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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IN FALL 2010, the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Michigan Historic Preservation Network created a preservation specialist position in the cities of Saginaw and Lansing, Mich., both of which were undergoing some form of rightsizing planning, most notably within the federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program¹ (NSP). The specialist provided technical assistance to NSP and city planning staff in each community, including Section 106 help, specification writing, infill design, GIS updating, master plan review and surveying historic districts. The specialist also worked with each city’s historic district commission and the community-at-large to educate and advocate for preservation citywide. This involved a number of tasks, chief among them was the establishment of local preservation advocacy groups.

From this experience, the case study offers a number of observations for preservation and planning professionals about the role of preservation in cities undergoing rightsizing. The case study also offers suggestions for integrating preservation into rightsizing more broadly, including the need for:

1) Large scale rightsizing programs such as NSP to offer homeowner improvement grants.
2) Integration of historic preservation into land bank² planning models.
3) More creative and flexible approaches to the reuse of historic buildings and spaces to meet changing housing needs in the face of contemporary demographic shifts.
4) Beginning the Section 106 consultation process and staff training in how to execute the process as early as possible when large scale demolitions are planned.
5) Neighborhood-based leadership to advocate for preservation.

The conclusions in this case study grow out of the experience of advocacy and assistance in two shrinking Michigan cities but the lessons learned should find wide application in any community considering rightsizing.
INTRODUCTION

IN OCTOBER OF 2010, the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) and the Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MHPN) secured a grant from the Americana Foundation to place a part-time preservation specialist in Saginaw, Mich. The goal of the Americana Foundation grant was to create a model that could showcase the positive effects of an intensified historic preservation approach in a city that was planning for rightsizing.

Since 2008 the National Trust had become increasingly concerned about the potential impacts of rightsizing as it emerged as a region-wide issue in the post-industrial cities of the Midwest and Northeast. The Trust feared that the federal Neighborhood Stabilization Funds allocated to implement rightsizing goals in many older cities would result in a wave of demolition on the scale that occurred half a century earlier with urban renewal and all its attendant loss of historic structures. While wanting to acknowledge the crisis facing many post-industrial American cities, the National Trust was also interested in promoting historic preservation as a part of the solution. To address these concerns, the Trust partnered with the Michigan Historic Preservation Network to establish a preservation specialist position. The role of the specialist would be to ensure that historic preservation was part of the rightsizing discussion among planners and decision makers, and also to develop the city’s capacity for advocacy through education and community organizing to bring about long-term systemic changes to the way historic preservation was included in the city’s planning decisions.

MHPN and NTHP secured additional funding from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) and the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office in September 2011 and expanded the project to include Lansing, Mich., as well. Though the overall goals of the project remained the same in each community, the strategies for achieving them differed greatly and depended on the unique conditions of each city. Most of the preservation specialist’s work in Saginaw and Lansing focused specifically on the rightsizing of residential areas as opposed to commercial districts because this is where Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) dollars were focused. While acknowledging the reciprocal relationship of commercial development to neighborhood planning, the focus was confined to these parameters to address the significant loss of historic residential structures occurring in both Lansing and Saginaw.

In this case study, the strategies applied in each of the communities have been combined and organized according to their relationship to the rightsizing planning process. These tactics were pulled both from a goal-oriented work plan developed at the outset of the position, as well as tactics that emerged spontaneously in the course of the work. Preservation strategies included the following areas of focus:

> Neighborhood Stabilization Program
> City Planning
> Historic District Commission
> Community-at-large
The strategies explored in this case study overlap. They are interpenetrating and not mutually exclusive. In many cases, work in one area highlighted a deficiency in another. For example, as work with the Saginaw NSP proceeded, it became clear that the city’s GIS database needed to be updated to reflect current historic district boundaries so that NSP staff could assess whether or not a particular building was historic and thereby adopt their rehabilitation plans accordingly.

This case study includes the following tools which were created as a result of these lessons and successes:

- **A checklist for rightsizing cities (pages 30–31):** to help preservation professionals, planners, and local advocates evaluate the planning methods currently in use in their community in order to identify strengths and weaknesses and develop a strategy for integrating historic preservation into rightsizing planning.

- **A land bank decision making flow chart (page 21):** to provide a framework that builds on previous land bank models for how historic preservation can be integrated into land bank decision making.

- **Further and suggested reading (Appendix C):** to provide a list of resources related to the intersection of historic preservation and rightsizing.

It also includes a brief discussion of recommendations and strategies used in other communities that may be applied to rightsizing planning, as well as general recommendations and conclusions.

This case study is designed for use by a broad audience across numerous disciplines (preservation, planning, municipal governments, community development corporations, etc.) to aide them in their efforts to incorporate historic preservation principles into rightsizing planning. The experiences in Lansing and Saginaw are intended to contribute to the growing knowledge base of information related to historic preservation and rightsizing. The case study provides a unique perspective on the issue that insists not only on well-laid plans but also on community involvement at every step of the process. Finally, this case study is intended to serve as a preliminary guide for historic preservation planning and advocacy in other cities across the country where rightsizing conversations are occurring.
The burst of the housing bubble in 2008 had a profound effect on many American cities. In some places, the collapse of the housing market accelerated a process of decline, begun in the 1970s, resulting in significantly smaller populations, crumbling infrastructure, and cash-strapped local governments. This has been particularly acute in the former manufacturing centers of the Midwest, such as Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo, as well as mid-sized and smaller cities. In response, city planners and policy makers have been forced to reevaluate their master plans and realjust their goals. For some this has meant changing the paradigm on which city planning has been based, from an expectation of continued growth to a need to manage a city’s contraction. Some call this “rightsizing” and have deliberately undertaken this planning approach.

The mayor of Detroit, Dave Bing, for example, is in the middle of a massive planning effort that will focus redevelopment and investment in several key neighborhoods in order to encourage density and streamline public services. Bing also plans to provide incentives for residents outside of these areas to relocate closer to the targeted centers. Gradually the areas of low population density will be converted to other land uses or land banked for future redevelopment. The process has proved to be highly political for the Mayor. Concurrent activities related to rightsizing, such as the shuttering of beloved neighborhood libraries, the demolition of public school buildings, and the renegotiation of city employee contracts, have sparked anger and led some to question the viability of rightsizing in a democratic society. To counter these criticisms, the Detroit Works Project, (http://detroitworksproject.com/), as the Mayor’s initiative is called, has built multiple public input sessions and neighborhood-level cooperation into its rightsizing strategy.

In other cities, the rightsizing process has been much more organic and less deliberate, depending on available funding and existing staff capacity. Both Saginaw and Lansing have undertaken some form of rightsizing planning in response to population loss and the housing crisis though their tactics have been less overt and concerted than that of Detroit. Public opposition therefore is not directed at rightsizing per se, but at the individual acts on the part of each city and its partners that are oriented toward the overall, largely undeclared, strategy of shrinking the building stock (i.e. demolition) and infrastructure to match current and projected needs. This lack of declaration on the part of both cities may or may not be intentional, but it avoids the type of opposition that has occurred in Detroit.

**Saginaw**

Bisected by the Saginaw River, Saginaw covers an area of 18.2 square miles. The 2010 census recorded the population at 51,000 people, down from its 1960 population peak of 98,000. According to the 2010 census, of the 23,574 housing units in Saginaw, 5,514 were vacant, up from 2,457 in 2000.

The response of the city’s development and planning office to shrinking population and the housing market collapse has been to pursue federal

---

**Vacancy Rates for Owner Occupied Residences for 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw County</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Saginaw</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral District</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Zone</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
funding for demolition and rehab of vacant and abandoned properties, most recently through the federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program. In addition, the city has partnered with the Saginaw County Land Bank and promoted an aggressive strategy that involves demolishing vacant properties, acquiring land, and land banking. While this strategy has been applied throughout the city, most efforts have been concentrated in an area referred to as the Green Zone. This area lies north of the downtown on the city’s East Side, as illustrated in the following map.

The Green Zone, which is close to many of the city’s former industrial sites, had become primarily an African-American working-class residential area by the 1960s. In recent years, it has experienced a high rate of abandonment. The building of the interstate bypass in the 1960s bisected the area and cut it off from the downtown, accelerating its decline. Currently, the city is working with the EPA to address infrastructure concerns in the Green Zone, including potential removal of roads, sewer systems, etc. In 2010–11 Saginaw rewrote its Master Plan to include more flexible land-use categories to accommodate tempered growth and manage decline in the Green Zone and other areas of the city.

Lansing

Lansing is also a river town but, unlike Saginaw, it has a more diverse economy, and its shrinking and subsequent rightsizing have taken a different form. In addition to being an auto-manufacturing center, it is also the state capitol and is located adjacent to East Lansing, home of one of the state’s largest schools, Michigan State University. Despite this, Lansing has experienced a net population loss in recent decades, with 4.1 percent decrease since 2000. In addition, of the 54,953 total housing units, 6,868, or 12 percent were vacant as of the 2010 Census.

The City of Lansing has also undertaken rightsizing activities in response to environmental conditions. In the 1920s, on the east side of Lansing, a significant number of worker housing units were constructed in the 100-year flood plain. This area, in the Allen Street Neighborhood, has been targeted by the Ingham County Land Bank for property acquisition and strategic demolition in order to remove housing units from the flood plain and prevent a crisis in the event of future flooding. In NSP application documents, this area is referred to as Urbandale and is described as a “neat area, great character, some stability, flood plain area. It doesn’t feel like a city—seems more rural, lots of
vacant properties and code compliance issues.” Because of the land bank’s ability to form dynamic partnerships with community groups, there have been a large number of resources to draw on for alternative uses for the vacated land so the lots in question have become an epicenter for urban farming activities.

The other rightsizing strategies undertaken in Lansing do not differ considerably from those of Saginaw. Lansing, too, is receiving federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds and is in the process of rewriting its Master Plan, though the plan concentrates less on new land-use categories and instead emphasizes development and form-based planning along major corridors. Though neither city labels its planning activities rightsizing as such, the cumulative effect of the application of these efforts amounts to a reduction of the built environment. It would be more accurate to describe this process, as Terry Schwartz from the Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative at Kent State has suggested, as a thinning of the city, rather than a shrinking of its footprint.

As of now, neither Saginaw nor Lansing has plans to de-annex areas of significant decline, although this would be more viable in Saginaw where decline has been acutely concentrated in the Green Zone on the northeast border of the city. Rather than de-annex however, the city and county have taken a mothballing approach to the land and are considering the area for green or light industrial development in the distant future. Lansing’s abandonment of residential buildings has been more evenly distributed within the inner ring of the city, which means de-annexation would not be a viable option.
Rightsizing, whether conscious or unconscious, poses significant challenges to historic preservationists. The following map indicates in purple Saginaw’s nationally and locally designated districts and historic sites. The circles overlaying the map indicate, in general, the target areas for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) and the city’s Master Plan new land-use categories. The circle indicating the location of the Green Zone has been filled in.

Rightsizing in Saginaw

Rightsizing, whether conscious or unconscious, poses significant challenges to historic preservationists. The following map indicates in purple Saginaw’s nationally and locally designated districts and historic sites. The circles overlaying the map indicate, in general, the target areas for the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) and the city’s Master Plan new land-use categories. The circle indicating the location of the Green Zone has been filled in.

Rightsizing and the Age of Housing Stock

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program has had an impact on historic resources in two ways. The first round of funding, referred to as NSP1, was focused primarily on demolition. Because of a lack of awareness on the location of historic resources, the condition of many of the buildings, and the lack of inclusion of historic preservationists in the planning process, there were significant losses within the districts. Additionally, the Section 106 process was not designed to accommodate the level of demolition review needed in a coordinated and systematic way.

Project reviews were done on a building by building basis rather than city-wide that would have allowed for an evaluation of the cumulative impact of the program.

With NSP2, which funded some rehabilitation, there were additional negative effects on historic resources. The significant restraints on the rehab requirements placed on the NSP program at the Federal, State and local levels complicated the rehab of historic buildings to a point of complete inefficiency. Additionally, the perceived costs associated with rehabilitating historic buildings, the short time constraints of the program, a lack of trained craftspeople available to do the work, a specification writing process controlled by contractor cost estimates, a lack of understanding of preservation planning and Section 106, and exclusion of staff people capable of meeting those planning needs made rehabilitation an unacceptable alternative.

In addition, acquisition of NSP2 properties was not driven by an overall plan to maintain integrity of key neighborhoods or shore up historic districts. Instead neighborhood stabilization was geared toward rehab expediency, “blight elimination,” and a perceived market demand that favored single-family suburban style houses on large lots with amenities like low-maintenance siding and new windows over the character, quality of materials and traditional urban setting that historic houses and neighborhoods can provide. In Saginaw, for example, before the arrival of the preservation specialist, determinations about what would be demolished versus what would be rehabbed were mostly subjective and relied heavily on the opinions and direction of NSP planning committee members, namely that of the Saginaw County Land Bank. Other relevant voices, including members of the city’s volunteer Historic District Commission, and important city staff such as the city planner, were excluded from NSP decisions.
The age of a city’s housing stock can give some indication of the potential impact that rightsizing can have on historic resources. Both Saginaw and Lansing have an older than average housing stock (the US median home age is 34 years, Saginaw’s is 109 years and Lansing’s is 54 years\(^4\)) but they also vary considerably from one another, as can been seen in Figures 5 and 6. Although both cities were founded at roughly the same time, they have experienced differing periods of boom and bust, as well as differing levels of demolition for development over the past century. In Saginaw, approximately 75% of the houses are 50 years of age or older and 44% of the total were built before 1939. Contrast this to Lansing’s housing age, which indicates a much younger housing profile with 26% built before 1939 and a more even distribution through the ensuing years. With a large number of houses older than fifty years old, the chance that some might be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places is raised. Add to this the consideration that much of the rightsizing activity, such as that supported by the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, overlays concentrations of older, undesignated buildings and there are significant adverse affects on potentially eligible resources.

While a building’s age does not necessarily make it historic, the high concentration of buildings in a city that are 50 years of age or older makes it much more likely that rightsizing activities will have an impact on potentially historic buildings and districts that have yet to be designated by either the local Historic District Commission or the State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service. There is also the impact that rightsizing may have on character defining features of the built environment, in terms of materials, spatial organization, building form, etc. even if rightsizing activities are directed away from designated or potentially eligible resources.
NTHP and MHPN saw the rightsizing planning in Saginaw and Lansing as an occasion to intervene productively, inspire community revitalization through historic preservation, and explore nontraditional approaches to the future city planning. The preservation specialist position was designed and funded to advance thoughtful rightsizing principles by providing technical assistance, as well as community education and organizational capacity building, so the city could continue to have a preservation voice going forward. This would be accomplished in three ways: participating in the Neighborhood Stabilization Program planning committee; providing technical assistance to the city planning department and historic district commission; and assisting the community-at-large.

**Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)**

Before discussing historic preservation in relation to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, it is necessary to clarify what NSP is and what its particular requirements are and how they affect historic resources.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Neighborhood Stabilization Program was established in response to the 2008 foreclosure crisis. Its stated purpose is “stabilizing communities that have suffered from foreclosure and abandonment…through the purchase and redevelopment of foreclosed and abandoned homes and residential properties.” There have been three rounds of NSP funds: NSP1, NSP2, and NSP3. These were funded by the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, the Recovery Act of 2009, and Dodd-Frank Act of 2010 respectively.\(^1\)

The Neighborhood Stabilization Program has affected historic resources in two ways. The first round of funding, referred to as NSP1, was focused primarily on demolition. A significant number of buildings were lost because of a lack of awareness on the location of historic resources, the condition of many of the buildings, and the lack of inclusion of historic preservationists in the planning process. Additionally, the Section 106 process was not carried out in a coordinated and systematic way required to accommodate the number of demolition reviews. Project reviews were done on a building-by-building basis, rather than citywide, which would have allowed for an evaluation of the cumulative impact of the program.

The second round--NSP2--funded some rehabilitation, but there were additional negative effects on historic resources. The significant restraints on the rehab requirements placed on the NSP program at the federal, state, and local levels complicated the rehab of historic buildings to a point of complete inefficiency (Figure 4). Other hurdles included the perceived costs associated with rehabilitating historic buildings, the short time constraints of the program, a lack of trained craftspeople available to do the work, a specification writing process controlled by contractor cost estimates, a lack of understanding of preservation planning and Section 106, and exclusion of staff people capable of meeting those planning needs.
In addition, acquisition of NSP2 properties was not driven by an overall plan to maintain the integrity of key neighborhoods or shore up historic districts. Instead neighborhood stabilization was geared toward rehab expediency, “blight elimination,” and a perceived market demand that favored single-family suburban style houses on large lots with amenities like low-maintenance siding and new windows over the character, quality of materials, and the traditional urban setting that historic houses and neighborhoods can provide. Before the arrival of the preservation specialist, determinations about what would be demolished versus what would be rehabbed were similarly subjective and relied heavily on the opinions and direction of NSP planning committee members, namely, that of the Saginaw and Ingham County Land Banks. Community members, including the members of each city’s volunteer Historic District Commission, and important city staff such as the city’s only planner, were excluded from NSP decisions.

In this case study, interactions with the NSP planning committee will focus primarily on the work done in Saginaw, where the relationship of the preservation specialist with the committee was much more involved and occurred over a longer period of time than in Lansing. As mentioned in the Introduction both Saginaw and Lansing participated in NSP1 and NSP2. The primary difference between the two was the level of demolition versus rehabilitation undertaken in the communities. NSP 3 is not contained within the scope of this case study because the period of its planning and implementation did not fall within the preservation specialist’s assignment period.

A few additional points that affect the assessment of the impacts of NSP concern the unique way that NSP is administered in Michigan:

1. In Michigan, the state historic preservation office (SHPO) is housed within Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), the same agency receiving NSP funds to be distributed to the municipalities and land banks. In effect, the SHPO is charged with regulating, through Section 106, the projects of its parent organization.

2. Both recipient communities and MSHDA were encouraged by HUD to apply additional standards to the rehabilitation work undertaken in the targeted neighborhoods with NSP2 funds. For example, MSHDA added a requirement that rehabs receive high energy star ratings. Then in Saginaw, NSP staff applied an additional requirement that all materials and labor be locally-sourced to the greatest extent possible and that all of the rehabilitated houses be lead free upon completion (as opposed to lead safe). These multi-layered requirements made rehabilitation of historic homes difficult and more costly.

3. If the cities do not spend the money allocated under NSP2 by specific deadlines, it is reallocated to other communities or returned directly to the U.S. Treasury. This placed significant pressure on cities to spend the money in a very short time frame, which resulted in hasty neighborhood planning and demolition decision making.
Viable solutions for neighborhoods and properties slated for demolition

*Neighborhood plan*

One of the most prominent and contentious of the NSP projects in Saginaw was the rehabilitation of the Jefferson Apartments, a late 1920s apartment building. The building is located in the heart of the Central Saginaw City National Register historic district and is within a block of some of the city’s most important architectural resources, including the iconic copper-domed lumber baron mansion known as the Hill House, as well as a mid-century modern residence designed by Alden B. Dow.

The NSP plan, which called for the rehabilitation of the apartment building, also called for the closure of the street in front of the building and the demolition of several of the adjacent homes to create a parking lot and playground. All of the buildings proposed for demolition were contributing buildings in the National Register historic district, though they...
varied in the degree of habitation and condition. The location of this neighborhood is circled on the map above. Area residents, who were investing in properties immediately surrounding the apartment building, objected to the proposed rehabilitation on the grounds that the public money would be better spent rehabbing the more significant historic houses in the neighborhood rather than the apartment building (the neighborhood development plan that called for the demolition of those buildings was not yet public knowledge).

The neighborhood and apartment building are also situated on the district’s major intersecting road, Jefferson Avenue, near the city’s East Side downtown central business district and a few blocks from some of the city’s major assets including the Hoyt Library, the Castle Museum, St. Mary’s Hospital, and the Saginaw Farmer’s Market. The proposed neighborhood plan would severely affect the character of a pivotal neighborhood within the district. Because of the potentially severe impact on historic resources, the plan was also extremely unlikely to receive a determination of no effect in a Section 106 review.
The importance of re-orienting this project to include a historic preservation perspective was essential, not only for the health of the surrounding neighborhood but also for the successful redevelopment of the building itself.

To address these issues, the historic preservation specialist created a “Historic Preservation 101” presentation for the NSP planning committee. The preservation specialist prepared an alternate development plan for the area, which was loosely based on the city’s Cathedral District Revitalization Plan from June 2008. The alternate development plan included a parking assessment, which found that if an on-street parking variance were applied to the development, as had been done with a similar apartment building one block away, the building would not need the additional surface parking lot. Additionally, the alternate plan called for neighborhood participation and recommended that funds applied to demolish homes in the area be used instead for rehabilitation and thereby stabilization of an important historic neighborhood. Finally, the plan offered concrete suggestions on implementation and helpful resources, such as restoration architects, which could assist the NPS planning committee in developing the Jefferson Apartment property in a sensitive and cost effective way.

At the same time that the neighborhood plan was being prepared and presented to the NSP planning committee, the preservation specialist established the framework for implementation if the plan were eventually adopted. Because an element of the original NSP plan involved the potential demolition of the historic Hill House, the preservation specialist located supporters for the preservation of the building within the community and also assisted the home’s current owners, who wished to sell the house to a buyer interested in rehab, to market and educate the public on the property. These efforts, combined with the efforts of several key community players, resulted in the formation of the Friends of the Hill House. Eventually, this group was able to purchase the property, in partnership with the Historical Society of Saginaw County, and plans to rehabilitate the building and use it to teach preservation trades.

An extended narrative of the experience related to the NSP apartment development can be found in Appendix A. Sparing the Hill House: A Lesson in the Power of Neighborhood Committees. The process of neighborhood plan creation, advocacy within the NSP planning committee, and community outreach in this instance demonstrates the tremendous need for historic preservation planners in neighborhood stabilization planning.
Marketing Strategies

A key issue confronting the Neighborhood Stabilization Program planning committee and city development staff was how to market rehabbed historic properties in intact neighborhoods. The preservation specialist provided material to the NSP marketing team to distribute to potential home buyers including brochures on state and federal tax credits and statistics on home value stability in historic districts. With several of the historic homes owned by the Saginaw County Land Bank, the preservation specialist conducted walk-throughs with staff and interested home buyers and provided them with preservation resource directories.

In addition, the preservation specialist used state and nationwide contacts with the NTHP and MHPN to market properties and connect the city with interested investors and developers for NSP multi-unit projects and other vacant historic buildings. The preservation specialist also met with interested developers and home buyers to discuss rehabilitation of historic buildings and the various assistance programs available to them. Much of the economic development in Saginaw County had previously focused on new buildings and commercial and industrial development, especially in outlying townships. The assistance provided by the preservation specialist therefore was intended to expand the city development and NSP staff’s knowledge and resource base to encourage more place-based economic and property development.

Two successful examples of this approach include the North School and the Bearinger Building, two historic buildings, both of which were slated for demolition. The City of Saginaw, like many shrinking cities, has an abundance of vacant school buildings such as the North School, a collegiate Gothic building from the 1920s. Located adjacent to the city’s major hospital, there had long been talk of its acquisition and removal for expansion of the hospital parking. This plan had moved into the planning phase when the hospital and NSP partnered on a number of projects on Saginaw’s West Side. At the same time, Central Michigan University was in talks with the city about establishing a satellite medical campus in Saginaw and was looking to partner with both of the city’s hospitals, on the West and East Sides.

To ensure that preservation of the North School was taken into consideration as these plans developed, the preservation specialist made contact with a number of planners and developers from nearby communities who had experience with large-scale preservation projects. A small committee formed, which meet with the mayor, development director, and school superintendent in order to initiate a discussion on how the school could be integrated into the hospital’s expansion and how these types of project had been completed in other communities. Though the proposed projects are still ongoing, the preservation of the North School has become an achievable goal for many of the city leaders.

Figure 8: Street facing view of the Bearinger Building
The second success is a large commercial building known as the Bearinger Building, located on the city’s East Side. The building, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, was condemned and slated for demolition in 2011. To avoid the loss of this significant building, the preservation specialist reached out to the statewide preservation network to solicit help from developers, planners, and other preservationists. Social media helped to spread the word on the potential demolition. One developer, who was interested in creating historic preservation-based charter schools, contacted the preservation specialist as a result of these efforts.

As with the North School, the specialist introduced the potential developer to city contacts and helped locate potential funding sources for the eventual rehab of the project. The charter school developer eventually lost interest in the building, however a new prospect emerged. A nonprofit, which had followed the story of the Bearinger on Preservation Saginaw’s Facebook page, a fan page started by the preservation specialist to rally local preservation advocates expressed interest in purchasing and rehabbing the building as its headquarters. Again, the specialist made introductions and provided information on funding sources. In the spring 2012 the nonprofit purchased the Bearinger began rehab in mid-summer, sparing one of Saginaw’s most distinctive buildings from the wrecking ball.

**Alternative Land Bank Process**

A block of houses seen in the photos in Figure 7 is part of the Cathedral District NSP zone and is also part of the Central Saginaw City National Register Historic District (circled on the map on page 20). The house indicated by the circle in Figure 9 was targeted for demolition by the Saginaw County Land Bank and was razed in summer 2011. The building was a contributing structure in a National Register district, its condition was stable, the surrounding houses were all occupied, and it was on the last intact block along a major corridor road. (Figure 10.) Therefore the demolition came as a surprise to many of the neighbors and area preservationists though the Land Bank insisted that the condition and level of lead contamination made rehabilitation too costly.

![Figure 9: Home on intact historic district block demolished in Summer 2011](image-url)
Such situations are a common occurrence in rightsizing cities, and they point to the need for a more strategic approach on the part of Land Banks and city development offices when approaching the reuse of lots in historic districts. Though cities and Land Banks are burdened with huge property inventories and do not have the resources to rehabilitate or dispense with each of them, they should consider historic designation status, condition of the block as a whole, and the integrity of the corridor before proceeding to demolish a historic building. At the very least, cities should encourage and provide incentives for salvaging historic building material. Few if any Land Banks or municipalities have been able to integrate salvage efforts into their operations.

The flow chart on page 21 was designed to guide land bank decision making. This model is loosely based on a decision making flow chart prepared by the Cleveland City Planning Commission to address vacant properties and published in its document *Re-Imagining a More Sustainable Cleveland.* The decision making flow chart presented here considers historic buildings as non-renewable resources and therefore seeks to apply an approach to property acquisition and use that casts land banks as stewards of the resources that contribute to the social and cultural character of a city. It does not condemn demolition in all cases, but urges more thought and care in its application.

**Figure 10:** The demolished house as it appeared in a 1992 survey of the surrounding historic district. It was largely unchanged at the time of its demolition in 2011.
**Hands-on Tool: Land Bank Decision making Flow Chart**

The decision making flow chart below is by no means prescriptive and is intended only to provide land bank planning committees, boards, and staff with a rough protocol that can be implemented when dealing with older, possibly historic buildings. It is not meant to be applied to every property. The suggestions at each stage in the flow chart represent actions that a land bank should take when faced with a potentially historic property. By implementing some kind of evaluation process, such as the one modeled here, a land bank (or any entity involved in vacant property acquisition), may save itself considerable time and avoid many of the typical pitfalls of Section 106 regulations and public opposition. The flow chart should be used when a property is being considered for acquisition and any action taken should be done as other paperwork and property preparation is being completed (deed, title, tax clearance, etc.).

---

**SHOULD THE BUILDING BE PRESERVED?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision factors</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. National Register district, local district or individually listed</td>
<td>The condition, character and importance of the house make preservation feasible and worthwhile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Architecturally significant or unique</td>
<td>1. Enumerate assets of site and building. What treatment options are available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preservation consistent with City’s Master Plan</td>
<td>2. Partner with local preservationists to market property for re-sale or alternate use (education center, office, commercial use, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Building has an acceptable level of physical integrity</td>
<td>3. Establish plan to mothball and stabilize building. Partner with neighborhood groups to adopt building and check on it regularly. Partner with artists and local gardening clubs, etc. to beautify exterior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Loss diminishes character of neighborhood</td>
<td>4. Open communication with City, State housing agencies, and HUD for find help for new homeowner with acquisition or rehab costs. Refer new home owners to external programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Located on an intact block, close to city amenities or along important corridor</td>
<td>5. Place a historic preservation easement on houses before selling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A Section 106 Review has determined an adverse effect on historic resources</td>
<td>7. Assist with designation process if not currently designated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No, Because of Condition</th>
<th>No, Not Historic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The building itself is historic but its condition makes rehabilitation financially impossible</td>
<td>Proceed with clearing of lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Can some material be salvaged, donated or sold before demolition? Potential partners include Habitat for Humanity, for-profit and non-profit salvage companies, individuals and historical societies.</td>
<td>Continue with evaluation of site for holding for long term green use, rehab, or redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enlist the help of local historians, students and preservation groups to document the building, including photos and narrative history. Donate materials generated to local archive or library.</td>
<td>see <a href="http://reimagingcleveland.org/about/links-and-resources/">http://reimagingcleveland.org/about/links-and-resources/</a> for additional strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Make the process as transparent as possible, engaging the community when the building is torn down by publically announcing all historic demolitions well ahead of time in newspaper and on website. Invite interested parties to demolition. Adopt an attitude of respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undertake mitigation as suggested by SHPO if using federal funds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adopt compatible infill guidelines if rebuilding on site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Key Rehabilitation Strategies:

Contractor training

One of the key issues that confronted NSP staff was the lack of qualified contractors able to do rehabilitation work in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. In response to this, the preservation specialist set up a contractor training session in Saginaw for area contractors interested in bidding on historic rehabs within the NSP program. The training was led by an architect with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The training program included a classroom session that gave a brief overview of the application of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards to residential rehabs. This was followed by a walk-through with the contractors, NSP staff, and the SHPO architect, during which time the Standards were explained using examples of actual work needed on a NSP house targeted for rehabilitation. This approach not only allowed local contractors to familiarize themselves with the Standards and expectations of the program, but also addressed many of the NSP staff’s questions about historic rehabs and materials. From this pool of contractors, a number of them went on to bid and complete work at two of the historic properties.

In addition, the preservation specialist was consulted on an as-needed basis by NSP contractors and staff when questions arose regarding rehab methods and application of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Infill design

The preservation specialist also helped NSP staff select infill designs for new construction in the Central Saginaw City National Register historic district. This process began with a review of already existing infill construction and a discussion of its merits and areas for improvement with NSP staff. After this, the specialist conducted a windshield survey in the neighborhood where the new construction would be built. Existing house types, as well as form, construction, spatial arrangement and materials were noted. Modern house designs that would complement the neighborhood and provide a comfortable, affordable place to live for residents were sought. A wide selection of about 15 house designs was chosen, discussed with SHPO architects and Section 106 review staff and then passed on to Saginaw’s NSP staff as suggested appropriate infill design. Two of the designs were selected and eventually built through the NSP program.

Figure 11: Contractors in Saginaw receive training on historic rehab

Figure 12: Pre NSP infill in Saginaw (center structure)
Pre NSP infill housing
Form, massing, setback, foundation height and fenestration are dissimilar from homes in surrounding district.

NSP2 designs selected by preservation specialist in consultation with SHPO architects.

These houses have some modifications that did not appear in the original designs (such as the smaller windows and decorative cornice element on the house in the lower photo), yet these houses still complement the district character well. They are also unique enough to be differentiated from the district’s contributing buildings.
The bid and specification review process for Saginaw’s NSP rehabs was unusual in that it allowed contractors to inspect the proposed rehab property and then create and submit their own specifications, the lowest and most reasonable of which was chosen by NSP staff. In other cities, NPS staff prepared the specifications, and contractors competed to provide the most reasonable price. Saginaw’s process, which had the approval of the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA), worked well enough for non-historic rehabs, even if costs were at times difficult to control. The process did not work for historic rehabs, however. As mentioned previously, only a few contractors were familiar with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards or had experience in estimating the cost of rehabs. In addition, recently passed lead safety regulations that require all contractors to pass a training course, prompted contractors to inflate the prices for rehab in homes known to contain lead paint.

The first step in addressing these issues was to compare the specifications being submitted to the Saginaw NSP staff with those in other NSP communities. The preservation specialist obtained historic rehab specifications and price points from Battle Creek, Kalamazoo, and Lansing and shared them with Saginaw’s NSP staff. The price calculations for each of the historic rehabs in Saginaw were also reviewed in detail by the preservation specialist, as well as by two SHPO architects familiar with current price points. This information enabled the NSP staff to create more realistic baseline pricing for potential contractors, shape expectations for the level of work, as well as eliminate some of NSP concerns over managing a historic rehab.

Figure 13: Because contractors wrote their own specifications for each of the historic rehabs, prices were often inflated, citing lead remediation and labor costs. One of the rehab specifications price sheets for this two story brick colonial estimated exterior paint work at $80,000, well above market estimates.
Section 106 review assistance

The preservation specialist was able to provide technical assistance to the NSP planning committee staff, especially concerning Section 106 review. As mentioned in the introduction to this section, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was the ultimate agency responsible for Section 106 review. With NSP, however, the administration of funds was delegated to grant applicants so the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) assumed responsibility for conducting environmental review. In practice, the actual work required to complete a Section 106 review was further delegated to the NSP communities, many of which were unfamiliar with the process. As a result, the Saginaw preservation specialist often served as the NSP staff’s liaison to the SHPO.

The preservation specialist helped the NSP communities understand the purpose of Section 106, a process meant to engage citizens in the planning of federally funded or licensed projects. The preservation specialist also reviewed communications from the SHPO regarding determinations of adverse effect with NSP staff, discussing definitions and explaining how the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards apply in each case. If more assistance or illustration was needed, preservation architects were consulted or illustrations from other communities were sought and provided. This assistance provided the preservation specialist an opportunity to communicate the NSP staff’s frustrations with the process to SHPO staff and communicate with other relevant government agencies as needed.

On the whole, however, the role of the preservation specialist in Section 106 was advisory. The specialist strongly encouraged the city to develop and normalize review as part of its activities beyond the scope of NSP to create a sense of ownership for staff and to avoid future difficulties.

Many of the issues brought up in the course of assisting the Saginaw NSP staff with Section 106 were larger than could be addressed by a single staff person. The same problems exhibited in Saginaw occurred in varying degrees in other Michigan NSP cities, including Lansing, and as a result many of them fell behind other states in their NSP spending goals. The causes of the Section 106 problems are complicated, but training NSP community reps in Section 106 or hiring a cultural resource manager to oversee MSHDA’s NSP review would have helped. In response to the lag created by the environmental review in Michigan, HUD has intervened and hired a cultural resources consulting firm to work in several of the NSP communities and assist with documentation and mitigation. Other communities, such as Calhoun County, chose to hire consultants on their own.
City Planning

Identification and documentation of properties

One of the major impediments to integrating historic preservation into rightsizing planning is often the lack of staff and resources to conduct the necessary survey and documentation work and integrate that information into its city databases and GIS. Another concern is the need for the integrated data to be shared with county governments, land banks, etc., so it can be incorporated into their systems and decision making as well.
To address these issues in Saginaw, the preservation specialist and the Michigan SHPO staff historian conducted a windshield survey of the historic districts in areas targeted for rightsizing, specifically the NSP target zones. The historian then made a determination of eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places to assist with the SHPO’s Section 106 review. In the NSP Cathedral District target zone, which overlays the Central Saginaw City National Register district, the loss of integrity was striking, as can be seen in the comparison maps below.
After the windshield survey was completed, the specialist and the SHPO staff reviewed the original files for each of Saginaw’s National Register districts. They noted borders, names, and contributing buildings outlined in the original files and compared them to SHPO’s maps and the Saginaw GIS maps. During the comparison, they noted many errors in the city’s GIS, which the city’s GIS technician then corrected. Once the maps at both SHPO and the city were accurate, they were shared with NSP staff, including those from Saginaw County government and the Saginaw County Land Bank, who subsequently integrated the corrections into their systems.

The specialist and SHPO staff undertook a similar process to review the locally designated historic districts in Saginaw, but found no errors. In summer 2012, as a result of the map updates, all of the properties within local and National Register historic districts were labeled in the city’s publically accessible, online property record system, so that any property owner, potential buyer, or city inspections officer searching for information on a particular building will know that it is within a National Register or local historic district.

In addition to the map and survey work, the preservation specialist, with the help of an intern from Eastern Michigan University’s Historic Preservation program, documented many of the Green Zone buildings along with their condition by photographing them and taking notes. The specialist also photographed and took notes on Saginaw’s numerous abandoned school buildings. This documentation was shared via social media outlets and will be donated to the Hoyt Library and Saginaw County Historical Society’s local history collection. These documentation efforts, and the oral histories described elsewhere, were undertaken to provide later generations with contemporary community perspectives on the process of rightsizing and to create an archive of buildings and spaces likely to be lost or significantly altered by rightsizing.

### Master plan review

During the time the preservation specialist was working in Saginaw and Lansing, both cities were in the process of revising their master plans. Saginaw’s master plan contained more provisions for rightsizing than Lansing’s as it introduced new land-use categories in underutilized areas such as the Green Zone, which was previously zoned single-family residential. The new land-use category, “Urban Enterprise Zone,” is intended to encourage land reclamation and flexible reuse related to green or non-traditional industries such as urban forestry, gardening or farming, solar panel and small wind farms, or light industrial. This category also allows residential uses on large lots as well as multi-family and senior living facilities.

Lansing’s revised master plan addressed issues of central urban decay and abandonment by focusing on strengthening and improving business districts along important corridors. This included instituting form-based codes, infrastructure improvements, and linking state and county-wide incentive and redevelopment efforts to these areas. The preservation specialist reviewed both Saginaw’s and Lansing’s master plans and submitted comments to city planners, city planning commissions and in Saginaw, presented her suggested changes at a city council meeting convened to discuss the master plan draft.

The specialist evaluated each master plan based on their inclusion of preservation planning principles and by the level of preservation stakeholders input solicited and received. Stakeholders were defined as homeowners, Historic District Commission members, cultural workers, etc. The specialist sent a letter outlining the findings of the evaluation to the Saginaw City Council, which is included in Case Study Appendix B. She sent a similar letter to the Lansing city planner and HDC.
An ancillary project to Saginaw’s master plan revision was an infrastructure study conducted by the EPA in the Green Zone, which evaluated the technical, environmental, and social challenges to infrastructure removal. City and land bank staff were the primary contacts for this project, but the preservation specialist also met with the EPA team on several occasions to provide perspective on the impact of rightsizing and infrastructure removal to historic resources. In addition, the preservation specialist gave members of the team a tour of the Green Zone with special attention paid to historic resources and provided material to the team on listed and potential resources in the Green Zone.

**Shrinking city checklist**

A checklist for shrinking cities (shown on pages 30-31) was created to help others identify a community’s planning strengths and weaknesses and determine how important and effective historic preservation is when approaching a rightsizing community. While lengthy, it is by no means exhaustive, and it represents an attempt to identify preservation planning strategies that are most effective at mitigating the effects of rightsizing on historic and cultural resources and that could be implemented, preferably in concert. This model checklist is intended to be used and modified as experience with rightsizing communities is expanded.

Each section of the checklist indicates an area of planning or community involvement that intersects with rightsizing. The criteria in each section are strategies that can be used to insure historic preservation is included. The sections are: Master Plan, Historic District Commission, City Planning and Development Staff, and School District. There are two additional sections that evaluate horizontal and vertical cooperation which gauge the level of cooperation between departments and groups at both the city level (horizontal) and cooperation among departments and groups across agencies and geographic region (vertical).

A total percentage score can be tallied at the end of each section as well as a sum total percentage score. A lower score in any area relative to the other sections may indicate a weakness in the preservation “infrastructure” of a city. The checklist points can then be utilized as action points for strengthening the historic preservation in the rightsizing process. The sum total score indicates a community’s overall historic preservation health. It should be noted that few, if any, communities would score higher than 75%, a score of 100% being an ideal rather than representative of any existing community. Any community scoring 50-60% in any area or in the total percentage might be considered to be doing an average job of protecting their historic resources. A score above 60% would indicate a high level of commitment to historic preservation planning practices and a score below 50% indicates large deficits in the community’s rightsizing plan as it pertains to historic preservation. A deeper, line by line examination of the checklist may reveal weaknesses particular to that community. Those weaknesses then suggest a way forward.
## Right-sizing and planning Strategies

### MASTER PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan explicitly includes HP</th>
<th>HDC and local historic preservation advocates included in MP process</th>
<th>Innovative zoning tools to encourage compact and mixed use developments including:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present and detailed=2</td>
<td>Present but not detailed=1</td>
<td>No=0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas zoned by building type, not by use</th>
<th>Planned Unit Development</th>
<th>Density bonuses</th>
<th>Mixed use zoning</th>
<th>Traditional neighborhood ordinance</th>
<th>Compact and cluster development</th>
<th>Provisions to retrofit of single use buildings to mixed use</th>
<th>Provisions allowing nontraditional use of vacant lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present and detailed=2</td>
<td>Present but not detailed=1</td>
<td>No=0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Main Street Program principles embraced in economic redevelopment**
- **Tax exemptions/credits for preservation/renovation/adaptive reuse**
- **Facade grants available**
- **Urban pioneer incentives**
- **LEED tax incentives for historic preservation**
- **Heritage tourism programs listed in MP**
- **Transfer of Development Rights program for historic preservation**
- **Preservation easement programs and partnerships**
- **Corridor design guidelines**
- **New growth directed to existing urban areas with appropriate infill encouraged**
- **Low density outward expansion controlled or limited**
- **Parking analysis**
- **Traffic studies**
- **Urban Growth boundary**
- **Sub-area and neighborhood level plans**
- **Landscape design provisions**
- **TND (Traditional Neighborhood Design) or LEED-ND goals**
- **Form based codes**
- **Project Rating Systems (establish guidelines and procedures to evaluate the proposed project designs)**
- **Maintain/preserve character of routes (scenic, historic, heritage)**
- **Reclamation of brownfield sites**
- **Renovation and reuse of existing buildings**
- **Design review board for large scale projects outside of the local historic districts**
- **Support crime reduction through environmental design (not closing off through streets, lighting, etc.)**
- **Support neighborhood revitalization through infrastructure upgrades and maintenance**
- **Require community impact statements for all locally unwanted land uses (Lulus)**
- **Remove zoning barriers to community gardens/community supported agriculture**
- **Rightsizing funding sources are identified**
- **Public input process is transparent and effective**

**Total Possible Section Score:** 78

### HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is a Historic District Commission to oversee the local historic districts</th>
<th>The HDC actively seeks to establish new local historic districts</th>
<th>Historic preservation/design guidelines and are accessible by public</th>
<th>HDC uses the SISR in its decision-making and conducts professional public meetings</th>
<th>Program and incentives to nominate properties to the NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No=0</td>
<td>No=0</td>
<td>No=0</td>
<td>No=0</td>
<td>No=0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section SCORE:**
## Ranking Level of Commitment to Historic Preservation Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Level of Commitment to Historic Preservation Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120-160</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-119</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-96</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 and Below</td>
<td>Requires a line by line examination of the checklist to reveal weaknesses that need to be addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide incentives for the owners of historic homes
HDC communicates regularly with residents of districts
Publically accessible property records reflect a building’s designation
Information related to local historic districts on the city’s website
Regular re-surveys of districts and neighborhoods are conducted
HDC does educational work such as workshops, brochures, etc.
HDC receives on-going training and regularly participates in development activities

### CITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT STAFF

**Section 106 Process in place:**
- List of relevant tribes and contact information
- Staff has received Section 106 training

**NAGPRA compliance**
- City, county and township GIS reflects historic resources and updates
- Building inspection team has received training on HP and communicates with HDC
- Designated historic preservation staff
- Staff is conversant in the SISR
- Staff regularly attends conferences and trainings related to HP
- City provides and maintains local directory of qualified craftspeople for HP
- HP resource and reference material readily available to staff
- Provides information packet to new homeowners in HDs
- The procedure for filing complaints on HD ordinance violations is clear
- Inspections department works closely with HDC to follow up on HD violations and complaints
- Provides homeowner repair and rehab grants specific to buildings in HDs

**School district has identified historic and potentially historic buildings**
- School district has a plan for re-use and/or maintenance of its empty historic buildings

**Horizontal Cooperation** There is cooperation and communication between:
- Interdepartmental staff
- HDC and city staff
- City staff and city planning commission
- City staff and city council
- City staff and public
- City staff and the school board
- City staff and business leaders
- City staff and housing coalition
- City staff and local non-profits related to HP and housing
- Planning commission, historic district commission and zoning

**Vertical Cooperation** There is cooperation and communication between:
- City staff and surrounding municipalities, counties, regional planning bodies, land banks and townships
- City staff and state agencies such as MSHDA, SHPO, DNR, MDOT, MEDC on HP
- City Staff and Federal agencies such as HUD, EPA, etc.

**Total Possible Section Score: 160** **Overall Score:**
Historic District Commission

Recruitment

An active Historic District Commission (HDC) can serve as a positive “voice of preservation” when a community is addressing rightsizing. The first step is to ensure a strong HDC with well-qualified members and an ongoing recruitment program. This will lead to self-confidence, visibility, and professionalism within the HDC.

In Saginaw, part of the work of the preservation specialist was to help current HDC members find the roles most suited to their individual personalities, expertise, and talents. This meant encouraging newer members to take on leadership positions and engage with the community by attending neighborhood and civic association meetings. It also meant improving communication with residents of local historic districts through mailings, blogs, and social media. HDC members were also encouraged to attend city council and planning commission meetings, visioning sessions, and open NSP meetings, and to assist the West Side Civic Association with its application to the Michigan Main Street program. The HDC was encouraged to establish a trusted media contact and to send regular updates on its activities to the media and its listserve, which included city inspections and development staff. Overall, the preservation specialists encouraged the HDC to become stewards of the community’s resources and a public relations team.

The preservation specialist also suggested new recruitment measures, such as placing an ad in the local newspaper and an announcement on the city’s website. She suggested a similar approach to the Lansing HDC as well.

The new recruitment measures worked well, and the Saginaw HDC gained three new members between January 2011 and January 2012, one of which is a resident of the Heritage Square local historic district and another who is a professional planner.

Training and Development

Training and development of the HDC took three forms. The preservation specialist carried out two training sessions for members of the Saginaw HDC focusing on the application of Secretary of the Interior’s Standards in decision making.

Second, the preservation specialist worked closely with the Saginaw HDC chair and secretary to answer their questions and develop their leadership skills. The chair and preservation specialist maintained regular contact through email, phone, and personal meetings to discuss legal, tactical and organizational issues.

Finally, when in attendance at Saginaw HDC meetings, the preservation specialist assisted with interpretation of the Secretary of Interior Standards, legal language, and meeting procedure and organization.
Landmark designation

In Lansing, the role of the preservation specialist centered on new local landmark designations. The City of Lansing has fewer local and National Register districts than Saginaw and as a result the HDC’s work is limited. An important step forward occurred with the establishment of the community advocacy group, Preservation Lansing (discussed in a later section). This group exerted pressure for additional landmark designation. Preservation Lansing member volunteers worked with the city’s planning department to update and scan potential district surveys, which will be posted on the city’s website. The city, the HDC and Preservation Lansing view this as a first step toward applying for a National Register historic district designation for the Downtown Neighborhood and for eventually creating a local historic district.

In Saginaw, additional pressure for historic district designations came as news broke about the NSP plan to demolish several historic homes for the Jefferson Apartment building (mentioned previously). The events of that controversy can be read in more detail in Case Study Appendix A, but the end result was the establishment of a local historic district study committee to prepare a report on the Jefferson Avenue corridor at the heart of the Central Saginaw City National Register district. If passed, this local district would be the first on the East Side of the river.
Community-at-large

Education & training for civic and neighborhood groups

Educating civic leaders, city staff, and residents about the need to consider historic properties in a community’s rightsizing efforts is crucial. The historic preservation specialist conducted a variety of educational interventions including:

> Training sessions for Lansing and Saginaw NSP planning committee and staff, the HDC, and the community groups.

> “Historic Preservation 101” talks to various civic groups such as the Rotary Club, the Downtown Business Association, the Castle Museum’s Lunch and Learn series, Saginaw Antique Society, Saginaw Depot Preservation Corporation, Friends of the Hill House, Friends of Hoyt Park, and the West Side Civic Association, among others.

> A public workshop on how to apply for historic preservation tax credits.

> Guest speaking for a public history classes at Saginaw Valley State University.

> Meeting with groups and individuals (homeowners, business people, design teams, etc) in Lansing to discuss historic preservation and related issues.

> Regular attendance at city council, school board, and neighborhood association meetings, along with other local preservationists to provide a consistent voice for preservation in all aspects of community decision making.

> Participation in various community events, such as giving tours of historic houses during the Jazz on Jefferson festival and participating in public work days at the historic Potter Street Depot, also helped educate the public about Saginaw’s historic resources.

The preservation specialist was also available to owners of historic buildings, residents, and organizations in both Lansing and Saginaw to discuss a broad range of topics related to historic preservation including incentives, rehabilitation techniques, school closures, lead remediation, historic designation, city building codes, etc. This was done on a regular basis and often included building walk-throughs and one-on-one consultation. To raise awareness about historic preservation and available resources, she distributed NTHP and MHPN brochures and directories of consultants, tradespeople, etc. to individuals in the target communities and to organizations working in historic districts and areas targeted for rightsizing, such as Healthy Homes Saginaw, Habitat for Humanity and the Ingham and Saginaw County Land Banks.

A historic preservation literature collection was also established in cooperation with the Saginaw HDC at the Hoyt Library and a similar undertaking is underway in cooperation with Preservation Lansing. These collections include window rehab instructional DVDs available for circulation and many non-circulating reference items such as the National Park Service’s Preservation Briefs.

Furthermore, students at Eastern Michigan University and Saginaw Valley State University helped conduct a series of oral history interviews in Saginaw. The intention of these interviews was to record what aspects of Saginaw’s history and environment were considered essential to the people experiencing the rightsizing process. Interviewees mentioned a broad range of sites including former auto manufacturing sites, lumber baron homes, transportation hubs, schools, and natural areas related to the nearby Shiawassee National Wildlife Refuge. Originally, these interviews were intended to be used for an exhibit on rightsizing and history at the Castle Museum, but in the interest of time,
the scope was scaled down. The interviews were copied, transcribed, and donated to the Saginaw Historical Society Archives at the Hoyt Library in Saginaw for their local history collection. In cooperation with staff at the Castle Museum, students also conducted an additional oral history with a descendent of one of Saginaw’s prominent early families. The information contained in the interview will be used to assist the Friends of the Hill House as they undertake a restoration of one of Saginaw’s last remaining lumber baron mansions.

Education on the intersection of rightsizing and historic preservation often extended beyond the communities in question. The preservation specialist gave presentations at a variety of conferences, contributed regular blog entries on Lansing and Saginaw to the National Trust’s website and wrote an article on rightsizing for a special historic preservation report published by Michigan Planner.

**Main Street and economic nodes**

The preservation specialist focused mostly on residential neighborhoods, but she also paid attention to economic development in business districts because of their critical role in strengthening surrounding urban residential blocks. Commercial districts often are the target of downsizing efforts, especially those left vacant by suburban sprawl. These areas of sprawl have now become centers of commerce and shifting that business back to city centers is a significant challenge.

When the preservation specialist’s work started in October 2010, the West Side Civic Association (WSCA), a small business owners’ association on Saginaw’s historic West Side, was considering the possibility of becoming a Michigan Main Street Community. The preservation specialist built relationships with a number of the business owners and strongly encouraged the association to apply to the Main Street program. Because the West Side business district was also a local historic district, the preservation specialist suggested they enlist the help of the historic district commission. Both groups then discussed how they could cooperate on other projects such as blight and graffiti elimination, code enforcement, grant applications, and signage, among others. The two groups continue to retain a strong relationship and open lines of communication.

On the East Side of the Saginaw River, the city’s central business district faces almost overwhelming circumstances because of its size and scale. Unlike the West Side, which is composed of two to three story brick Italianate buildings from the 1870s-90s most of which are currently occupied and concentrated within a small area, the East Side commercial buildings are much larger, spread out, and sparsely occupied. As a result, there has been a high rate of demolition, both public and private, in the East Side business district. This has left many blocks of open space and eroded the area’s density.

In 2011 two of the East Side’s central buildings, the Bancroft Hotel and the Eddy Building, situated on two corners of the main downtown intersection, went into foreclosure and were acquired by MSHDA. These two National Register-listed buildings had been used for low-income housing. Realizing the importance of these structures to the city’s identity, the DDA convened a series of visioning sessions to help determine the future of the Bancroft and Eddy. These sessions provided an opportunity for the preservation community to communicate the importance of historic preservation planning to a larger audience. Community members, residents of historic districts, the HDC, and members of Preservation Saginaw attended the sessions and made it clear that the preservation of historic resources was crucial to the future of this area. In the end, their recommendations for the preservation of the buildings constituted a significant portion of the final report prepared by the DDA.
Figure 14: Downtown Saginaw in the mid-1960s, landmark buildings highlighted by star and arrow.

Figure 15: The same area of Downtown Saginaw today.
Preservation Saginaw and Preservation Lansing

Two very different advocacy groups emerged in each community in response to concerns over rightsizing. Preservation Saginaw was organized as an informal group of interested people who met semi-regularly and were willing to step up and organize if specific issues emerged. Preservation Saginaw provides preservation assistance to other groups, and its members usually speak up in public forums on issues related to historic preservation. There is little interest or will, however, to incorporate the group as a nonprofit, and Preservation Saginaw remains largely an ad-hoc social group.

In Lansing, preservationists take a more active role. Preservation Lansing began as a loose affiliation that existed primarily on Facebook and was administered by a Lansing HDC member and the preservation specialist. In October 2011, a member of the Downtown Neighborhood Association contacted Preservation Lansing and expressed interest in expanding the group, holding regular meetings, and establishing a clear record of action in the community.

After several meetings, the group decided to move historic preservation into the spotlight in Lansing by forming an organization that would bestow yearly historic preservation awards for rehabilitation work, rather than to get involved directly in city politics and development. Then once this organization had built its reputation and membership, it would undertake further advocacy activities.

In May 2012 Preservation Lansing announced its new award program at a press conference, which was covered in all major Lansing news sources. This quickly thrust the group into the public eye as the voice for preservation in the city of Lansing. As a result, Preservation Lansing was drawn into a controversy involving the demolition of several historic properties on the Lansing Community College campus and was obliged to expand the scope of its advocacy work. Preservation Lansing now advocates for the establishment of a local historic district and for exploring alternatives to demolition, such as rehab, moving and salvage. Preservation Lansing is also partnering with the Ingham County Land Bank and the Michigan Historic Preservation Network (MHPN) to market and dispense historic properties owned by the Land Bank.

Preservation Lansing is now pursuing a 501(c) 3 nonprofit status and expects to complete the process in the next year.

Figure 16: One of Lansing’s most beloved historic buildings, the Darius Moon House.
Preservation Trades

An ongoing issue in Saginaw has been the lack of skilled craftspeople to work on historic buildings. General contractors were experienced in new construction, but finding someone able to do plasterwork or stone masonry on existing buildings was difficult and expensive. To address both the gap in skilled labor and the scarcity of jobs for new-build contractors, Saginaw Valley State University (SVSU) decided to establish a preservation trades certificate program. The program’s curriculum will provide students with a survey of historic preservation, materials science, and building trades courses with special emphasis on hands-on experience in woodworking, masonry, and surface finishes.

SVSU has been able to link its efforts with those of the Friends of Hill House, who are in the process of restoring and developing a plan for the historic Hill House. SVSU hopes that the Hill House will become the location of the preservation trades summer field school and that it will bring new people and attention to the heart of the Central Saginaw City National Register district, an area targeted in NSP2 for rightsizing.

Advocacy

Both preservation groups undertook advocacy efforts to disseminate information related to preservation issues, as well as get the word out on various events. They established relationships with media contacts that proved eager to write on issues related to historic preservation. The preservation specialist purposely encouraged members of Preservation Lansing and Preservation Saginaw to take the lead in speaking to the media on behalf of preservation to educate local advocates and to cultivate long-term relationships with the media.

The preservationist specialist also helped with letter-writing campaigns to city leaders and editorials for local newspapers and preparation of talking points for various issue-specific preservation groups who were preparing to speak at city council meetings and to the media. The specialist also assisted in preparing plans-of-action, financial plans, fundraising plans; giving advice on assembling a board and other topics. Among the issue-specific groups that were advised on advocacy were the Saginaw Depot Preservation Corporation, Friends of Hoyt Park, Friends of the Hill House, Save the Cat Lady’s House campaign, the Lansing Downtown Neighborhood Association, Ingham Great Start, and Saginaw’s Occupy Wall Street opposition to the eviction of low income residents in the historic Bancroft and Eddy buildings.

The preservation specialist also encouraged members of Preservation Saginaw, Preservation Lansing, both HDCs, members of civic associations, and other community contacts, to attend the meetings and work days of other neighborhood groups to build bridges between them and to promote preservation as a strategy for community building and growth.

Additionally, regular email updates on issues and events were sent out to lists of contacts in each community. Social media also played a distinct role. By creating fan pages for both Preservation Lansing and Preservation Saginaw and enlisting the help of local advocates to administer them, it was possible to communicate preservation related news, share photographs and other materials and to mobilize people quickly if needed.
SUMMARY

Successes

The intervention strategies covered in this report have resulted in a number of successes for historic preservation in both Saginaw and Lansing. Most importantly, there has been a blossoming of awareness on the importance of historic preservation in both cities, which has drawn attention to their historic district commissions and the fledgling advocacy groups, Preservation Saginaw and Preservation Lansing. This attention has allowed for the development of important partnerships with land banks, city development offices, city leadership, civic associations, the media, and residents of historic districts. Members of the HDC and the advocacy groups have developed a new set of leadership skills as they've expanded their influence within their community. This development alone will ensure that historic preservation will remain part of the conversation on rightsizing.

Figure 17: Two of the historic homes spared from demolition by Preservation Lansing.
Other successful outcomes include the following:

> An updated GIS for Saginaw integrated with the city’s online property records.

> A new organization, Friends of the Hill House, preventing the demolition of historic structures within the Central Saginaw City historic district, and creating a local historic district study committee to study the area.

> Preventing the demolition of the North School, a former high school on Saginaw’s West Side, and planning for its integration into the adjacent hospital’s plans for expansion.

> Preventing the demolition of the historic Bearinger Building in downtown Saginaw and assisting new owners with planning.

> Strengthening the Saginaw Depot Preservation Corporation, a nonprofit whose mission is to restore and protect the Potter Street Depot, one of Saginaw’s most significant historic resources, located in the heart of the Green Zone.

> The new Lansing Preservation Award program.

> A preservation trades program at Saginaw Valley State University in partnership with the Friends of the Hill House.

> Bringing issues within the NSP2 program related to Section 106 and rehab of historic properties to the attention of MSHDA and HUD, and attempting resolution at a community level.

> Increased communication between city staff and SHPO.

> Increased attention to the actions of land banks, especially in Saginaw.

> A new marketing partnership with the Ingham County Land Bank and Preservation Lansing.

> Designation of the historic West Side Saginaw as an associate level Main Street community.

> Integrated suggestions concerning historic preservation into both cities’ Master Plans final drafts.

---

Figure 18: Eastern High School, Lansing, Michigan
Lessons Learned

It would be impossible for one, part-time staff person to solve all of the problems concerning the intersection of rightsizing with historic preservation in rightsizing cities. It is better to think of this intervention model as a potential first step toward fostering a preservation ethic within the shrinking city. Though there were many successes, a number of challenges also arose that, in retrospect, could have been handled differently.

First, communication with NSP staff on matters related to Section 106 and the role of the preservation specialist could have been made clearer. Many NSP staff were unfamiliar with the various organizations associated with historic preservation and their differences and therefore assumed that when the preservation specialist recommended a particular treatment or method, the Section 106 process could be circumvented. An additional assumption was that presence of the preservation specialist at NSP planning meeting constituted a form of mitigation of adverse effects. Definitions laid out in the job description, such as what was meant by “technical assistance” should have been discussed not only with high level NSP staff, but support staff as well, in order to avoid the misunderstanding that the specialist was there to complete the Section 106 work for them. A summarized version of the specialist’s work plan should have been distributed and referred to in any communication of tasks with NSP staff.

Considering the relative success of the program in residential areas, it was clear that more could have been done to strengthen core commercial areas, provided additional time and resources were available. One idea that never came to fruition was a plan to hold a workshop in partnership with Saginaw’s DDA and business association for business owners, developers, and investors on historic preservation. This could have followed the visioning sessions that were done for the rehabilitation and reuse of the Bancroft and Eddy buildings. Another idea to improve the prospects of Saginaw’s commercial cores would have been to establish relationships not only with public funders, such as MEDC, and private developers, but also with local banks and credit unions in order to advocate for low-interest loans for historic preservation projects.

Figure 19: Demolition of an entire city block proving that attrition continues to be a persistent problem in downtown Saginaw’s East Side business district.
More could have been done to engage populations not typically associated with historic preservation and enlist their support through the building of neighborhood committees in the rightsizing zones.

Some additional challenges remain to be tackled regarding the role of preservation in rightsizing cities. Those that were beyond the scope of this case study include the following:

> What to do with former and abandoned transportation buildings such as train stations, bus terminals, etc.

> How to deal with lead contamination and remediation in historic buildings.

> How to create an economically feasible model for the salvage of materials in historic homes slated for demolition.

> How to deal with the effects of school, library, fire and police station closures.

> How to address the effects of city staff shortages, bankruptcy, and austerity on the quality of rightsizing planning and implementation (i.e. who will control the process of rightsizing?).

> What to do about predatory real estate speculation in neighborhoods devastated by foreclosure and abandonment.

> How to stem the continuing tide of foreclosure and bank-initiated demolitions of historic properties.

> How to navigate restrictive ordinances and laws that do not allow for innovative or unusual land use.

**General Observations and Recommendations**

Synthesizing these successes and challenges in an overall preservation strategy is difficult, especially considering the diversity and complexity of conditions that exist among shrinking cities. Some commonalities do emerge, however, based on the work in these two cities.

The greatest barrier to historic preservation in shrinking cities is the lack of financial resources available to assist property owners in improving their homes or businesses, a problem aggravated by the foreclosure crisis, unemployment, and the decades-long general decline in wages. With the elimination of the Michigan Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit, no incentives remain to help the average homeowner with the rehabilitation of historic buildings. This is entirely separate from the equally important issue of the lack of available development capital, which continues to be addressed at a local and state level and incentivized to a certain degree, though it is still underfunded. The lack of financial assistance available for single-family residential and small business owners is one of the greatest impediments to progress, stabilization, and historic preservation in shrinking cities. With this in mind, the following observations and recommendations are offered.
1. In the future, funding for rightsizing and public programs, such as NSP, should be coupled with or based upon homeowner and small business improvement grants, ideally focused on core historic neighborhoods, to assist the people who are already living and investing in their shrinking city. This also offers current residents control over the form that neighborhood stabilization might take and could prevent displacement or gentrification.

2. Land Banks should integrate more preservation planning into their work when operating in historic districts. The Land Bank Decision Making Flow Chart found on page (21) is a good place to start.

3. Single-family housing is prevalent in many shrinking cities but this does not necessarily correspond to the needs of the community or anticipated housing trends, which are expected to shift toward senior housing rather than families as the baby-boomers age. Nor are programs such as NSP necessarily designed to address those needs. Rightsizing, in many ways, represents an attempt to resolve the contradiction of continued social and economic fluidity and the obduracy of a city’s physical attributes: buildings, streets, and infrastructure. More flexible ideas of how historic buildings and neighborhoods can be repurposed for shifting trends while still maintaining an acceptable level of material integrity need to be embraced to ensure their continued use and place in the community.

4. In the future, when expansive, federally funded programs for rightsizing are undertaken, like NSP, Section 106 consultation should begin as early as possible. Additionally, if a city, state or federal agency is using consultants for assistance; those consultants need to be cultural resource professionals experienced in Section 106 and familiar with federal regulations. Further, as a matter of course, all Community Outreach Specialists and Grant Implementation Specialists employed by state agencies for the administration of such grants should receive Section 106 training before such programs are undertaken.

5. Environmental review for large scale rightsizing projects should consider cumulative and/or programmatic effects, rather than attempting to determine the effect of every individual project on a property-by-property basis. Without this, there is no meaningful way to marry the intent of Section 106 and rightsizing efforts for positive effect. Inclusion of historic district commissions, residents and local preservation advocates should be integrated into the Section 106 Review process.
6. On July 22, 2012 in *USA Today*, Peter Edelman, director of the Georgetown Center on Poverty was quoted in an article on the exploding rates of poverty in the U.S. “We have some deep problems in the economy,” he said, adding that these problems extended beyond the recent recession. He cited globalization, automation, outsourcing, immigration, and less unionization as factors that have pushed median household income lower than at any time since the launch of President Lyndon Johnson’s war on poverty in 1964. “I’m reluctant to say that we’ve gone back to where we were in the 1960s. The programs we enacted made a big difference. The problem is that the tidal wave of low-wage jobs is dragging us down and the wage problem is not going to go away anytime soon.”

These trends cannot be separated from the crisis facing many American cities, and they point to the need for sweeping social changes in order to save them. Though there is little that the average preservationist can do in the face of global economic forces at a local level, one area cited by Edelman that can be addressed locally is to fill the vacuum of working-class leadership left behind by the unions.

The opportunity for historic preservation in rightsizing cities is the creation of working-class leadership in new organizations that go beyond the entrepreneurialism of the Main Street program, urban farming, arts collectives, cottage industries, and other small business-oriented solutions. New committees of unorganized working-class residents within the neighborhoods targeted for rightsizing can be formed around historic preservation.
Other Potential Strategies

If the definition of what it means to include historic preservation in planning decisions made within a shrinking city is broadened to include not only the reuse and rehab of buildings but also the reclamation of space, a whole host of innovative approaches to rightsizing emerge. Some of these may be paired with traditional historic preservation planning efforts to great effect.

> Strengthening historic neighborhoods based on transportation development. Cincinnati’s Over the Rhine historic district, which broke ground for a new light rail in February 2012, will be linked to universities and other nodes, improving the quality of life for residents and insuring regular circulation through and to the district.7

Another example of how transportation planning can be used in rightsizing can be seen in St. Louis, where removal of a half mile stretch of elevated highway along the Mississippi is being considered as part of an effort to reconnect the city with its waterfront, the St. Louis Arch grounds, and the historic Laclede’s Landing district. Reconsidering freeway and interstate bypasses, many of which were built during a shrinking city’s peak, could help heal fractured urban space and revitalize historic districts.8

> Engaging the local food and agriculture movement. In Buffalo, foodies and urban gardeners use vacant lots creatively in traditional and historic neighborhoods, especially on corner or anchor lots. The focus here is often on income-producing gardens that sell vegetables to local restaurants and use innovative small-space farming techniques, such as aquaculture, rather than a strictly nonprofit model.9 Also, the establishment of culinary incubators – dedicated to early-stage catering, retail and wholesale food businesses – in underused historic buildings would be an ideal reuse for church or school kitchens that are no longer used. Urban forestry is another possibility, although the constraints on zoning and application of USDA grants to these types of projects is limiting.

> “Sportification” of derelict lots and sites. While many shrinking cities have cash-strapped local governments that are unable to fund parks and recreation projects (Saginaw, for example, eliminated their parks and recreation department due to budget constraints), engaging local hobbyists and athletes in reclaiming and maintaining vacant lots can be a potential strategy for increasing circulation in underused urban spaces both large and small. While motorcross bike or snowboard courses might be appropriate for large former industrial sites, bocce ball courts might fit well on a small side lot. These uses may be permanent, spontaneous, or temporarily used for an event.10
> Pop-up events or temporary events that reclaim vacant or underused urban space, including buildings. These are limited only by the imagination but could include resale bazaars, movie showings, theater performances, soup kitchens, hostels, etc. This is an idea that has been embraced in Cleveland, as well as in Germany by certain parts of the academic and artistic community.\(^1\)

> Conceptual architecture and art installations using vacant and abandoned homes could be suggested as a way to mitigate adverse effects in cases of Section 106, by providing architectural experimentation or as a way to engage neighborhoods. An interesting example of this is a project completed in 2010 by five fellows from the University of Michigan’s architecture school in collaboration with Design99 in Detroit. The fellows purchased a foreclosed house for $500 and used the house to experiment with conceptual architectural designs which has now become a piece of public art.\(^2\)

> Embracing a city’s industrial heritage as a key component of planning, as was done in Portland, Ore., can provide a way forward in the rightsizing process. While many cities have focused on the reuse of former industrial sites for residential and recreational development, especially when they exist along rivers, Portland has embraced the historic use of the riverfront and created “Industrial Sanctuaries” that protect historic industrial sites from competing land uses and incentivizes their reuse for new industry by suppressing real estate costs.\(^3\) This approach is part of larger vision of centralized commerce that contains growth and encourages a robust economy and environmental sustainability.

> Senior and retirement housing developments that are integrated into a community’s rightsizing plans at a neighborhood level can help stabilize neighborhoods as the population ages. These developments can be designed so as to be indistinguishable from other housing in the area or can be adapted within existing historic buildings. Additionally, they should take advantage of existing social networks, should encourage intergenerational interaction, and should incentivize businesses to adopt practices that make them more attractive to senior populations. This would require a paradigm shift in the way that senior housing developments are conceived. Currently they often amount to no more than ghettos or warehouses for the elderly and are often isolating, boring places to live. In time the market will have to respond to the growing demand for a type of senior housing that is safe and affordable, but also integrated in to the larger life of a city’s neighborhoods. When it does, cities undergoing rightsizing should embrace the aging and learn to weave senior housing into the existing tapestry of the city’s fabric.

The above examples are but a small sampling of the potential projects that could be coupled with historic preservation and rightsizing. Partnerships and engagement with groups and individuals not traditionally associated with preservation advocacy but that may have an interest in preserving or reusing particular buildings, neighborhoods, or lots can be assembled when flexibility and creativity is applied.
This could include urban gardeners, neighborhood groups, architecture school labs, land banks, construction contractors, walkability advocates, bike groups, homelessness advocates, education advocates, small business incubators, local food advocates and restaurateurs, artists, real estate agents, veterans groups, unions, fraternal organizations, sports teams or clubs, senior organizations, etc. The preservation advocate can be a hub around which these disparate groups are united and organized and through which they communicate with city planners and decision makers. This requires a certain measure of openness to alternative uses for older and historic buildings and spaces, perhaps even an embrace of what Terry Schwartz of Kent State University refers to as the “non sequitor city.”

The effect of these localized coalition efforts can accumulate over time, and as they do, so can they attract more migrants of what Richard Florida refers to as the “creative class” to the city, as has been seen in the rapid redevelopment of Corktown and Midtown in Detroit both of which showed an increase in population in the 2010 Census rather than a decline.14

Keep in mind, however, that, on the whole, the net effect of this approach is to mitigate conditions rather than effect long-term societal change. The strategies listed above have very little impact on the experience of the city for the majority of “native” working class and impoverished residents, which is why the building of neighborhood leadership is so important, both for protecting historic resources and in insuring that rightsizing is undertaken in a democratic fashion.

Conclusion

Historic preservation can be a means to create and maintain walkable, authentic, humane and livable cities. It should, as Donovan Rypkema and Cara Bertron have asserted in their recent report to the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation, Historic Preservation and Rightsizing (http://www.achp.gov/achp-rightsizing-report.pdf), be the nexus around which all other rightsizing planning turns. Historic preservation can also serve as a way to democratize the process and empower citizens to identify for themselves what should remain and what should be let go. In this way, cities in crisis, no matter their size or dimension of their losses, can, as the city of Detroit’s motto exhorts, “rise from the ashes” and make themselves anew as resilient, dynamic and more respectful places that are capable of meeting the needs of their residents.

The realization of historic preservation planning as the key component of rightsizing cannot occur without significant public investment, however. In many cases, such as in Saginaw, capital is nearly, if not totally, absent and debt loads bear down heavily on local governments. For this reason, historic preservationists should be tireless in not only seeking public-private investment opportunities and grants but demanding debt forgiveness, tax capture, homeowner rehab grants, and a mass mobilization of public and private funds to meet the needs of American cities.

Rightsizing in post-industrial cities will continue regardless of the will of preservationists and other advocates who might oppose its effects. Whether rightsizing can be transformed from demolition triage and haphazard land banking into a thoughtful process that leverages historic resources for the benefit of all, remains to be seen. Much will depend on the actions of preservationists.
Sparing the Hill House: a lesson in the power of neighborhood committees

One of the most prominent and contentious of the Saginaw NSP projects involved the rehabilitation of a late 1920s apartment building. The building is located in the heart of the Central Saginaw City National Register historic district and is within a block of some of the city’s most important architectural resources, including the iconic copper-domed lumber baron mansion known as the Hill House, as well as an Alden B. Dow designed mid-century modern residence.

NSP plans called for rehabilitating the building as well as closing the street in front of the building and demolishing several of the adjacent homes to create a parking lot and playground. Buildings proposed for demolition were contributing buildings in the historic district though they varied in the degree of habitation and disrepair. The location of this neighborhood is circled on the map below. Additionally, the neighbors, who were investing in properties immediately surrounding the apartment building, voiced considerable objections to the proposed rehabilitation on the grounds that the public money would be better spent rehabbing the more significant historic houses in the neighborhood (the neighborhood development plan was not yet public knowledge).

The neighborhood and apartment building are also situated on the district’s major intersecting road, Jefferson Avenue, near the city’s East Side downtown central business district and a few blocks from some of the city’s major assets including the Hoyt Library, the Castle Museum, St. Mary’s Hospital, and the Saginaw Farmer’s Market. The suggested neighborhood plan would have had an enormous impact on the character of a pivotal neighborhood within the district. The proposed plan was also extremely unlikely to receive a determination of no effect in a Section 106 review. The importance of reorienting this project to a historic preservation perspective was essential not only for the health of the surrounding neighborhood but also for the successful development of the building itself.

To begin to address the issues with the proposed development plan, the preservation specialists gave a “Historic Preservation 101” presentation to the NSP planning committee. Second, the preservation specialist created an alternate development plan for the area that was loosely based on the city’s 2008 Cathedral District Revitalization Plan. The alternate development plan included a parking assessment that found that if an on-street parking variance were applied to the development, as had been done with a similar apartment building one block away, the project would not require a new surface parking lot.

Additionally, the plan called for neighborhood participation and suggested that funds applied to demolish homes in the area be used to rehabilitate them instead and thereby stabilize an important historic neighborhood. Next, the plan offered...
concrete suggestions on implementation and connected the committee to resources, such as restoration architects, that could assist them in developing the property in a sensitive and cost effective way.

Finally, the preservation specialist began working Neighborhood Renewal Services (NRS), a nonprofit that owned the historic Hill House, drafting and circulating a Request for Proposals for the redevelopment of [the apartment house of Hill House]. NRS was anxious to find a suitable owner for the house as they were disbanding. In addition, the preservation specialist worked with several potential buyers to draft rehab plans for the building and assemble proposal packages for submission to NRS.

At first, the NSP planning committee agreed to accept the preservation specialist’s plan and find ways to implement it as the apartment development moved forward. The committee selected an architect to design a plan for the building on the merits of his previous preservation work, which had been awarded the Governor’s Award for Historic Preservation. The NSP requirements that the building be lead-free imposed a considerable challenge, however, and a determination was made to gut the interior of the building while retaining some features such as the marble steps of the entrance way and the terrazzo hallway floors. Unfortunately during the course of interior demolition, the NPS staff did not adequately supervise the work, and the terrazzo and marble were destroyed, thereby increasing rehabilitation costs. Because of these costs and the city development staff’s inexperience in historic preservation development, an appropriate developer for the property was difficult to secure.

The preservation specialist then tried to educate NSP staff on various historic preservation inducements, such as the Michigan Historic Preservation Tax Credits, that could be leveraged to attract developers. Despite this, NSP staff continued to interpret the lack of interest in the development as related to their lack of a comprehensive site development plan. To that end, the Land Bank and city moved forward with acquisition of surrounding properties for the original parking lot and playground plan as well as the closure of the street fronting the apartment building. In response, the preservation specialist surveyed the neighbors about the proposed development and presented their questions and concerns to the NSP team.

1. If the apartment building is primarily composed of studio and one-bedroom apartments, how many children will be living in the building to require a playground? Additionally, the City of Saginaw has no Parks and Recreation Department so who will have responsibility for taking care of this playground? If it is the responsibility of the apartment management, will the playground be accessible to children not living in the apartment development?

2. The neighborhood is currently composed mostly of childless couples, retirees, and singles who are recent additions to the neighborhood and who moved there specifically to renovate a historic house and were attracted by the unique character of the neighborhood. Many of them began as tenants in one of the two 1920s era apartment buildings in the neighborhood and moved into houses from there. Does this development reflect the needs of the neighborhood and its demographics? Does it take current residents’ needs into account? What do they see as the future of their neighborhood and how does this development coincide with that?

3. The closure of a street to create a cul-de-sac has been shown to be less safe for children and residents as it decreases the level of traffic and eyes on the street and creates a dead social space. In addition, the current circulation patterns of the neighborhood have an enormous affect how people moving through the area experience and relate to the space. These patterns of circulation are character defining and difficult to change once altered. Has this been adequately considered? Has a strong case been made for altering the neighborhood’s circulation pattern?
4. One of the neighbors, who has lived in her house only 10 months, has reported continued harassment from the city’s inspection department. Though they have issued no citations, they have visited her home several times and have reportedly threatened her with condemnation. This is the same house that was referred to in NSP meetings as having strategic importance to the development of the site and which NSP staff anticipated would go in to foreclosure. Are NSP and city staff proceeding in a democratic and fair way? Are their actions in line with the intent of the program? Has every effort been made to ensure that current homeowners have been connected to resources that might help them stay in their homes?

5. The development plan for this area was largely conceived of by the Saginaw County Land Bank’s director, whose decisions on property acquisition and building condemnation are rarely questioned. How does the plan fit with the City’s Master Plan and with the overall goals of the community? Has the city planner been included in the development of this plan? Has the city’s transportation engineer? Why or why not?

6. Is the development plan for the apartment building based on real market research and demands or is it instead based on perceived demands? For example, perhaps this building would be better developed to address unmet housing needs for Saginaw’s senior population which is expected to grow considerably as is happening nationwide.

After the preservationist specialist presented and raised these questions at a number of NSP planning meetings, the NSP staff made a determination to hold a public meeting and to invite neighbors and other stakeholders to discuss potential plans. The preservation specialist was tasked with setting up this meeting. In addition, the suggestion by the preservation specialist to hold a design charrette or visioning session instead of a public presentation was rejected for being too time and resource intensive even though the preservation specialist offered to lead it or to retain pro-bono help.

As the preservation specialist moved forward with plans for a neighborhood meeting, she met with the individual whose house had been threatened with condemnation. After touring the house and examining some of its major issues, the two worked together with to create a plan of action and budget for the resolution of those issues. One year later, the condition of the house has stabilized considerably, and there is no longer a looming threat of condemnation.

While the neighborhood meeting was in its final planning stages, it was learned that all houses in the block surrounding the apartment development, including several that were not owned by the city or Saginaw County Land Bank but in private hands, had been submitted to SHPO by NSP and city staff for Section 106 review with the intention of demolishing them. This included the historic Hill House, a much beloved community icon. The neighbors were outraged and felt as if the city and NSP staff had acted in bad faith by moving forward with their plans to demolish the neighborhood. In response, one resident obtained documentation of the demolition reviews from SHPO through a FOIA request and then passed them on to the media. The neighbors, along with members of Preservation Saginaw, organized a series of meetings where a statement in opposition to the plan for the neighborhood was drafted, as well as a list of requests.

In July and August 2011, the press ran several stories related to the proposed demolitions and NSP projects. In addition, the Facebook page for Preservation Saginaw exploded with new “likes” and active commentary. Neighbors of the apartment and members of Preservation Saginaw took the lead in speaking for their group to the press and gathering supporters. Finally, in mid-August a public meeting was called in Council Chambers to address the proposed demolitions and apartment development.
The meeting was attended by approximately 60 people and several media outlets. Following the overwhelming community response in opposition to tearing down the homes in the neighborhood, NSP backed away from its plans for demolition. The controversy had a number of other outcomes as well.

At the meeting, members of Preservation Saginaw presented the city’s development office with a number of specific requests, including the creation of a local historic district for the Jefferson Avenue corridor and a moratorium on demolitions in the area. As a result, a local historic district study committee was formed. Approval of a local historic district encompassing the area of the proposed apartment development is expected in late 2012.

Shortly before the meeting, the Hill House was featured in the online version of This Old House Magazine, and support for Preservation Saginaw and the neighbors fighting the demolition poured into the magazine (http://www.thisoldhouse.com/toh/photos/0,,20539082,00.html). People who had grown up in Saginaw but had not been back for more than 50 years wrote in with their memories of the Hill House and the neighborhood. In response, a Friends of the Hill House group formed whose leaders arranged for the house to be sold to the Historical Society of Saginaw County for $1. Currently, the Friends are developing a plan for the house for use as an interactive educational space for preservation trades training.

In addition, the Saginaw County Land Bank, under new leadership as of January 2012, has committed itself to finding owners for historic homes rather than pursuing demolition as the first course of action. This includes selling buildings below purchase price and providing potential buyers with information related to preservation, including resources for locating contractors with preservation experience. The Land Bank Decision-making flowchart (see page 21) was partially inspired by this experience and, if applied in the decision-making process, could prevent many of the snarls and controversies that plague Land Banks in shrinking cities.

A direct consequence of the proposed demolition of the Hill House and the houses that surround the NSP apartment development was the establishment of a preservation trades certificate program at Saginaw Valley State University (SVSU). Initiated by Mayor Greg Branch in cooperation with the MHPN’s education committee, SVSU staff, Castle Museum staff, and the preservation specialist, the program will feature a unique curriculum of hands-on work, historic preservation field methods, and architectural history. While the terms are still being negotiated, it is expected that the Hill House will become the program’s continuing laboratory, which will expose students to local history and traditional building methods as well as increase traffic and exposure for the Central Saginaw City Historic District. This partnership will provide the city with a pool of skilled craftspeople and strengthen a core historic neighborhood at the city’s center. The program is scheduled to begin in Fall 2012.

NOTE: As of this writing, no developer has been secured for the Jefferson Apartment building and it remains vacant. Several potential developers have cited the stripped condition of the building as a cost-impediment to rehabilitation.
Appendix B

Letter to the Saginaw City Council on the City’s Draft Master Plan

August 14, 2011

Dear Planning Commission and Advisors,

This letter is in response to the Draft Master Plan for the City of Saginaw posted for public comment on June 13, 2011 on http://www.saginawmasterplan.com/.

First, I want to commend you on the tremendous effort you are undertaking. Also, thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments and observations on the proposed plan. I am a preservation specialist working in Saginaw for the Michigan Historic Preservation Network and the National Trust for Historic Preservation so the focus of my critique will be on the inclusion of Saginaw’s historic resources in to the Master Plan. I hope you will be able to integrate my suggestions, where needed, in to the final draft.

To keep my comments brief, I have presented them below in list form.

- No member of the Historic District Commission was included on the Planning Committee. Their decisions affect property values and the character of Saginaw’s neighborhoods and business districts so their inclusion would have been important.

- There are many photos of buildings from Saginaw included in the MP. Some of these buildings are historic and some not, but there are no architectural descriptions included in the MP.

- There are also no descriptions of general building stock in the infrastructure section or zoning sections of the MP. Considering the age of Saginaw’s housing and commercial building stock and the amount of public money invested in their improvement and maintenance, this is an important omission. Perhaps housing stock and their associated issues (lead contamination, etc.) can be contained within its own section? Ditto for older commercial buildings.

- An inventory of key historic resources is not included in the MP. These would be resources whose continued use and/or existence has been identified as important to Saginaw’s identity and a community priority. Examples of this would include the Castle Museum, the Bean Bunny sign, the Roethke Houses or the Temple Theater. The description of these assets on p. 43-44 does not include mention of their listing on the National Register or inclusion in local or national districts. Also, this list of assets is very short. Perhaps it could be broken out in to thematic sections such as Natural, Cultural, Civic, etc.?

- A historic district map is not included in the map section, nor are there descriptions of the local and national register districts.

- In the section on the demolition of dangerous buildings, there is no description of how these trends and actions have impacted historic resources, even though the highest areas of dangerous building concentration overlay significant historic districts. Neither is there mention in the description of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program of how the city has planned to address issues of blight and demolition in historic districts or use these programs to reverse these trends.

- In the section on strategies to deal with decline, there are no options explicitly associated with historic preservation such as offering historic buildings for sale at below market prices, providing tax breaks to businesses willing to relocate and rehab a historic building, or providing grants to homeowners living in historic districts.
> I am excited by the land use category “Urban Venture Area,” but am curious as to how this will intersect with already existing historic districts. Have the locations of local and national districts and resources been considered in this reinvention of traditional neighborhoods? I see that historic districts have not been included as one of the additional considerations. Could this be done?

> I am excited to see Place Making as a listed goal in the MP. Can the link between creating a sense of place and the role of historic preservation be more explicitly spelled out? I am disappointed to see no mention of any historic preservation strategies listed as a means to achieving this goal. When we speak of a sense of place, it is not just the river and new development that we should think of. We also think of the buildings and the businesses and the houses that make Saginaw unique and special. Finding ways to protect Saginaw’s unique identity should be considered first in the effort to create a sense of place.

> Historic preservation strategies should be included in the action plan checklist as well. Here are some examples but many more could be considered:

• Improvements to the Old Town streetscape are important but what about offering façade grants to business owners?
• Help Old Town apply to be a Main Street community
• Provide business owners local tax incentives or grants if they start a business in a historic district or building
• Sponsor training and provide information for local contractors and business owners on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
• Establish a business incubator in a historic building
• Strengthen the HDC and link their efforts to the work of SCENIC (working together as opposed to against one another)
• Work with local realtor associations to promote Saginaw’s historic districts and homes and educate on historic properties
• Work with the land bank to create an aggressive mothballing program for important vacant structures in historic districts

> There is no mention of historic resources in the action item related to right-sizing. This should be included.

In conclusion, everywhere in the MP are indications that historic resources are vital to Saginaw’s future though strategies for their development are largely absent. Historic districts and buildings remain largely invisible in the plan as it is. This omission would be a tremendous impediment to further progress and a missed opportunity. The reuse of Saginaw’s historic buildings and districts, while accepting that some resources may be lost in the right-sizing process, needs to be addressed. Historic preservation should be prioritized as a key strategy for managing Saginaw’s decline while simultaneously creating a sense of place that will strengthen it in the future.

Thank you again for your time. I welcome any questions or comments on my remarks.

Sincerely,

Brenna Moloney
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Suggestions for Further Reading
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1 The Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) was established by the federal government for the purpose of stabilizing communities that have suffered from foreclosures and abandonment. NSP funds may be used for: purchase and redevelopment of foreclosed homes and residential properties; purchase and rehabilitation of abandoned or foreclosed homes and residential properties; establishing land banks for foreclosed homes; demolishing blighted structures; and/or redeveloping demolished or vacant properties.

2 Land Banks are a community development tool designed to avoid the potential neglect or misuse that comes from selling land at auction. Their objective is to restore the integrity of the community by removing dilapidated structures and redeveloping abandoned properties. A Land Bank is able to acquire abandoned land through the foreclosure process and determine the best use of that land. It can assemble land for transfer to adjacent homeowners, developing long and short-term green spaces, and assembling land for new housing and commercial development.
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