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### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

BGES, Inc. (BGES) was contracted by the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) to conduct an historical building survey of the Fairview neighborhood of Anchorage Alaska. Work under this contract included the following tasks:

- Research of the history of Fairview;
- Identification of all buildings (both commercial and residential) in Fairview that were constructed during, or prior to 1962 (Figure 1);
- All of the buildings identified as being constructed during, or prior to 1962 were photographed and described in architectural terms;
- For each building constructed during, or prior to 1962, an Alaska Historic Resources Survey (AHRS) card was prepared (these cards are included in Appendices A through AF;
- A photographic log has been prepared to catalogue all of the properties that were identified as being constructed during the applicable time period described above and subsequently photographed; and
- The locations of buildings identified to be potentially significant and potentially eligible for historic preservation, as well as potential historic districts within the Fairview neighborhood have been identified. The locations of these identified buildings and districts are represented on Figure 2 (at end of text).

After several planning meetings were held between representatives of the MOA, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and BGES; the research phase of project activities began. During this phase of work, BGES reviewed a database of properties in Fairview that was provided to us by the MOA. Pertinent property details were gleaned from the database, and a new database was prepared that was a concise version of the larger MOA database. In addition, the MOA provided a large map of the community of Fairview, which was instrumental in assisting with the locations of many of the subject properties. Additional research included reviewing property details in the MOA online property information database; and the MOA Property Appraisal Department was visited on several occasions in order to obtain information on properties that were identified in the field as being constructed before the stipulated date, but did not have any entries for that address in the MOA databases.

In some instances, properties in the field had different addresses affixed to the building as
compared to the MOA Property Information Database, in which case the addresses that were affixed to the individual buildings were ultimately utilized in preparation of the AHRS cards.

Our project staff attended a block party that was held by the Fairview Community Center near the beginning of the field work. This allowed us to meet many of the residents of the neighborhood, who would later see us driving by. We also met Fairview Neighborhood Council members, who provided some historical information that proved valuable in developing the historical narrative of the neighborhood, presented in Section 2.0 below.

The field work (photographing and describing the buildings) was scheduled such that the majority of the properties could be photographed during the fall season, after leaves had left the trees, but before the snow fell; for the greatest visibility of the buildings. Our field crew generally conducted the building reconnaissance in teams of two persons; with one individual taking the photographs, while a second team member wrote a description of the property. The written description was important because it gave perspective to the portions of buildings or other structures on the property that could not be viewed in the photograph. In the cases where additional sheds or other small structures were observed; these items are generally described on the AHRS cards, but were not photographed. In some instances, a second residential building that was constructed during or before 1962 was observed on a property, and in this case, a second AHRS card was prepared. These properties are often distinguished by numbers such as 1435 and 1435.5 Ingra Street.

In general, members of the community were very supportive and inquisitive about our efforts. The properties were generally photographed from the perspective of the street, such that our field team members were not intruding on private property. The AHRS cards included in Appendices A through AF were prepared by adapting the information from the concise database prepared as described above. In addition, the AHRS cards have a detailed architectural description of each building and in some cases, exceptional property details, which were prepared in general accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation, as modified by instructions provided to us by SHPO personnel.

Funding for this project has been provided by the MOA, the National Park Service, the

Department of the Interior through the assistance of the Office of History and Archaeology, and the Department of Natural Resources.

### 2.0 FAIRVIEW NEIGHBORHOOD ARCHITECTURAL DOCUMENTATION

### 2.1 Sample Description

The Fairview architectural documentation sample included 519 individual buildings, constructed between 1914 and 1962. These 519 buildings included 467 residential and 52 commercial buildings ( $90 \%$ and $10 \%$ of the total sample, respectively).

### 2.2 Sample Historical Context

Figure 1 details the construction history of the Fairview building sample. After decades of stagnant growth, residential construction increases immediately prior to U.S. involvement in World War II, followed by a lapse in new construction during the war as Americans invested their labors in the war effort. An influx of U.S. military development in Alaska and concomitant movement of servicemen and civilian support into the Anchorage area, including Fairview, came on the heels of a 1946 visit by Gen. Dwight Eisenhower. The rate of people moving into Anchorage from the continental U.S. peaked with the 1947 opening of the Alaska Highway for civilian use. The events of 1946 and 1947 also initiated commercial development to Fairview, as seen in the building sample. The combined forces of Fairview growth and an interest in the expansion of the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) led to the annexation of Fairview by the MOA in 1959 (Tower 1999:99, 104, 107).


Figure 1: Fairview building sample construction history ( $N=519$ ). Buildings constructed prior to 1959 were considered when defining potential historic districts, as this was the year of annexation of Fairview by the city of Anchorage. NRHP Eligibility Assessment for Individual Buildings, 1914-1962

### 2.3 National Registry of Historic Places (NRHP) Eligibility Assessment for Individual <br> Buildings, 1914-1962

Recommendations regarding the NRHP eligibility of individual buildings were based upon their potential significance under significance Criterion C (embodying distinctive characteristics of type, period, and method of construction). THRC examined the existing degree of integrity of feeling, design, location, and materials, and retention of character defining features, based upon the original architectural style at its documented construction date (integrity of association and workmanship were not applicable).

Architectural historians are in basic agreement with a general set of guidelines established to provide an empirical foundation for evaluating the integrity of a given building. These guidelines are intended to result in a finding that a property either retains or does not retain
sufficient historic or architectural integrity to qualify for NRHP listing. Following and adapted from Calvit (2007:4.3-4.4), these guidelines include:

- Alterations that singly, will not wholly compromise historic integrity:

0 Refacing with an incompatible sheathing material (i.e., stucco, brickface) that does not obscure critical architectural or building elements; or
o Replacement of windows/doors with modern units incompatible in design and/or materials; or
o Changes to some original windows/openings that do not obliterate or largely obscure original fenestration design or pattern; or
o Changes to plan that do not affect overall mass/scale or obscure original primary façade; or
o Alterations to roofing materials; or
o Removal of secondary functional or decorative architectural features-i.e., chimneys, brackets, window hoods, moldings.

- Alterations that may, singly or wholly compromise historic integrity:
o Refacing with an incompatible sheathing material that does obscure all or most critical architectural or building elements; or
o Changes to plan/additions that severely compromise overall mass/scale or obscure the primary façade; or
o Severe alterations to roofline.
- Alterations that may, in combination, wholly compromise historic integrity:

0 Refacing with an incompatible sheathing material (i.e., stucco, brickface) that does not obscure critical architectural or building elements and one or more of the following:

- Replacement of porch columns with incompatible supports; and/or
- Replacement of windows with modern units incompatible in design and/or materials or size and shape; and/or
- Removal of all or most character defining functional or decorative architectural features (i.e., brackets, window hoods, moldings); and/or
o Any three of the following:
- Refacing with an incompatible sheathing material (i.e., stucco, brickface) that does not obscure character-defining architectural or building elements; and/or
- Replacement of porch columns with incompatible supports; and/or
- Replacement of windows/most openings with modern units incompatible in design and/or materials; and/or
- Removal of all or most character defining functional or decorative architectural features (i.e., brackets, window hoods, moldings); and/or
- Changes to size and shape of multiple window/door openings.

The degree of individual building retention of integrity and defining features for residential properties was assessed by comparing the existing building photograph with scholarly analyses and historical depictions of buildings and building styles constructed ca. 1925-1965 (e.g., Aladdin Co. 1929, 1937, 1956; McAlester and McAlester 1984; Nelson 1952). Use of published contemporary house catalogs (such as those of the Aladdin Co., e.g., 1929, 1937, 1956) is a relatively straightforward means of understanding the nature of variability, and of continuity and change, in residential architecture styles in the years surrounding the catalog dates. The styles of pre-designed houses and house plans offered by companies such as the Aladdin Co. combined existing popular styles and stylistic developments created by the companies. Comparing period house catalog images representing "ideal" styles to existing residential buildings can allow observation of general character-defining features of a particular period house style, and permit an evaluation of the degree to which the existing building retains those features.

The comparative utility of a period "ideal" style as pictured in period catalogs is dependent upon the extent to which a specific building or array of buildings approximates that "ideal" style. For the Fairview residential building sample, the approximation is often strikingly close to the styles presented in period catalogs from the Aladdin Co. (1929, 1937, \& 1956). Figure 2 provides a number of East 13th Avenue residences as examples of this close approximation. It shows that while the existing residential buildings do differ in the ways in which they vary from the "ideal" style, they do not differ in kind from that style. In other words, there is but a small degree of variation within the framework of the "ideal" styles.

For the Fairview sample, individual buildings were recommended as eligible due to sufficiently strong integrity of feeling, design, location, and materials, and retention of character defining features, based upon the original architectural style at its documented construction date (integrity of association and workmanship were not applicable). Individual buildings were recommended as not eligible when there were sufficiently apparent, substantial, or incompatible alterations in original roofline, cladding, fenestration, or structural additions; which offered little or no integrity of feeling, design, location, or materials, or retention of character defining features. Of the total 519 buildings in the Fairview sample, 238 (46\%) are considered individually NRHP eligible, including 228 residential and 10 commercial buildings.


Figure 2: Residential housing style examples, ca. 1940-1955: Aladdin house catalogs (top two images) and Fairview houses (bottom four images). (THRC image, after Aladdin 1937, 1956 and BGES photographs)

### 2.4 Fairview Potential Historic District Delineation and Justification

The boundaries delineating the discontinuous Fairview Neighborhood Historic District, 1914-

1958 are found in Figure 3. The relevant dates cover the initial settlement of Fairview to the eve of its 1959 annexation by Anchorage. Table [insert number] describes the Fairview building sample.

Table 1: Fairview building sample: NRHP eligibility and presence in historic district.

|  | RESIDENTIAL |  |  | COMMERCIAL |  | TOTAL |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| YEAR BUILT | ALL | NRHP <br> ELIG | IN <br> HD | ALL | NRH <br> P <br> ELIG | IN <br> HD | ALL | NRHP <br> ELIG | IN <br> HD |
| 1914-1958 <br> (Fairview HD) | 439 <br> $(94 \%)$ | 218 | 189 | 33 <br> $(63 \%)$ | 5 | 1 | 472 | 223 | 190 |
| 1959-1962 | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(6 \%)$ | 10 | 0 | 19 <br> $(37 \%)$ | 5 | 0 | 47 <br> $(9 \%)$ | 15 | 0 |  |
| TOTAL | 467 <br> $(100 \%)$ | 228 | 189 | 52 <br> $(100 \%)$ | 10 | 1 | 519 <br> $(100 \%)$ | $\mathbf{2 3 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 0}$ |

As discussed above, the Fairview building sample represents and well describes major historically-known residential and commercial development trajectories in the Anchorage area. The spatial, temporal, and historical aspects of properties and themes underlying the potential historic district are internally consistent and coherent, and are distinct from surrounding properties and themes.

The potential historic district boundaries encompass residential and commercial buildings constructed between 1914 and 1958, which have been individually assessed as potentially significant. Selected areas include those with a considerable density of potentially significant residential and/or commercial buildings (approximately four buildings per block) and those with a lesser density if their presence appreciably enhances the integrity of setting of higher density areas. Distant individual buildings or small building clusters are not included in the discontinuous historic district regardless of potential individual significance, as they lack the extent of integrity of setting possessed by the bounded building areas.

### 2.5 Secretary of the Interior/National Park Service (NPS)/NRHP Guideline Adherence

To the extent possible, assessments regarding potential significance and eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places and potential historic district delineation for properties included in the Fairview architectural documentation follow guidelines set forth by the U.S.

Department of Interior (1983, 1997a, 1997b).

### 3.0 A BRIEF HISTORY OF ANCHORAGE AND ITS FAIRVIEW NEIGHBORHOOD

### 3.1 Beginnings

In 1778, Captain James Cook, on his quest to find the western entrance to the elusive Northwest Passage, said of the area dividing "Cook's River" (now Inlet) that it was "as favorable to settlement as any under the same latitude." ${ }^{1}$ The local Denaina people who knew that already, would wait thirteen decades before other Americans sought to prove him right. Like so many other towns west of the Mississippi, Anchorage owed its life to a railroad. In many ways, the city location was problematic, as the inlet offered extreme tides, shallow anchorages, and mud flats, while mountains formed a barrier to the east of the glacial moraines that form the Anchorage "Bowl." Yet, once the federal government chose the route for the Alaska Railroad and made it known that the Alaska Engineering Commission would be constructing a work camp at Ship Creek; the location made sense. And, location is the key to understanding Fairview's past and future. This area, in its short settlement history, has been an ideal of community life for its residents, an escape from convention, a frustrating nexus of social pathologies, and, recently, a place for a revival of that community ideal. All of these are still visible in the properties and structures of Fairview, a neighborhood that is not Downtown, not Eastside nor Midtown, but has always been an island in the middle.

The early history of Anchorage was well-remembered and is well-documented. Confidence was

[^0]high enough for the new town that 655 lots were sold at the initial auction on July 10, 1915. ${ }^{2}$ Although the local economy and population declined within a few years, the City was incorporated in late 1920 and began its existence independent of the Alaska Engineering Commission. A rough and tumble frontier town, the laws against vice did not seem to extend to The Line, where the demimonde supplied entertainment in a district located to the south and east, prefiguring the development of Fairview. ${ }^{3}$

While the railroad had supplied the only economic rationale for Anchorage's presence, conditions inhibited the city's desired port development. In the 1920s, aviation quickly proved its worth and potential. The City's first airfield, now the Park Strip, was built in 1923. As traffic increased, so did the need for an outlying facility, met by a flat area to the east. Merrill Field, named after a popular bush pilot who died on the job, began operations in 1929. The larger international airport, which began operations in 1951, did not supplant Merrill Field's utility for private and bush operations, and the facility remained the eastern boundary of the Fairview neighborhood. ${ }^{4}$

In 1939, Anchorage had a population of about 4,000, but world events soon changed that. In 1940, construction began on what would become Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson, beginning a period that saw Anchorage's infrastructure strained to its limits, but ultimately resulted in its improvement. At that time, only Fourth Avenue had paving. There was no housing for war workers. The only way out of town was by rail. The housing situation never was resolved, but by October 1942, the Glenn Highway connected Anchorage to the Richardson Highway, and ultimately to the newly-built Alaska Highway. The Glenn Highway would play a role in Fairview's development, fostering a commercial and industrial district on the neighborhood's north boundary and serving to funnel southbound traffic onto Gambell Street,

[^1]the development of which would eventually divide Fairview.

Housing had been problematic during the war; as 1946 began, the number of families unable to find housing for purchase or rent produced a housing crunch, with few building supplies available. The war's end did not terminate the federal funding that brought jobs and people to Anchorage, and not less than twenty-seven different government agencies made requests for employee housing. By summer, the situation was called "tragic." ${ }^{5}$ Many veterans liked what they saw in Alaska, and Congress honored their service and the Territorial interests by passing a law making homesteading straightforward for them. ${ }^{6}$

The housing need led to the development of Fairview, as its location near Merrill Field, the Glenn Highway, the military bases, downtown, and the main north-south traffic route of Gambell Street added up to destiny. Factor in the area's minimal slopes and dry upland soils, and builders had few challenges. People had built homes in the area ranging from shacks to crafted log cabins during the war years, but settlement became more systematic afterwards as platting created a standard road grid. ${ }^{7}$ For building, in 1947, an Oregon-based company recognized an opportunity and began importing prefabricated houses to Anchorage for the first time. ${ }^{8}$ Demographically, the war and post-war influx brought a wider variety of Americans to the north, which helped to form the African-American community; its members founded the local chapter of the NAACP in 1951. While many made their residence in Fairview, the city never developed a concentrated minority area, such that busing to diversify the public schools has never taken place. ${ }^{9}$ By 1950, Anchorage's population stood at 11,254 within the city limits and 30,600 in the overall area, indicative of the homesteading and settlement that had occurred in places like

[^2]Fairview beyond the Municipality's purview. ${ }^{10}$ In a notable piece of neighborhood history, its residents provided an opportunity seized by Larry Carr and Barney Gottstein as they opened their first grocery store at 13th and Gambell, the first in their eventual network of stores. ${ }^{11}$

### 3.2 Formalization and Struggle

Settlement expanded from the City's boundaries, yet consolidation was virtually inevitable. The City's first annexation occurred in 1945, encompassing three hundred acres south of downtown. Other neighborhoods followed—Eastchester, University, Mountain View, Russian Jack, Rogers Park, Spenard—leaving Fairview isolated in the middle. Like those in other neighborhoods, many Fairview residents stoutly resisted annexation by the MOA, as basic services were met through the Fairview Public Utility District. Many saw themselves as independent pioneers who neither wanted, nor needed the bureaucratic oversight of City Hall. Wasn't Alaska supposed to symbolize freedom? There were also justified fears of increased property taxes, building codes, and, for those purveyors of vice, regulation. The discussion extended through the 1950s. Just prior to a vote in 1958, a newspaper editorial commented "everyone knows that Fairview is the controversial 'island' of non-corporate land which now sits almost smack in the center of the existing townsite of Anchorage." ${ }^{12}$ The issue passed that year, approved by sixty percent of the neighborhood's voters. Although opposition continued-legal challenges went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, but failed to make its docket-the neighborhood became part of Anchorage. Fairview's location could not be denied. ${ }^{13}$

[^3]Alaska's first oil boom began after the Swanson River field was discovered in 1957. Within five years, offshore platforms began to dot Cook Inlet. As early as 1961, the City recognized that the neighborhood would undergo extensive changes. Leaders commissioned a planning study to anticipate desirable outcomes over the next 20 years; the planners showed good prescience by predicting an urban population of 225,000 -optimistic, actually, prior to the Prudhoe Bay strike, but close in the end. Planners recognized the value of Fairview's location and recommended "rehabilitation and clearance of Fairview for commercial or high density development consistent with its proximity to the Central Business District."14 There had not been much construction since the neighborhood had been settled, nor in Anchorage as a whole, as the major Cold War defense structures had been completed and there was economic recession during 1960 through 1962. The Good Friday earthquake in 1964 ended that as reconstruction monies flooded in, allowing the city core to rebuild rationally and better than before. ${ }^{15}$

Not much of that trickled into Fairview, though, which had not suffered extensive damage. In 1965, the City Planning Commission called Fairview's housing "among the poorest in the city" and noted that virtually every block suffered from "lack of paving, accumulated trash, or junked cars." There were also more traffic accidents than in any other residential area. With traffic increasing on Gambell and Ingra Streets due to Anchorage's growing population, the commission recommended zoning those as commercial, eliminating the single-family homes, and encouraging high-density housing; subsequently, this zoning change occurred. The report noted, though, that "this neighborhood will neither upgrade itself nor attract new development." ${ }^{16}$

Improvements to the traffic arteries were necessary for the City, but did not enhance the neighborhood's family-friendly qualities. Discussion on widening Gambell Street to four lanes
${ }^{14} 1980$ Anchorage, Alaska, Metropolitan Area General Plan (1961), 71.
${ }^{15}$ Wangness, A History of the Unification, 8, 9.
${ }^{16}$ Municipality of Anchorage, A Neighborhood Planning Program for Anchorage, Alaska (City Planning Department, 1965), 115-19.
had occurred as early as 1958. ${ }^{17}$ It was Fairview’s "Main Street" flanked by small businesses. The 1961 plan for 1980 Anchorage envisioned a freeway leading south from the Glenn Highway passing between Merrill Field and Fairview, with Gambell important, but not primary. ${ }^{18}$ Had this occurred, the character of Fairview might have turned out differently, but the City went with the lower-cost option and created four-lane, one-way streets on Gambell and Ingra, forming high-volume obstructions to pedestrians and effectively dividing the neighborhood.

The oil boom of the 1970s, provoked by North Slope discoveries, kept Anchorage's growth rate steep; by 1975, Anchorage's population was estimated at $180,000 .{ }^{19}$ About 5,000 of those called Fairview home: some because it always had been, others because it was affordable, still others only until they could move to a better neighborhood. Property owners and investors had used the boom to remake the neighborhood, tearing down the homes of the 1940s and 50s and building apartments, most of only passable quality. Half of Fairview's families earned less than the Anchorage median income, while 12 percent lived at or below the poverty level. In 1974, the City undertook a neighborhood survey and summarized Anchorage's problems as follows:

1. Land use conflicts between older single-family homes and multi-family structures and commercial establishments.
2. Inadequate parkland and recreation facilities.
3. General deterioration of homes and other structures.
4. A social atmosphere depressed by degeneracy, which residents described as "crime" or the presence of "undesirables," and by a slum-like, trashy environment.

While Anchorage and Alaska have long been characterized by a mobile in-and-out-of-state nonNative population, this tendency was marked in Fairview. The 1970 Census showed that 57 percent of residents had lived there for a year, while only a quarter of residents had lived there more than three years. Almost three-quarters of residents were renters. An equal percentage of survey respondents described the housing as rundown. Yet all was not negative; the survey

[^4]commented on the caring and vigor of the community council, and the desire of residents to work toward improvement. People also appreciated an affordable neighborhood, even if it did have some undesirable elements. Tellingly, a divergence appeared between respondents who did not desire even more multi-family housing and the City’s long-term perspective: "Fairview has important locational values for multi-family use.,20

Fairview resident and journalist Stan Jones wrote, "For years, the raffish little neighborhood of Fairview was the closest thing to a slum that Anchorage has ever seen. . . . best known for high crime, low rents, and good barbecue."21 Throughout the 1980s, the neighborhood had a high profile in police reports and newspaper stories of indigency, drugs, and crime. The recession at mid-decade led to high vacancy rates and a general economic downturn, hurting primarily not those already in poverty but those who had bought during the boom without having any financial cushion; foreclosures led to investment buying, absentee landlordism, and high turnover of renters. The neighborhood did not look good, feel safe, or attract the financially capable sort of people that realtors appreciate.

### 3.3 Renewal and Prospects

Fairview residents had longed complained of inadequate public recreation facilities. The City took steps to respond to these in the 1980s. Using a combination of federal and state funds, in August 1980, residents helped break ground for a neighborhood recreation center (Fairview Recreation Center), which became a social hub for all ages. ${ }^{22}$ In 1985, the Anchorage Assembly took the 8th Avenue block between Karluk and Medfra Streets containing the S \& S Apartments, called the "last major packet of hardcore blight," and turned it into the Fairview Lions Park. ${ }^{23}$ This provided much-needed recreational space, complementing the other two parks of the

[^5]neighborhood: Fairview Park, 1217 LaTouche, established in 1968; and Fairbanks Park, 530 E 11th Ave, established in 1922 and renovated in 1996 with Community Development Block Grant monies. ${ }^{24}$

Voters approved bond monies in the 1990s for a variety of neighborhood improvements. Many of these pertained to traffic patterns; the straight streets invited speeding, so several were blocked, narrowed, or curved for traffic "calming."25 Neighborhood beautification was also included for pleasing visual effects. These changes went hand-in-hand with the involved residents of Fairview taking steps to improve their chosen neighborhood: the creation of a neighborhood strategy plan in 1991, the invigoration of the Community Patrol, and cooperation with a community policing initiative by the Anchorage Police Department. ${ }^{26}$ Subsequently, home sales have increased along with property values as the desirability of Fairview has shown steady improvement. While it remains one of Anchorage's poorest neighborhoods, its thriving social diversity and hard-working families show continued evidence that the problems of the past do have solutions. ${ }^{27}$

As has been typical of Alaska, little thought was given to historic preservation, given the dynamics of the neighborhood's residential history and its proximity to downtown, ensuring that the first wave of single-family homes would yield to higher density options. Shortly after statehood, city-wide, ninety percent of homes had been built after 1940, fifty percent after 1950. ${ }^{28}$ What was notable? What was worth preserving? A statewide overview commissioned by the American Society of Architectural Historians found no buildings in Fairview worthy of

[^6]mention. ${ }^{29}$ Visitors to the neighborhood can easily spot the few remaining vintage log cabins, such as the one on 13th Avenue and Karluk Street (built in 1947), but these too are subject to the forces of economics. One on $16^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Karluk Street was lost in 2006 to make way for a 38-unit condominium, and City planners expect more to follow. ${ }^{30}$

Already visible is some modest gentrification as property values rise and urban-minded folks looking for short commutes to downtown or midtown workplaces begin to invest and upgrade. While this may be seen as desirable and the best use of Fairview's location, its historic role has often-though by no means exclusively-been as a place for people who sought alternatives to conventional bourgeois neighborhoods, whether they sought to live life on their own terms, sought neighbors like themselves, or found Fairview attractive or necessary for financial reasons. Fairview may become highly desired by the professional class; if so, it will be a much different neighborhood than it has been.

[^7]
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