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Introduction

Research Problem and Objectives

This thesis analyzes how historic preservation can add value to revitalization strategies in Camden, New Jersey. Through a case study framework, it examines how preservation projects have been implemented in comparable cities that have been facing the challenges that greeted many post-industrial cities across the United States beginning in the second half of the 20th century. Some of the most significant barriers to preservation implementation have fundamentally been economically driven and the question of what happens to preservation in economically disinvested communities with scarce resources and dire public needs is compelling and under-researched. The research seeks to investigate how disinvested communities make choices concerning their built heritage and under what circumstances they have chosen to preserve, and why. Through surveying the benefits and disadvantages that preservation has allowed these cities to realize, the research seeks to understand the incremental value and long-term benefits of adopting preservation-based approaches to revitalization in legacy cities, by specifically looking at the case of Camden, New Jersey. Historic preservation is not intended to resolve the complex social, political and economic issues that drive systemic disinvestment and decline, but it has been a significant component in the sustainable development of other cities that are currently facing or have faced decline in the past. It is a common practice in many of the most unique, desirable and economically self-sufficient urban neighborhoods and districts across the country and it is of no coincidence that the seeds of nascent revitalization are frequently born out of our cities’ historic urban neighborhoods. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has reported that neighborhoods comprised of older buildings with smaller footprints result in more social communities with a greater amount of small businesses, bars, restaurants, and culture than large-scale new construction, based off of data collected in
Cities that choose to preserve their urban heritage often do so at the considerable expense of current resources; however, this strategy has often led to broader and longer term sustainable development and the creation of vibrant, culturally robust communities that would not otherwise be possible.

**Methodology**

The researcher selected the city of Camden as a case study because it faces many common urban challenges as other post-industrial cities that often take precedence over preservation needs and dominate public resources and policy, making it a good model for this study. The researcher had the opportunity to intern in Camden at Cooper’s Ferry Partnership, the citywide economic development corporation where she gained insight into the current redevelopment and revitalization initiatives that are taking place in the city. The researcher engaged in conversations with individuals involved in community and economic development, as well as historic preservation professionals and urban planners, while conducting secondary research on the historic and current context in Camden. For the case study analysis, the researcher identified several other post-industrial cities believed to have social, political and economic similarities to Camden and were evaluated based on the degree of these shared characteristics. The cities that were found to have the highest degrees of similarity—six or more of the same indicators—were scanned for preservation policies and projects that have been implemented with measurable impact within their respective communities (Appendix Figure 4). From these mini case studies, the researcher has synthesized the common practices and strategies that were used to examine how these tactics would play out in the Camden context.

---

Historical Context

The city of Camden is located in southwestern New Jersey across the Delaware River from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and was essentially founded due to its proximity to Philadelphia by means of trade. Early development formed in clusters stemming from the nascent ferry industry to transport people and manufactured goods to Philadelphia starting in the late 17th century, including taverns, hotels, and industrial sites. In 1852, the Camden-Atlantic Railroad was established and the manufacturing sector in Camden rapidly expanded in response to this enhanced regional connection.2 Camden produced everything from fig soap and pork sausage to iron works; the rise of manufacturing and greater regional connection brought by the railroads transformed Camden from a small ferry town with a modest manufacturing base into a city in its own right, best illustrated by its population boom from about 20,000 in 1870 to 116,000 in 1920.3 Neighborhoods formed to accommodate the population growth, including the first federally-funded planned community, Yorkship Village, today known as Fairview, for New York Shipbuilding Corporation employees during World War I. The accompanying development during Camden’s boom era including grand department stores, hotels and movie theaters made Camden an exciting urban destination during the first half of the 20th century. The city’s three largest employers, Campbell Soup, New York Shipbuilding Corporation, and Radio Corporation of America comprised 70% of the city’s employment base

---

and carried the municipal economy through the Great Depression, with growth continuing through World War II.¹

Mid-century, however, a familiar story of decline ensues. As yet another victim of the great “deindustrialization of America”, Camden lost 48% of its manufacturing base between 1960 and 1970, largely in part due to the closure of the New York Shipbuilding’s operations in the city.⁵ Between 1940 and 1970, increasing competition from the suburbs witnessed a steady out migration of the white population from the industrial city, as African Americans began moving in. Race riots in the 1970s accelerated white flight to the suburbs, as former residents of the city no longer felt personally or economically secure due to the dramatic loss of jobs and increase in racial tensions. The employment sector did not improve and by the turn of the 21st century, Camden was bankrupt and the New Jersey state government initiated the largest municipal takeover in U.S. history, relinquishing the local government of all authority and injecting $175 million to revitalize the local economy. This succeeded in partially revitalizing the downtown business and waterfront district, but did not resolve many of the core issues of unemployment, crime, poverty, and deterioration in city-wide infrastructure that continued to make life difficult for residents.

Today, 38% of Camden residents live below the poverty line and the population has shrunk down to just over 77,000 from its peak of over 124,000 in 1950.⁶ The violent crime rate in Camden is seven times higher than the U.S. average and unemployment hovers well above the state rate at 16%. The state takeover ended in 2010, and the city regained control of its

⁵ Gillette, *Camden after the Fall*, 43.
municipal affairs and the city is now refocusing its revitalization efforts to address the shortcomings of the previous plan. Major issues that challenge development in the city today include rampant disinvestment, the presence of derelict and abandoned structures, brownfields in need of remediation, high crime rate, extreme poverty, and high unemployment and homelessness.

Current revitalization strategies are based on attracting new business investment through the continued build out of the Camden waterfront as an effort to leverage existing assets, and expanding the institutional presence in the downtown through the educational and medical institutional anchor system. Other revitalization goals include neighborhood stabilization, infrastructure improvement, greenway investment and cultivating a “strong sense of place” to attract a new generation of people who want to live, work and invest in the city.

Recently, the New Jersey Economic Development Authority (NJEDA) signed into legislation the Economic Opportunity Act of 2013, offering generous tax credits to eligible businesses that are making capital investments and creating or retaining jobs in the state of New Jersey. This act is anticipated to make a significant impact on Camden, which has been designated a “Garden State Growth Zone” which makes the city and potential businesses choosing to locate there eligible for the maximum level of tax incentives. At the time of this thesis, it is still too soon examine any measurable impacts of this act, though it is expected to change the landscape of the economic development prospects in Camden as eligible business investors may receive up to $30 million in tax credit compensation from the state.7 Despite, these massive economic development incentives, Camden is overburdened with a high concentration of the urban poor and a

---

structural deficit that has made it dependent on state aid. Howard Gillette stated that every entity that would hurt real estate in Camden County is placed in the city; this concentration of adverse uses makes resolving Camden’s development and growth issues ever more challenging.

**Significance and Hypothesis**

While severe, these challenges are not isolated to Camden, but rather prevalent in many post-industrial cities across the country, allowing research on the effectiveness of revitalization strategies to be broadly applicable if adapted to local conditions. Many experts have found that preservation remains a relatively small aspect of overall planning strategy and implementation in legacy cities, and that, “despite 70 percent of the surveyed cities having certified local government status, which affords cities access to technical and financial assistance for preservation-related activities and tends to indicate strong municipal commitment to historic preservation,” preservation of the legacy assets found in these post-industrial cities is not leveraged to its full potential nor is it generally part of the redevelopment ethos.8

Researchers contend that the historic infrastructure of legacy cities contain enormous amounts of sunken investments, and understanding how these under-leveraged resources can contribute to urban revitalization is imperative to efficient implementation.9 Camden and similar older industrial cities also play a unique role in American cultural identity, carrying within its fabric an architectural legacy that is the physical representation of the story of contemporary American formation. A belief amongst preservationists is that the key to developing the future, lies in embracing the city’s past:

---

Historic preservation. It is the foundation and initial step to redeveloping the postindustrial district in the American city. Rehabilitating the existing buildings, streets, and open space is not only practical; it is sustainable both from an economic and environmental point of view. It creates an aesthetically pleasing environment that utilizes the best attributes of the district -its sense of place.\textsuperscript{10}

This research tests the hypothesis that there is a significant role that preservation can play in legacy cities and their redevelopment as they find ways to regain relevancy in contemporary society, and specifically that there is a case to be made for the adoption of a more integrated preservation-minded approach in Camden, New Jersey.

This topic attempts to further bridge the gap between preservation and the perception of progress by examining both traditional and non-traditional tools and strategies that have been used nationwide to implement preservation and examining the potential outcomes of applying them to the Camden context. By identifying where preservation outcomes and other public values intersect, preservation values are more likely to become part of conversations concerning the future development of the city. If we can continue to demonstrate that preservation is not only feasible for communities with scarce resources, but adds sustained value to impoverished neighborhoods, it can help expand the definition of what preservation is and increase its integration with planning, community development and revitalization strategies that are regarded as more established methods of achieving public goals.

**Key Definitions**

**Adaptive reuse:** specifically refers to the process of repurposing a historic building for a use different from its original intent.

**Community development corporations/organizations:** grassroots organizations working to

\textsuperscript{10} Paul Hardin Kapp and Paul J Armstrong, SynergiCity Reinventing the Postindustrial City (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2012), 28.
improve, stabilize and/or revitalize disadvantaged neighborhoods.

**Historic preservation**: This term will be broadly defined to encompass any activity that pertains to the maintaining and preserving of existing and historic buildings throughout the city, including traditional preservation activities including the rehabilitation, documentation, restoration, reconstruction and/or designation of the historic built environment (generally including properties over fifty years old).

**Legacy city**: American legacy cities refer to former industrial powerhouses and hubs of business, retail, and services primarily in New England, Mid-Atlantic and the Midwestern regions of the US that have experienced the loss of jobs and population starting in the mid-20th century, and now face economic, social, and physical challenges due to these changes.

**Millennials**: The cohort of individuals belonging to Generation Y, typically born in the 1980s to 1990s and represent young people with future earning potential. Millennial retention is a common goal of economically developing cities as they are seen to drive growth by supporting local economic activities through their work and leisure lifestyles.

**Revitalization**: The implementation of public, private, non-profit, and/or grassroots efforts, strategies and resources to foster economic growth, enhance market demand and improve the quality of life of low-income residents.

**Urban development, community development**: Terms that are used interchangeably to represent current urban planning practices used to address urban challenges and improve the quality of life for residents.
Literature Review

Existing research on revitalization and urban redevelopment practices in Camden, New Jersey reveals that little has been published concerning the use of historic preservation as an urban revitalization strategy, despite increasing adoption of this practice in other cities. This literature review will be structured by analyzing the parallel tracks of community development research and historic preservation as an economic development strategy, with a specific emphasis on existing publications regarding the impact of tools and strategies that have achieved the combined goals of preservation and urban revitalization. Examining current literature on these topics will provide the necessary context to analyze the impact of implementing preservation in the city of Camden towards achieving the combined goals of preserving a rich urban heritage to guide future development in the city, while encouraging sustainable growth and revitalization of this post-industrial city in decline.

Historic Preservation Context

The city of Camden is a Certified Local Government, and the planning department hosts a Historic Review Committee that oversees development pertaining to over 90 historic designations including the city’s nine historic districts—the last of which was designated in 2007.¹¹ The city also has several historic overlay and conservation overlay zones incorporated into its zoning and land use plan.¹² While preservation infrastructure exists in the city, it is not actively pursued as a revitalization strategy and according to developers; historic preservation is often overlooked when it comes to development matters. Revitalization efforts that have

rested on demolition as one of the central pillars of progress for many decades have caused friction between the city’s goals of economic development and preservation. This is well illustrated by the recent loss of the Sears Department store on Admiral Wilson Boulevard, a national and state registered historic structure that was built in 1927 and demolished in 2013. Campbell’s Soup purchased the iconic building in 2012 and demolished it under the justification that it was impeding the success of the nearby development of its corporate office park. Camden Mayor Dana Redd stated on the demolition, reiterating the common belief that demolition is tantamount to progress, “This is great news for the city, for Campbell and the region...The demolition of this property finally clears the way for future development in the Gateway Neighborhood. My administration looks forward to continued collaboration with Campbell as we strive to spur economic development and move Camden forward.”13 This notion that demolition signals progress is particularly damaging to the preservation ethos and may in part be attributed to the lack of research that links preservation to improved outcomes in urban redevelopment projects.

On the other hand, Camden has witnessed a few isolated cases of successful preservation projects, including the redevelopment of the former headquarters of the RCA Victor Company, located in the historic neighborhood of Cooper Grant along the Camden Waterfront. Dranoff Properties, a local Philadelphia based real estate developer who has worked on several adaptive reuse projects, converted former manufacturing plant into what is called today the Victor Building, a mixed use luxury residential and retail project on the Camden Waterfront. This building, visible from Philadelphia, is significant for its Classical Revival industrial architecture and for being the home to the Victor Talking Machine Company and

---

Radio Corporation of America—two pioneers in the development of recorded sound and communications technology during the early 20th century. While the majority of Camden’s turn-of-the-century industrial waterfront buildings have been demolished, The Victor is an example of a successful high visibility adaptive reuse project that adds character and vitality to the city.

**Urban Revitalization Context in Camden, New Jersey**

The most comprehensive description of Camden’s renewal process is encapsulated in Howard Gillette’s book, *Camden after the Fall: Decline and Renewal in a Post-Industrial City*, which documents Camden’s transformation post-World War II, identifying the various social, political and economic drivers of Camden’s decline, and the city’s efforts to rise from its proverbial ashes. Absent from Gillette’s description of the redevelopment efforts in this book is any description of concerted preservation efforts to aid in the re-development of the city, though Gillette has written separately on the importance of leveraging legacy assets to “capitalize on previous investments in existing structures” and “how tapping hidden value in underutilized or abandoned sites can generate new activity and wealth.”

Regarding demolitions, he also recognizes the importance of preservation related activity in positioning Camden to add more value to the region through a triple bottom line approach,

“Surely, there will be those who will celebrate the demolitions of these structures as part of the city’s progress. The rest of us should be pressing for uses that do more to advance not just profit but a more comprehensive approach to enhancing Camden as a vital part of the South Jersey region.”

---


Another leading expert on economic development practices in Camden is John Kromer, a recognized leader in urban policy making and neighborhood reinvestment strategies, who served as Chief Operating Officer appointed by the state through the Municipal Rehabilitation and Economic Recovery Act (MRERA- the state government intervention in Camden enabling legislation from 2001-2010). In *Fixing Broken Cities*, Kromer outlines the breadth of economic development issues Camden was facing including eminent domain practice and the associated backlash, sales of tax liens to put delinquent properties back in the real estate market, population displacement as well as government attempts to alleviate this consequence of redevelopment, and anchor institutional development. Despite a comprehensive overview of the urban development practices in Camden, historic preservation and related research was excluded from his discussion, though many of the tools and strategies mentioned also impact preservation activities such as abandoned property treatment, housing rehabilitation and demolition, eminent domain and tax policy.

**Economics of Historic Preservation**

In the broader field of economics and historic preservation, the economic benefits of historic preservation have been widely published. Donovan Rypkema has written extensively on this topic and is considered a pre-eminent leader in the field. In *Economics of Historic Preservation: A Community Leader’s Guide*, Rypkema succinctly and powerfully demonstrates how historic preservation activity has been linked to benefits including but not limited to job creation, increased investment and spillover into the local economy, and downtown

---

revitalization.17 Randall Mason, the chair of the graduate program of historic preservation at the University of Pennsylvania, published *Economics and Historic Preservation, A Guide and Review of the Literature* offering an extensive survey of what is understood and published in the field of economics and preservation, grouping the sources into various categories, containing a section on research pertaining specifically to economic development.18 Mason has classified the types of existing research to include: a) basic cost studies (financial pro-formas, cost benefit analysis etc.) of specific projects, b) economic impact studies, the most common form of analysis in depicting economic benefits of preservation, “They effectively present the argument that historic preservation is a legitimate category of economic activity and investment, and a contributor to regional/urban economies,”19 and lastly c) case studies, many of which have been published by the National Trust summarizing the wide range of economic redevelopment strategies employing historic preservation.

Another expert that must be mentioned regarding this topic is David Listokin of The Urban Policy Research Center at Rutgers University. He and his colleagues have done the most sophisticated economic impact studies of historic preservation activity and he has written extensively on the preservation movement and cases where preservation has been linked to positive effects in urban revitalization.20

---

Historic Preservation and Community and Economic Development

Further limited in scope, there has been a movement to research, primarily from preservation advocacy groups, the connection between the economics of historic preservation to the urban revitalization of legacy cities and as a community development strategy. In the article, “Historic Preservation and Urban Revitalization in the Twenty-first Century” published in the Journal of Planning Literature using an expansive definition of historic preservation, Stephanie Ryberg asserts that the vast majority of research publications concerning the intersection of historic preservation and urban revitalization were commissioned by preservation advocacy groups, and not present in urban planning journals. This article presents a strong overview and survey of the current state of preservation as an economic development measure, and focuses its discussion based around four themes that speak the most to historic preservation (1) the “New American City,” (2) place matters in economic and community development, (3) anchor institutions, and (4) legacy cities.21 Ryberg also links to other sources that have noted the collaborative potential between revitalization and preservation, including Eugenie Birch and Douglas Roby in their 1984 article, “The Planner and the Preservationist: An Uneasy Alliance,” published in the Journal of the American Planning Association, which summarized the synergies and tensions between preservation and urban planning during the early 1980s, concluding that the fields had a highly interconnected relationship and shared common goals. Ryberg also discussed Christopher Silver and John Crowley in their 1991 article, “Revitalizing the Urban South Neighborhood Preservation and Planning Since the 1920s,” who argue that preservation was used as a method for revitalization in this context, but that

---

preservationists, instead of integrating into urban planning strategy and implementation, acted parallel to urban planners working separately to meet the same goals. Another comprehensive resource on the role of urban preservation in community building was listed in a 1998 special issue of Housing Policy Debate, which advances the notion that policy makers and decision makers must better understand the preservation practice due to its growing role in heritage tourism, neighborhood development and downtown revitalization.22

Other authors including Christopher Wonjo in his paper, “Historic Preservation and Economic Development” argue that historic preservation and economic development are two tools that can be used in the revitalization of failing cities. He points out that recent economic developments have often included aspects of historic preservation, and that the two jointly seek to improve city conditions, as well as conditions within communities. Wonjo also examines local and state incentives for historic preservation, as well as the question of how planners can contribute to historic preservation efforts.

Alan Mallach in Regenerating America’s Legacy Cities presents case studies of successful redevelopment and revitalization projects in legacy cities drawing conclusions from these studies to recommend urban development strategies that incorporate preservation values such as retaining traditional urban core and creating re-use opportunities with existing fabric, though he does not specifically call this historic preservation. As part of the right-sizing movement—a planning strategy to address issues in post-industrial cities by adjusting the physical fabric of the city to anticipate the needs of current and future population change—there are a number of studies analyzing the role of preservation in cities undergoing rightsizing and how preservation tools can be applied to right sizing initiatives and become more embedded within these existing

revitalization strategies. Donovan Rypkema has also published reports on this topic, as in the paper, “Historic Preservation and Rightsizing Current Practices and Resources Survey,” he surveyed 20 cities in effort to understand the role of preservation in this strategy and concluded that historic preservation, “is at best, on the fringe. Though preservationists are included in comprehensive planning efforts in some cities, most feel that their contributions do not substantially influence the plans.”

Several studies examine the impact of specific tools that achieve the combined goals of historic preservation and economic development. Stephanie Ryberg’s Ph.D dissertation Neighborhood Stabilization Through Historic Preservation: An Analysis of Historic Preservation and Community Development in Cleveland, Providence, Houston and Seattle presents a thorough documentation of community development corporation activities across the country, with detailed case studies of four chosen cities, analyzing how and why CDC’s select preservation as an active strategy to achieve their mandated public goals of revitalizing struggling neighborhoods.

Another pertinent resource for conducting tool impact analysis is data conducted by the Main Street program. The Main Street Program’s website and publications provide reinvestment statistics and strategies for economic development through the rehabilitation of historic buildings in downtowns across the country. Including data through 2012, Main Street has recorded and published statistical data pertaining to the net gain in businesses and jobs for every dollar of reinvestment in historic preservation in Main Street communities, leading the Main Street program to be recognized nationally as a particularly effective form of economic

development that has helped revitalize downtown corridors. They have many publications geared towards guiding struggling downtown revitalization and community development organizations to address core issues such as abandoned properties, business retention and job growth.

**Conclusion**

Aside from a smattering of studies, there has not been much published research regarding the specific measurable impacts of preservation tools on post-industrial cities, and virtually no research on the impact and potential value of historic preservation in Camden. This calls for a broader scan of activities that have been used in comparable cities to demonstrate the potential outcomes of implementing preservation in distressed communities to achieve improved urban revitalization outcomes. This lack of research that specifically identifies the measureable and documented benefits of integrating preservation into revitalization initiatives in post-industrial cities renders this investigation more challenging while demonstrating that there may be unexplored opportunities in adapting preservation strategies to unlock the untapped value within Camden’s existing asset
Camden Overview

In order to understand how preservation can add value to revitalization efforts and identify strategies that strengthen the effectiveness of redevelopment initiatives while preserving Camden’s remaining architectural heritage, the researcher sought to understand the challenges the city is currently facing, which in large part dictate the focus of existing revitalization approaches. Research into the active revitalization strategies in the city reveal that economic development priorities dominate the city’s development landscape, focusing primarily on the growth of the city’s business and institutional centers, while also including strategic neighborhood planning efforts to improve the inner-city neighborhoods. There has been some isolated high-profile historic preservation activity including the adaptive reuse and preservation of the Joseph and Benjamin Cooper houses, as well as the successful redevelopment of The Victor building on the Camden waterfront, in addition to some neighborhood based housing rehabilitation programs, indicating that historic preservation has been on the agenda of select entities within Camden. However, given the extensive loss of cultural heritage in the city and the pervasive association between demolition and progress, the city as a whole has not actively leveraged Camden’s past and its existing heritage to inform the creation of its future. Many persistent problems that result from greater political and social forces urgently demand the attention of Camden’s scarce resources, ones which urban design professionals are not equipped to address in isolation.

Research reveals that the city of Camden is bifurcated in terms of both development and the challenges experienced within two sections of the city that have grown with increasing distinction. The separation between the commercial waterfront and central business districts and the residential neighborhoods, the first of which was rebuilt and transformed into a hub of
entertainment, education, and medicine, and the latter of which houses the city’s residents and has remained disinvested, crime ridden and underserved by the city’s redevelopment initiatives, has resulted in disproportionate treatment and allocation of reinvestment resources. Many indicators including high crime and poverty, population loss, vacancy and abandonment and a poor public school system are signs that deeper systemic political and social issues must be overcome before substantial change can manifest. CQ Press ranked Camden highest in its list of 432 crime-ridden cities in America, which was determined by reports in crime categories including: murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, and vehicle theft. This report also indicates that Camden ranks five times higher than the national average in terms of crime rate.\(^25\) The city dismantled the former municipal police department and replaced them with the Camden County Metropolitan Police Department in the middle of 2013, which has increased street police presence and cracked down on illicit activity resulting in an overall crime decrease by 14%, with an even greater decrease of 20% in homicides as of December of 2013.\(^26\) Despite overall city-wide crime decreases, neighborhoods where the most drug-related crime occurs have not witnessed a significant improvement indicating that pockets of the city may not be highly prioritized. Paul Schopp, a professional historian and member of the Camden Historic Preservation Commission, has counted that there are over 20 different policing agencies within the city, at the federal, state, county and local level, whose existences attests to the significant crime burden the city harbors for its 77,000 residents.\(^27\)


Cooper’s Ferry Partnership (CFP) is an economic development corporation of Camden whose central mission is to revitalize the city through attracting investment, facilitating public-private partnerships, and engaging in projects that will transform Camden into a city in which people once again want to live, work and invest. CFP has commissioned numerous master plans for urban neighborhoods as well as capital construction projects in the city since the company’s inception in 1974; this non-profit’s vision and unique role in the city of connecting private investors and institutions, to the local, state and federal governmental entities and community residents have driven much of the positive change that has taken place over the decades including the demolition of the waterfront prison site, reopening of public parks, and waterfront development projects. CFP is a sophisticated organization that oversees revitalization projects throughout the city, including a few historic preservation related projects, and while they have a few preservation projects and the work they are involved in is frequently subject to Section 106 review due to the high amount of federal and state funding they receive for project implementation, preservation is not recognized as part of their core mission. Urban renewal, demolition to clear land for new development, and abandonment has removed much of the character enhancing fabric from the city’s landscape, forcing the vision for community revitalization concepts to rely on new construction. Anecdotally, the researcher has observed that many model case studies of urban revitalization, many of which Camden looks to for best practices to foster similar revival schemes, have taken place in historic neighborhoods where the urban fabric helps breed grass-roots community development. Millennial attraction and retention is a major economic development priority, and many of the revitalized communities that have successfully attracted a young professional and artistic community were facilitated by

29 Author held an internship with Cooper’s Ferry Partnership from Summer 2013-Spring 2014.
the existence of historic urban fabric. This concept is further explored in the following chapter on case studies, and through a deeper examination of the historical challenges and attempts of the city to overcome these challenges, this thesis hopes to test the hypothesis that preservation activity can add value to development goals while protecting Camden’s unique assets to ensure that it is a city with a distinct character, and a rooted sense of place that will attract people in the future.

**History of Revitalization in Camden**

Camden has a tradition of rebuilding. Under Al Pierce’s tenure as mayor of Camden between 1959 and 1969, he campaigned under the slogan, “Save our City” which sought to revitalize Camden through an aggressive redevelopment program that was published in 1962, setting the precedent in the city for associating demolition with progress. In an excerpt from Camden’s city plan in 1962, it states:

“If the functions for which the city was built cease to be needed, and if they are not continuously replaced by new functions, the city will decline or disappear. If the worn parts of the city are not replaced by and are, instead, allowed to remain as a sort of urban backwash, the processes of change and new development will take place outside of the city. If the people of a city want this new growth to occur within their city, its environment must be enhanced.”

This enhancement was proposed to take place in the form of building a new network of highways connecting residential neighborhoods with the downtown, restoration of downtown residential centers and traditional commercial corridors that were rapidly decaying, and rebuilding the160 acre heart of the city into a new shopping and commercial district that was to compete with the opening of the suburban Cherry Hill Mall in 1961. This plan, like many “classic pro-growth urban renewal programs” which were sprouting up around the country during this

---
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time, was based on the assumption that growth was imminent, as long as land was freed to accommodate this growth, along with the necessary supporting infrastructure.\(^{31}\)

Public housing was introduced to Camden in 1938 and was seen as a popular alternative to low rent housing offered by the private sector. The public popularity behind these programs incentivized local politicians to build more of these projects, but most of these housing developments were offered on the condition of racial segregation, creating conflicts that only worsened as whites increasingly moved out of the city to the suburbs and the urban black population increased. Historically, racial minorities in Camden were relegated to the oldest inner city housing stock, which were plagued with deplorable conditions. Racially segregated public housing combined with pervasive demolition through urban renewal did little to alleviate the housing shortage for the black and Puerto Rican urban poor as housing stock was being destroyed at a rapid pace while the urban non-white population increased. This led to the joint formulation of public housing provision initiatives and redevelopment planning as allegations of significant displacement issues became publicized. As civil rights groups illuminated the extent of the problem, citing that as many as, “three thousand city buildings had been demolished in the previous six years with no low-cost housing to replace them,” the government felt increasing responsibility to address this crisis.\(^{32}\)

Also during this time, Camden experienced severe budgetary shortfalls where the city’s deficit surpassed its revenue. The city’s revenue was significantly short of meeting the city’s basic needs and the city government continues to struggle with balancing the budget. Property values continued to drop as crime increased, and former city residents fled to the suburbs—forcing the municipal authorities to raise the tax rates to make up for the decline in revenue

\(^{31}\) Ibid, 269.
\(^{32}\) Ibid, 75.
associated with the depreciation in property values, generating a hostile business operating environment, resulting in a steady continuing loss of business including both Lit Brothers and Sears department stores. Camden continued to decline through the 1970s and by 1979 the city’s total property value had fallen to $277 million, compared to neighboring suburban Cherry Hill, whose property was valued at $1.1 billion for a significantly smaller population.\textsuperscript{33}

The 1980s saw a shift in redevelopment practice that followed a strategy to build on Camden’s existing assets, which contemporary decision makers deemed to be Camden’s waterfront. This guiding strategy ultimately resulted in the conversion of the central waterfront from its previous industrial use to a leisure and entertainment retreat for tourists and visitors. In 1983, the Greater Camden Movement commissioned American Cities Corporation to create a comprehensive plan for the waterfront site. This report recommended that redevelopment should leverage and prioritize the city’s principle assets including its proximity to Center City Philadelphia, the presence of higher education institutions and medical facilities, and its two remaining major corporations—Campbell Soup and RCA, and recommended building a “lively urban environment” around these assets reflecting, “a contemporary approach... that used public incentives to attract private investment.”\textsuperscript{34} This scheme sought to bring the middle class back to Camden and improve life for all of the residents, largely through new construction of leisure and entertainment based anchor institutions such as the waterfront aquarium, regional concert venue/entertainment center, and baseball stadium.

Waterfront redevelopment also brought the city’s first market-rate housing in decades, which was anticipated to revolutionize the look and feel of the downtown: an adaptive reuse project utilizing the former RCA Victor manufacturing building that converted the former factory

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, 93.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid, 125.
into luxury rentals units. While this facelift on the waterfront sought to improve Camden’s negative image to spur private investment, the positive impacts of waterfront redevelopment were largely confined to the downtown waterfront commercial district, and benefits did not spread to the neighborhoods leaving large portions of the urban population unaffected by these revitalization efforts leading some experts to condemn, “Camden’s waterfront history serves as a cautionary tale about the limits to what investments in a single sector of a city can do for the whole.”35 The waterfront investment succeeded in building a bubble-like destination district for visitors along the waterfront, but failed to spur development elsewhere in the city. The residential and largely historic working class neighborhoods of Camden continued to experience problems associated with disinvested communities, as the redevelopment program the city pursued created instead what has been referred to as urban entertainment destinations (UEDs), “These UEDs are isolated from the surrounding city – a metropolis of itself that ignores the reality of homelessness, unemployment, social/environmental injustice and crime.”36 In The Tourist City, Dennis Judd states that, “Where crime, poverty and urban decay make parts of the city inhospitable to visitors, specialized areas are established...[becoming] public parts of town, leaving visitors shielded from and unaware of the private spaces where people live and work.”37 This separation is largely what the experience of the city is like today, as the Central Waterfront District is a virtual crime-free zone that is host to hundreds of thousands of visitors each year for entertainment as well as professional office workers who commute to the central business centers in Camden from neighboring communities in Pennsylvania and Southern New Jersey for work. In order to achieve the success of creating a regional tourist destination along the

37 Dennis R. Judd and Susan S. Fainstein, “The Tourist City” (Yale University Press: 1999), 36.
waterfront, Camden elected to increase the distance between this economic development zone and the rest of the city that remained largely disinvested; this separation further explains why reinvestment initiatives pursuing this strategy have not resulted in elevating the city as a whole. This development pattern is not isolated to the entertainment waterfront, but is also seen in the institutional presence growth, as one individual with a deep understanding of Camden politics stated, “George Norcross is building an island inside a sea of poverty.”

This redevelopment of the major business centers and relative neglect of the neighborhoods spurred a response at the neighborhood level, which saw the creation of social programs that sought to address issues of displacement caused by the urban renewal. Camden’s first neighborhood based initiative targeted rehabilitating abandoned homes for new occupancy with the formation of a new organization entitled Camden Housing Improvement Projects (CHIP). CHIP released a study in the 1960s stating that 10,500 of the city’s 35,000 residential units needed rehabilitation. Initially, the implementation of the project was made possible through a revolving loan fund and contributions from private local supporters such as Campbell Soup, RCA and First Camden National. However, the program was ineffective at addressing the roots of the issue, and offered “scattered housing rehabilitation” that did not tackle the underlying forces that were causing additional abandonment, nor keep up with the pace at which it occurred. Faulty construction as well as defaults on loan payments by the low income tenants further rendered this project unsustainable, ultimately resulting in its failure. Other notable housing rehabilitation initiatives include those spearheaded by local church organizations, including Sacred Heart Church’s community development branch- the Heart of Camden, as well as St. Joseph’s Procathedral in East Camden, which created the St. Josph’s

38 Interview with Rutgers University Professor, April 2014.
39 Gillette, Camden After the Fall, 149.
Carpenter Society CDC as a modest housing rehabilitation project that grew to alleviate more comprehensive poverty related issues for neighborhood residents.\textsuperscript{40}

In 2002, the state government of New Jersey enacted legislation that restructured Camden’s governance instigating a state take-over of municipal authority, which provided that a state appointed Chief Operating Officer would, “reform municipal government, stabilize the local economy, and stimulate investment and development that was intended to eventually end Camden’s chronic dependence on massive infusions of state aid.”\textsuperscript{41} The Municipal Rehabilitation and Economic Recovery Act (MRERA) also included a $175 million fund from the State Economic Recovery Board to be used as public sector investments for economic development and local government reform.\textsuperscript{42} John Kromer, who served as interim director of Camden’s Redevelopment Authority for over a year, stated that the MRERA succeeded in investing the $175 million capital fund on strategic value enhancing projects in the city, but did not correct systemic issues associated with the structural deficit or promote more efficient state and local communication and collaboration as the provision for municipal government reform was ill prepared and poorly implemented.

The state of New Jersey had infused funds totaling $1 billion into the city of Camden for economic development during the first decade of the new millennium, which was exclusive of


the aid sent to Camden schools.\textsuperscript{43} One of the underlying systemic issues contributing to Camden's state of decline involves the structural deficit, which creates a negative feedback loop, where Camden, in efforts to attract investment, offers generous economic incentives and tax abatement programs resulting in lower municipal tax revenue as land is heavily undertaxed, “With its churches, schools, nonprofits, government offices, city-owned vacant land, and 37 entities with tax abatements - including the for-profit Adventure Aquarium and the city's only high-rent apartment building - Camden is 58 percent tax-exempt.”\textsuperscript{44} Another source cites that, “Camden's annual city budget is currently $150 million, but its tax revenue is less than $25 million.”\textsuperscript{45} The last time Camden County conducted a revaluation of property values was in 2007, though they are currently undergoing another revaluation set to conclude in 2015.\textsuperscript{46} This anticipated increase in property values along with the massive haircut of city government jobs—including the entire 270 officer local police force in 2013—indicates that the city is moving towards a more balanced budget in the future. Howard Gillette succinctly describes the significant of this issue, “Camden cannot control its own fate, without its own money.”\textsuperscript{47}

as while the goal is to improve the local conditions, it is in the interest of those benefitting from these incentives that Camden continues to remain eligible to receive them. The educational and medical institutions in the city along with corporations like Campbell Soup, Rutgers and Rowan University and the Cooper Hospital System drive the local economy, and their agendas are prioritized in state and municipal affairs.

**History of Preservation Efforts in Camden**

Howard Gillette, author of the book *Camden After the Fall: Decline and Renewal in a Post-Industrial City* and Professor of History Emeritus at Rutgers-University Camden listed three factors that can determine the effectiveness of preservation in the city of Camden:

1. Cooper’s Ferry Partnership, as the primary economic development corporation of the city, is the most well positioned entity within the city to cultivate historic preservation as a strategy for neighborhood stabilization as it oversees a broad range of city-wide planning projects, and serves as an intermediary facilitating public-private partnerships, working directly with the community, government and outside investors to promote revitalization and sustainable development in Camden.

2. Currently, there is unstable leadership at the neighborhood level. The long term residents of Camden are aging and have largely moved out of the city or are no longer politically active. The younger generation of residents is struggling financially and is not well-positioned to participate in community development practices, nor are they as connected to the history of the city.

3. The power structure within the municipality and the South Jersey region is characterized by a hierarchical political machine that yields enormous influence over the political and development agenda within the city.
To understand the current climate of historic preservation in the city of Camden, the researcher also interviewed Paul Schopp, a member of the Historic Preservation Commission in Camden since 1998, former director of the Camden Country Historic Society, and a preeminent local and regional historian who has written over nine National Register nominations for Camden city properties. The modern preservation movement gathered momentum in Camden in the 1980s with local advocates like Lynne Robbins who began conducting a historic survey for the city. Richard Grub & Associates updated the historic survey in 2008 to include the Parkside neighborhood in East Camden, and provide a comprehensive survey of the historic resources in the city to help guide planning and redevelopment efforts. The newest iteration of this survey identified over 5000 historic resources within the city, including historic districts, buildings and structures.48 In the 1980s, the city also edited historic preservation policy so that all properties within the districts were considered eligible until proven otherwise, which dramatically impacted the consideration of historic properties in the city with regards to government funding through Section 106 and Executive Order 215. In total, 8 historic districts have been designated, the last of which was designated in 2007.49

At the county level, increasing development pressure resulted in the creation of a historic preservation fund. This report came about through,

“Recognizing the prospect of dwindling open space, Camden County residents voted overwhelmingly in support of a referendum to create the Camden County Open Space, Recreation, Farmland and Historic Preservation Trust Fund in November 1998. The Trust Fund raises an estimated $2 million per year, which, to date, has been used to help protect about 860
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acres of open space, to enhance 26 recreational facilities, to restore 16 historic properties, and to preserve two farms.\(^5\)0

The goal of the plan is to protect the environmental, cultural, historic and scenic features of the county to enable the accommodation of various active and passive recreational pursuits.

Through conversations with historic preservation professionals in the city, and attending a historic preservation commission meeting in Camden, the researcher has observed that the preservation is not operating as intended. Among the primary concerns contributing to the dysfunction include a steady decline in resident participation, complete bypassing of the Historic Preservation Commission in consultation for historic properties, lack of education and communication with regards to basic historic preservation principles within the planning board, consistent overturning of HPC decisions in every significant preservation battle to take place in the city, a flawed permitting system, inadequate code enforcement, and a lack of appreciation for history that differs from the history of current residents.

While the city of Camden is a Certified Local Government, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) serves as an advisory body to the city planning board, with little regulatory authority. While technically the HPC oversees development activity that takes place within the city’s designated historic districts, the HPC is frequently cut out of the approval process either with developers bypassing the local HPC and consulting directly with the State Historic Preservation Office, or by overturning the recommendation of the local HPC, resulting in effectively no protection over the city’s historic buildings.

In Camden, historic preservation activity, as the system is set up to function, is often stifled due to conflicting interests from powerful entities within the development arena that are furthering the city’s professed agendas of economic development and community revitalization,

primarily through strengthening the educational and medical anchor institutions as well as the secondary and tertiary businesses that support this institution-oriented development. Other entities such as the Campbell Soup Company also hold significant influence over development, coming into prominence in preservation discourse after the acquisition and demolition of the iconic and locally beloved Sears Building, to make way for a new corporate complex and enhanced visibility from Admiral Wilson Boulevard.

One example that illustrates the challenges often met by preservation in the city, involves the construction of the River Line, a $603 million NJ Transit project in South Jersey that serves to connect Camden to the state capital, Trenton. The transportation project received criticism for exacerbating the divide between the neighborhoods and the waterfront, by primarily servicing the waterfront district and largely bypassing the neighborhoods all together. The project also met considerable opposition as it proposed and succeed to develop along the five-block long Cooper Street Historic District, traditionally a residential street listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1989. Constructing the light-rail line through this street has compromised the historic integrity of the historic district, disrupted the traditional character of the neighborhood and resulted in the demolition of three contributing historic buildings in the neighborhood. Despite appeals and applications from the local community, the recommendations of the Camden City Historic Preservation Commission, as well as multiple rulings by both the State Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Sites Council against the project location, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection ultimately rejected appeals to relocate the light rail to run through Market Street, the traditional commercial district as well as the historic trolley route through the city to the waterfront, citing economic hardship amongst other reasons that relocation of the project was infeasible. This unpopular decision led the opposition to state that, “the decision to build the light rail on
Cooper Street... is an example of how politically powerful entities shape the city, rather than
good planning or the will of residents who have cared for their neighborhoods through the
decades.”51 The light rail line was intentionally designed as a life line to enhance regional
connectivity to the major business hubs within the city, at the behest of Rutgers University and
other local institutions, to further the economic development agenda through capacity and
growth building for powerful local and state institutions. “Because it is a state agency, NJ Transit
does not need approval from the Planning Board to build in Camden. Yet such a large agency
also has limited ability to understand the needs of a city or a neighborhood,” said Edward
Teitelman, former chairman of the Camden City Historic Preservation Commission.

Concerning the significance of preservation in Camden and the ramifications of
ahistorical development in the city, Paul Schopp stated in an interview

"Take a city like Camden," he said. "You cannot separate its history from its
industrialization because it was the industry that caused the city to grow the way it did. Look at Fairview, once known as Yorkship Village when it was constructed for New York
Shipbuilding workers. Or Morgan Village, originally constructed for people who worked
either at New York Ship or Camden Forge. These neighborhoods were shaped by the
industries that gave rise to them. You can't really hope to understand the residents'
daily physical reality or sense of self without understanding the industrial activities that
were the center of their community experience."52

Fairview today embodies many of the issues that face historic preservation in Camden.
The first federally funded planned community constructed in 1918 as a company town for New
York Shipbuilding Corporation, Fairview was one of the first designated historic districts in the
city (1974), containing one of the city’s two designated Main Street corridors, which are both
now inactive. Fairview was well maintained until the 1980s when the advent of Section 8 low-
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income housing subsidies brought demographic changes to the neighborhood, resulting in increased crime, combined with increased taxes, illiquidity resulting in mortgage defaults during the late 80s. These issues led many of original residents of Fairview, particularly those involved in historic preservation activities, to move out of the city. By 1992, the majority of the residents that maintained a high standard of appearance and adherence to Fairview’s established design guidelines had moved out of the neighborhood. Sue Brennan, the former director of the now defunct Fairview Main Street Organization from 2002-2008, former head of the Fairview Historic Society, as well as a lifelong resident of Fairview, states that lack of code enforcement and false permitting add to Fairview’s current state of decline. In a city that focuses on economic development and encouraging investment, historic preservation has been stigmatized by the associated rules and regulations that prolong the development approval process, rendering development more difficult, costly and time consuming. Further, the residents of Fairview today largely do not identify with the history that is preserved and reflected in the historic architecture. This sentiment of “not our history” is reflected in other neighborhoods throughout the municipality as well.

Despite the seemingly broken system of historic preservation in the City of Camden, there have been some successful instances of preservation in the city, including the Security Trust Building at 3rd Street and Market Street and the successful conversion of the former RCA Victor manufacturing headquarters to market-rate residential loft development. The Heart of Camden and St. Joseph’s Carpenter Society have also succeeded in housing rehabilitation activity in neighborhood pockets within the city. Howard Gillette comments that it is hard to do preservation when you are running in a country that measures progress in generating new

things.\textsuperscript{54} The city may be operating under the misguided ethos believing that preservation is counter to progress. Camden currently wants to highlight projects that exemplify growth and new development, and there is no existing entity that is adequately advocating for the value of the historic storefronts, or that the city has solid reusable working class housing stock. Another issue is that people do not have the information they need to accurately assess the situation, as public records are not well documented and readily accessible. Dramatic demographic changes have resulted in a loss of continuity in the city, as the fabric of the city and the population, have both witnessed dramatic upheaval. Gillette also observes that the people who care about the historic continuity of the city are aging and departing and the traditions of the city are more attached to an oral history sense than built form.

When asked about the future of preservation in Camden and where the movement must focus its efforts, Paul Schopp quoted a former longtime Camden School board member, Jose Delgado, who stated that regardless of all the redevelopment efforts and market rate housing brought into the city, no one will ever move back to the city unless the school system is fixed. This concept goes back to the early days of Camden reform politics, as Samuel Appel an advocate who sought to address racial segregation in housing as well as poor underfunded schools, stated in 1966, “A city cannot be rebuilt if it does not concentrate on the education of its citizenry and especially its children. Physical improvement will mean little if education is neglected.”\textsuperscript{55} Similarly for preservation, education concerning the city’s history and inclusion of the urban heritage in the school’s curriculum is essential to foster interest in the preservation of Camden’s legacy.

\textsuperscript{54} Gillette, Howard. Interview by Author. Personal Interview, Camden, New Jersey, April 15, 2014.
\textsuperscript{55} Gillette, \textit{Camden After the Fall}, 74.
Comparable City Case Studies

The struggle of post-industrial cities is not an isolated phenomenon and much can be learned from the experiences and actions of municipalities that are facing similar battles with population loss, rampant disinvestment and decay within traditional urban spaces. Many of these cities are grappling with the effects of globalizing corporations, shifting demographics, increasing crime, and worsening blight. While much of this change began to take place in the middle of the 20th century, cities were hit at different points in the cycle, some earlier and some delayed, allowing us to learn from the various experiments in urban revitalization that different locales adapted, and examine the gradient of positive and negative outcomes of different strategies and tools. The cities that experienced decline earlier have provided an opportunity for researchers to study their revitalization strategies in an effort to guide community development and redevelopment efforts in other cities that are attempting to address similar issues.

This widespread trend of decline and disinvestment concentrated in former industrial and manufacturing cities can be reflected in the rise of the community and economic development industry which is the leading sector of generating creative solutions to grassroots preservation. Stephanie Ryberg notes that in the 1960s, only a handful of community development corporations (CDCs) existed across the country. This number expanded to over 2000 by 1991, and to over 4000 as of 2014.56 This expansion in the number of CDCs in part reflects the crisis experienced in urban communities across the country as well as a shift in the development field to address these new issues with place-specific revitalization through localized action groups, working in a variety of neighborhoods to enhance the physical
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environment and built landscape, and provide social services, economic opportunities, affordable housing, and education.57

Since the 1960s, research shows that 114 community development corporations have utilized historic preservation in their urban revitalization pursuits.58 Ryberg, through her doctoral research found that the number of CDCs employing historic preservation as a strategy to improve community conditions has increased and that, “Although these CDCs are only a small percentage of the total such organizations in the U.S., they are at the forefront of developing innovative ways to reuse the historic built environment as a linchpin of sustainable community development.”59 As noted in her research, CDCs across the country have used preservation initiatives to both strategically combat rising gentrification as well as counter the downward spiral of urban deterioration. She found that preservation has also benefitted the local organizations as it:

...fosters organizational growth and sophistication. It requires CDCs to navigate complex regulatory constraints, brings new financing and partners to the table, increases organizational capacity, diversifies their business models, generates local, state and federal recognition, and gives them niche expertise within the community development sector.60

The intersection of community development and preservation became more pronounced with two policies that expanded the scope of preservation from individual buildings to entire districts and communities, strengthening the natural relationship between urban planning and preservation. In 1976, Congress created the historic tax credit program to incentivize developers to rehabilitate income producing historic buildings. In 1977, the non-profit National Trust Organization created the National Main Street Center to revitalize historic downtowns and

57 Ibid, 1.
58 Ibid, 33.
59 Ibid, 2.
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traditional commercial corridors. Main Street was born out of a pilot program to see if declining
downtowns could be economically revitalized while preserving its unique cultural character and
heritage. It is a program that has a high degree of measurable success, with extensive data
collected of the impacts that the program has had on the local community. Congress created
the Low Income Housing Tax Credit in 1986, and three groups focusing on neighborhood level
revitalization formed: the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation in 1978, Local Initiatives
launched the Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative which engages five different departments
including the Department of Housing and Urban Development to support local place-based
community revitalization by providing technical assistance to empower local communities,
integrating funding resources and programs such as Promise Neighborhoods and Choice
Neighborhoods. In outlining best practices for the implementation of historic preservation in community
development, the researcher has taken elements from case studies as well as toolkits that have
been assembled by industry professionals, to examine possible synergies between preservation
and revitalization. For all of their diversity, the stories of preservation and community
development share a couple of common characteristics, “They recognize the power of historic
preservation as an effective tool for sustainable revitalization, and they suggest ways to harness
that power in everything from zoning ordinances and reinvestment incentives to preservation-

61 Kennedy L. Smith, “Historic Preservation Meets Community Development,” The Community Land Use
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friendly building codes and innovative new uses for old buildings.”63 These strategies unlock the hidden potential lying within existing buildings and infrastructure, recognizing them as tangible assets to be leveraged. Post-industrial cities contain collections of abandoned and underutilized structures that are conducive to a variety of uses and entrepreneurial activities, which legacy cities must cultivate to begin their long road back to prosperity. To quote Jane Jacobs, “Old ideas can sometimes use new buildings. New ideas must use old buildings.”64 This ethos calls for a necessary balance of old and new development to foster a healthy economy and supportive physical base that allows this type of diverse environment to thrive. Best practices will encourage the rehabilitation, adaptive reuse, and infill of the historic built environment to create a balance that contributes to a culturally and economically robust urban community.

There is also a sustainability case to be made for preservation in older industrial cities, as repurposing old buildings preserves the embodied energy as well as the sunk costs that the municipality invested in the creation of the modern city, while extending the life of materials that still have viable uses. Currently, demolition debris accounts for one-third of all debris in waste in urban landfills, meaning, rehabilitating historic structures can reduce the amount of waste that society produces.65 As sustainability becomes a greater concern, this argument may grow in strength, along with the more traditional and difficult to quantify justification for preservation, which primarily concerns the social and aesthetic impact that preservation has on place-making:

Adding to the sustainable benefits of preserving the postindustrial district are the intangible aesthetic benefits that come with the patina of age. "Character," an often difficult element to describe, is something that historic preservationists care deeply

about, and once restored it becomes highly marketable. Cobblestone or brick streets, continuous brick facades with large windows and steel structures, such as water tanks, conveying systems, and even smokestacks, provide environments that are distinctive and interesting to experience.\textsuperscript{66}

Authenticity and character cannot be built, though they are traits that aged buildings and historic neighborhoods possess effortlessly, along with pedestrian scale and walkability. Industrial building footprints are highly adaptable and can be reused for residential and recreational purposes and, “when all of these attributes are taken into consideration during the planning and design process, the perception of the postindustrial district begins to change from a collection of abandoned buildings and streets to an actual place with both a purpose and an identity.”\textsuperscript{67}

Incorporating historic preservation as a strategy for revitalization also presents an opportunity to capitalize on another trend of millennials, entrepreneurs and residents becoming increasingly attracted to urban places with character, because the location provides them with the quality of life that they seek in terms of proximity, density and walkability, while the built environment reflects an authentic sense of place that is rooted in history. As the authors of \textit{Synergicity: Reinventing the Post-Industrial City} argue, legacy cities must draw on principles of historic preservation and sustainability to remain globally competitive and this can be done by repurposing former industrial and warehouse districts for new mixed uses, “City districts need to have some ‘grit’ in order for people experiencing them to feel connected to the place and its history.”\textsuperscript{68} In other words, preservation and its role in creating desirable, culturally robust communities cultivate social capital, which is what disinvested communities need to rebuild and revitalize. As the world becomes increasingly homogenized in its relentless push towards
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modernization, reconnecting to the unique place-base pasts that characterized these once mighty post-industrial cities offers them an opportunity to illuminate their proud history and differentiate themselves from the pack.

Preservation as a field has expanded its scope from individual buildings to broader districts in the decades since public policy formalized preservation's development as a field, fostering a natural connection to the urban planning profession. Many professionals within the field recognize the obvious benefits and synergies of combining preservation and planning programs, however, research shows that few cities and communities have formally adopted this beneficial integrated approach to leverage preservation as a strategy that directly complements their revitalization efforts. Community and economic development entities that do espouse preservation as a central strategy, have used preservation to achieve specific outcomes that target their central missions such as provision of affordable housing and spur commercial development through a variety of dominant and less common preservation methods and tools. Stephanie Ryberg, in her research on CDCs and their use of preservation found that, “CDCs use ten preservation strategies to achieve six community development outcomes (listed below).”

### Historic Preservation Strategies
- Adaptive reuse: 57%
- General preservation (no use change): 51%
- Historic rehabilitation tax credits (federal): 50%
- Designation: 12%
- Facilitation: 10%
- Main Street: 9%
- Preservation planning: 9%
- Heritage education: 5%
- Advocacy: 4%
- Historic building trades: 3%

### Community Development Outcomes
- Affordable rental housing: 61%
- Commercial development: 41%
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable homeownership</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable senior housing</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for special needs populations</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce development</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods that community development organizations have used to achieve these outcomes include pairing preservation financing with low-income housing tax credits and other affordable housing funding to improve projects' financial feasibility, promoting commercial development through business district revitalization programs by adaptively reusing buildings such as manufacturing centers, churches or schools, along with traditional preservation restoration and rehabilitation projects concerning apartment buildings, single-family housing, and mixed-use structures. At least half of the CDCs Ryberg surveyed rely on federal historic rehabilitation tax credits to finance these projects, demonstrating the importance of this tremendous preservation resource in aiding development and gap financing.70

Through a systematic review of existing literature, media sources, and examinations of case studies, the researcher has outlined best practices and strategies that communities of declining and disinvested cities have used to leverage their heritage assets to contribute to community rebuilding. In the following chapter, the research examines the factors that contributed to the success of these tools and strategies to predict how they may or may not benefit development in Camden. The first step in this research was to identify comparable cities that were facing similar issues as Camden, to ensure the applicability of these practices. A more detailed description of the methodology is located in the introduction; however, media and literature scans of best practices were conducted for activities in cities that had similar preservation and political infrastructure as Camden, similar competing public values and priorities, and similar challenges that needed to be addressed by the revitalization efforts. Of
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the cities identified through this scan, the following cities showed relevant preservation based revitalization practices that are pertinent to the study.

**Cleveland, Ohio**

Today, downtown Cleveland is experiencing a rebirth that has been catalyzed in part through the preservation of its existing assets. Private individuals, non-profits and community development corporations have spearheaded the revitalization of the downtown and historic neighborhoods of Cleveland to yield positive results for its. Though some neighborhoods have remained heavily disinvested, the isolated successes that this former manufacturing center has achieved yield important insights that illustrate how preservation can be part of a sustainable development strategy.

Famicos Foundation was established over 40 years ago and is today one of the oldest CDCs in Cleveland. The organization's primary goals are to prevent further decay and provide quality housing for the area's low-income residents in the present, and to foster a stable, mixed-income, thriving neighborhood in the longer term. Their work primarily concentrates in the Glenville and Hough neighborhoods of Cleveland, though they have also spread their mandate to encompass parts of the greater Cleveland Region. Famicos Foundation’s target area is facing challenges including physical deterioration in housing, concentrated poverty, a failing inadequate school system and other related issues, which the CDC has chosen to combat with preservation through fostering revitalization by leveraging the neighborhood’s central location and historic buildings, and addressing the negative effects of blight and abandonment through preserving and maintaining the community’s valuable existing assets. Amidst the challenges of its target neighborhood, “In a sea of disinvestment, Famicos’ restoration and repurposing of

---

historic buildings provides a symbolic assertion that there is a contemporary purpose and a viable future for its service area. “Through small scale rehabilitation that has today amounted to the creation of over 1000 homes for local residents, Famicos built a local reputation as a leader in making preservation work towards addressing the needs of low-income residents. The City and local community development entities gave Famicos two opportunities that would become high-visibility gateway preservation projects including the chance to rehabilitate thirteen structures known as Heritage Lane Homes and spearhead the Glenville-Wade Park Strategic Investment Initiative (SII). Through the strategic investment initiative in partnership with Neighborhood Progress, INC, a local community development funding intermediary, Famicos, for the first time, actively engaged with local residents, business owners, and other stakeholders to create a strategic neighborhood based plan for its target area. The completion of the SII planning process transformed the CDC into a “holistic, strategic community development organization”. As part of this new organization, preservation became an embedded organizational value that bolstered its neighborhood stabilization strategy, establishing it as a leader in the field of integrating community development and historic preservation, granting Famicos authority in this niche market of Cleveland's community development industry. To date, the organization has undertaken fourteen historic preservation projects that range from historic register nominations, strategic planning, traditional restoration and rehabilitation, converting historic buildings to affordable housing, senior housing and market rate housing, as well as facilitating private-sector preservation.  
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Through the Strategic Investment Initiative, Famicos developed a vision that incorporated historic preservation as a prominent theme throughout, as a primary revitalization goal and a mainstay of the overall strategy. The plan’s vision statement is as follows:

We are building our future on the solid foundation of our past... We are fortunate to have some of the most historic, well‐built homes and apartment buildings in Cleveland. Much of our energy in the next decade will be devoted to preserving and restoring this legacy. From multi‐million‐dollar rehab projects to adding lighting, we will do small and large projects that beautify our neighborhood and ensure that its historic buildings will stand for another 100 years.74

This plan recognizes the benefit of cultural heritage functioning as a marketing tool to attract different types of new residents, and the belief that restoring the intrinsic character and beauty of the neighborhood will result in a more desirable and sustainable community in the long run.

This strategy runs counter to a prevailing notion of cities in decline that demolition equals progress. In a controversial 2013 New York times article, Sandra Pianalto, the president and chief executive of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, stated, “It is not the house itself that has value, it is the land the house stands on...This led us to the counterintuitive concept that the best policy to stabilize neighborhoods may not always be rehabilitation. It may be demolition.”75

Eerily echoing the misguided underpinnings of urban renewal in decades past, this type of thinking does not work if there is a lack of development activity and market demand in the area. As history has proven, the clear‐it‐and‐they‐will‐come philosophy has proven erroneous and wasteful. As Famicos understands, land itself in these disinvested areas has little inherent value; it is the existing assets, amenities and infrastructure that provide the opportunity to attract investment to the area once again.
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Other researchers including Allan Mallach and Lavea Brachman identify three types of legacy city neighborhoods, which include the core, endowed with viable buildings and robust urban fabric, intact residential neighborhoods, and disinvested areas characterized by rampant abandonment and demolition. Mallach and Brachman cite the historic areas of Cleveland’s Warehouse District and St. Louis’ Washington Avenue, “...as examples of “core” successes and recommend preserving “intact neighborhoods’” as viable communities, although they dismiss the potential for preservation in “disinvested areas” and accept demolition as an unquestioned necessity.”76 While demolition is undoubtedly the best solution in certain situations, it should always be questioned and rigorously vetted for potential alternatives. Preservationists such as Cara Bertron, director of PlaceEconomics’ Rightsizing Cities Initiative, are increasingly advocating for strategic demolition and preservation, which is in line with responsibly considering the best solution for disinvested neighborhoods. Aaron Wunsch, a preservation professor at the University of Pennsylvania poses the question, “Why raze now what will be a neighborhood reborn in 20 years?”77 Illuminating the fact that no one can predict where the market will go, and communities must seriously consider, what is at stake and whether something better for the community in the long term will take its place.

Cleveland’s thriving revitalized theater district is another example of a successful preservation project. Downtown Cleveland Alliance, a nonprofit organization that represents property owners, estimates that the population in downtown Cleveland is now up to 12,000

people, an increase of 200% since the year 2000, with rental occupancy in the downtown at 95 percent. These positive trends are largely attributed to initiatives that cities experiencing downward spirals are using to lure residents, including aggressive tax credits, business incentives and promotion to young professionals looking for affordable and bike-friendly urban lifestyles.\textsuperscript{78} Ray Shepardson, a former Board of Education employee turned preservationist, was highly influential in the transformation of Cleveland’s disinvested downtown in the 1970s into a blossoming arts and culture district anchored by historic theaters. Through his passion and belief of the inherent value in the neglected historic art centers, Shepardson, “helped launch a local historic preservation movement in 1970 when he spearheaded the preservation of Playhouse Square's then-abandoned movie palaces and vaudeville houses.”\textsuperscript{79}

His efforts began when he joined Playhouse Square Association to help save Cleveland’s downtown theaters, some of which were threatened to be razed and converted to parking lots in 1972. The work to save the theaters involved buying time by pursuing legal action through city officials to deny development approvals for the new parking lots, raising public and private seed money for rehabilitation costs, acquiring talent to anchor the theaters with solid programming, unifying management and ownership of the different theater assets, commissioning an innovative design that transformed the district into a connected complex, and successfully listing all of the theaters on the National Register. By 2014, PlayhouseSquare as a management entity has grown to preside over more than 2.3 million square feet of office and retail space in northeast Ohio, about half of which is in the prime theater district, including five


historic theaters that date back to the 1920s, which were renovated as part of a 27-year, $55 million initiative leveraging public and private funds. Concerning their strategy for successful development of the area, Allen Wiant, the vice president for strategic development in the theater group’s real estate division says, “We are creative, and that carries over to how we create a neighborhood.”80 This resonates with preservation’s capacity to partner with the entrepreneurial and artistic communities that are spearheading revitalization in a grassroots manner in urban centers across the country:

This backward-forward vision coupled with a risk-taking spirit makes the preservation community a natural partner with the creative-entrepreneurial community. In historic places, more often than not, these two groups are one and the same. Both groups often share common goals: to make the most of the resources that are available and to live and work in a meaningful and dynamic environment. The potential of the social capital that preservationists bring to the table should not be dismissed by municipal governments; instead, it should be embraced. Historic preservation is a civic-minded, community-building endeavor.81

Playhouse Square’s residential real estate component may provide a model for other struggling post-industrial cities that are searching for the synergy that connects collective benefits to the agendas of the performing arts, urban development and affordable commercial real estate.

After the successful renovation and re-opening of its historic theaters, which the company was able to implement in phases by re-opening the theaters separately, they created a real estate division in 1999 to develop mixed-use projects surrounding the theater complex to provide complementary uses, enhancing demand within the theater district by supplying more residents and potential visitors to the market area. Beyond increasing the supply of theater patrons, this project expanded the successful rejuvenation of the arts district into a full-time mixed-use community, creating a planned and preserved district that serves the organization’s cultural revitalization and economic development mission.
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Another important Cleveland case study is St. Luke’s Manor, which received the 2012 National Trust/HUD Secretary’s Award for Excellence in Historic Preservation. Built in 1927, the former hospital shuttered its doors in 1999 and remained unoccupied for 12 years. It was listed on the National Register of Historic Properties in 2005 and today, the majority of the 390,000 square-foot building has been converted into 137 units of affordable senior housing. The remainder of the building will be occupied by an award-winning charter school and multigenerational wellness and education center. Saint Luke’s Manor is already a local landmark, and is an example of a preservation project anchoring a neighborhood revitalization effort.82 Neighborhood Progress, Inc partnered with community development organizations and foundations to involve residents of Cleveland’s historic Buckeye-Shaker neighborhood in a community planning process. Buckeye-Shaker is located about five miles east of downtown, and had experienced significant physical deterioration, and struggled to meet the needs of its large population of youth and seniors. Issues surrounding resident concerns about housing maintenance, elimination of blight, and safety, became central drivers behind the creation of an innovative, resident-focused community redevelopment plan that sought to address these challenges. St. Luke’s re-use project was a key to the community plan. The site had sustained extensive damage from looting and neglect over the years prior to renovation, and the building in its unmaintained state stood as a grim reminder of the neighborhood’s decline and as an obstruction to revitalization efforts. The structure’s preservation and adaptive reuse were viewed as a tipping point upon which the fate of the neighborhood could turn.

In 2011, Neighborhood Progress partnered with Pennrose Properties, an experienced national affordable housing developer, which has also developed projects in Camden such as the

successful Roosevelt Manor or Baldwin’s Run affordable housing rental complexes, to implement a “three-phase approach to preserve and celebrate its historic elements while also accommodating its new uses.” In many of the rooms and the lobby, they were able to preserve historic details such as fireplace mantel, marble flooring and original finishes, and replaced the old patient rooms and administrative offices with residential senior apartments, while they incorporated a fitness center, computer room and administrative support space into the renovated wings. This $54 million rehabilitation project was financed through both public private sources as broken down below:

Phases I and II received federal low-income housing tax credits, state and federal historic preservation tax credits, and funds from the city and Enterprise Community Partners. Phase III received approximately $3 million in federal and state historic tax credits and more than $5 million in federal and state new markets tax credits. An additional $4 million in foundation and private support played a critical role in securing TIS as the anchor tenant and making possible the $15 million final phase.

This adaptive reuse project has served as a catalyst for the redevelopment of the surrounding Buckeye-Shaker neighborhood and is only part of a larger $113 million in public and private funds that have been invested within a half-mile of St. Luke’s Manor, including the creation of additional quality residential housing and an educational campus which have served to further revitalize the surrounding neighborhood.

Flint, Michigan

As another city that has suffered from the collapse of the automobile industry, Flint, Michigan has experienced the effects of prolonged depopulation resulting in the rapid shrinkage of its employment sector, residents and housing stock. Flint is located 60 miles northwest of Detroit along the Flint River, and began as a timber town before the advent of General Motors, which led to the city’s dependency on an automobile industry dominated economy. Despite numerous economic development incentives in the form of tax abatements and cheap development financing to encourage growth and bolster the central business district, public policies and generous state aid failed to reverse the relentless economic decline that came to characterize the city. Flint lost close to 30,000 jobs between 1970 and 2006, and the population fell by almost a third to 112,524 at the 2008 census. The city also experienced an increase in its African American population from 28% in 1970 to 54% in 2000. These demographic changes combined with economic decline dramatically changed Flint’s landscape from dense urbanization to that of a pastoral environment that is plagued with crime and concentrated poverty.

Despite the discouraging conditions in Flint at the turn of the new millennium, there have been some recent records of success attributed to a variety of redevelopment and reuse projects, which have primarily taken place in the downtown representing a new wave of development that is transforming Flint from factory town to a college town anchored by four academic institutions. Flint Mayor Dayne Walling recently praised the downtown, “Flint’s upgraded downtown serves as the hub of our growing higher education, healthcare, and
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financial sectors. It’s the common ground where we can all come together from across the city and county.\textsuperscript{89} This resurgence of Flint’s downtown is fueled by a mixture of private and public investment, with a few highly visible historic preservation projects that represent sustainable components of this downtown resurgence. Financing sources include private developers, nonprofits such as Uptown Developments, Uptown Reinvestment Corp. and Future Flint, along with universities such as Kettering and Michigan State, organizations such as the Genesee County Land Bank and Michigan State Housing and Development Authority, and finally some of Flint’s wealthy families who want to give back to the town responsible for their success.\textsuperscript{90} Uptown Developments plans to invest $30 million in redevelopment projects in the downtown, spanning seven different projects to enliven the downtown. Uptown Development’s previous projects followed a mixed-ground floor retail with upper floor office and residential development concept, which has historically been a successful arrangement to maximize downtown vitality. As the seeds have been sewn for a nascent grassroots revitalization movement coupled with planned downtown rejuvenation, young talent with familial ties to Flint find that they are returning to the disinvested city, excited by the prospect of what it can become and the upside of being party to its success. The New York Times wrote an article on a young urban designer and real estate developer who returned to his hometown of Flint to contribute to the revitalization efforts. On why past investments have failed, he states:

The problem with most of the projects of the past was they were silver bullet projects. They were supposed to fix everything. The biggest flaw was they relied on tourism, and that is just not based in reality. So what we are doing this time around is more basic real estate, offering space the community needs: residential, offices, retail, knowing the retail is going to be the most difficult part. We’ve made the ground floor of our lofts so
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there is space for bars and restaurants. We're basically doing it just one building at a
time. We're doing most of the buildings mixed use with all three components... We're all
anxious to do more new construction, but we're using what's here for now.91

Several of these redevelopment projects include the conversion of the 1925-era National Bank
building into residential lofts, the redevelopment of the Rowe Building and adaptive reuse of
three historic downtown buildings into a mixed use modern office-loft-retail luxury building, as
well as the renovation and reuse of the Durant and Berridge Hotels as student housing and
apartments.92

The resurrection of the Vehicle City Arches in 2004 had significant symbolic value for the
city residents, demonstrating the capacity of recognizing built heritage to foster community
pride, “the iconic, ornate, lighted wrought iron toppers above Saginaw Street that were taken
down, it's believed, for wartime metal scrap...While mostly decorative, the restoration was part
of a huge, unified civic effort that gave locals a rallying point and a solidified identity.”93 Future
Flint, the group that spearheaded the Arches project, also commissioned other heritage projects
such as erecting bronze statues of Flint's famous founders and leaders to enliven downtown
streets. The arches project on Saginaw Street, the main street of the industrial city, is an
example of a successful place-making initiative that is heritage based and may serve as a catalyst
for other preservation based revitalization initiatives that are in the pipeline. A personal
description of the public sentiment this project elicited is encapsulated by this statement from
Scott Whipple, Flint native, and real estate professional involved in the revitalization of the city:

It gave Flint a very distinctive sense of place ... I was astonished when they went up. All
of a sudden everyone was proud of Flint: We're a cool town. People were using them in
ad campaigns for business. They were used to show the beauty of downtown and it
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made people want to come here. It also got people to notice and remember we have a totally fascinating history.94

These heritage based preservation projects are complex financially, as they involve historic tax credits, layered with grants, bank loans, HUD loans, and multi-tiered financing from private and public sources. Again, in this case, we are seeing a fusion between preservation and the creation of a lively arts, culture and entertainment district, that will complement the existing infrastructure and amenities. 95

Another preservation case study in Flint, involves the preservation of Carriage Town, which was once a thriving residential and manufacturing area that was the home of the carriage-making industry. Decline set in and by the 1980s, Carriage Town had the highest crime rate in Flint, which was already consistently ranked among the most dangerous cities in the country. Carriage town was also within a city designated historic district, which imposed regulations on the demolition of all structures within the historic district, resulting in a collection of derelict and decaying historic structures.96 Demolition still occurred, just at a slower rate than neighboring communities, which resulted in a dramatic decline in housing density over the decades, leading to greater open space and contributing to the earlier referenced pastoral feel of Flint today.

Anticipating that the neighborhood could become a tourist attraction, the city helped restore a commercial corridor, Water Street, which had a few dilapidated carriage factories and a dilapidated brick building known to be the birthplace of the General Motors Corporation. The AutoWorld theme park played an unexpected role in spurring Carriage Town’s revival. After AutoWorld closed in 1984, residents who were committed to saving housing stock comprised of
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Queen Anne, Greek revival and American foursquare style houses became the primary drivers of neighborhood revitalization, constituting a grass roots approach to preservation after the city implemented heritage-tourism plan failed. Community residents interested in saving the neighborhood had to combat rampant crime that ranged from prostitution, drugs, to petty thieves and slumlords, but they created a neighborhood association, organized yearly cleanups and rehabilitated several homes within the community.

Locals recognize the value of preserving the neighborhood’s unique heritage and point to the renovation of the Berridge Hotel as a catalyst for Carriage Town’s upswing. Prior to its renovation, the 99 rooms of the hotel were renting for $19 a night and was known for being a haven for drug and sex trades, and as undesirable housing for some of Flint’s poorest citizens and recent parolees. This site was detrimental to the development of Carriage Town, and eventually the project was able to raise $6.2 million from 18 different sources to convert the former slum hotel into 17 apartments, now at 100% occupancy along with the rehabilitation of an adjacent residential property. Eliminating this source of blight was instrumental and crucial to the revitalization of the neighborhood and stands as an example where adaptive reuse of what was formerly considered blight in lieu of demolition resulted in a successful project that preserved neighborhood character, while adding value to revitalization efforts in the neighborhood.

**Cincinnati, Ohio**

Though Cincinnati has more than 21 local historic districts and more than 28 National Register historic districts, historic preservation as a revitalization strategy in Cincinnati is characterized by grassroots advocacy groups involved with smaller projects that are piecemeal in nature but have developed a critical mass resulting in an overall revitalization of the district:
What is happening is a reflection of broader national trends. Millennials are flocking to places of community and history. As seen in places like Philadelphia, Buffalo, N.Y., and Cleveland, one of the main ways millennials are getting involved in community building efforts is through historic preservation, which promotes economic stability and community identity.  

Groups like the Cincinnati Preservation Collective (CPC) advocate, “Preservation starts before buildings are endangered. By meeting monthly and hosting regular preservation events, we hope to mobilize the preservation community in Cincinnati. If we can -as a city- learn more about preservation and put more value into it, we can ensure that our historic infrastructure is protected and experienced by future generations.”  

Their scope of work is currently focused on five historic buildings throughout the city that they hope to impact and bring back to life. Another group, called 3CDC, a nonprofit corporation funded by the city’s Fortune 500 companies, is a well-known success story of urban revitalization, and has worked on a development that focuses on linking Cincinnati’s downtown business district to the historic Over-the-Rhine neighborhood, traditionally an immigrant German neighborhood, by assisting the city with investing in a new streetcar line connecting OTR with the city core. Enhancing connectivity between historic neighborhoods and traditional commercial centers is another form of preservation practice which speaks to the principles of the SynergiCity concept for the post-industrial city:

Preservationists need to do more than use policy tools; they need to attract investors and develop markets that can sustain redevelopment. Typically, this process begins by matching the right occupant to the right building.....entrepreneurs who wanted historic character in their workspace, moderate overhead, and proximity to downtown. Once an initial market of similar creative-work-based businesses was established, other businesses, services, and amenities soon followed to serve them.  
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3CDC is heavily involved in building community in the OTR neighborhood, and has tasked the CPC with growing membership, and developing an organizational strategy that targets the protection of the Cincinatti’s most at risk historical assets, by cultivating formal partnerships, fundraising, and raising the profile of historic preservation. Today the OTR neighborhood is now the largest and most intact historic district in the country and the site of many local fledgling preservation groups that focus on preservation from the ground up. Projects such as PlayCincy, an initiative to increase spontaneous play in public spaces, Spring in Our Steps, which aims to enliven old alleyways and staircases, and OTR-A.D.O.P.T., a group founded to stabilize historic structures plagued by delinquent landlords define the culture of this grass roots approach to preservation.

Pittsburg, Pennsylvania

According to SynergiCity proponents, the successful transformation of Pittsburg from “Steel City” to “Knowledge City” was the result of several key factors: realistic assessment of existing assets and problems, creative long-range economic regional planning, a shared vision, a tradition of public-private partnerships, private entity involvement, authentic citizen participation, strategic investments, organized feedback and evaluation, and dedication to the set mission. Pittsburg’s model did a remarkable job of attracting young educated individuals with future earning potential, or “boomerangs” back into the city, young people who had ties to the city that left and since returned, attracted by job opportunities, a vibrant cultural scene, low cost of living and overall quality of life, as “This bottom-up energy was especially exhibited by young adults in their twenties and thirties who began populating older neighborhoods,
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renovating houses, creating art, and starting new businesses.” Pittsburg was able to capitalize
on this trend, first and foremost because it was able to transition and diversify its economy after
it lost 40% of its manufacturing jobs to reposition its employment sectors to health care,
education, research, technology, finance, and the arts. Despite this maneuver, Pittsburgh still
faces challenges that include a, “surplus of vacant land and buildings, declining neighborhoods,
racial and socioeconomic inequities, aging infrastructure— such as combined sewer overflows
and bridge maintenance, stressed municipal finances, fragmented government, and an
underfunded public transit system,” but overall its development over the past 25 years is a
model example of how to leverage existing assets and considering historic competitive
advantages while moving towards the future.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation published a best practices case studies guide
for rebuilding communities, highlighting two projects from Pittsburgh that involve aspects of
design and restoration, financing, and economic development, demonstrating model instances
of preservation serving as a catalyst to successful neighborhood revitalization. One project
assists low income families with achieving homeownership in a weak housing market dominated
by rentals, by offering affordable financing to purchase rehabilitated historic housing stock.
After the reduction of the steel industry in the 1960s and 1970s, Pittsburgh experienced many of
the common symptoms of decline familiar to post-industrial cities—loss of employment
opportunities, dramatic population reduction, and lack of economic opportunity, leading to the
abandonment and subsequent deterioration of its housing stock. Pittsburg responded with a
sustained downtown revitalization effort, one component of which is the Lease-to-Purchase
Program, which started in the Garfield neighborhood of Pittsburgh’s East End. The major players
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involved in this program include the Bloomfield-Garfield Corporation, which began in 1975 as a
grass-roots advocacy organization and has since evolved into an economic development and
community service provider. The Lease-to-Purchase program, which Bloomfield administers,
focuses on providing homeownership opportunities to low-income families that would not
normally qualify for feasible mortgages through traditional banks. The program provides
renovated and rehabilitated housing stock to the customer who is approved by the corporation
and required to deposit $1,000 to lease the home and enter into a payment structure based on
monthly rent payments that are deposited as mortgage payments until the renter is able to
acquire the mortgage loan directly over a period of 12-24 months.

This program has made significant impact in showcasing the synergy between
preservation and affordable housing, demonstrating the potential for people with poor credit
histories to become homeowners while conserving historic building stock and providing high-
value housing for low income residents in older neighborhoods. Restored historic buildings
provide high value housing for low-income residents and families are incentivized to improve
their financial capability. The success of the project is demonstrated in the move of the
Corporation to develop a 50-unit for sale combined new and renovated housing project in the
Garfield neighborhood. The guide lists the key factors of success for this project as follows:

- Bloomfield-Garfield Corporation maintains a strong relationship with the residents
  throughout the process.

- The program only accepts individuals who plan to stay in the house and are committed
to the agreement and homeownership.

- The corporation develops and manages the building on its own, ensuring stable, reliable
  management
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• The corporation provides assistance to buyers to clear their credit histories through the programs of the Neighborhood Housing Agency.

• The City of Pittsburgh Urban Redevelopment Authority supports the corporation by offering financial support to make the houses affordable through its Community Development Block Grant program.

Another significant project was a creative solution for visible urban blight that shared the burden of renovation and preservation between the city Redevelopment Authority and new home owners. As urban neighborhoods face issues with concentrated poverty and abandonment, dilapidated and blighted properties with limited available resources for redevelopment are a major concern, and potential home buyers often lack the financial capital and technical expertise to conduct major renovations independently. Community development groups in Pittsburgh have chosen to address this by providing assistance for exterior building restorations while leaving the interior renovations to the potential home owners, showcased in the rehabilitation of Denny Row, a historic block in Pittsburgh that sustained damage through 15 years of vacancy and vandalism. The Allegheny West Civic Council, Inc. (AWCC), a volunteer-based community organization dedicated to the preservation and revitalization of the historic Allegheny West neighborhood of Pittsburgh’s North Side and the North Side Leadership Conference (NSLC), a coalition of 14 North Side neighborhood organizations that provides technical expertise lead this project, providing full-scale exterior restorations of the facades of the buildings, as well as the streetscape, preserving the architectural character and integrity of the block, raising the appeal of the properties allowing them to be sold to interested buyers who would be responsible for interior restorations. The project was a success. Some measurable impacts included reducing the number of vacant properties from 14 out of 19 to 2, with homeownership increasing from 2 houses prior to the redevelopment scheme, to 11 owned
houses. Market sales prices of the existing homes multiplied greatly from $10,000 to $160,000 increasing municipal tax revenue by $50,000 annually.\textsuperscript{105}

The factors of this success and practices that can be adapted from this project include the benefits of working with professional and sophisticated partners, creativity and a solid understanding of the local real estate market. AWCC had a prior established reputation for successful rehabilitation projects, and were thus already connected with the homebuyer market specifically looking for historic buildings. This connection coupled with their local real estate market expertise allowed them to cultivate the necessary relationships with capital lenders, buyers, and enact creativity to structure the redevelopment to maximize benefit to all parties.

**Newark, New Jersey**

Another relevant case study listed in the Rebuilding Communities Best Practices Guide by the National Trust details the model of religious institutions playing a leading role in community revitalization efforts. St. James Community Development Corporation in Newark, New Jersey rehabilitated a collection of limestone row houses, serving as an example of a church organization spearheading a high-impact historic preservation project to spur urban neighborhood revitalization.

Religious institutions of longevity within urban communities witness the progression of decay in declining cities. The institution had bared witness to the decay in the historic North Broad Street neighborhood for many decades, and in 1995 the group managed the rehabilitation of a group of abandoned, three-story, limestone row houses, which yielded tremendous impact in terms of neighborhood stabilization and combatting blight. This is
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important for disinvested neighborhoods as it provides a necessary facelift to the area, and in this case has proven to be a catalyst in attracting private investment resulting in a healthy and dynamic mixed income environment. The reuse of economically feasible properties with historic significance effectively preserves the architectural character of a neighborhood, which offers residents a sense of continuity and positive change, reversal of negative change and also catalyzes a new interest in the remaining existing assets of the neighborhood. The identified factors of success include:

- Funding and support from the city of Newark to attract additional capital to the project. Through its HOME (The HOME Investment Partnerships) and CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) programs for community development projects, the city leveraged $1.8 million in loans and $1.8 million in equity, with the addition of a nominal grant from the Episcopal Church Center.
- Usage of traditional preservation and economic development financial incentives like the historic and low income housing tax credits.
- Ability to successfully secure development funding for preliminary work that made it possible to later obtain project approvals and permanent funding.

The St. James CDC is a model example because it:

...Successfully preserved a historic streetscape through the restoration of the front facades and entrance stoops, within the context of rehabilitation of the buildings into safe, efficient and code-compliant family housing. The project stimulated support and interest in the development of adjacent properties and neighborhoods, and helped to attract people back to the area. The rehabilitated row houses have played an integral role in stabilizing a historic neighborhood and countering urban blight by attracting investors to the area and enticing families of various incomes.  
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This case illustrates the added value of preservation to standard revitalization efforts in that the high visibility and symbolic value of treating iconic neighborhood structures can have a catalytic impact on development in the surrounding neighborhood that is more sensitive to the beauty and heritage of the area, and more meaningful to the community itself.
Best Practices

Based off of these case studies, the researcher has identified the following best practices that were central to the successful implementation of preservation strategies that improved the efficacy of revitalization initiatives in the comparable cities examined.

1. Establish expertise and a reputation for historic preservation rehabilitation work.
2. Public Private Partnerships with each entity specializing in their relative comparative advantage.
3. Rigorously consider possible alternatives to demolition.
4. Communities need “gateway” preservation projects that catalyze similar investments and focus on high-visibility preservation projects that foster community pride.
5. Help religious institutions or community organizations of longevity engage in preservation oriented development.
6. Build off of the academic, medical, and entertainment anchor markets and facilitate complementary uses that are suitable for preserved fabric.
7. Recognize the value of existing housing stock in resolving issues of affordable housing and capitalize on the benefits of layering tax credit incentives of both historic properties in creating affordable housing development.
8. Establish preservation projects that are not only based on tourism but “reality” or the existing residents and employees that live and work in the city.
9. Use heritage as a model, building the future of the city on its past, so that people are reminded of the interesting components of Camden’s history and not its decline.
Applying Preservation Best Practices in Camden

The initial intent of this thesis sought to examine how select preservation tools might be implemented in Camden to see whether and how they might benefit the local revitalization efforts taking place in the city, however, after researching the existing preservation infrastructure, research revealed that many of the common tools currently used to preserve heritage in urban built environments are already in place in the City, but the system is either non-functioning because of deeper socio-political issues or is not actively enforced by the entities that are currently affecting change in the city. As discussed in a previous chapter, Camden is a Certified Local Government and the city has eight state historic preservation districts that are currently under protection, with many other individual landmarks, however, many of these protected structures remain unsafe from development pressure as Camden has witnessed the destruction of many heritage assets that were previously under protection, and the guidance of the Historic Preservation Commission can and is overturned and disregarded. In response, the approach has shifted to focus on broader strategies that utilize combinations of tools and expertise, and seeks to answer the same fundamental question of how preservation and revitalization can mutually benefit each other and further how communities can begin to shift their approach to preservation if they have not previously pursued it as a fundamental strategy. Through examining case studies of successful projects that have combined preservation and revitalization goals, the researcher has synthesized several key practices that contributed to the successful implementation of the projects observed in their respective communities, and evaluate whether Camden could reasonably adopt these practices.
Best Practices

Establish a strong local advocate for preservation and develop entity expertise in historic preservation project implementation.

In order for public discourse to shift, an advocate for preservation must make a case for its value and benefit to the community. The case studies reveal that this is often taken up by a local entity that has strong ties to the community, such as a local CDC, or at times by an impassioned individual or grassroots organizations. Local advocates for preservation can influence the public agenda and guide development decisions that previously may not have considered preservation as an option. Naturally, expertise and a strong understanding of preservation processes is also important, though may be less common. Stephanie Ryberg, in her assessment of how CDCs develop expertise in preservation, prescribes the common trajectory of action and outcomes:

First, for a CDC to enter the preservation business, it is imperative to find a "gateway" project that has a high degree of synergy with the organization's pre-existing focus. A CDC's initial efforts are crucial in building the organization's capacity and getting over the learning curve of financing, designing and meeting the regulations of preservation projects. Second, once an organization begins to build internal capacity and expertise in preservation, it is able to both complete additional projects with increasing rapidity and take on a diverse range of initiatives.107

She goes on to state that the nature of preservation projects is highly opportunistic and often time-sensitive. CDCs must be aware and prepared to take advantage of these opportunities when key projects arise. Once they begin developing preservation expertise, these organizations can become increasingly recognized for their work in restoring dilapidated and blighted landmarks, “These high-profile, high-risk, and high-reward endeavors can garner local, state and even national accolades, generating additional business and allowing an organization
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to carve out a niche market in the local community development sector.”  

Further, organizations that expand to preservation work and develop a portfolio of successful projects can attract future projects of the same nature, diversifying their revenue stream.

Adding preservation as a fundamental component of revitalization strategies will help organizations cultivate stronger community relationships, by requiring the organization to gain a deeper understanding of the history of the community. This understanding of the community is a critical component of establishing preservation expertise. Stephen Danley, assistant professor of public policy and administration at Rutgers University, in his entry, “Place-Making, Jargon and Crossing Cultural Divides” from his Local Knowledge blog, discusses, the importance of continuity and history in informing place-making:

> There is power in these activities and the history they draw from. But accessing that power will require the difficult work of building trust with, and learning from, community. A good place to start is by ensuring place-making isn’t about making something new, but helping something old come alive again.  

He adds that history plays a critical role in gaining community support, “It is tremendously difficult for those who don’t know the history of a location to rally people with their vision.”

The Camden Night Garden Event held on April 17th, 2014 was an example of a community informed effort that leveraged knowledge of the past to create a powerful place-making event that reclaimed a traditionally negative space and transformed it into a positive one. Spearheaded by Coopers Ferry Partnership in partnership with Nuit Blanche New York, the event took place at the former waterfront prison site that was demolished in December 2009, transforming it into a night time festival with thousands of local and visitor attendees.
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Successful preservation based projects are in part determined by the meaning and relevance they have to the community that houses them. Cooper’s Ferry Partnership practices community survey based approaches to neighborhood planning and holds regular meetings with community representatives; therefore, transferring this expertise towards deciphering the heritage values of a community to inform preservation practice is certainly within reach.

Professor Danley references another example that illustrates the benefits of this community-based approach when he worked with neighborhood associations involved with post-Katrina rebuilding in New Orleans. Public housing developers wanted to reconstruct the housing developments in a suburban neighborhood to face inwards towards an open green square, but the community remained staunchly opposed to this proposal. The developers later learned that the housing in question was located along the Mardi-Gas parade route and sitting on porches facing the parade each year was a fond tradition shared by members of that community; Danley says of this, “It was a cultural link to their street. For that to get lost is a huge loss in issues of urban development.” Historic preservation is not merely about preserving the physical fabric of the community, but about preserving the underlying social practices that give the place its meaning. To ensure that these practices are observed and considered when making development decisions, it is important to recognize how the development will not only affect the physical fabric of a community, but how it will affect the way the community operates.

---

Focus on high-visibility preservation projects that have the power to foster community pride.

Allowing the past to inform the future development of the city is a central tenant to preservation. Heritage projects have symbolic meaning and are strongholds of collective

---
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memory that can attract and retain members of the community—if these physical representations of social memory are lost, we will observe a continued erosion of continuity and linkages that tie residents to the city. As witnessed in the case studies in Flint, Michigan, with the renovations of the Berridge and Durant Hotels, as well as the reconstruction of the Vehicle City Arches, heritage projects that are met with local market demand add unique value to communities that may surpass the value added by new construction, due to their ability to direct public discourse, remind residents of a grander past, and evoke the connective and unifying power of collective memory. The central argument of the book Beyond Preservation: Using Public History to Revitalize Inner Cities, states that the most effective way to leverage preserved landscapes is to subject them to community-level grassroots interpretation, for it is this interpretation of public history and collective memory that, “anchor people in the flow of time and expose relationship between the past and the present,” creating the benefit derived of a built environment that reflects the shared values of that community.112

Restorations and renovations of long standing neighborhood structures have symbolic value that foster pride and attract residents back to Camden. One successful example of an iconic restoration is the previously mentioned adaptive reuse of the former RCA Victor Company headquarters on the Camden Waterfront, redeveloped by Dranoff Properties in 2004, into private luxury loft residences, constituting the first market-rate housing project in Camden in decades. The project was in its lease-up phase for 3 years and has since reached stabilized occupancy.113 The Victor, the rebranded identity for the renovation of the historic structure colloquially referred to as the Nipper Building, is a reminder of Camden’s industrial past. It is

one of the last remaining structures of the music recording business that occupied 22 buildings that once stood on the Camden Waterfront, producing products that would revolutionize society and its experience of recorded sound. Since the opening of the project, former employees of RCA have been revisiting the city and the Victor Pub located in the ground floor, drawn by their former ties to the building, including the former mayor of Camden, Gwendolyn Faison, who was an employee of RCA over twenty years. She stated of the building, "This place is so full of history and I think we should be paying more attention to history when it so involves our city. Camden doesn't get the credit for what it deserves."114

While much of the industrial waterfront heritage buildings have been cleared, remaining historic fabric primarily along Market and Cooper streets face redevelopment challenges, including the Radio Loft redevelopment project which was also acquired by the same developer as the Victor; this project has been postponed due to high environmental remediation costs, which have rendered the project financially infeasible. Contamination is a common hindrance to preserving industrial heritage as it can prohibitively drive up development costs.

High visibility projects do not have to be confined to the central commercial areas. Of the case studies examined, including the Famicos Foundation housing restoration and other instances of neighborhood row-house rehabilitation have proven to be successful harbingers for reversal of blight in certain neighborhoods. As they were previously symbols of decay and visual evidence of the deterioration within the neighborhood, renovating these old structures have greater symbolic value beyond providing additional units of housing. As historic preservation in residential neighborhoods has been effective in increasing property value, there is fear that aggressive and proactive preservation, in this case restoration, can be too successful and lead to

114 Hoag Levins, “A Hundred Years of Camden’s RCA Building 17 Former Employees Pack Centennial Event in Famed "Nipper" Landmark,” Historic Camden County (July 17, 2009), accessed from http://historiccamdencounty.com/ccnews140.shtml
gentrification. This association between gentrification and preservation may be one reason preservation has not been widely adopted as a community development measure:

“Contemporary critiques of historic preservation emphasize equity issues and draw on long-standing perceptions of the field as an expensive, elitist practice. Critics argue that preservation standards require large expenditures that the poor cannot bear and that, property value increases will drive out low-income homeowners and renters (Fein 1985; Sohmer and Lang 1998; Listokin, Listokin, and Lahr 1998; Smith 1996; Werwath 1998; Lees, Wyly, and Slater 2007). Although surprisingly little empirical research exists on the actual relationship between preservation and gentrification (Allison 2005), the legacy of the perception is a burden on the profession, particularly when working in low-income communities (Listokin, Listokin, and Lahr 1998, 465).”

While a common critique of preservation lies in the unsubstantiated claim that it is directly linked to gentrification and displacement, this is still too distant of a concern for Camden according to off-record conversations with community and economic development workers in the city, and as documented by Camden’s exceptionally weak real estate market. Poverty trends have been increasing, 36% of the population below the poverty line in 2010, Camden’s unemployment rate is three times higher than that of New Jersey State, and the median household income is low around $24,000 compared to $55,000 at the state level. These poor economic indicators negatively impact the population’s ability to purchase property. According to a HUD housing market analysis of Camden,

The sales housing market in the city of Camden submarket has tightened since 2000 but remains soft because of a large supply of available attached row homes, many of which require rehabilitation. Currently, the estimated sales vacancy rate is 4 percent, lower than the rate of 5 percent reported in the 2000 Census. Homeowners currently account for 43 percent of occupied units in the city.

---

implying that this is a renter dominated market. According to an economic impact analysis of the target area for a housing rehabilitation program led by St. Joseph’s Carpenter’s Society, replacement costs are well above market value for rehabilitated properties in the target area, as St. Joseph Carpenter’s Society reports that their rehabilitation costs are $90,000 per unit, while the appraised value for comparable units is merely $46,900.117

In economically challenged markets, consider conservation overlays in lieu of historic districts. Numerous cities have employed Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Districts, including the Queens Village neighborhood in Philadelphia. Camden currently has two conservation overlays in its zoning ordinance that are subject to design review by the Historic Preservation Commission. Conservation districts are a mechanism with which a municipality may use to preserve the character of a neighborhood without subjecting it to formal historic district regulation. These conservation zones typically protect general character defining features that impact the experience of the neighborhood, including the lot size, building heights, and general streetscape, while they rarely set controls on windows, building materials, paint color and decorative details.118 Robert E. Stipe describes the benefits of Conservation Districts in an article entitled, “Conservation Areas: A New Approach to An Old Problem,” as taking more of a carrot approach which attempts to incentivize property owners rather than subject them to regulatory “sticks.” The district is simply defined and flagged as a special interest area to be conserved,
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and held to existing land use regulation. Conservation district programs have been established for a variety of combined preservation and revitalization purposes including, “to stabilize existing neighborhoods, as in Nashville, to increase or preserve the supply of affordable housing, as in Phoenix, and to revitalize close-in neighborhoods, as in Davis, California.” ¹¹⁹ Some purported benefits of these districts include: public determination of which characteristics should be preserved to allow for a more community-based values approach, emphasis on the collective sense of place based on general scale, massing and orientation attributes rather than minute details, and being subject to review under the local planning staff instead of formal historic preservation commissions. ¹²⁰

In general, however, this practice may not provide adequate protection in Camden, as studies have noted that “in areas where there is a pattern of low maintenance and unsympathetic exterior alterations, conservation districts with limited design review are less effective at preserving neighborhood character.” ¹²¹ As noted previously, historic protections can be used both to prevent excessive development and gentrification in hot markets, as well as to protect neighborhoods from unchecked deterioration, though communities should reflect on whom the protections are benefitting and whether these restrictions and regulations serve the community that resides within them:

“Especially in poorer neighborhoods, designation as a historic district does little to enhance the cultural patrimony. We should admit reality and limit discretionary review to structures of true historic significance. All other designated landmarks and historic districts should be required only to comply with printed regulations, with no further review.” ¹²²

¹²⁰ Historic Preservation Policies,” Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning.
¹²¹ Lubens and Miller, “Protecting Older Neighborhoods Through Conservation District Programs.”
Further, rigid regulatory stipulations that are subject to the Secretary of Interior’s Standards, may not be nuanced enough to yield the best result for every community, particularly extreme cases such as the challenging conditions facing urban residents in post-industrial cities like Camden. The researcher witnessed a Historic Commission Meeting in Camden City Hall, and through observations and conversation with the commissioners present that day found that the regulatory burden of meeting historic district requirements often fell on absentee homeowners or owners who were unaware of the district regulations and had been told by their contractors that they had received all necessary permits to proceed with construction. This gap in information concerning historic district regulations is further aggravated by issues with poor enforcement, yielding detrimental impacts on both the homeowner and the protected built environment. Informal conversations with Fairview residents as well as Sue Brennan, the former Fairview Main Street Director, revealed that Fairview, the first designated historic district in the city, has undergone immense change over the past few decades and that the neighborhood has seen dramatic increases in crime, shifting demographics in residency, and a lack of enforcement of historic district regulations coupled with a lack of resident compliance both intentional and due to ignorance of the regulations. Given the struggles of the residents of present day Camden, policies and “stick” based regulations that transfer the financial burden of compliance onto the residents themselves have detrimental impacts. Alexander Garvin, author of The American City: What Works, What Doesn’t states:

Every property owner is responsible for cultivating cultural patrimony. Too often, government inadvertently hastens the deterioration and destruction of the cultural patrimony by imposing regulations that are difficult and expensive for property owners to comply with. In those instances, property owners either are dissuaded from making improvements by the added cost of complying with regulations or ignore the regulations and make less costly improvements. Such burdens prevent preservation and must be eliminated. More important, government has a more important role to play in helping
property owners to cultivate the cultural patrimony through the use of strategic public investment, regulation and incentives.123

This suggests that the government should address the burden of preserving the architectural heritage by offering subsidies to homeowners in difficult situations like Camden, where the constituency is not always comprised of willing participants.

*Recognize the value of existing housing stock in resolving issues of affordable housing and capitalize on the benefits of layering tax credit incentives of both historic properties in creating affordable housing development.*

As witnessed in the case studies, there is synergistic potential between historic housing stock rehabilitation and creating affordable housing. New Jersey State has implemented a Rehabilitation Subcode Policy, the first policy of its kind in the country passed in 1999, to tailor structural and safety regulations that work with the specifications of older buildings to avoid the costly and often unnecessary work of adapting older buildings to modern code during rehabilitation.124 According to Robert Thomas, the former Historic Preservation Officer in Camden, “abandoned row houses ‘adversely affect neighboring properties, thus causing further abandonment,’ which has led to demolition by neglect resulting in fragmented rows, vacant lots and at times the destruction of entire city blocks. This vacancy and abandonment discourages investment in these neighborhoods. The New Jersey Rehab Code was implemented to alleviate this vicious cycle, leading to,

...an impressive surge in reinvestment in New Jersey. Historic preservation has been embraced as a rehabilitation practice...public and private partnerships have been formed to further the restoration of buildings, National Register nominations were
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submitted for the downtown commercial districts, and local historic commissions
guided exterior design.\textsuperscript{125}

This project had enormous impact, allowing rehabilitation to become increasingly attractive
relative to new construction, by reducing construction budgets by up to 25% for many urban
development projects; renovation accounts for about 43 cents of every dollar of construction
authorized by building permits in New Jersey. This policy has encouraged the reuse of historic
building stock and allowed for greater preservation of architectural character in urban
neighborhoods across the state by educating and drawing attention to the economic feasibility
of recycling buildings and revitalization through preserving the old.\textsuperscript{126}

As discussed previously, housing rehabilitation efforts led by local CDCs have had limited
effectiveness in addressing the root of the issue, as the real estate market fundamentals are still
poor. While the policy has succeeded in preserving over 1000 properties in Camden, it is
difficult to say whether this policy has helped revitalize these neighborhoods. Abandonment
still outpaces the rate of rehabilitation, and vacancy rates are increasing in the target area of a
housing rehabilitation initiative.\textsuperscript{127} On a more positive note, despite an overall increase in
vacancy and a study revealed that in this rehabilitation target area, the rate at which the
vacancy increased is less than that of comparable neighborhoods where rehabilitation has not
taken place.\textsuperscript{128} While weak market fundamentals detract from the profitability of these projects,
numerous policy tools and tax incentives can be layered to improve the viability of these
projects in Camden. Rehabilitation appears to not only be heavily economically incentivized, but
also the more sustainable option, while offering the opportunity to create symbolic value

\textsuperscript{125} National Trust for Historic Preservation, \textit{Rebuilding Communities}, 12.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{127} Smith and Hevener,“The Impact of Housing Rehabilitation on Local Neighborhoods: The Case of St.
Joseph’s Carpenter Society,”10.
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid, 14.
depicting an impending upswing by preserving neighborhood character, sense of place and architectural heritage within a community.

The feasibility of creating affordable housing through rehabilitation using preservation as a neighborhood revitalization strategy, can be further enhanced by engaging in public-private partnerships with each entity specializing in their respective expertise and competitive advantage. Partnering with experienced national affordable housing developers such as Pennrose Property, is a successful model, which was seen in the St. Luke’s Manor project in Cleveland, Ohio, as well as the Baldwin’s Run neighborhood development in Camden. Though not a strict preservation project, Baldwin’s Run was structured as a partnership between the Housing Authority of Camden city (HACC), St. Joseph’s Carpenter Society, and Pennrose properties to create 516 new housing units through adaptive reuse and infill, on what used to be a crime-ridden public housing super block.129 This project is regarded as a success as it leveraged existing assets, and created quality low-income housing units in a space that previously had negative associations, while realizing the financial benefits of the combined tax incentives.

*Decision makers should rigorously consider possible alternatives to demolition.*

Urban critic Roberta Brandes Gratz argues that demolition is a simpler and more easily financeable endeavor compared to preservation which comes is riddled with regulatory red tape and complex layered financing structures, but that preservation is worth the labor when we examine the history of our most desirable urban neighborhoods and see that the vast majority of them were once decaying slums. When we see this cycle of development repeat itself, it becomes evident that clearance eliminates the option to create a unique environment that
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cannot be replicable elsewhere. Richard Florida, a native New Jersey resident and urban studies theorist, warns against the unintended and unforeseen consequences of destroying traditional community fabric, and promotes the values of a grassroots, community based approach to neighborhood revitalization that focuses on existing assets.  

The case study involving the Playhouse Square revitalization of downtown Cleveland, required legal action to delay permitting approvals for the parking lot project that was to follow the demolition of the historic theaters that are now some of downtown Cleveland’s greatest assets. The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning’s historic preservation strategy lists permitting approval delays as a tool for municipalities to enact to ensure that if demolition occurs, it occurs responsibly:

Depending on the size of a municipality, the growth rate, and its attitude toward development, the process for submitting, approving and processing a demolition permit can vary significantly. The length of the permitting process can give municipalities and residents time to meet with developers and properly review their proposal and its impacts on the community. A demolition delay sets up a longer permitting process and requires a teardown to be reviewed by a building review commission. This strategy requires developers or homeowners to put more planning into the teardown, and can help to counteract the effect that teardowns have on community character by providing time to ensure that interested parties are notified and that the new house is in character with the existing housing in the neighborhood.

While the permitting process is indeed a critical point of intervention for the municipality, the culture of the city is still pro-demolition and pro-development. Camden wants to show off new development and does not have an advocate for historic preservation that is making the case that the existing can be renewed and that this may yield greater results than demolition and new construction. Demolition is still inextricably linked to the concept of progress and the city needs to see more catalytic projects of successful renovation and creation stemming from the
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city’s existing historic assets and infrastructure to change this dominant perception, particularly at the neighborhood level. For this to occur there has been a recognized need for a certain degree of entrepreneurship, to spark, ignite and catalyze an area’s preservations efforts. The MIT study on Placemaking contends that:

In fact, a commonality of many projects is the prominence of what Project’s for Public Space’s Fred Kent calls a “zealous nut”—a singleminded, tireless, passionate advocate for the project who is also a great connector. The cases examined here present a diverse group of individuals; the “visionary” role can be filled by anyone from a community activist to a city official, from a foundation funder to a developer.132

We also witnessed this phenomenon in the Playhouse Square revitalization case study, where Ray Shepardson played the role of the visionary and single handedly revolutionized the fate of downtown. For this to be possible, there must be existing assets for visionaries to leverage, and the government must foster an environment that allows these entrepreneurial preservationists to thrive, and feel that enacting change is possible. Given the state politics that have relentlessly driven municipal affairs over the past few decades, it may be difficult for the municipal government, or any single entity within Camden to create this environment where the people feel empowered to enact change, at the behest of the political engine which holds a high concentration of power in determining the outcome of development projects in the city. However, this type of unbridled passion, fearless creativity and entrepreneurial spirit will greatly enhance the odds of preservation based projects that will be able change the course of development in the city. This argument is reiterated by Richard Florida in his work, The Rise of the Creative Class, “...creative individuals and industries, as well as local cultures of openness and diversity, drive regional economic success.”133 He maintains that creative individuals and companies are attracted to places with a sense of authenticity and place which is derived from a mixture of old and new structures that collectively produce a sense of history and significance. Counter to

Florida’s assertions, Stephanie Ryberg points out that, “Florida’s work [is] largely anecdotal and no research to date has empirically studied if there are connections between preservation and a city’s ability to attract the creative class.” While it is true that Florida’s claim lacks empirical research, we can still observe these trends in familiar neighborhoods, as in Philadelphia, the neighborhoods of Fishtown, Point Breeze and East Passyunk are experiencing creative revivals emanating from within the historic urban fabric. We can perhaps also draw connections to Soho in Manhattan in the 1970s, as the former factories and loft spaces of this downtown neighborhood were reclaimed and repurposed by the creative class, which led to the transformation of the neighborhood from abandoned industrial wasteland to the world class mixed high-end retail and residential lofts that characterize it today, unified architecturally by its cast-iron facades. This transformation spread to other neighborhoods in Brooklyn, as in Williamsburg and Dumbo and now Bushwick and Bedford-Stuyvescent which are feeling the effects—all of these neighborhoods are connected by their distinct architectural heritage, though the revival is primarily market driven. This suggests that it may be in the interest of preservationists to attract investors and develop markets that can support preservation oriented development, which involves finding appropriate tenants or buyers to lease or sell the property to, which in the case of Camden may be businesses that complement the existing industries in Camden, or can somehow benefit from Camden’s unique assets. The primary ingredient for success in development projects is market demand:

Most historic preservation strategies work only when there is market demand. Without buyers for historically significant buildings, development rights, income tax credits and real estate tax abatement will go unused, and revolving funds will deplete their coffers because they cannot resell the historic properties they have acquired.\footnote{Garvin, The American City: What Works, What Doesn’t, 497.}

Camden’s market economy is still developing, and is not strong enough to support many developments on its own, due to the high poverty level and the financial struggles of many of the city’s residents. As Father Michael Doyle, pastor of Sacred Heart Church, observed, America decided to concentrate its poor. Camden thus harbors a great percentage of this market, while crime, drugs, poor school system and other factors continue to negatively affect market demand. A way to mitigate this unstable market demand is to build off of the regional anchor institutions to find uses for historic buildings that complement these industries.

Help religious institutions facilitate preservation based community development

The Newark, New Jersey case study involving a CDC formed by a religious institution provides a fitting model for Camden. Religious institutions in Camden have been at the forefront of rehabilitating housing stock for low income residents, but have not moved towards higher visibility residential preservation projects that have, in other cities, catalyzed further neighborhood change as a positive symbol that the neighborhood is turning around. This represents a relatively untapped opportunity for religious institutions of longevity in the city, that already have experience in housing rehabilitation, to become effective agents for preservation. Two local church organizations have developed housing rehabilitation programs, including St. Joseph’s Carpenter Society in East Camden, and Sacred Heart Church in the Waterfront South neighborhood. St. Joseph’s Carpenter Society was created in 1985 and improves the quality of life for families and helps them achieve home ownership through education, development and community organizing. To date they have rehabilitated 800 abandoned homes, while 6,700 people have attended the Campbell Soup Homeowner
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Academy, which they created in 1993. Father Doyle, a Camden priest who has led the Sacred Heart Church in the Waterfront South neighborhood of Camden City for over 39 years, has witnessed the decline of the city and has dedicated his life to community building at the neighborhood level. One relevant program he has spearheaded entitled, Heart of Camden, whose mission is, “To improve the quality of life for the children of the neighborhood of Waterfront South by providing safe, decent, affordable housing for families,” has rehabilitated 250 vacant homes since its inception in 1984, and fosters home ownership by offering low interest rate repayment structures to potential residents who would normally be unable to purchase a home. In addition to residential rehabilitation, the Heart of Camden is also involved with commercial and public space rehabilitation including parks, vacant lots and public theaters. The headquarters of the Heart of Camden is located in an adaptively reused theater, one of the only remaining historic theaters on Camden’s Broadway dating back to 1915, which also houses a gymnasium and a counseling and resource center. At this level, we see a significant community effort to rehabilitate and leverage both existing housing stock as well as a few commercial properties that have greater visibility.

Father Doyle also preaches the immeasurable benefits of beauty, in an interview he quotes Dostoyevsky, “Three things will save the world: truth, goodness and beauty. And if the first two fail, beauty will do it. I would like to be dedicated to creating a bit of beauty in Camden... Beauty will save us.” The continued presence of the church allowed it to witness Camden’s transformation through decades of decline. This deep connection to the community,

139 “Rock Center: Camden Priest: “Beauty Will Save Us.”
along with the benefit and social values that are inherently embedded in its institutional mission, make this type of organization well positioned to spearhead preservation efforts. Establishing partnerships between religious institutions, community and economic development corporations and government to leverage available resources for funding, such as HOPE, HOME and CDBG grant funds, Historic and Low Income Tax Credits and other institutional grant sources, combined with renovation expertise would constitute an effective concerted effort to match the right players with the necessary resources.

*Coordinate preservation-based revitalization projects with the needs of the established anchors of the local economy*

In the case of Playhouse Square, the foundation was able to establish a regional entertainment anchor through the preservation based redevelopment of historic assets within the downtown. Once this anchor was established, they formed a real estate division that focused on developing mixed use projects within the downtown, creating complementary uses by not only adaptively reusing the physical historic structures, but also by looking at the combination of historic uses within those structures that traditionally created a vibrant downtown. Camden has established an economy based off of its educational and medical institutions, as well as a regional entertainment center on the Central Waterfront district. It may be beneficial to see how preservation projects can serve the needs of the anchor economies and potentially provide space for secondary and tertiary businesses. Rutgers University occupies buildings in the Cooper Street Historic District, and the campus has already appropriated numerous historic buildings for supporting academic uses. Historic buildings and traditional commercial corridors serve as popular incubators for small businesses and eateries that are amenable to student populations. Preservation projects can help the city make the
transition to provide uses that benefit the existing residents, students and employees that live, study and work in the city. Literature on the role of anchor institutions and preservation implicates the natural overlap between the two:

Anchor institutions’ role as real estate developers offers the most direct connection to preservation (ICIC 2011). Many anchors have long-standing ties to the urban core with a physical infrastructure firmly rooted in place. There is a logical overlap between the location of anchor institutions and historic resources, setting up potential partnerships and/or conflicts.140

Cleveland’s downtown Playhouse Square case is again exemplar of this connection between the local economic anchor and its connection to preservation, as the entertainment Playhouse anchor leveraged the infrastructure in place in the historic center of the city. Camden has excellent potential to expand the waterfront entertainment industry, to include attractions that are based on Camden’s unique heritage assets, including its natural landscape and situation between two rivers, and remaining historic resources. Entities within the city may recognize that preservation can serve as a regional draw and establish unique preservation based anchors that benefit the residents as well as the regional markets. Studies indicate that heritage tourism has increasingly become part of economic development strategies nationwide, and that it has grown within the tourism sector itself. Donovan Rypkema, rightfully asserts that heritage assets are the only assets that are not replicable in other places, are individualized, and uniquely place-based.141

Howard Gillette stated that the city recognizes that the area surrounding the present day Cooper Street Historic District has prime potential to become a successful arts and

education district. With the historic Cooper Branch Library at Johnson Park located across from the former Nipper Building (today The Victor), in conjunction with the 3rd Thursday art crawls, the Rutger’s Campus, and the scale and walkability of Cooper Street as well as the Cooper Grant Neighborhood, this downtown area represents a possible opportunity for socially conscious development. Gillette states that the key issue in development here would be to preserve the human scale of this district to ensure its vitality. Maintaining the streetscape with infill projects sensitive to the historic built environment would also be desirable. Historic preservation typically addresses vacant parcels next to older, pre-existing buildings, as it is concerned not only with isolated structures, but the surrounding context as well. Conventional preservation practice supports new construction that maintains cohesion of the traditional built environment prescribing that new development should follow the size, scale, and setbacks of the surrounding structures to create a more aesthetically pleasing and cohesive streetscape. 142 Cases have also reported that anchor institutions can repair the relationships they have with their surrounding community if these relationships have been damaged by past pro-demolition development patterns, by employing sensitive development strategies that include preservation moving forward. 143

Conclusion

Historic Preservation has been increasingly adopted as a revitalization strategy by communities across the United States, though in legacy cities it continues to play a small role in broader urban planning and revitalization initiatives. This decision to integrate preservation as a planning strategy is in part determined by the underlying economic conditions, as well as the public perception of its value in terms of economic return and social benefit. Preservation’s association with gentrification and as an elitist government practice that only serves a small portion of the community has negatively impacted its integration into common community development practice. In order to shift public opinion in a community that is new to preservation work, it is imperative that there is a local advocate for preservation that can demonstrate through successful projects that preservation-based redevelopment adds substantial benefit to the community, as an economic development tool that can catalyze further change, as a sustainable development tool that leverages a community’s existing assets, reducing waste and building on past infrastructure investments, and lastly as a community development tool that establishes ties with the resident and visitor community, and holds symbolic value representing the reversal of decline, while enhancing community vibrancy and cultural continuity.

Disinvested communities must also move past the commonly held perception that demolition and new construction signals progress in order to recognize that redevelopment and the successful preservation of historic fabric can yield longer term benefits by leveraging a community’s unique assets that are irreplaceable elsewhere. These unique assets and the mix of historic building types are essential to fostering a nurturing environment for small businesses and desirable community services that attract commercial and residential market demand. The
challenges of Camden and other legacy cities lie in their ability to address the underlying socio-political and economic drivers of their current conditions, and re-establish their relevancy in the post-industrial landscape. Research has shown that one component of successful rebuilding is to plan long-term for the creation of a vibrant and dynamic urban built environment that best facilitates the community’s current and future needs. Part of the challenge of reinvention certainly involves new construction; however, without a tangible link to the past, the community will lose an opportunity to create a multi-dimensional urban experience that is truly unique, with a strong sense of place and identity to build a better future.
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APPENDIX

Figure 1 Camden Municipal Boundaries
Figure 2 Camden Aerial Historic and Conservation Overlay  
Source: GIS and Camden Land Use Plan
Figure 3 Camden Census Tracts

Source: CamConnect.org
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</table>
Figure 5 Camden Industrial Waterfront 1928
Source: Cooper’s Ferry Partnership

Figure 6 Camden Waterfront Development 1914
Source: DVRBS.COM
Figure 7 1300 Admiral Wilson Blvd, Sears-Roebuck Building (1931)  Source: DVRBS.COM

Demolished in 2013

Figure 8 Sears-Roenuck Building 2007  Source: NJ.COM
Figure 9 The Victor, formerly the Nipper Building, RCA Victor Company Camden Plant Source: Wikipedia Commons

Figure 10 RCA Victor Company Assembly Line Source: Shorpy.com
Figure 11 Yorkship Village (Fairview) First federally funded planned community
Registered State and National Historic District

Source: YorkshipVillage.com

Figure 12 Fairview Village Today
Source: Kitchen & Associates Adaptive Reuse
Figure 13 Historic Cooper Street 1916  
Sources: Rutgers University

Figure 14 Modern day 429 Cooper Street, Historic District Still Standing  
Source: Rutgers University
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