



Survey of Citywide Preservation
Planning in American Cities

PREPARED BY RANDALL MASON
FOR THE PRESERVATION ALLIANCE FOR GREATER
PHILADELPHIA
MAY 2008

SURVEY OF CITY-WIDE PRESERVATION PLANNING IN AMERICAN CITIES

Prof. Randall Mason
Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, University of Pennsylvania
For the Preservation Alliance of Greater Philadelphia

INTRODUCTION

Many American cities have developed a thriving historic preservation infrastructure: robust historic preservation policies, a variety of organizations and agencies working to advance preservation, and any number of successful building-scale restoration projects and historic districts. Historic preservation activity has become a key ingredient of successful cities and city planning. Yet distinct, free-standing preservation plans—providing guidance for linking and expanding the different parts of this infrastructure—are rare. Too often, historic preservation planning is pursued as a separate activity, not linked to core planning and development functions, and relegated as an adjunct to urban planning policies dominated by economic development concerns.

The purpose of this report is to survey patterns and trends in preservation planning at the city-wide scale in U.S. cities. (A few Canadian cities were included, despite the different governmental structure and planning traditions in Canada.) It presents an overview of recent practice and draws on contemporary efforts to implement city-wide preservation planning in larger American cities. To collect data, information and personal contacts were sought via on-line searches, other desk research, academic literature, and interviews to identify cities undertaking city-wide preservation planning efforts.

THE IDEAL

The ideal situation for citywide preservation planning—which rarely exists in all its aspects—is worth contemplating at the outset. Ideally, up-to-date physical survey and historical research provide a knowledge base about resources to preserve; a range of preservation planning and policy options are available to support actual preservation activity (historical designation/listing, design guidelines, area plans, financial incentives for rehabilitation, and so on); and deliberate preservation planning organizes and integrates these two levels of preservation activity. Further, preservation planning ideally works hand-in-hand with the overarching planning, zoning, economic development and other built-environment functions of the city government. Preservation plans are not managed by historic preservation professionals alone: the work of government agencies is supported by politicians, a range of nonprofit organizations (preservation advocacy groups, community groups, educational and cultural institutions like museums and universities), and a knowledgeable public. Successful preservation plans enable continues economic growth and revitalization while also creating and sustaining the cultural benefits the are the core purpose of historic preservation.

While it is extremely difficult to pull together all these factors, a number of cities have made substantial progress toward this ideal. In nearly every large city, basic historic preservation functions are in place: a local preservation ordinance, district and landmark listings, an appointed commission with some staff, some survey, some kinds of integration of preservation into master plans or area plans. In a few cities, strategic plans with a strong base of knowledge and data have yielded much stronger results than a mere collection of individual preservation activities are likely to bring. Cities sampled in this survey included Charleston (SC), Los Angeles, San Francisco, Fort Worth, Phoenix, Kansas City, Seattle, and Salt Lake City (many others were investigated, but those listed here stood out as leaders).

What are the biggest obstacles to achieving the ideal? The primary obstacle is marshaling resources enough to build a strong base of information as well as support a strategic planning process among the many partners contributing to a city's preservation infrastructure. People, time, money and influence need to be dedicated to the purpose. Though preservation planning is not about survey for its own sake, nor is historic designation and protection an end in itself, surveys and historical research provide an essential base for any policies or decisions. Surveys are time and resource-intensive, and seldom keep up with the demand for information. At the same time, changing historical canons, public awareness and historic preservation methods highlight the need to make surveying and historical research an ongoing affair—not a one-time product.

The second substantial challenge for preservation planning at the city-wide scale is making connections between preservation and other urban planning, land-use regulation and governance activities—economic development, urban planning/zoning, community development and other processes. The danger for historic preservation planning is in being marginal and separated from the planning mainstream. In these instances preservation too often becomes an activity only for a preservationist audience. The goal of city-wide planning is broadening the audience and constituency of preservation. Preservation planning driven by survey alone, or concerned with isolated monuments or districts without being connected to overall decision-making about a city's economic development, public investment and urban form, is less effective. Cities with massive amount of survey data that is never consulted are a disappointment. When preservation planning is connected to the mainstreams of development and planning policy, the results are notable (consider Providence's College Hill or Philadelphia's Society Hill plans from the late 1950s, or the emergence of adaptively reused loft districts in most cities).

A preservation plan is not a document merely arguing the preservation is a good idea and listing the sites to be preserved. It should articulate a vision for the role of historic preservation in a city's future, and elaborate on strategies for achieving this vision. Historic preservation is just one among many "public goods" that city planning (writ larger) is intended to provide. (Some preservation plans explicitly describe the "public value" of preservation as a prelude to the policies, plans and projects they suggest to realize the public benefits of investing in historic preservation.) Going beyond advocacy, preservation plans take on the additional challenges of confronting trade-offs between economic development, community desires, environmental sensitivities and other public

goods. Preservation plans engage in the nitty-gritty of reconciling conflicting processes and integrating the work of preservation with the other planning measures necessary for urban growth and change. Such plans may take an advocacy ethic and prosecute it strongly, but they go beyond mere advocacy to specify modes and means of realistic implementation. They also abide by the basic city-planning logics of basing decision on research and analysis of options, and that public engagement results in better decisions.

WHAT KINDS OF PLANS ARE BEING DONE?

Having sampled the 100 largest cities in the U.S. (as well as others that came to our attention), there are four types of city-wide preservation plans being done today: free-standing plans; chapters of comprehensive plans; efforts organized around neighborhood- or area-planning; and survey driven plans. (Arguably, a fifth type of plan exists, consisting of a city's variety of preservation efforts—surveys, histories, regulatory efforts, commissions, incentives, and the like—collectively referred to as “historic preservation plans.” Even more narrowly, some cities publish catalogs of surveyed buildings and call this a plan. This report does not focus on such plans, instead dwelling on more deliberate, forward-planning efforts.)

Free-standing plans

Few cities have undertaken freestanding preservation plans: they are rare but not unknown. Less than a dozen examples exist, including Charleston (SC), Los Angeles, Fort Worth, and Salt Lake City. (Other large cities have extensive preservation infrastructure and strong preservation policies and processes, ongoing survey programs, and certain roles for preservation in the ongoing management of the city—New York and Chicago, for instance—without relying on preservation plans, per se. These cities are of less interest to this study specifically concerned with the tool of the city-wide preservation plan.)

It is worth noting that a few smaller cities have commissioned freestanding preservation plans, including: Waterloo, IA; Franklin, TN; Abingdon, VA. Methodologically, these plans marry a strategic approach (articulating a vision for the community's continuing emphasis on historic preservation as a local planning tool) with selective survey and historic context writing. A number of small cities in California and Texas have also formulated preservation plans, owing to state-level programs to help fund these activities. In practice, these plans tend to be straightforward summaries of local history, historic preservation tools and policies already in force (Burbank, CA, for example).

Stand-alone preservation plans demonstrate a higher level of commitment to preservation as part of a city's approach to planning and development—to its future. The driving forces behind such plans are strongly motivated, politically influential preservation constituencies within the communities. These preservation plans increasingly are designed to be strategic—that is, setting out a number of goals beyond survey and regulation, aimed at better integration of preservation with broader planning frameworks

and development activities. And the cities undertaking these plans are places with broadly recognized historic resources and long traditions of preservation/stewardship. Even when preservation plans are freestanding they need to be closely tied to existing planning structures and institutions in order to influence urban development.

Comprehensive plan “chapters”

The majority of cities undertaking preservation planning pursue it as part of a comprehensive plan (Atlanta, for example). This takes the form of a “chapter” of the comprehensive plan—in some cases because it is recognized by political or planning authorities that historic resources are a significant aspects of planning/built environment issues; in other cases, because of state-level legal and policy requirements.

When historic preservation plans are simply folded into to comprehensive planning efforts, it is easy to under-value and undermine the contributions preservation makes to urban development. Even though a range of tools are available and a modest level of survey and designation are carried out, preservation remains on the sideline of debates over—and efforts to actively shape—the character of the city. Preservation runs the danger of warranting only pro forma mention, getting framed as an optional “amenity,” getting reduced to regulation, or traded off against other aspects of the plan.

Neighborhood-driven or area-planning approaches

Some cities apply preservation as a community building and planning strategy, employing an approach to preservation planning aimed at strengthening communities and organized at the scale of the individual neighborhood. In many instances, the choice of which neighborhoods get preservation planning attention is fairly ad hoc—chosen opportunistically, rather than according to strict criteria. Surveying historic properties and writing context statements are regarded, in these cases, as part of a strategy of process of framing community goals and vision. In cities pursuing this model—examples include Seattle, San Francisco, Phoenix and Indianapolis—somewhat decentralized, neighborhood-level preservation plans are used to gradually extend the reach of preservation across the city. To different extents, these efforts are supported by citywide regulatory and contextual frameworks; while they may lack in strategic, city-wide vision, such efforts seem better suited to solving more immediate threats to historic communities. Arguably, this is a more pragmatic approach to preservation planning, particularly in a time when resources to mount preservation planning efforts are scarce, targeting areas under acute threat or where political leverage is greatest.

Survey-driven plans

Though they were once the standard of preservation planning (in the mid-to-late 20th century), efforts driven by survey are more rare these days—partly because surveys are regarded as expensive, time-consuming undertakings; partly because the more ambitious outlook and sophistication of the preservation field’s leaders, these days, is more attuned to making an impact on the whole of the city (not just those precincts deemed “historic”

by consensus) which requires a strategic approach. In these cases, the plan revolves around a future-oriented vision of the city and the role historic buildings/places are desired to play in that future (generally, this role is conceived as a combination of both cultural/memorial/visual/identity-building functions as well as economic expectations held for redevelopment/revitalization).

Even in the most strategy-oriented plans, survey data still serves as a critical foundation for planning efforts. And some cities focus their resources on extending survey—or revising criteria for surveying and listing—because it is simply easier politically, pragmatically, and legally to build on the long-standing tools, policies and institutions. Explicit contexts—statements about the thematically important aspects of a place’s narrative, which essentially serve as a way to prioritize preservation attention—are more and more common. A context should be a critical, early part of the survey process. Creating context statements/studies are a prelude to survey is an increasingly common practice (San Francisco, Los Angeles, Charleston, and it is common in Canadian practice too). And this aligns very clearly with the push for more strategic preservation plans: context statements give preservation leaders and staff a more solid base on which to make decisions on the allocation of scarce resources (for survey, for investment, for manpower). Many surveys/registers are acknowledged to not be representative (vis-à-vis ethnic groups, historic periods, geographic areas of a city) and therefore in need of revision and updating. Carefully done context statements help reveal past biases and gaps.

(Baltimore presents another model of city-wide preservation planning. The Baltimore City Heritage Area, created in 2001 by the Mayor’s Office under the auspices of a state heritage areas program, constitutes an additional layer of the City government’s preservation planning activity. Heritage areas, as a type of preservation policy, do not rely on public ownership or regulation; rather, they are entrepreneurial, partnership-based strategies for integrating development and preservation efforts (often across political jurisdictions) to broaden public access to historic and natural resources (both for residents and visitors). The Commission for Historical & Architectural Preservation is the City’s lead agency for historic preservation survey, listing, and regulation; the Heritage Area complements these traditional preservation activities by organizing heritage development efforts (particularly tourism) taking advantage of the city’s historic resources and requiring extensive cooperation of private and public-sector partners.)

COMMON ELEMENTS OF CITY-WIDE PRESERVATION PLANS

Cutting across the different approaches to organizing preservation planning, several common elements are shared by most of these recent efforts.

The basic historic preservation planning infrastructure is assumed to be in place: an ordinance and a few organizations (public and nonprofit). Further it is assumed that some level of survey, historical context, listing, and mechanisms for regulating listed properties exist.

Community participation is a part of most preservation plans, even though preservation plans are seen as mostly the province of professionals. What public involvement exists tends to be formulaic: public meetings and consultative committees drawn from civic leadership, political, and business circles. The urgent discussion about building a public constituency for historic preservation is too rarely heard or creatively approached.

Some preservation planning efforts are explicitly aimed at revising existing legislation, policies or regulations. In Fort Worth, for example, the revision of the preservation ordinance is a specific goal of the plan. Since many ordinances were created a generation ago (or more), it is sensible to think about revising them. Plans also commonly aim to expand the kinds of resources considered for listing and protection—the two most frequently cited kinds of resources are recent past/Modernist resources and places associated with ethnic histories. Vancouver, British Columbia, is undertaking a notable effort to “upgrade” and extend its historic properties list (“heritage register”) in both these directions. Because their list was last reviewed in 1986, they recognize that heritage priorities and interests have changed and are deliberately launching a multi-year, theme-based survey (beginning with post-1940s properties) aimed at bringing new and more-publicly relevant properties and districts in to the historic preservation planning regime the city already has firmly in place.

More and more often, specific efforts are made to articulate the economic benefits of historic preservation as part of the rationale for doing preservation planning. This is the most promising and prominent issue tying historic preservation to the mainstreams of urban governance, and preservation plans, it follows, are pressed to link preservation efforts to direct economic benefits (profiting from preservation). Sometimes in the guise of protecting assets important for heritage tourism (Franklin, Charleston); in other cases citing the evidence supporting the idea that historic preservation regulation increases property values. In some cases, planning efforts are focused on making economic arguments for preservation and stimulating use of financial incentives.

KEY VARIABLES

Looking across the kinds of citywide preservation planning efforts currently (or recently) being undertaken, and interviewing a variety of staff and consultants involved in devising some of the plans, seven key variables emerged. These variables are not promoted here as essential ingredients for successful preservation plans, but rather as issues addressed in some way by most efforts.

- Driving issue

Preservation plans are motivated usually by a driving issue—sometimes reactive, sometimes proactive. This issue is sometimes the loss of an important resource (a common occurrence in preservation history of many cities); more often, preservation plans are longer-term, thoughtfully designed responses to the lack of strategic vision for preservation in the broader scheme of a city’s growth. Thus,

the driving issue for many city-wide preservation plans is a cumulative frustration with failure to include or support preservation in everyday planning decisions. In other cases, the opportunity presented by a pro-preservation political regime, a mandated periodic updating of the comprehensive planning, or a state program to enable municipal-scale preservation planning stimulates a planning effort.

• The driving organization

While multi-sector partnerships are the norm in most planning and preservation efforts these days, one organization often takes the lead in city-wide preservation plans. In most cases, this is an agency of the municipal government. Historic preservation agencies are most often organized as sub-groups within planning departments, though there are many variations on this theme as well as a number of exceptions (in which case the preservation agency reports directly to the executive—the mayor or city manager). Another common source of leadership is the nonprofit preservation community; and, more rarely, (regional) foundations.

• Organizational structure of the city's preservation community

In most cities, the public preservation agency takes the lead, and some government staff are devoted strictly to preservation. This staff is most often a department or sub-group of the planning department. In addition, other, somewhat independent centers of leadership in the preservation and civic communities play some role in most of the efforts (whether it is the leading nonprofit preservation group, a local foundation, downtown business/owner's group, or university). As with most preservation or planning efforts nowadays, partnership is the rule.

• Integration of preservation with other planning/development processes

Whatever the institutional arrangements of a city's preservation agencies, a key variable—perhaps the key variable—affecting the efficacy of preservation planning is how well it is integrated with broader urban planning, economic development and political priorities and procedures. To the extent that historic preservation is isolated from these broader processes, it loses its potential to influence the city at large (though it may still be quite successful on certain site or areas of the city). Sometimes the difficulties of integration is expressed in conflicts or contradictions between zoning and preservation regulations, lack of administrative collaboration between departments with related responsibilities (building inspection, zoning, economic development, and historic preservation, for instance), or competition over the emphasis of project plans or area/neighborhood plans (in which preservation often is pitted against development).

• Survey vs. strategy

The balance between emphasizing survey (gathering and organizing information) versus emphasizing strategy (influencing and shaping future decisions through analysis or through forming partnerships) is a key differentiating factor between different types of plans. Good survey is a foundation for good strategy and

decision-making, but not a substitute for them. Survey is expensive and time-consuming, and is (or should be) in a state of constant revision and addition. Collecting data is difficult in itself; making it useful and accessible requires great effort in itself. Even the most exhaustive surveys rarely yield any sensible result to the public (Chicago's extensive survey, accessible online, is an exception); yet a reliable and reasonably comprehensive survey is an essential basis for policy and development decisions. As a complement to survey, strategy means shaping policy decisions, designing the processes of implementing and supporting preservation (politically, administratively, financially), and thinking about systemic change as well as project-, site-, or resource-specific outcomes. Both survey and strategy are essential to an effective preservation plan, though neither should be allowed to dominate the planning.

• Funding sources

Funds to do the planning itself is a necessary issue, of course. This can come from many different sources. Funds from operating budgets rarely suffice to maintain any level of proactive survey as well as routine administration of preservation ordinance responsibilities. Therefore bond issues, foundation grants or other special sources of funding are used for preservation planning. The second funding issue is securing funds to carry out provisions of the plan and staff/monitor/implement the measures called for in the plan (i.e., additional survey, design review). Better integration of preservation activities with mainstream planning and development processes (as opposed to sowing conflict between preservation and development) should increase the availability of implementation funds.

• Constraints

Ambitious efforts like city-wide preservation plans require risk-taking on the part of supporters and advocates. Framed another way, preservation planning faces a number of pragmatic obstacles and constraints alongside the strategic and intellectual challenges. Lack of political support both within the planning apparatus and more generally in the civic sector is a common obstacle. Closely related, weak public support for preservation—or rather, over-reliance on a small, highly committed cadre of preservation supporters—is a problem in nearly every city (Charleston is a possible exception). More practically, Staff capacity was commonly heard as a limiting factor in cities undertaking preservation plans.

CONCLUSIONS

City wide preservation planning seems to be undergoing a mild boom. As historic preservation gains greater, gradual acceptance as a tool for urban development as well as a memorial and artistic activity, the perceived need for preservation planning increases. In varied forms, preservation planning is gaining acceptance as an essential function of city governance.

As outlined here, there are many ways to organize preservation planning. There is no one best model; it should respond to the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats specific to each city. A number of good models and best practices are out there. The best preservation plans expand on traditional preservation planning tools (survey, regulation, incentives) and work to transform the city's use of preservation to be more forward-looking, more publicly engaged and integrated with other urban planning and development processes. The framework described here (key concepts and plan types) will ideally support critical thinking about doing more citywide preservation planning and doing it better.

This report is a preliminary analysis of a national survey; comments, suggestions and leads to be explored in our continuing research are greatly appreciated. Please contact rfmason@design.upenn.edu.

APPENDIX: Brief summaries of a selection of cities currently or recently undertaking preservation plans.

Los Angeles

Supported by the Getty Foundation, the City of Los Angeles has undertaken a massive survey effort—SurveyLA—to build understanding the resources needing protection as well as managing the information better, integrate preservation better into city planning and development decisions, and enable a more proactive approach for the city’s preservation community. Initial studies led to the creation of a new Office of Historic Resources in the city’s Planning Department to spearhead the context-building and survey work, and advanced the complex partnerships needed to support such an ambitious effort in so large and complex a city. This is an especially daunting and impressive effort, given the scale of the city (at 465 square miles, Los Angeles is about three and a half times the area of Philadelphia, at 135 square miles) and the growth dynamic of the region, and the accomplishments of the city’s preservation community.

Charleston, SC

Charleston’s 1974 plan set the standard for the preservation plan as architectural survey. Cataloguing the historic architecture of the city’s core, it built upon and extended the city’s legacy as one of the most thoroughly preserved cities in the U.S. When Charlestonians recently launched an effort to revise and extend their preservation, their approach was strategic. The current planning effort epitomizes the current state of best-practice preservation planning—extensive public involvement, strategic integration of a wide range of preservation planning measures, and selective survey and documentation to broaden the geographic scope of areas coming under the purview of preservation planning and cultivate a forward-looking preservation planning (“stewardship”) ethic. It builds on an extremely strong base: years of preservation advocacy, implementation, strongly integrated preservation, city planning and economic activities, and very strong political support.

San Francisco, CA

A new initiative of historic survey work has recently been launched by the Neighborhood Planning group of the city’s planning department. Beginning in 2000, the work responded to the city’s aggressive pursuit of area plans and up-zoning, often done in areas without historic resource surveys.

Though there is no official preservation element in the General Plan, a citywide preservation policy document being prepared. Preservation, meanwhile, enjoys strong political support right now, supporting efforts to make preservation planning more proactive. With funding from a number of sources (CLG, state cultural funds, a special “trust fund” and a foundation), a program of widening survey is underway in areas such as Market-Octavia, Japantown, and Balboa Park. The survey methodology calls for

context statements and reconnaissance surveys as preliminaries to more detailed work, and they have looked to Los Angeles' efforts as a model.

Salt Lake City, UT

Salt Lake City has recently embarked on a preservation plan aimed at revisiting the preservation and zoning ordinances, and perhaps extending (geographically) the standard preservation tools of listing buildings, creating historic districts, and advocating the use of economic incentives. The plan is following a typical planning process: forming an Advisory Committee to help identify goals, policies and support for the plan; holding open houses and other meetings to gather public input; stakeholder interviews (people who have dealt with the ordinance and program to get their insight); the writing of a plan outlining general strategies and specific implementation steps.

Salt Lake City has a fairly standard array of preservation policies, tools, organizations and partnerships. The Preservation Program for Salt Lake City is run out of the Planning Division, with two preservation staff positions supporting a nine-member appointed Commission. The City's Planning office has elements in each community plan dealing with historic preservation (the City does not have a city-wide land use master plan). The new Preservation Plan will be one of several topic-based city wide plans similar to our Transportation Plan and Open Space Plan to help bridge the gaps left by community-by-community planning efforts.

Salt Lake City seems typical in many ways: in the range of ongoing preservation efforts; the modicum of political support for preservation; and the current effort to elevate preservation thinking about the ad hoc and community specific efforts to a city-wide and future-oriented scope. The plan reaches out to non-preservation sectors as potential partners, embraces public outreach, and regards the relationships between preservation and planning as a central issue.

Kansas City, MO

In 1997, the FOCUS Kansas City Master Plan, a 25 year strategic and comprehensive plan, was completed. (FOCUS stands for "Forging Our Comprehensive Urban Strategy.") This vision-centered effort was widely inclusive of different parts of the city's leadership and citizenry. A city-wide Preservation Plan was identified as one of seven Phase II elements of FOCUS; the goals included: accelerating the survey of historic resources; utilizing preservation as an economic development strategy, including tourism; improving regulatory processes; and increasing public awareness.

The City's preservation processes and organizations seem typical: the city's planning department serves as a small staff to an appointed Landmarks Commission. Financial and manpower constraints have prevented implementation of many FOCUS ideas, leaving the Commission and its survey efforts more reactive, not proactive. A new zoning code, under review, promises to integrate preservation with zoning, subdivision regulation and other land-use tools.

Overall, there is a sense that there is not an ideal climate for preservation in Kansas City, so implementation of new plans (no matter how good or visionary it may be) will be difficult. Denver is the model cited by some local officials, and indeed a loft/arts district (the Crossroads) is emerging.

Phoenix, AZ

Phoenix has made a strong efforts to survey and designate its many post-WWII neighborhoods in advance of development pressures. Not driven by a plan per se, the 45 local historic districts extend the application of their preservation ordinance. Survey efforts appear to be the vanguard of Phoenix preservation planning efforts. The Historic Preservation Office organizes survey by theme and geography, in pieces that are more doable financially and physically than a city-wide survey. The post-war residential landscape is a time-sensitive priority for them, but thematic areas constitute the largest gaps in research. Pro-active thematic surveys on ethnic themes have recently been undertaken: an African-American survey is complete; Asian-American and Hispanic-American are underway.

The preservation infrastructure of Phoenix is typical: a volunteer Commission; Historic Preservation program staff of six. Historic Preservation Ordinance: creates Historic Preservation Commission (appointed by City Council, volunteer). The Historic Preservation Office houses the professional staff for the Commission, and, reports directly to the City Manager (not to the planning office). The Commission and Historic Preservation Office work in partnership with local preservation groups, Arizona heritage foundations, and the SHPO, and homeowners. Modest financial incentives support model projects.

Among the Commission's responsibilities is creating and implementing an historic preservation plan, which has not taken the form of a free-standing plan. Rather, guidance for the general policy of extending the reach of local historic districts comes from the city-wide preservation element included in comprehensive plan—"Conservation, Rehabilitation, and Redevelopment Element of the General Plan"—the goals of which are quite broad. Most funding comes from the City budget; bond grants sustained them for long time.

Public support for residential historic districts seems strong. Such a large number of historic districts can only happen with accepting communities. Local officials report generally good results from their public involvement activities, which include presentations to village councils as well as citywide bodies like the planning commission and city council. Proactively, they hold workshops at beginning of context and survey studies.

Fort Worth, TX

The Fort Worth Citywide Historic Preservation Plan, completed in 2003, is a notable example of a free-standing preservation plan. The plan analyzes existing surveys, historical research/context studies, and economic studies, and bases its recommendations on community input and visioning exercises as well as analysis of existing policies, tools and data. It seems empirically strong and strategically sound.

The main goal of the Plan was to build a consensus between business development and preservation interests. To this end, significant effort was made to consult widely. Local officials report that the public is very aware of preservation in the city. Most people relate historic preservation with core areas of the down town, but efforts are being made to raise awareness about other, less recognized historic areas.

The plan also gathered basic information about existing preservation programs, policies and surveys, and analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the various aspects of Fort Worth's preservation infrastructure. The plan did not involve extensive survey work; a large survey of the surrounding county (including Fort Worth) had previously been done. Rather, this plan identified gaps and priorities for ongoing survey, including post-1945 communities and ethnic theme studies.

A brief historic and development context was included in the plan, as well as a section on the "public value" of preservation highlighting the economic benefits of historic preservation. This clearly identified the Plan with constituency building rather than simply cataloguing existing surveys and research.

Meetings were held city wide to gain information about the public's view of historic sites and preservation efforts. The planning effort was led by the city's historic preservation program, which is housed in Planning and Development Division. Funding for the Plan came from a variety of sources: City, state, and CLG funds, as well as private donations from targeted fundraising efforts. Interestingly, the financing, planning and implementing of the plan was done independently from the Texas Historical Commission's efforts to stimulate preservation planning.

The plan has been running successfully and smoothly. In the beginning of July 2007, revisions to the preservation ordinance were made, implementing the largest portions of recommendations of the plan. At that point, the majority of the plan will be implemented.

Seattle, WA

Seattle's city wide preservation infrastructure is very complete. Most of the preservation planning activity seems focused on a robust neighborhood-based planning system to complement citywide preservation policies.

In addition to typical preservation policies and tools (a landmarks ordinance, 350 designated landmarks, seven historic districts, and a landmark TDR program), there is an impressive list of 38 Neighborhood Plans in which preservation is integrated, often as a

leading concern. These plans are managed by the city with significant community participation. The expansion of neighborhood preservation surveys has been preceded by the development of context statements, that are both area-specific and thematic.

Seattle's strategy of pursuing neighborhood-scale preservation planning, as opposed to city-wide, is mirrored in the organization of city agencies and responsibilities. The Historic Preservation Program is located in the Department of Neighborhoods, which leads the Neighborhood Plans. The Department of Neighborhoods is parallel to the Department of Planning and Development and the Department of Economic Development, which have city-wide responsibilities.

Arlington, VA

A large county jurisdiction (effectively though not literally a large city), Arlington's historic preservation staff has developed an extensive database of survey information accumulated over years of effort. Though housed within the planning agency, the challenge faced by preservation has been utilizing this information base (and the strong preservation ethic driving over the years) in the planning, regulatory infrastructure, public attitudes toward development and neighborhood protection of a fast-growing county.

From a large base of National-Register districts, authorities have been searching for ways to include preservation-supportive planning in other tools—not just local historic districts, but form-based zoning and special district plans. As with many other jurisdictions, the relationship between preservation staff/agency/leadership and planning staff/agency/leadership within the government apparatus has been an obstacle. As has the management and utilization of a wealth of historic survey data collected in non-digital formats.