring the University's opposition to annexation and rezoning of an area near the Duke Homesites on which some developers plan to build an apartment complex. Speaking for the University as a "citizen of Durham," he says that Duke feels such building would be "contrary to the proper long-range plan for the development of the area for single-family dwellings" (underlining added) and would mean "deterioration of one of the City's most attractive surrounding regions." In addition, he outlines the University's particular interest in this case:

Furthermore, Duke is personally and vitally concerned about the effect of this apartment plan on both the Duke Homesites and the University's research activities at its animal farm west of the Bypass. High-density development of the type proposed would have serious consequences for these areas of immediate University concern.

Since neither the Homesites nor the farm are directly adjacent to the land tract in question, it seems likely that the University's attitude in this case is similar to that in the Married Student housing controversy of 1967; the apartment complex makes the land in the vicinity (in the words of Mr. Ashmore, see page 9) "automatically and immediately ... less useful to the University, less marketable, and less valuable."

However good the University's reasons for opposition may be, they clearly stem from concern for the interests of the institution and even more, the interests of its faculty who reside in the vicinity (about 30 per cent live in the Duke Homesites).
The losers, predictably, are Durham's low income families, whose interests were probably not even a consideration in this action. According to the developer, Teer and Greenberg, Ltd., these apartments are directed at student clientele. This group (as is shown below) occupy a significant amount of housing which could otherwise be used by low-income families -- the group for which the housing shortage is most acute; and the construction of this 224-unit complex could potentially free a large portion of much-needed dwellings.

Student impact on Durham housing is quantitatively more important than faculty impact. More details about the specifics follow in the next section.
One of the continuing problems is the injection of large numbers of transfers and graduate students. As enrollment has increased, further strains have been placed on the already tight situation. According to forecasts, enrollment past and future looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such increases are not without impact. An additional 35% increase in enrollment has tripled the number of undergraduates living off campus. From less than 100 in the past, the number has tripled to nearly 600.

Duke has been able to meet this demand by promises for new multi-dwelling construction for three years; Bristol Court and Ho.

In an attempt to meet off-campus student living, a study of under, as well as the author and others (see Preface to this section). Of approximately 590 cards sent out, 209 or 35% were returned. Apartments claim 73 per cent of the respondents. (A sample card-questionnaire is included)

Because of the greater need for family-type dwellings, particular attention is given to four-or-more room apartments
Dear Student:

The UCM/YM-YWCA Community Concerns Committee is researching Durham housing problems. One aspect of the problem concerns the impact of having Duke students live off-campus. For purposes of this study, we are asking you to complete the attached self-addressed card. If you have any questions, please call 684-3196 or 684-3737.

Thanks,
Reed Kramer

Address:______________________________

Are you renting a room, apartment, or house?__________
If apartment or house, how many rooms (excl. bath)?______
How many persons share your accommodations?__________
What is the monthly rental rate? (total, not per person)  
______________________________  (This is important for determining the price-range of student-occupied housing. If you do not wish to reveal your own rent, please omit address in question (1) and answer this question. You will remain unidentified.)
Does this include utilities, water, and/or heat?__________
Is your place furnished by the owner?____________________
Who is your landlord or agent?________________________
Would you rate your place plush, good, mediocre, or poor?
______________________________
and houses. Among apartment dwellers, 70 per cent pay rent of $130 per month or more (without utilities). Only 6 per cent pay less than $60, and 24 per cent occupy probably the most needed type—with rent from $75 to $125.

For single-family and duplex residents, the largest number live in four- or five-room houses. Three-room units range in price from $36 for what the residents classify as "poor" to $100 for "good," excluding utilities. Four-room dwellings vary from $45 "poor" (no utilities) to $150 "very good"—with a substantial middle-section of highly desirable units suitable for family living, renting for $80 to $85. The five-room units only range from $90 to $110, mostly including only water. Six- and seven-room units rent for about $50 "poor" to $125 "good." All the 8- to 10-room places are classed as either mediocre or good, and they rent for $95 to $125. Larger units are good to plush for about $175.

Off-campus undergraduates then do occupy a significant number of units which would serve well for families of low and moderate incomes.

Graduate students also make a significant impact on Durham housing. Since many of these have families or at least spouses, it is likely that they occupy even more units which could otherwise be used by low-income households. Duke University cannot overlook the fact that its presence in Durham injects many transients into the housing market and increases the strain particularly on low-income families.
Duke University has an efficient situation and is a contributor to the

1) The University has been of
last five years, has added living units which to prop-
the East or West campus. C
ished; and Z. has finished;
152 inhabitants remain
(A complete list is avail-

2) Steady increases in the number of persons almost two
have placed strain through the years. The University --
faculty has grown from 340 to 450, and the number of students has increased from 5,069 to 7,692, making the expected
reach 10,000 by

3) Data gathered for this paper states that students living
off campus seek suitable housing for low-income
family household for which the shortage is most severe.

Despite a semi-official policy of "non-partisanship" in local
affairs -- consistent with the "ivory tower" concept of the
university -- Duke has been heavily involved in local housing
matters:

1) In closely related controversies over public housing on
Bacon Street and sale of Duke Married Student Housing, the
University entered prominently into the political scene --
apparently with little cognizance of the implications of
its actions beyond preservation of narrow institutional
financial interests.

2) Duke has pressured and bargained with the State Highway
Commission to preserve its houses in the Erwin Mills area
during construction of the Expressway, and the result has
been the removal of other homes occupied by low-income
families. Later, Duke plans to demolish the houses it saved for its own construction.

3) A recent example of open political activity by the University is a letter from Chancellor Woodhall written to city officials in opposition to a proposed apartment complex. The University took the action in order to preserve the utility of its not-too-near animal farm and protect property values in the Duke Homesites.

All of these involve direct intervention in local housing matters, and all of them ultimately work against the poor. Even the sale of Horrereene Road housing cannot be viewed as beneficial. As Preiss says in his Herald article, it provided the City with some relief after officials failed to plan for relocating families displaced by new highways; and it allowed Duke to get rid of some rather unwanted units. For the poor, it meant 220 badly-suited apartments, plus the destruction of 28 decent houses a year later for construction of replacement student dwellings.

No question remains concerning Duke's involvement in Durham housing affairs; the only issue is who will benefit from the actions taken. If Duke University does not wish by its action and inaction to continue giving firm acquiescence to the status quo, then new policies must emerge. The recommendations which follow are intended to aid in finding new directions.
Recommendations

The author's recommendations fall into three categories:

1) Immediately implementable, requiring little study

2) Significant policy changes involving presently-owned units

3) Other possible actions

1) Immediately-implementable Actions

a) Before any additional persons are evicted from University-owned housing, Duke should make sure they have suitable housing in which to move. "Suitable housing" means a location of comparable size and cost which is reasonably close to place of work. Either the University or its agent should hire personnel to perform this function who can work closely with resident groups not only for relocation but also for hearing grievances.

b) The University should maintain a policy of making minor repairs consistently (such as painting, fixing porches, replacing rotten boards). Erwin-area residents feel that presently Duke is very erratic in making repairs, and this is annoying and inconvenient for the tenants.

c) Paved streets and a gas line for the Erwin area should be provided by the University. Responsibility for both these improvements rests with the landowner, and these are basics which Duke should supply to its tenants.

d) As previously mentioned, the University should study the activities of Southland with regard to Duke tenants and re-
evaluate its relation to that agency.

e) Duke should continue the precedent set by the Patlock Park
development and encourage the creation of similar parks on other
vacant lands.

2) Significant Policy Changes Involving Presently-Owned Units

The large block of houses in the area between Campus Drive
and Erwin Road offers potential for significant university
action by taking advantage of federal programs to rehabilitate
these homes and sell them to the occupants.

The University's Comprehensive Campus Plan, which projects
institutional expansion, calls for construction of several Graduate
Student Residential Units and Parking Facilities in this
area—some by 1975, some later, though lack of available funds
is likely to delay them further. (A map of this plan follows
this page.) The Married Student Housing project on Erwin Road
is the first of these planned units. It was originally planned
for Vance and Bynum, but was moved north because of the unsuit-
able terrain.

The author recommends that all other of these planned struc-
tures be re-located so that few, if any, additional houses will
have to be demolished. Some possible alternative spots are
shaded yellow on the map, but these represent no authoritative sug-
gestions. Other possibilities include the various University-
owned lots (see listing). The author believes that higher pri-
ority should be given to preservation of the homes than to loca-
tion of the housing units within the confines of the campus.
## Proposed Building Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Educational Building</strong></td>
<td>$19,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Library Addition — Chemistry Building — Renovation of Old Chemistry —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of present Engineering Building for Mathematics, Computer Center, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology — Phytotron — Arts Center, Phase I — Emperor Tandem Accelerator Building —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Library Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woman's College</strong></td>
<td>$7,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Science Building — Physical Education Building — Woman's College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Renovation — Renovation of Carr Classroom Building — Housing for Undergraduate Women — Student Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Men</strong></td>
<td>$7,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education Facilities for Men — Housing for Undergraduate Men — Renovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Student Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Engineering</strong></td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medical Center</strong></td>
<td>$28,844,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Diagnostic Clinic Addition — Basic Sciences I — Clinical Research II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(hyperbaric unit) — Hospital Renovations — Teaching and Administration Building —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library — New Hospital (140 beds) — Hospital Chapel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divinity School</strong></td>
<td>$2,002,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity School Addition (including administrative wing, chapel, and auditorium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine Laboratory (Beaufort, N. C.)</strong></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Teaching Laboratory, Phase I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land and Service Facilities</strong></td>
<td>$5,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating Plant Modernization — Parking and Roads — Renovation for Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services, and Alumni Affairs — Service Center, Phase I — Duke Press</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building — Land Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$75,576,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Costs presented here are based on estimates by architects and past experience. Building costs in the Research Triangle area are now rising more rapidly than they have in the past, and these figures may well have to be adjusted upward.

**Source:** Excerpted from *The Fifth Decade: Duke University* (published 1967)
Graduate students have always lived off-campus, sometimes some distance; and while recognizing the value of proximity both to campus and to each other, the author believes that equally-desirable locations can be found elsewhere, without causing the destruction of so many dwellings.

The University is not of course primarily in the business of landowning, and it should and does wish to keep such activity to a minimum. Tenants, on the other hand, generally desire to own their homes if they can arrange it financially. About ten years ago—before the University owned the houses—Erwin Mills offered to sell at least some of the units to tenants, but not many accepted the offer. Since that time, however, Federal assistance has become available for rehabilitation of substandard units and for low-cost financing for home-buyers with low incomes.

One such program is Section 221(h) (of the National Housing Act) enacted in 1966 and amended in 1968. A detailed description from HUD is given on the following page. In brief, the law provides mortgage insurance to non-profit organizations for the purpose of purchasing and rehabilitating substandard homes to sell to low-income persons. The buyers (income limitations for buyers are given in Table VII, Section I) can receive long-term mortgage insurance at the below-market-interest rate of 3%; they must pay a $200 downpayment.

The few restrictions are hardly limiting. The non-profit group must agree to sell the rehabilitated units, but any houses which cannot be sold may be rented under the Section 221(d)(3)
Home Ownership for Low Income Families

Purpose
To assist and encourage home ownership by low-income individuals and families.

Specific Uses
Insurance of mortgages executed by nonprofit organizations to finance the purchase and rehabilitation of deteriorating or substandard housing, and insurance of mortgages financing the resale of the housing to individuals and families having incomes below the maximum income permitted for those eligible for rent supplements under the rent supplement program.

Terms
MORTGAGE OF A NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION:
- Maximum mortgage amount—not more than the appraised value of the property when purchased plus the estimated cost of the proposed rehabilitation.
- Maximum maturity of mortgage—as determined by FHA.
- Interest rate—6 percent up until final endorsement of mortgage for insurance, then 3 percent.

MORTGAGE OF A HOME PURCHASER:
- Maximum mortgage amount—an amount equal to that portion of the unpaid balance of the project mortgage allocable to the individual dwelling involved.
- Repayment period—a term equal to the remaining term of the mortgage, or 20 years, whichever is less. Term can be up to 25 years if purchaser is unable to make the monthly payments required by a shorter term.
- Interest rate—3 percent.
- Minimum downpayment—$200 (which may be applied to closing costs or prepaid expenses). Any prepaid expenses required must be paid in addition to the $200.

Who May Apply
A nonprofit organization approved by the FHA Commissioner may apply for insurance of a mortgage financing the purchase and rehabilitation of housing for resale to low-income purchasers. A low-income individual or family may apply for insurance of a mortgage financing the purchase of a home from the nonprofit organization.

Special Requirements
Property to be rehabilitated must consist of not less than five single-family units, and be of detached, semidetached, or row construction. It must be located in a neighborhood which is sufficiently stable and contains sufficient public facilities and amenities to support long-term values; or the rehabilitation of the housing, plus related activities of the nonprofit organization together with activities of other housing owners in the neighborhood and by public authorities, must be of such scope and quality as to assure a stable environment.

A nonprofit mortgagor must agree to sell the dwellings after rehabilitation to low-income individuals or families.

The mortgage given by a low-income purchaser must contain the provision that if the mortgagor does not continue to occupy the property, the interest rate shall increase to the highest rate permitted by FHA. However, the increase in interest rate will not be applicable if the property is sold to the nonprofit organization from which the home was originally purchased, a local housing authority, or another low-income purchaser approved by the FHA.

Related Programs
Rent supplements, low-rent public housing.
rent-supplement program. If the original purchaser moves out, the interest rate goes up to market-level, unless the house is sold to another FHA-approved low-income person, the local housing authority, or the non-profit originators.

The author recommends that Duke University implement a

221(h) program in the Erwin area where it owns homes.

Cost: This appears to be a fairly incidental factor. Federal assistance covers the price of rehabilitation. Perhaps the only major expenses would involve personnel. Extensive aid is available to the University from the North Carolina Low-Income Development Corporation.

Feasibility: Morton Hoffman reports that the nationwide average purchase price for 221(h) homes is $4000. $6000 is the figure they quote as rehabilitation costs, plus $1,100 fees. The average value of Duke houses in the projected area is very near the $4000 figure (see Appendix II), and Mr. Henricksen estimates that average renovations needed to bring the houses up to Federal standards (see Appendix III) runs close to $6000. Duke's Erwin Area units seem to be just the kind best suited to the 221(h) program.

The research group also points out several problems with rehabilitation. Approval is not always easily obtained by debt-ridden poor persons. Further, the $10,000 is generally the maximum loan—though often it is not sufficient. Not all persons are motivated to participate in such a program, either; though this should present less of a problem here, since Duke already owns the houses.
Implications: Such a program would involve the University in a somewhat new way in community life. Yet, as this paper has attempted to show, Duke is already heavily involved in housing (and other) local affairs. The neutrality advocated by "ivory tower" believers is simply not possible for a large institution; this program offers the opportunity for making a contribution to community life and to lives of numerous individuals.

In principle, there appears little difference between this program and the Research Triangle Park, which uses the resources of three area universities for the development benefit of the larger community. (The Park is a more popular undertaking, however, for it brings revenue to faculty at all three schools.) The housing program, being a unique university venture, could serve as a pilot experiment for other academic institutions. Academic involvement and research is certainly possible in connection to such a project.

The implications in the community offer perhaps the greatest risk for the university. The effects of such a program would likely extend beyond the number of persons immediately helped by it. Home-ownership for this many additional persons might raise expectations among other low-income persons, reduce the control of housing by local real estate interests, and jeopardize the power of the Durham political leadership. Duke would likely risk further alienation from this segment of the community, while offering new possibility and hope for the area's low-income residents.
Other programs tie in easily with one outlined above. Under 221(d)(3), Duke can obtain mortgage money at below-market-interest rates for rehabilitation of homes for rent, and occupants can obtain it directly through the same program.

3) Other Possibilities

University investment might possibly be useful for providing the capital in construction of low cost housing for eligible persons. Further research is needed to explore this and other ways the University might be utilized in eliminating the housing problem.

Conclusion

All of these recommendations -- while not complete nor perfect in their conception -- offer the beginnings for constructive University action aimed towards improving housing conditions. The second one, providing for rehabilitation of homes and sale to occupants, is the most far-reaching and important.

Neither these recommendations nor any other policies regarding housing should be made by the University without consultation with the persons affected by these decisions. For too long, the needs of Durham's poor have been ignored by Duke. They must be brought in to share in making the decisions which have such far-reaching implications in their lives.
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APPENDIX II

List of Duke-owned Properties
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461 Oregon St.</td>
<td>P-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
121 Alexander St.
222 Alexander St.
307 Alexander St.
122 Anderson St.
213 Anderson St.
2021 Campus Dr.
2117 Campus Dr.
2113 Campus Dr.
2231 Erwin Rd.
1403 Fisher St.
318 Garden St.
405 Swift Ave.
1913 Yearby St.
1915 Yearby St.
1917 Yearby St.

Medical Campus Residences

2321 Erwin Rd. P-1
2325 Erwin Rd. P-1
2413 Erwin Rd. P-1

East Campus Residences

*304 Berkeley St. D-2
817 Berkeley St. P-1
219 Berkeley St. P-2
306 Chisolm St. B-2
197 Chisolm St. P-2
813 Chisolm St. P-2
312 Chisolm St. P-1
511 Chisolm St. P-1 1/2
*1202 Green St. Cin-1
*811 Buchanan Blvd. P-2
311 Bagleyfield St. P-1
*1305 Green St. P-2
521 Bancroft St. P-1
*1204 W. Kirkham St. Stucco-2
*1410-1414 W. Kirkham St. P-2
*619 Chisolm St. P-2
*621 Chisolm St. P-2

Buildings with apartments
DUKE UNIVERSITY: LAND-HOLDINGS
(Exclusive of campus and Highway 51 properties)

I. Occupied or Occupiable Units (152)
A. East Campus north: [Buchanan to Sedgefield Street]
   (17 bls. with)
   [Markham to Green Street]
   about 30 units)
   1. 604 Berkeley St. (2 apartments--faculty
      617 Berkeley --employee
      806 Onslow--Duke faculty
      807-809 Onslow--faculty
      813 Onslow--faculty
      814 Onslow--faculty
      819 Onslow--student
         5 small apt.
      821 Onslow--2-3 apt. employees
      1409 Green--duplex students
      1305 Green--duplex students (handled by Southland)
      813 Buchanan--4 apt.
         3 students/faculty
      1204 W. Markham--3 apt. students
      1410 and 1412 W. Markham--duplex, open market
      821 Lancaster--old residents-non-Duke
      811 Sedgefield--open market by Southland

B. Erwin Area: [Campus Drive north to Erwin Road, Anderson]
   [to Oregon Street, all streets inclusive]
   2004 Acme
   2006 Acme
   2008 Acme
   2009 Acme
   2011 Acme
   2014 Acme
   2015 Acme
   2016 Acme
   2017 Acme
   2020 Acme
   2021 Acme--occ?
   207 Alexander
   211 Alexander
   217 Alexander
   218 Alexander
   218 Alexander
   220 Alexander--(Classed as "W. Campus" on Duke's list)
   221 Alexander
   221 Alexander--(on Duke list under "W. Campus")
   223 Alexander
   302 Alexander--(on Duke list under "W. Campus" res.)
   401 Alexander
   405 Alexander
210 Anderson
212 Anderson
216 Anderson
213 Anderson
220 Anderson
312 Anderson
313 Anderson
316 Anderson
317 Anderson
320 Anderson
321 Anderson
400 Anderson
401 Anderson
402 Anderson
403 Anderson
410 Anderson (on Duke list under W. Campus)
412 Anderson (on Duke list under W. Campus)
1701 Bynum
1703 Bynum
1704 Bynum
1820 Bynum
1821 Bynum
1824 Bynum
1828 Bynum
2021 Campus (W. Campus list)
2017 Campus (W. Campus list)
2122 Campus (W. Campus list)
1623 Erwin
1625 Erwin
1627 Erwin
1711 Erwin
1713 Erwin
2005 Erwin
2007 Erwin
2009 Erwin
2013 Erwin
2015 Erwin
2019 Erwin
2021 Erwin
2214 Erwin
1406 Faber
311 Garden
313 Garden
1906 Lewis--decent
1907 Lewis
1910 Lewis
1911 Lewis
1914 Lewis
1915 Lewis
1916 Lewis
1917 Lewis
1920 Lewis
1921 Lewis
1702 W. Markham
1704 W. Markham
205 Oregon
209 Oregon
211 Oregon
220 Oregon
222 Oregon
223 Oregon
225 Oregon
300 Oregon
302 Oregon
305 Oregon
306 Oregon
310 Oregon
311 Oregon
401 Oregon
406 Oregon
1702 Pace
1706 Pace
1708 Pace
1709 Pace
1710 Pace
403 Swift
1702 Vance (True Gospel Bap. Mission
1818 Vance
1820 Vance
1913 Yearby (on Duke list under W. Campus)
1915 Yearby (on Duke list under W. Campus)
1917 Yearby (on Duke list under W. Campus)
2008 Yearby
2012 Yearby
2014 Yearby
2014 Yearby
2017 Yearby
2018 Yearby
2021 Yearby

C. Others [author's information shows these to be Duke-owned]
   [although not confirmed by the Duke list]

2010 Acme (not on Duke list but part of Erwin acquisition)
221 Anderson

710 Buchanan
404 Case
1501 Erwin (Nearly New Shop)
1407 W. Pettigrew (Dean of WC)

II. Scheduled for demolition immediately (7)
619 Berkeley
2321 Erwin
2413 Erwin
2325 Erwin...
612 Onslow
303 Oregon
2006 Yearby
III. Units Demolished for Institutional Use (51)

A. Electrical Facilities (8)
   409 Anderson Street
   409 Anderson
   411 Anderson
   413 Anderson
   415 Anderson
   417 Anderson
   1825 Bynum
   1829 Bynum

B. Rehabilitation Center (8)
   2100 Erwin Road
   2102 Erwin
   2106 Erwin
   2110 Erwin
   212 Atlas
   210 Atlas
   206 Atlas
   208 Atlas
   These are adjacent to the Center, both were used
   by the contractors--206 is now demolished; 208 is
   still being used by construction personnel.

C. Parking lots (6)
   2023 Erwin
   2321 Erwin
   2325 Erwin
   407 Trent
   409 Trent
   411 Trent

D. Married Student Housing--yet to be started (29)
   1807 Erwin Road
   1811 Erwin Road
   1901 Erwin Road
   1905 Erwin
   1909 Erwin
   1911 Erwin
   1913 Erwin
   1917 Erwin
   1919 Erwin
   1923 Erwin
   1925 Erwin
   201 Anderson Street
   207 Anderson
   211 Anderson
   213 Anderson
   217 Anderson
   219 Anderson
   1804 Yearby
   1808 Yearby
   1810 Yearby
   1900 Yearby
   1904 Yearby
   1908 Yearby
IV. Demolished for Other Reasons (usually poor condition of House) (27 Units)

815 Buchanan
1401 Caswell
1404 Faber
1007 Maxwell
1009 Maxwell
1011 Maxwell
1012 Maxwell
1013 Maxwell
1014 Maxwell
1015 Maxwell
1016 Maxwell
1017 Maxwell
1018 Maxwell
110 Ferrell Alley
112 Ferrell Alley
114 Ferrell Alley
815 Onslow
817 Onslow
410 Powe
412 Powe
414 Powe
401 Swift
1824 Vance
1826 Vance
1905 Yearby
1907 Yearby
1911 Yearby
1916 Yearby
2004 Yearby

V. Vacant Lots (this list is not complete)

213 Alexander
310 Anderson
314 Anderson
1819 Bynum
1818 Bynum
Erwin, Elf, Elba, Fulton (forested block)
212-14-16-18 Oregon (wooded lot)
2003 Yearby
Wilkerson Lane
1016 Wilkerson
10181 Wilkerson
10183 Wilkerson
500 Block Maplewood (rear 1016 Burch)
1704 Vance

Lots on old city’s west side block
APPENDIX II

Duke University Purchase from Burlington Industries
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vac 2007 Acme St #6 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>5050.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Acme St #5 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>1470.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Acme St #4 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3270.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Acme St #3 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>4430.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Acme St #2 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3370.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Acme St #1 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3530.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwin Rd #9 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>3320.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Erwin Rd #8 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>2550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Erwin Rd #7 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>6100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Erwin Rd #6 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>7040.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Erwin Rd #5 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>7140.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Erwin Rd #4 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>5450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Erwin Rd #3 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>5760.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Erwin Rd #2 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>6030.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vac 2023 Erwin Rd #1 Bl A Sec 2</td>
<td>5590.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409 Anderson St #1 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>830.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413 Anderson St #2 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>4630.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415 Anderson St #4 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>4150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417 Anderson St #3 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>4280.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826 Vance St #5 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>4650.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826 Vance St #5 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>3390.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Details</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824 Vance St 6 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>3470.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 Vance St 7 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>3330.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816 Vance St 8 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>3190.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819 Bynum St</td>
<td>600.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821 Bynum St 9 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>4180.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825 Bynum St 10 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>4140.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829 Bynum St 11 Bl L Sec 2</td>
<td>3350.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 W. Markham Ave pt 35-36 Bl 8</td>
<td>5820.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 W. Markham Ave pt 35-36 Bl 8</td>
<td>3910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Acme St 16 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>3190.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Acme St 15 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>3330.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Acme St 14 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>4020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Acme St 13 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>3080.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Acme St 12 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>5110.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Acme St 11 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>4760.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Acme St 10 Bl C Sec 2</td>
<td>5670.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627 Erwin Rd 8 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>5200.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Oregon St 7 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>3170.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209 Oregon St 6 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>3340.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Oregon St 5 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>3520.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 Oregon St pt 4 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>3920.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 Oregon St Gr/pt 3 Bl C Sec</td>
<td>3580.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303 Oregon St Pt 3 Bl C Sec-4</td>
<td>3070.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 Oregon St pt 1 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>3750.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 Oregon St</td>
<td>3170.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1623 Erwin Rd 10 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>5970.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625 Ervin Rd # 9 Bl C Sec 4</td>
<td>6090.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1713 Ervin Rd</td>
<td>6740.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207 Alexander Ave # 26</td>
<td>4960.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Alexander Ave</td>
<td>5680.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 Alexander Ave # 5 Sec 4</td>
<td>2450.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Alexander Ave # 4 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>6570.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Alexander Ave # 3 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>2760.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 Alexander Ave # 2 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>2630.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 Alexander Ave # 1 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>3770.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710 Pace St # 6 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>2685.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1708 Pace St # 7 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>3075.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706 Pace St # 3 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>3245.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 Pace St # 9 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>2975.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222 Oregon St # 10 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>3080.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Oregon St # 11 Bl E Sec 4</td>
<td>2940.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212-14-16-18 Oregon St</td>
<td>2960.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1711 Ervin Rd</td>
<td>6190.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 Bynum St</td>
<td>3400.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 Oregon St</td>
<td>3200.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306 Oregon St # 1 Bl D Sec 4</td>
<td>3560.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302 Oregon St # 2 Bl D Sec 4</td>
<td>2220.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Oregon St # 3 Bl D Sec 4</td>
<td>3210.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709 Pace St Bl F Sec 4</td>
<td>3595.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1709 Bynum St - 401-05 Alexander</td>
<td>11430.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 Vance St</td>
<td>690.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1702 Vance St # 5 Plat e</td>
<td>2350.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 Lewis St #6 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>3270.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910 Lewis St #7 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>4700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906 Lewis St #8 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>3610.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 Anderson St #11 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>3690.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 Anderson St #10 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>4350.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vac 314 Anderson St #9 Bl E</td>
<td>1590.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312 Anderson St #19 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>4370.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vac 310 Anderson St #20 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>630.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Yearby St #3 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>5340.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Yearby St #2 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>4040.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Yearby St #1 Bl E Sec 2</td>
<td>4700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Yearby St #16 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>5140.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Yearby St #15 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3960.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Yearby St #14 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>4600.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Yearby St #13 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3860.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Yearby St #12 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3480.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Anderson St #11 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3850.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 Anderson St #10 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3390.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216 Anderson St #9 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3140.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 Anderson St #8 Bl D Sec 2</td>
<td>3700.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ASSESSED VALUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$605,982.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Durham County Tax Office
1966 Assessments
APPENDIX III

Memorandum from Director of Housing (Duke)
MEMORANDUM CONCERNING REAL ESTATE PROPERTIES HELD BY DUKE UNIVERSITY

May 7, 1969

The function of the Office of Housing Management as related to real estate is to manage Duke-owned rental properties held by the University until the land involved is needed for physical plant expansion.

In view of the urgent need for economical housing in West Durham, Duke rents houses not needed or suitable for University use to Durham residents, not necessarily persons connected with the University. Rents for all properties are reasonable for the type of unit involved and comparable to other housing in Durham. Budgetary analysis shows that the University is not realizing profit from rental of its units but that cost of upkeep, taxes, insurance and administration is about equal to income.

Rental properties are rented to acceptable applicants without discrimination due to race, creed or nationality in compliance with (1) Dr. Knight's announced policies and (2) requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Southland Associates is Duke University's agent for properties which are not specifically reserved for University use. Southland has agreed to manage the properties on a non-discrimination basis. Properties reserved specifically for University use are managed by the Director of Housing Management.

Attachment 1 shows a list of residences located in "West Campus Residences", a budget location for all living units located south of the railway right of way parallel to Pettigrew Street. Houses not on Campus Drive or the one on Swift Avenue are properties acquired to assist in completing the entire package of land area between East and West Campus, augment properties acquired from Burlington Mills, known as "Real Estate Operations".

The "Real Estate Operations" were acquired from Burlington Mills. As indicated in Attachment 2 some of these buildings are used for offices or storage by Duke departments, but most are rented by Southland Associates as residences. A few Duke employees are known to reside there, however, most tenants are not Duke connected. The Office of Housing Management will certify any Duke employee to Southland for assignment to vacancies with they exist.

Southland experiences few vacancies in the Duke properties which it manages, which is indicative of the need for this type of housing in Durham. Southland assures that all building meet
Durham city building codes for the type of structures involved.

Units shown on Attachment 1 under "Medical Campus Residences" are houses which are located on University property for years. These will be razed this summer to ready the site of the proposed Eye Clinic.

Houses shown on Attachment 1 under "East Campus Residences" lie just north of East Campus. Five of these units are reserved for student use. One retired employee continues to reside in one home. Additional properties are purchased from time to time by Mr. Henricksen at the direction of the Executive Committee.

Attached are copies of the Southland lease form and the informal lease used by this office.

L. W. Smith, Jr.

LWSjr:lw

Attachments
Rental Agreement

To: ____________________________

Durham, N. C., on a month to month basis beginning on the ____________________________ Day of ____________________________ at a rental of $________ per month payable one month in advance on the first day of each month on time. If this application is approved, we agree to the following:

1. To make all rent payments at your office promptly when due.

2. To keep the house and premises in a good, clean condition and, on vacating same, to clean up the house and lot and to leave all fixtures in the house, basement, or on the lot.

3. To use the proper care in the use of plumbing, heating, and hot water equipment, and to pay for any unstopping of sinks or toilets after the first week of occupancy, and to be responsible for any damages to plumbing and heating equipment and soil drains being due to negligence or carelessness on our part; also to be responsible for any other repairs of matters not caused by us, by our negligence, or by any one on the premises with our permission.

4. To make or allow no offensive use of the property, or use same in violation of any law.

5. To give you thirty days notice before vacating the property, and to allow you the privilege of showing the property to prospective tenants or purchasers during our occupancy.

6. To see that water service is discontinued, and that all plumbing and heating is properly drained to prevent freezing, and that floors and windows are properly locked and fastened, and the keys returned to you.

7. It is further understood that this agreement, if accepted by you, is to continue from one rental period to another, and subject to term no changes made by either party upon due notice, and further that this property cannot be sublet by written permission from you at

8. If it is further understood and we hereby agree, that if we fail to pay the rent as herein stipulated within five days after the first day of the period of rental agreed to herein, then the agent or owner may enter and take possession of said property and may begin action to recover same without further notice to vacate and in such case, we hereby waive all legal requirements of notice to vacate and premises.

It is further agreed that:

__________________________________________________________

CREDIT INFORMATION:

Name

Reason

Present Address

Present Rental Rate $______

Rent paid to

How long at present address

Wk. $______

Name of employer

How long employed

Number in family

Number working

Approximate income $______ Wk. $______

REFERENCES

Name

Address

Name

Address

Name

Address

It is understood that when this application is signed by us and accepted by the owner, or agent in charge, it shall constitute a rental agreement.

Accepted by:

SOUTHLAND ASSOCIATES

______________________________

Agent in Charge

______________________________

day of __________, 196__
To: [Recipient]  
From: [City of Durham, North Carolina]

Date: [Insert Date]

Subject: URA Accommodation Letter

Dear [Recipient],

We are pleased to confirm your application for a university accommodation. The accommodation will be at [Specify Location] and is expected to be available from [Insert Date] to [Insert Date].

The monthly rent will be $[Insert Amount] and will be payable on the 1st of each month in advance.

The utilities, services including electricity, heat, and water, are provided. The following appliances are available: two [Insert Appliances]. The [Insert Appliances] are furnished with the [Insert Appliances].

The University will ensure the premises and [Insert Appliances] are maintained and will be responsible for any damage to your personal property and belongings.

If these terms are acceptable, please sign at the space indicated and return the original to this office.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

A. W. Smith, Jr.
Director of Housing Management
The Fifth Decade Program

General Chairman:
George V. Allen

National Sponsoring Committee:

Chairman:
Dr. James R. Killian Jr.

Campaign Operations Committee:

Chairman:
Clifford W. Perry

Major Gifts Committee:

Chairman:
Edwin L. Jones, Sr.

Special Gifts Committee:

Chairman:
Charles B. Wade Jr.

Key Gifts Committee:

Chairman:
Thomas A. Finch Jr.

Trustee Committee for Institutional Advancement:

Chairman:
George V. Allen

Washington, D.C.

Thomasville, N.C.

Birmingham, Ala.

Charlotte, N.C.

Charlotte, N.C.

Winston-Salem, N.C.

Marshall I. Pickens

Charlotte, N.C.

Henry E. Rauch

Greensboro, N.C.

Charles S. Rhynie

Washington, D.C.

Thomas E. Solthate, Jr.

Mount Vernon, N.C.

Charles B. Wade Jr.

Winston-Salem, N.C.

Wright Tisdale, ex officio

Dearborn, Mich.

Gifts from individuals, foundations, and corporations will provide the bulk of the funds to meet the University’s objectives during the Fifth Decade Program. Opportunities are available for commemorative gifts to pay tribute to donors or to those whose memories they wish to honor. Information on memorial opportunities, gift planning, and other aspects of the Fifth Decade Program are available on request. Please address inquiries or requests to Mr. George V. Allen, General Chairman, The Fifth Decade Program, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706.

Proposed Building Projects

General Educational Building: $19,130,000
- Perkins Library Addition
- Chemistry Building
- Renovation of Old Chemistry
- Renovation of present Engineering Building
- Mathematics, Computer Center, and Geology
- Phytotron
- Arts Center, Phase I
- Emperor Tandem Accelerator Building
- Special Library Materials

Woman’s College: $7,050,000
- Renovation of Science Building
- Physical Education Building
- Woman’s College Library Renovation
- Renovation of Carr Classroom Building
- Housing for Undergraduate Women
- Student Center

Undergraduate Men: $7,800,000
- Physical Education Facilities for Men
- Housing for Undergraduate Men
- Renovation of Student Union

School of Engineering: $4,000,000
- Engineering Building

Medical Center: $28,844,000
- Private Diagnostic Clinic Addition
- Basic Sciences I
- Clinical Research II (hyperbaric unit)
- Hospital Renovations
- Teaching and Administration Building
- Library
- New Hospital (140 beds)
- Hospital Chapel

Divinity School: $2,002,000
- Divinity School Addition (including administrative wing, chapel, and auditorium)

Marine Laboratory (Beaufort, N.C.): $1,000,000
- Research and Teaching Laboratory, Phase I

Land and Service Facilities: $5,750,000
- Heating Plant Modernization
- Parking and Roads
- Renovation for Development
- Information Services
- Alumni Affairs—Service Center
- Phase I—Duke Press Building
- Land Acquisition

Total: $75,576,000

Note: Costs presented here are based on estimates by architects and past experience. Building costs in the Research Triangle area are now rising more rapidly than they have in the past, and these figures may well have to be adjusted upward.

Excerpted from The Fifth Decade: Duke University (Published 1967)
Duke has diversified holdings in Durham

By Jean Cary and Dub Gulley

Supplemental Editors

Besides its many other economic interests in Durham as an employer and a consumer, Duke University is a much diversified landlord. The American university is not so much a Durham landlord than a Durham university. Duke University arrived in Durham, it began exerting a major influence on the city. For all of us part-time Durhamites, who live here for perhaps 36 months of our lives, the city can easily seem like an accessory of Duke University. It offers us food and some slight entertainment; it serves us with drugstores, laundries, and the like; it affords temporary shelter for imports and visiting parents; and it provides housing for most graduate students and some undergraduates.

Surprising as it may seem, Durham was here before Duke. James B. Duke chose Durham as the sight of his brain child pretty much as a last resort, but as soon as the University arrived, it began exerting a major role in the community. According to Gerhard Henricksen, treasurer of the University, Duke bought all of the campuses for long range planning. Henricksen said, "We will eventually need all the land between Duke University Road and Erwin Road. At the present time we have two-thirds to three fourths of the land,"

Most of the units purchased from Erwin Mills can be classified as low-income housing. An official city report in 1968 describes the housing situation as "tight." Making this analysis more clear, an exhaustive housing study completed that year predicts a shortage of 4600 to 5200 units by 1975. Thus the conclusion can be drawn that Duke owns that number of units which are much needed by the Durham community.

In 1969 Duke gave residents of a 12 block area 6 months eviction notice, where Duke planned to build new Student Housing. The loan from HUD never came through, and the Marist Student Housing could not be built, but by that time 29 families found other housing. When asked if the University helped the families find other housing, Henricksen said, "Larry Smith, housing director, is supposed to assist them, and if they can't find anywhere else, he will help them stay as much as a year." He said that the University always checks with HUD before making a housing decision, before the community. "We get permission from HUD. An inspection of the properties is available for the evicted residents. We also give all the occupants 6 months eviction notice." Harry Boyle, a community organizer for ACT in Durham questioned Henricksen's statements. "I've worked with some of these people for more than a year, and no one has ever told me they were going to find housing, and the residents find other housing. In fact, I know that several families had to leave because they simply couldn't obtain any housing available. Some families had to move as far away as Carolina to find housing, and others were evicted, and they were looking for housing. Many of these families had been life-time residents of Durham," Boyle said.

Boyte continued, "As far as I know, the University does not ask HUD for permission. I don't think that HUD can prevent the University from making any housing changes in the community. All I know is that the University is required by law to inform HUD of what they are doing." Henricksen said, "When the University bought the property from Erwin Mills, 15-20 per cent of the housing units were obsolete." The University said Henricksen was faced with costly repairs ($5000 per house), or demolition. Concerning the expenditure for repairs Henricksen said, "...you would have enough rent out of it to pay for it;" especially since the University would have to build these houses down to fulfill its long range planning.

Currently the University uses some of these houses for storage and office space. Larry Smith, Housing Director said that the University uses the least livable dwelling units for storage. "We would never evict anyone for office space," Smith added.

In addition to the land between campuses, Duke owns property North of East Campus, bordering by Buchanan Street and Sedgefield Street, Markham Street and Green Street. Henricksen explained that the University likes to have three houses behind East Campus for its students and faculty. "For example, when we have a visiting professor, (Continued on Page 5)

Durham faces severe shortage in all low-income housing

By Doug Hastings

Although it may come as a surprise to many Duke students whose knowledge of Durham reaches about as far as the Ivy Room, there is a severe lack of decent housing in the city. While housing is a concern affecting all segments of the Durham population, the shortage is felt most by low and middle income residents.

Four of the city's census divisions in 1960 had median incomes of $3000 or less and 60 per cent of the housing units in these areas were deficient. In fact, the dwellings of these families whose income was under the city average were found to be deficient. Low and moderate income households occupy a disproportionate number of rented homes (72 per cent) and even a higher percentage, 83.6, or substandard renter units.

According to the 1969 census, the overall percentage of substandard housing units in Durham is 29 per cent. Fourteen percent are overcrowded. Durham's housing units are also generally very old. In 1960 51.1 per cent of the occupied units were built before 1939.

Not only are the present needs great, but there is no indication that housing demands will slacken in the 1970's. A demand for

University housing problem plagues most major schools in the country

By Doug Hastings

In 1961 the U.S. Census Bureau called Durham the sight of his brain child pretty much as a last resort, but as soon as the University arrived, it began exerting a major role in the community. According to Gerhard Henricksen, treasurer of the University, Duke bought all of the campuses for long range planning. Henricksen said, "We will eventually need all the land between Duke University Road and Erwin Road. At the present time we have two-thirds to three fourths of the land,"

Most of the units purchased from Erwin Mills can be classified as low-income housing. An official city report in 1968 describes the housing situation as "tight." Making this analysis more clear, an exhaustive housing study completed that year predicts a shortage of 4600 to 5200 units by 1975. Thus the conclusion can be drawn that Duke owns that number of units which are much needed by the Durham community.

In 1969 Duke gave residents of a 12 block area 6 months eviction notice, where Duke planned to build new Student Housing. The loan from HUD never came through, and the Marist Student Housing could not be built, but by that time 29 families found other housing. When asked if the University helped the families find other housing, Henricksen said, "Larry Smith, housing director, is supposed to assist them, and if they can't find anywhere else, he will help them stay as much as a year." He said that the University always checks with HUD before making a housing decision, before the community. "We get permission from HUD. An inspection of the properties is available for the evicted residents. We also give all the occupants 6 months eviction notice." Harry Boyle, a community organizer for ACT in Durham questioned Henricksen's statements. "I've worked with some of these people for more than a year, and no one has ever told me they were going to find housing, and the residents find other housing. In fact, I know that several families had to leave because they simply couldn't obtain any housing available. Some families had to move as far away as Carolina to find housing, and others were evicted, and they were looking for housing. Many of these families had been life-time residents of Durham," Boyle said.

Boyte continued, "As far as I know, the University does not ask HUD for permission. I don't think that HUD can prevent the University from making any housing changes in the community. All I know is that the University is required by law to inform HUD of what they are doing." Henricksen said, "When the University bought the property from Erwin Mills, 15-20 per cent of the housing units were obsolete." The University said Henricksen was faced with costly repairs ($5000 per house), or demolition. Concerning the expenditure for repairs Henricksen said, "...you would have enough rent out of it to pay for it;" especially since the University would have to build these houses down to fulfill its long range planning.

Currently the University uses some of these houses for storage and office space. Larry Smith, Housing Director said that the University uses the least livable dwelling units for storage. "We would never evict anyone for office space," Smith added.

In addition to the land between campuses, Duke owns property North of East Campus, bordering by Buchanan Street and Sedgefield Street, Markham Street and Green Street. Henricksen explained that the University likes to have three houses behind East Campus for its students and faculty. "For example, when we have a visiting professor, (Continued on Page 5)
Students living off-campus cause dilemma for University

By Bob Switzer
Supplement Editor

Because of a housing shortage on campus, over 500 Duke students currently live off-campus. This shortage may continue as the student body grows. There is no provision in the University’s plans to accommodate the housing needs of all students.

The new housing shortage is being felt by many students who are in need of housing. Some students have been forced to move off campus, and others are moving in order to find a place to live.

The problem is being addressed by the University and the student body.

The University is currently working on a new housing project that will be located off-campus. This project will provide additional housing for students who are unable to find housing on campus.

In addition, the student body is working to address the housing shortage by forming a housing committee. The committee is working to identify areas of the city where housing is available and to negotiate with landlords to secure housing for students.

The housing shortage is a serious problem that is affecting many students.

Married student housing controversy

By Jeff Forster
Assistant Editor

One of the most controversial issues facing the University is the question of married student housing.

The University has a policy that prohibits married students from living on campus. This policy has been criticized by many students and alumni.

There have been several protests and demonstrations on campus in recent years to bring attention to the issue of married student housing.

The University has maintained its policy, citing the need to maintain a traditional and family-oriented campus.

Some students and alumni have argued that the University is forcing students to live off-campus and that this is having a negative impact on their education and social development.

The University has been criticized for its policy on married student housing.

Critics have pointed out that the University’s policy on married student housing is discriminatory and that it is preventing many students from living on campus.

The University has defended its policy, stating that it is necessary to maintain a traditional and family-oriented campus.

The University has also been criticized for its policy on married student housing.

Critics have pointed out that the University’s policy on married student housing is discriminatory and that it is preventing many students from living on campus.

The University has defended its policy, stating that it is necessary to maintain a traditional and family-oriented campus.

The University has also been criticized for its policy on married student housing.

Critics have pointed out that the University’s policy on married student housing is discriminatory and that it is preventing many students from living on campus.

The University has defended its policy, stating that it is necessary to maintain a traditional and family-oriented campus.
Duke purchases of Erwin Mill houses make it large landlord

By Adrenee Glover
Supplements Editor

Duke moved from being a small, somewhat accidental landlord, to being a major Durham real estate owner in 1964 with the purchase of 140 housing units from Erwin Mills, part of Burlington Industries.

In 1964, Duke University purchased property, named at $605,985 from Erwin Mills concentrated in the area between East and West campuses.

The University razed 29 of the housing units in the early summer of 1968. According to a report on Duke's housing by Reed Kramer, former president of the YMCA, many of the housing acquired lacked central heating and had sub-standard plumbing and/or electrical wiring. A proposed married student housing unit was slated for the area. Since the federal loan to finance the construction did not come through, the married student housing was never built. The University demolished the 29 empty units.

Gerhard Henricksen, who is in charge of buying and selling University property, said that 15-20 percent of the units bought from Erwin Mills were obsolete. To repair a house that never had been heated or plumbing would cost the University around $5000. According to Henricksen, "even if you did (repair the house) you wouldn't get enough rent out of it to pay for it." Persons occupying a house slated for demolition are given two months' notice to find suitable housing on an already tight market.

Restoration

A member specifically if the University helped residents find housing after they had been evicted, Henricksen said, "Larry Smith, Housing Director, tries to help them find houses. He is supposed to assist them, and if they can't find anything in six months, we have let them stay as much as a year."

Smith said that a member of Southland Associates, the University's realty agency, helped the former Erwin Mills residents find homes because he knew all the families personally. Erwin Mills had employed Southland to manage the houses before the University purchased them.

Harry Boyle, a community organized in Durham questioned the University's efforts in locating new housing for these residents. "Several families who had lived in Durham all their lives had to move to other towns to find housing because there was no housing available for them in Durham. Other families have been forced to live in trailers because there were no houses available which they could afford."

Director of Student Affairs, Joe Martin, pointed out that some of the residents of these houses were paying $44.00 a month rent, and "it would be pretty difficult for someone to find comparable housing for that amount of money, especially in Durham where there is such a severe low-income housing shortage."

Harvard

Duke is not the only school in which students and faculty, and concerned citizens have criticized the university's real estate policies. Last spring students at Harvard protested the university's "unresponsiveness to Cambridge."

Dan Connelly, Chairman of the Cambridge Housing Convention said, "We want to make the university realize its obligation to do something. It seems that Harvard only responds to militant-type groups but not to municipal government or citizens of Cambridge. Harvard just doesn't want to communicate with 'ordinary people'."

Until the student protest dramatized the expansion issue, the Harvard Corporation had made no statement on the housing problem. Now the corporation promises, "Our future expansion of the university which involves the elimination of existing residential housing will include provision for relocating existing tenants..."

Raising Rents

Before the Universities purchased property, previously owned by mill employees as soon as it comes on the market. Commenting on this, Mr. Henricksen said, "We do not need land necessarily just for expansion but we need more land to complete areas we are in; parcels of land to fill the gaps between the two campuses, between East and West Duke University Rd. and Erwin Rd. We have 2-3/4 of it. Most of this land (not owned by the University) is owner occupied."

As reported in Kramer's paper, if a unit is bordering on substandard, the general policy of the University is to board it up to prevent vacants while waiting to have it demolished, rather than renovate the house. Whether or not the University would demolish a house depends, according to Henricksen, "on what we could get for it."

In recent years Duke has razed 85 houses either because of the condition of the houses or to make way for institutional expansion.

Landlord

(Continued from Page 3)

"it's nice to have these houses for him to use; also some of our new faculty like to have houses the first year while they look for a place."

The only non-Duke personnel living in these units are original tenants from the time of Duke's purchases.

The areas of housing around the University which will be torn down to accommodate the throughway lie south of East Campus and along Erwin Road. Most of these units are in the low-income or low-rent category. Thus, the severe shortage of these houses, described by the Morton Hoffman Report. "The Housing Needs of Low and Moderate Income Households in Durham" will be accentuated by the throughway construction.

"The expressway will, however, have little effect on campus properties or projected construction in the University. Some students have accused Duke of negotiating with the State Highway Department to insure that the path of the throughway would have minimal effect on the University. Henricksen, denied these allegations, saying, "we had no part in it."

The University, however, has consulted with the Highway Department in regard to another part of the expressway. Plans for an interchange at the juncture of Anderson and Erwin Roads have been opposed by Duke. The West Durham Merchants have joined Duke in appealing the proposed interchange, and no final decision has been reached by the Highway Department.

In exchange for the sections of Duke property which the Expressway will affect, the Highway Department has given the University several acres east of Campus Drive.

Many of the houses Duke owns are in a delapidated condition.
This house is one of the few houses in good condition. It is a former Erwin Mill house.

—Housing, a national problem—

This sort of real estate activity, in no way limited to Chicago and Columbia, prompts many observers to consider the American university an integral part of the troubled urban scheme. Such deep commitment to the status quo by the colleges often puts them in a position of opposition to real forces for social reform. Even if a college is not actively perpetrating a specific social evil, as in the case of Chicago or Columbia, it can contribute to the perpetuation of society’s ills merely by its inactivity.

This is, unavoidably, Duke’s situation in Durham. Duke is a real estate owner, landlord and an agent in urban renewal. Its students and faculty contribute to the housing shortage. Duke’s corporate needs cause it inescapably to have an effect on the way of life in the Durham community. The decision remains in the University’s hands as to whether this will be a destructive or a constructive effect.

(Continued from Page 3) there is an acute housing shortage in Durham. Poor Hardest Hit

As in other parts of the country, poorer residents are hardest hit by housing problems. Federal standards set 25 per cent as the maximum income which any person or family should have to pay for shelter. Higher payments mean less money for other essentials. In 1960, over 40 per cent of Durham renters paid at least 25 per cent of their incomes for housing, and one-fourth paid over 35 per cent. By far the greatest burden fell on households with annual incomes of less than $3000.

Vacancies

The number of housing vacancies in Durham is also low—reflecting the fact of prospective home owners. Although the number doubled between 1950 and 1960, it dropped slightly between 1960 and 1967, when the vacant units totalled 1,350. Of these, only 650 were classified as available vacancies. The remainder were seasonal units or dwellings not for rent or sale. The most reliable present statistics show that probably not more than 750 units are now vacant and available. Furthermore, even though building has increased substantially, over 85 per cent of the available vacant units in 1967 were rented ones. This leaves only about 11 openings for a prospective home buyer in Durham. The rented housing is the type most sought by Duke undergraduates living off campus. Their numbers have tripled in the last two years, thus adding even more pressure to the tight housing situation in Durham.

Urban renewal has been and continues to be the largest demolisher of houses, highway construction among other public and private actions. However, this has also contributed. Approximately 3000 dwelling units have been torn down in Durham County from January, 1960 through April, 1969. Striking disproportions in relation to the poor housing problem are evident among racial lines. In 1960 78.9 per cent of non-white housing was classified as substandard. The figures for whites was 27.6 per cent. In addition, 72.8 per cent of non-white, renter-occupied housing was built before 1939. The city-wide figure for pre-1939 dwellings is 51.1.

Crisis in low-income housing—


dwelling units have been torn down in Durham County from January, 1960 through April, 1969. Striking disproportions in relation to the poor housing problem are evident among racial lines. In 1960 78.9 per cent of non-white housing was classified as substandard. The figures for whites was 27.6 per cent. In addition, 72.8 per cent of non-white, renter-occupied housing was built before 1939. The city-wide figure for pre-1939 dwellings is 51.1.
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