

Planning Context

The Highland Park Community is located at the northeast corner of the City of Pittsburgh, nearly five miles from Downtown. Its neighboring communities include East Liberty, Lincoln-Lemington-Belmar, Larimer, Stanton Heights, Garfield and Morningside. In addition to the residential portion of the neighborhood, the community contains Highland Park and the Pittsburgh Zoo and PPG Aquarium, which cover a large part of the community's land, 500 acres and 77 acres, respectively.

Neighborhood History

Alexander Negley became the first permanent settler of Highland Park in 1778. The county surveyor Robert Hiland subdivided the Negley's land holdings when he laid out Negley and Hiland Avenues in 1837, giving his own name to Hiland Avenue, the spelling of which was later changed to "Highland." The earliest settlers farmed the land, but were soon replaced by new and wealthy families. During the 1880s, large homes in Queen Anne Style or Richardson Romanesque Style homes were built along Highland Avenue, known as "Millionaires' Row."

Highland Park opened as a city park in 1889, providing a respite from the social and environmental realities of industrial urbanism. The Pittsburgh Zoo was opened in 1898. Such developments, along with the electrification of the streetcar system in 1896, attracted more people to the area. Technological advances, along with the perception of the community as a fashionable place to live, accounted for the explosion of growth.

In the first decade of the twentieth century, the most intensive development took place. During this time, approximately half of the houses standing west of North Highland Avenue were built, giving the neighborhood its physical character. Large houses lined Highland, Stanton, and Negley Avenues. Behind these streets, more modest single-family middle-class houses lined the flat sections of the neighborhood. Although these smaller houses were closely spaced, they were set back from the street, giving a feeling of spaciousness. The large homes that lined North Highland Avenue were given a large front lot, which created a feeling of grandeur. Almost all of the building activity during this time was residential, with the exception of a few apartment buildings, and some commercial buildings along Bryant Street. In addition, three churches were built, including St. Andrew's Episcopal Church (1903-07).

More development took place following World War I. Most of the construction involved higher density developments, such as row houses, double houses, and apartment buildings. With accessibility from the automobile, construction moved up the steep hillsides, away from the streetcar lines. The building boom that occurred before the Great Depression occupied most of the available land. However, there was some additional development in the 1930's. A variety of house styles, such as Colonial Revival, Tudor and English period, Craftsman, Mediterranean, Modern, and Romantic were built during this time. To make room for more housing, property was subdivided. Infill housing placed new styles next to old, and resulted in the eclectic neighborhood that Highland Park is today.

In the years following World War II, there was little development with most of the available land already occupied by houses. Large lots were subdivided and rental developments, such as Highland Towers, were built.

Demographics

In planning for Highland Park, demographics were studied for the neighborhood as well as for several of the surrounding East End communities to which Highland Park is often compared. The communities analyzed include: East Liberty, Morningside, Friendship, Shadyside, Point Breeze, and Squirrel Hill South. Demographics for the City of Pittsburgh as a whole were also reviewed. For the analysis, data were used from the US Census 1990 and Census 2000, as reported in the Department of City Planning 1990 Census reports, the 2000 Census profiles on the Department of City Planning website, and the University of Pittsburgh UCSUR reports on the 2000 Census on the University of Pittsburgh website. For the figures referred to in the discussion below, please see Appendix I.

Summary of Findings

Overall, it is apparent that Highland Park is similar to its neighbors in certain ways, and quite unique in others. In several measures, such as housing type, family structure and racial makeup, Highland Park is much more similar to the City of Pittsburgh than it is to any of the individual East End neighborhoods to which it is often compared. In general, it appears that the demographics do bear out the perception of Highland Park as a neighborhood that includes a mixture of different household and family types, age groups, incomes, and races. Some highlights of demographics findings are listed below.

- The percentage of children (aged 0-17) in the population is much higher in Highland Park, East Liberty and Point Breeze than it is in Friendship or Shadyside.
- In Highland Park and East Liberty, unlike the other East End neighborhoods studied, the relatively large proportion of children in the population is a growing trend.
- The proportion of seniors (aged 65 +) in the community is shrinking in Highland Park, as in most other East End neighborhoods and the City, but at varying rates.
- The racial makeup of Highland Park in 2000 was quite different from most other East End neighborhoods', but similar to the City of Pittsburgh's as a whole.
- Within the neighborhood itself, the level of racial integration, block by block, is higher than most of its comparison communities as well as the City of Pittsburgh over all.
- The percentage of growth of the minority population in Highland Park (+73%) was greater than in most of the other East End neighborhoods.
- Highland Park lost a greater proportion of its white residents (-22%) between 1990 and 2000 than any other neighborhood studied besides East Liberty (-53%). The City of Pittsburgh lost 15% of its white population, and its minority population grew by 5%.
- Highland Park had almost even proportions of black and white youth (aged 0-17) in 2000, with a small population of "other minorities." These proportions and the way that they

have changed since 1990 are different from all other neighborhoods studied, but closely mimic the City of Pittsburgh's pattern.

- The minority youth (aged 0-17) population in Highland Park grew by 93% between 1990-2000, while the white youth population dropped by 24%.
- The percentage of youth aged 16-19 currently enrolled in school in Highland Park is lower than all of the other East End neighborhoods studied except for East Liberty, and also lower than the City of Pittsburgh average.
- The proportion of youth aged 16-19 that is neither enrolled in school nor employed is higher in Highland Park than in most other East End communities besides East Liberty and is higher than the City of Pittsburgh average.
- Highland Park has a lower poverty rate than the City or East Liberty, but greater one than Morningside.
- The proportion of single-parent families in Highland Park grew between 1990 and 2000, at a rate that was faster than the City's.
- In every neighborhood studied and in the City of Pittsburgh in general, black children are less likely than white children to live in a married-couple home, and more likely to live in a single-mother home.
- Both black and white children who live in Highland Park are less likely to live in a single-mother household than in any other neighborhood studied, except for Point Breeze.
- Highland Park seems to be quite unique among the East End neighborhoods studied in that it has almost equal amounts of rental- and owner-occupied housing units. Highland Park's rate closely mimics the City's, whereas every other neighborhood studied is skewed either towards rentals or ownership.
- Highland Park's resident transience profile matches the City's almost exactly, with 53% of the population living in the same house that they did in 1995. Shadyside and Friendship show much higher rates of transience, with only about 30% of the population living in the same house as in 1995.

Overview of Population

A preliminary look at the population levels of the East End communities studied shows some general similarities among them. The overall population of most of these neighborhoods declined from 1990 - 2000, as it did in the City of Pittsburgh as a whole (Fig. 1 & 31). Although Highland Park lost 4% of its population during this decade, this drop was less severe than that of the City of Pittsburgh (-9%), and was also less than other East End communities such as East Liberty, Morningside and Friendship (-14%, -11% and -9%, respectively). Of the neighborhoods studied, only Shadyside showed a gain in population during the decade 1990-2000 (+3%). The proportions of various age groups (0-17, 18-64, 65+) within the population also appear to be quite similar among the East End neighborhoods studied, and they changed in largely similar ways between 1990-2000 (Fig. 7 & 32). The 18-64-year-old age group is by far the largest in each neighborhood, and their proportion in the population increased slightly within most neighborhoods and in the City from 1990-2000. (In Highland Park, the proportion of 18-64-year-olds decreased by 0.5% between 1990-2000.)

When the trends are reviewed more closely, however, it is clear that both the makeup of East End neighborhood populations and the ways that they are changing over time vary significantly between communities (Fig. 27, 29 & 30). One of the most notable differences is that the number of children living in Highland Park, East Liberty and Shadyside actually increased by over 10% between 1990 -2000, whereas in every other neighborhood studied, and in the City of Pittsburgh in general, it decreased by between 5% to 17% (Fig. 2 & 33). The percentage of children (aged 0-17) in the population is much higher in Highland Park, East Liberty and Point Breeze than it is in Friendship or Shadyside. This indicates that in Highland Park and East Liberty, unlike the other East End neighborhoods studied, the relatively large proportion of children in the population is a growing trend.

Also notable is the fact that both the number and the proportion of seniors (aged 65 +) in the community is shrinking in Highland Park, as in most other East End neighborhoods and the City (Fig. 7 and 32), but at varying rates. The number of seniors in Highland Park declined by 19% between 1990 and 2000, similar to the City of Pittsburgh rate (-17%), but much less than the rate of decline in both East Liberty and Friendship (-30%.) In contrast, Point Breeze lost only about 6% of its seniors (Fig. 33.)

Race

Home to a mixture of people of different racial and ethnic groups, Highland Park is considered by some to be one of the more ‘diverse’ and ‘integrated’ neighborhoods in the East End. It is interesting to examine whether this perception is borne out in the actual demographic statistics, and what trends may indicate for the future of the neighborhood.

Figure 3 shows that the racial makeup of Highland Park in 2000 was quite different from most other East End neighborhoods’, but similar to the City of Pittsburgh’s as a whole. Highland Park’s population was 65% white, 30% black, and 5% other (including Asian and biracial among other groups). The only other East End neighborhood with a racial mix similar to Highland Park’s is Friendship; most of the others had far smaller proportions of black residents and higher proportions of whites. The notable exception is East Liberty, which had 73% black and 22% white residents.

Breaking this down into individual age groups, Highland Park is shown to be even more different from its neighbors. For example, Highland Park is the only neighborhood in the East End that has almost even proportions of black and white youth (aged 0-17), with a small population of “other minorities,” a profile that is similar to the City of Pittsburgh’s (Fig. 24). Every other neighborhood studied has a youth population that is dramatically skewed racially in one direction or another (with the exception of Friendship, where the proportions of all three categories are more similar, the largest proportion being black).

The level of integration in a community is an important measure of its well-being. Communities that are integrated by race, for example, represent lower levels of racial bias and disparities in outcomes associated with race, than communities that are not. Integration, as distinct from “diversity”, measures the extent to which community members in different groups (e.g. whites versus nonwhites, renters versus owners of residential housing) are distributed evenly throughout the community. For example, if a neighborhood’s population consists of 50% white residents and 50% black residents, but all of the white residents live in the western portion of the neighborhood, and all of the black residents live in the eastern portion, we could say that the neighborhood’s population is diverse, but it is not integrated.

One common measure of integration is called the “index of dissimilarity”. This quantity measures, roughly, the fraction of the population of one of two groups (say, blacks as compared to whites) that would have to move between various portions of a community (say, Census blocks) in order for the fraction of blacks in each portion of the community to be equal to the fraction of blacks in the community overall. Lower dissimilarity measures indicate a more complete level of integration than higher measures do; a dissimilarity measure of 0 means that the two groups are represented in each portion of the community in an identical fashion as in the community overall, while a dissimilarity measure of 1 indicates perfect segregation: all members of one group live exclusively in one portion of the community.

Using data from the 2000 Census at the lowest level of aggregation, namely the Census “block” (about the size of a city block), we have computed the index of dissimilarity for the black/white racial segregation in Highland Park as well as our usual comparison set of neighboring and “peer” communities. Figure 34 shows that Highland Park, with a dissimilarity measure of 0.39, is among the most racially integrated of all these communities (only Friendship, at 0.37, is more integrated). Particularly striking are the high segregation measures for Morningside (0.70), Point Breeze (0.76), and Shadyside (0.50). By comparison, the black/white segregation measure for the City of Pittsburgh is 0.67, according to the Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Research. Thus, we may conclude that according to this measure, Highland Park has a higher level of racial integration than most of its comparison communities as well as the City of Pittsburgh overall, and it much more closely resembles the City of Pittsburgh according to the diversity of its population than nearly all of its comparison communities.¹

Examining the way that neighborhood racial distribution has changed over time yields more interesting information.² The Department of City Planning 1990 Census Population and

¹ Calculations of the Racial Dissimilarity Index were prepared by Angela Foster, Assistant Professor at the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh. The relevant discussion was provided by Michael Johnson, Assistant Professor at the H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management, Carnegie Mellon University. All other calculations, figures and discussion related to demographics in the Community Plan were prepared by Susanna Bjorkman of Brean Associates.

² It is important to note, when looking at shifts in population of various racial groups between 1990 and 2000, that the way in which “race” was queried in the 2000 Census was somewhat different from the way in which it was

housing Report gives information on race in two categories: white and “combined minority.” Therefore, for purposes of comparison across time, those two categories have been utilized. Figure 8 illustrates how the combined minority population may differ between neighborhoods, showing what the racial distribution of the combined minority category was in 2000. Most notably, in Shadyside and Squirrel Hill South the predominant minority group was Asian, whereas in Highland Park and every other neighborhood studied as well as in the City of Pittsburgh, blacks represented by far the largest proportion of the combined minority category.

Figures 5 and 24 show that in every neighborhood studied, the white population fell and the combined minority population rose between 1990 and 2000. The proportions of this change, however, differed between neighborhoods. Figure 4 shows that the percentage of growth of the minority population in Highland Park (+73%) was greater than in most of the other East End neighborhoods, with the exception of Morningside (+116%). However, Morningside’s starting 1990 minority population was relatively quite small. Also, Highland Park lost a greater proportion of its white residents (-22%) between 1990 and 2000 than any other neighborhood studied besides East Liberty (-53%). The City of Pittsburgh lost 15% of its white population, and its minority population grew by 5%.

The shift in the racial makeup of Highland Park between 1990-2000 was especially notable in the 0-17 age group. During this time period, the majority group of youth aged 0-17 in Highland Park shifted from white to combined minority. This is different from every other neighborhood studied, in which the gaps between existing majority and minority groups remained largely the same or were widened (Fig. 10 & 11). The current racial distribution of Highland Park’s youth population and the way that it has changed since 1990 closely mimics that of the City of Pittsburgh as a whole. Of all of the neighborhoods studied, Highland Park is the only one that is similar to the City in this way. Figure 9 shows the extent of the change in the racial distribution of the youth population in terms of the percentage of change within each racial group. The under-18 minority population in Highland Park grew by 93% during this time period, while the white under-18 population dropped by 24%. The relative proportions of these changes in Highland Park are far greater than those in any other East End neighborhood studied, except for Morningside.

asked about in the 1990 Census. In 2000, people were given the opportunity for the first time to report their race as “biracial.” Before this, people who were of mixed-race ancestry were forced to choose one race category, such as white, black, Asian, or “other.” This means that potentially some people who self-reported as white, or black, or Asian, etc. in the 1990 Census may have self-reported as biracial in the 2000 Census. For this reason, researchers are cautioned against making direct comparisons between 1990 and 2000 population levels of different racial groups. However, in Highland Park and the other East End communities studied, the number of people who reported themselves as biracial on the 2000 Census is relatively low (in Highland Park 159 people, or 2.4% of the population, registered as biracial; city-wide the average was 1.6% of the population). Also, presumably not all of the people who claimed to be biracial in 2000 had reported in 1990 as being from the same racial group (e.g. all of them registered as black, or all registered as white), so the effect is likely to be spread out somewhat across all racial groups. Therefore, it can still be useful to examine general trends that are much larger than could be accounted for by the discrepancy of this small segment of the population.

Education

One way to gauge a community's prosperity is to assess the educational achievement of its residents. Figure 13 shows that the adult residents (aged 25+) of Highland Park are relatively well-educated, including a greater proportion of college graduates and a smaller proportion of high school dropouts than the City of Pittsburgh's average. Highland Park's residents are also better educated than residents of East Liberty, Morningside, and Friendship. Highland Park residents are less well-educated, on average, than residents of Shadyside, Point Breeze and Squirrel Hill South.

In terms of the achievement of its youth aged 16-19, Highland Park ranks somewhat lower than its neighbors (Fig. 14). The percentage of youth aged 16-19 currently enrolled in school in Highland Park (76%) is lower than all of the other East End neighborhoods studied except for East Liberty (65%), and also lower than the City of Pittsburgh average (85%). The proportion of the youth population that is neither enrolled in school nor employed is higher in Highland Park than (12%) in most other East End communities besides East Liberty (15%) and is higher than the City of Pittsburgh average (8%).

One way to assess a community's level of engagement in its public schools is to see what proportion of the children in the community attend private school. Figure 15 shows that Highland Park's rate of private school attendance (36%) is above the City's average (23%) and far more than the neighboring communities of East Liberty (18%) and Friendship (9%) but is actually far less than other East End communities such as Shadyside (65%) and Point Breeze (56%). These numbers do not reflect the number of children in these communities attending public magnet schools, only those enrolled in private or parochial educational institutions.

Income

The most obvious way to assess the prosperity of a community is to look at the income levels of its residents. The table below shows the median income brackets for Highland Park and the other neighborhoods studied:

| Neighborhood | Median household income bracket |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Highland Park | 40,000-44,999 |
| East Liberty | 15,000-19,999 |
| Morningside | 35,000-35,999 |
| Friendship | 20,000-24,000 |
| Shadyside | 30,000-34,000 |
| Point Breeze | 60,000-74,999 |
| Squirrel Hill South | 35,000-39,999 |
| Pittsburgh City | 25,000-29,999 |

At first glance, Highland Park seems to be relatively very prosperous – its average is higher than every neighborhood studied except for Point Breeze. However, the numbers for many East End neighborhoods can be somewhat misleading, probably due to the high numbers of college and graduate students living in certain neighborhoods. Figure 12 shows the proportions of the populations of each neighborhood that are currently enrolled in college or graduate school. The relatively high proportions for Shadyside, Friendship and Squirrel Hill South may help to account for the lower income levels in these neighborhoods. Interestingly, Highland Park has a lower percentage of residents enrolled in higher education (8%) than the City of Pittsburgh average (13%).

A clearer picture of Highland Park's relative prosperity is given by the spectrum of household incomes across the population, rather than just the medians. Figures 16 and 17 show the income profile of Highland Park as compared with the City of Pittsburgh and East Liberty, Friendship, Point Breeze and Morningside. Highland Park has proportionally fewer households earning less than \$20,000 per year and a greater proportion earning over \$50,000 a year than the City of Pittsburgh (Fig. 16). Of the other neighborhoods, Highland Park's profile seems to be closest to those of Morningside and Point Breeze, although Point Breeze has a much greater proportion of households earning over \$100,000 annually. Highland Park has a significantly smaller proportion of households earning less than \$20,000 per year than either East Liberty or Friendship. The five neighborhoods have somewhat similar proportions of households earning between \$20,000 and \$50,000 per year.

Looking at poverty levels (Fig. 18), Highland Park seems to have lower rates of poverty than many of the other East End neighborhoods, but again, the relatively higher levels of adult students within the population in some of the other neighborhoods may influence these numbers. A more telling comparison for Highland Park may be with its immediate neighbors, East Liberty and Morningside, and with the City of Pittsburgh. Highland Park has a lower poverty rate (12%) than the City (20%) or East Liberty (30%), but greater than Morningside (7%). Highland Park's proportion of households at 200% of poverty (27%) is the same as Morningside's but far less than the City's (41%) or East Liberty's (56%).

Household Characteristics

Knowledge about the different types of households that are prevalent within a community brings greater understanding of the character of that community, and the kinds of issues that are key to shoring up quality of life and community health. Figure 19 shows the proportion of households that are “families” (those composed of people who are related to each other), and also the proportion of households that are families with children. Non-family households could be people living alone, or in a roommate situation. Highland Park, with 53% family households and 25% families with children, matches the City of Pittsburgh’s overall profile almost exactly. Most of the neighborhoods studied have similar proportions of families with children (25%), except for Shadyside and Friendship, which have far fewer families with children and family households in general than the other neighborhoods in the area. Morningside and Point Breeze have a slightly higher proportion of family households, at about 62% each, but nearly the same proportions of families with children as the other neighborhoods.

Looking a more specifically at family structure, Figure 20 illustrates the proportion of all families with children that were single-parent families in 2000. Highland Park appears to be in the middle range of the neighborhoods studied, with 39% of its families with children being single-parent families. This is below the City’s average of 48%, and well below East Liberty’s rate of 77%, but far above the rates for Shadyside and Point Breeze. Figure 21 shows that the proportion of single-parent families in Highland Park grew between 1990 and 2000, and at a rate that was faster than the City’s.

Another way to examine family structure is to consider the number of children within a community that are living in various family situations, rather than to count the families themselves. Figure 25 shows the proportion of children under 18 were living in married-couple families in each neighborhood in 2000, and also gives detail for white and black children specifically. At first glance, Highland Park appears to be in the middle of the range of the neighborhoods studied, with 57% of its children living in married-couple families. When looked at individually, however, both black and white children in Highland Park are more likely to live in married-couple households than in any other neighborhood studied (except for Point Breeze), in some cases dramatically so. Figure 26 similarly shows that both black and white children in Highland Park are less likely to live in a single-mother household than in any other neighborhood studied, again except for Point Breeze. It is clear from Figures 25 and 26 that black children are less likely than white children to live in a married-couple home, and more likely to live in a single-mother home, in every neighborhood studied and in the City in general.

Housing and Migration

When planning for the future of a community, it is useful to have a sense of how transient its residents are, whether they tend to stay in the community for decades, or have a tendency to move frequently. Figure 22 shows the proportion of each neighborhood's residents that lived in the same house from 1995-2000. It also shows the proportion that stayed in the City of Pittsburgh and in the general Western Pennsylvania region over the same time period. Highland Park's profile matches the City's almost exactly, with 53% of the population living in the same house that they did in 1995. Shadyside and Friendship show much higher rates of transience, with only about 30% of the population living in the same house as in 1995.

Another issue that influences a community's structure and character is the proportion of owner versus rental housing in the neighborhood. Highland Park seems to be quite unique among the East End neighborhoods studied in that it has almost equal amounts of rental- and owner-occupied housing units (Figure 23). Highland Park's rate actually closely mimics the City's, whereas every other neighborhood studied is skewed either towards rentals (East Liberty, Shadyside and Friendship), or ownership (Point Breeze and Morningside). It is important to keep in mind that these figures are based on housing units, not structures, so that a house which has been subdivided for rental may have multiple housing units within it, but the identical house which is owned by a single family would be considered one housing unit. Highland Park's housing unit vacancy rate of 8.5% is in the middle of the range of the neighborhoods studied, the lowest being Squirrel Hill South at 4% vacancy, and the highest being East Liberty at 14% vacancy. The vacancy rate for the City of Pittsburgh is 12%.

Overall, it is apparent that Highland Park is similar to its neighbors in certain ways, and quite unique in others. In several measures, such as housing type, family structure and racial makeup, Highland Park is much more similar to the City of Pittsburgh in general than it is to any of the individual East End neighborhoods to which it is often compared. Several trends unique to Highland Park have interesting implications for its future. For example, the high recent growth in youth population, and in particular the black youth population, may bring with it growing needs for after-school activities and recreation. The fact that these youth increasingly live in single-parent households may make such needs even more pressing. In general, it appears that the demographics do bear out the perception of Highland Park as a neighborhood that includes a mixture of different household and family types, age groups, incomes, and races.