

THOMAS HARDIMAN AND PUBLIC HOUSING

Highlights:

- Thomas Hardiman fought against public housing.

Hardiman Fought Against Public Housing

HARDIMAN REPRESENTED RESIDENTS WHO WANTED TO KEEP LOW INCOME RESIDENTS FROM MOVING INTO THEIR COMMUNITIES

1994: Hardiman Represented Residents Of Allegheny Commons East In Their Effort To Keep The Federal Department Of Housing And Urban Development From Allowing Very Low Income Residents Into Their Community

1994: Hardiman Represented Residents Of Allegheny Commons East In Their Effort To Keep The Federal Department Of Housing And Urban Development From Allowing Very Low Income Residents Into Their Community. According to the Pittsburgh City Paper, “Hardiman registered as a non-partisan voter in 1992, but went Republican in 1994. He began building a bipartisan political network that went far beyond his wife’s family. In 1994, at then-City Councilor Dan Onorato’s request, he represented the residents of Allegheny Commons East in their effort to keep the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development from allowing very-low-income residents into their North Side community. (Onorato is now county controller and the Democratic candidate for county executive.)” [Pittsburgh City Paper, 7/2/03]

- **Hardiman: “[T]he Influx Of Public Housing Units Will Depress Property Values.”** According to the Pittsburgh City Paper, “[T]he influx of public housing units will depress property values,” Hardiman wrote in court filings. That would harm Edgewood’s tax base, he added. Hardiman’s pleadings dismissed out of hand the possibility of HUD making payments to Edgewood to make up for any damage to the tax base. “There is no adequate legal remedy because the damage will be ongoing and, as such, impossible to measure,” he wrote. The only solution, Hardiman’s filings implied: Put the poor elsewhere. Edgewood lost the case, but political pressure compelled HUD to reduce the number of subsidized homes in the little borough from eight to three.” [Pittsburgh City Paper, 7/2/03]

1996: Hardiman Represented Edgewood Borough In A Case Against HUD’s Plan To Turn Eight Homes Into Subsidized Housing Because They Would “Depress Property Values”

1996: Hardiman Represented Edgewood Borough In A Case Against HUD’s Plan To Turn Eight Homes Into Subsidized Housing Because They Would “Depress Property Values.” According to the Pittsburgh City Paper, “In 1996, many Edgewood Borough residents and officials were in an uproar over a Department of Housing and Urban Development plan to buy eight houses and turn them into subsidized housing for low-income families. The eight houses were to be among 100 purchased countywide, as part of a settlement of a court case alleging a history of discriminatory racial segregation in public housing. Edgewood, though, wanted no part of the effort. The borough hired Hardiman, who was fresh from his successful fight against HUD at Allegheny Commons East. “[T]he influx of public housing units will depress property values,” Hardiman wrote in court filings. That would harm Edgewood’s tax base, he added. Hardiman’s pleadings dismissed out of hand the possibility of HUD making payments to Edgewood to make up for any damage to the tax base. “There is no adequate legal remedy because the damage will be ongoing and, as such, impossible to measure,” he wrote.” [Pittsburgh City Paper, 6/26/03]

- **Hardiman Argued For Housing The Poor Elsewhere.** According to the Pittsburgh City Paper, “The only solution, Hardiman’s filings implied: Put the poor elsewhere. Edgewood lost the case, but political pressure compelled HUD to reduce the number of subsidized homes in the little borough from eight to three.” [Pittsburgh City Paper, 6/26/03]

1998: Hardiman Represented The Housing Authority Of Pittsburgh In A Case Against A Woman Whose Section 8 Benefits Were Being Terminated

1998: Hardiman Represented The Housing Authority Of Pittsburgh In A Case Against A Woman Whose Section 8 Benefits Were Being Terminated. According to the Pittsburgh City Paper, “In August 1998, the two teenage sons saw a car sitting in a supermarket parking lot with the engine running, according to court filings. [...] A month later, the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh notified Powell that it was terminating her Section 8 benefits, based on federal regulations allowing it to cut off the subsidy if a resident commits a violent crime in the ‘immediate vicinity’ of their home. [...] It could have ended there. Instead, the Housing Authority hired Hardiman, who appealed Wettick’s decision.” [Pittsburgh City Paper, [6/26/03](#)]

- **Hardiman Arranged For The Housing Authority To Place Her Subsidy Into Escrow, Leading Her Landlord To Threaten Her With Eviction.** According to the Pittsburgh City Paper, “At about the same time, court filings by Powell’s attorney allege, Hardiman’s office arranged for the Housing Authority to pay Powell’s subsidy into an escrow account, rather than to her landlord. That prompted her landlord to threaten her with eviction. In an angry court motion, Powell’s attorney accused the authority of ‘attempting to achieve & by deceitful and unlawful means, what it could not achieve on the merits: the eviction, and consequential homelessness, of Beverly Powell and her 10-year-old child.’” [Pittsburgh City Paper, [6/26/03](#)]