

Historic Preservation Strategy Report



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
November 2008

INTRODUCTION	3
<i>DEFINITION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION:</i>	3
HISTORY OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION:	3
<i>HISTORIC PRESERVATION AND THE LAW:</i>	4
<i>HISTORY OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN THE CHICAGO REGION:</i>	5
<i>OUTLINE OF A LOCAL PRESERVATION ORDINANCE:</i>	7
IMPACTS OF LANDMARK DESIGNATION:	9
<i>HOUSING VALUES, PROPERTY VALUES, AND HOUSING MIX:</i>	9
<i>COMMUNITY CHARACTER:</i>	9
<i>ENERGY CONSUMPTION</i>	10
<i>EMPLOYMENT:</i>	11
PRESERVATION STRATEGIES:	13
<i>DOWNTOWN REVITALIZATION / "MAIN STREET:"</i>	13
<i>PROGRAMS AND FINANCIAL INCENTIVES</i>	15
<i>HERITAGE TOURISM</i>	15
<i>RENOVATION ZONING</i>	16
<i>NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION DISTRICTS</i>	17
<i>COMMUNITY SURVEYS</i>	18
<i>PERMITTING REVIEW OR DELAY</i>	18
CONCLUSION	18

Introduction

Historic buildings have a strong narrative quality. Some, like Independence Hall in Philadelphia, speak to the origins and ideals of a nation. Others, like Frank Lloyd Wright's Robie House, convey a rich vernacular aesthetic. Still others, like the Roberts Temple Church of God in Christ, recall history-changing events (in this case, the incendiary open-casket funeral of Emmett Till). These spatial "stories" are often the strongest link between society and the built environment. They bind communities together, projecting a shared past in a common space. They set communities apart, conveying a unique identity in an increasingly homogenous world.

This folklore of place also translates to sites absent bricks and mortar. The Sauganash Treaty Elm marked where local Native American leaders officially ceded their tribal lands to the United States in 1835. Today, a plaque marks the site near Kilbourn Avenue on Chicago's Northwest Side. A field in Will County's Homer Township holds a monument to its former owner, John Lane Sr., inventor of the steel plow in 1833. In Rondout, an unincorporated rail hub in central Lake County, a historic marker tells of the botched train robbery there that ended the infamous Newton Boys' 5-year crime spree in 1924.

The eras and significance of the above examples are different, but they share one trait: they have all been designated "historic," and then preserved, restored, or commemorated. The following report will look at the many ways that communities in the Chicago region protect the places that are important to them – and the impacts of such landmarks on our economy, environment, and quality of life. As part of a series of strategy reports for CMAP's *GO TO 2040* Regional Comprehensive Plan, this paper is informed by formal academic research and news reports from local and national sources. First, it outlines the definition and history of preservation. Then, it covers the impact of preservation on issues like land value, community character, and economic development. Last, it provides an overview of the various regulatory and economic policies to promote historic preservation.

Definition of Historic Preservation:

Historic preservation is a subjective science that avoids clear definition. Is it an ancient temple, left untouched for posterity? An antebellum mansion, renovated in the 1920s with indoor plumbing, electricity and subtle exterior alterations? A log cabin, built new for an outdoor museum? Or a modern office tower sprouting from a Beaux Arts façade? Generally, some would consider each a form of preservation. But more often, historic significance – and the means to preserve it – is a relative matter that stems from the social context and aesthetic sensibilities of the beholder. In this report, "landmark" is defined as any structure, site, or district that is *legally* designated historic – and "preservation" refers to the administrative process to determine and designate landmarks. This definition refers to all forms of legal designation, from restrictive local landmarks to the more symbolic listings on the National Register of Historic Places. The nuances and requirements of each distinction will be covered in further sections of this report. These definitions are not exhaustive, and they oversimplify the semantics of "preservation" and "historic." However, they are necessary to concisely cover a topic this broad and digressive. Alternative definitions are encouraged.

History of Historic Preservation:

Though the precise origin of historic preservation in the United States is debatable, the first site to be saved by a formal, private organization was George Washington's Mount Vernon Estate in Virginia (Waite et al., 1997). In 1858, 59 years after Washington's death, the Mount Vernon

Ladies' Association bought and restored his weathered property. Today, it is the most visited house museum in the United States, and still managed by the ladies' association (mtvernon.org). In 1889, Arizona's Casa Grande ruins became the first historic site to receive federal protection (Stipe, 2003). This reflected that era's heightened concern for archeological sites endangered by the nation's westward expansion. Since then, the American preservation movement has undergone many transitions – from promoting patriotism to showcasing design to conserving resources and community character (Rose, 1981).

In 1931, Charleston S.C. became the first American city to adopt a local historic preservation ordinance. These regulations acted as an extension of the local zoning code, and established a Board of Architectural Review to vet construction plans within designated areas. The Charleston ordinance also suggested that true historic character is the collective identity of many structures, not a handful of insular landmarks. This philosophy, later called "*tout ensemble*" by preservationists in New Orleans, would influence the way experts across the country approach the landmarking process (Stipe, 2003).

Today, preservation's scope has outgrown the Colonial enclaves, stately homes and Native American ruins that once defined the cause, and now extends to structures and styles that seemed disposable just decades ago. This February, a landmark preservation board in suburban Seattle voted to preserve a Denny's restaurant that anchored a prominent intersection there for nearly 50 years. The basis for saving the boarded-up diner was not architectural significance nor a notable historic event – according to the board, the structure's value lie in the fact that it is "an easily identifiable visual feature of its neighborhood" (Bhatt, 2008). The decision was not without controversy, and its implications speak to the inherent ambiguity of phrases like "community character" and "architectural heritage."

Historic Preservation and the Law:

Few preservation projects avoid debate. Most often, the tensions stem from disagreement about historical merit or resistance to increased property restrictions. To sift through the controversy, embattled preservation causes often look to the courts. Key legislation and judicial decisions are as follows:

An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities (1906): This was the country's first legislative response to fears that "historic landmarks, historic or prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest" were threatened by development and westward expansion. The act empowers the President to designate National Monuments from federal lands, posing the threat of fines and imprisonment if their protections are violated. In 1916, President Woodrow Wilson created the National Park Service (NPS), a special bureau of the Department of the Interior to supervise all national parks and monuments. Primarily used to preserve sites of natural, geological or archeological significance, the Antiquities Act has counted sites like Wyoming's Devil's Tower, Arizona's Grand Canyon and California's Death Valley as National Monuments (www.nps.gov).

Historic Sites Act (1935): This enacted the first national preservation policy that pertained to all lands, public and private. It also established the National Historic Landmarks Program, and commissioned a national building survey (and decades later, an engineering record) under the aegis of the National Park Service. The HSA also authorizes the federal government to perform preservation work on historic sites.

Continued

Department of Transportation Act (1966): This is widely considered the strongest federal preservation law on the books. Its Section 4(f) requires that the U.S. Department of Transportation avoid any project that may compromise a recreational, historic or wildlife area unless there is “no feasible or prudent alternative” (www.nps.gov).

National Historic Preservation Act (1966): This legislation created the National Register of Historic Places and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), whose federal responsibilities are delegated to State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs). Each state has a SHPO, which evaluates nominations to the National Register and oversees many of the regulations named in the NHPA. While the SHPOs make recommendations and often work as mediators in contentious preservation projects, the National Park Service sets the criteria for National Register listings and manages most of the financial incentives linked to this designation (Stipe, 2003).

The National Register is maintained by the NPS and serves as a continuation of the Registry of National Historic Landmarks established under the Historic Sites Act. A listing on the Register qualifies the property for preservation grants and tax benefits. It also subjects the site to Section 106 protections. Section 106 requires that projects on National Register properties that are funded, approved, or undertaken by a federal agency account for the impact of their actions, and allow for the appropriate SHPO to comment (Stipe, 2003). It should be noted that a National Register listing alone does *not* prevent demolition or restrict rehab, but the Section 106 review can provide political leverage if a federal project is considered too invasive for a site. National Register designations are almost always 50 years old or older, and subject to the [*Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*](#), commonly called the “Secretary’s Standards.” Owner consent became required in 1980 (Listokin, 1998).

City of Chicago Landmark Ordinance (1968): Though three years behind New York’s, the Chicago ordinance was a strong early example of local preservation legislation in a major city. Unlike the largely honorific distinction of the National Register, properties protected by Chicago’s (and most cities’) local ordinance are legally bound to criteria uniquely outlined during that landmark’s designation (e.g. the ivy-clad walls of Wrigley Field are strictly off-limits, while approved changes to other parts of the stadium are permissible). Though the Chicago ordinance does not explicitly prohibit demolition or major aesthetic changes to landmarked properties, it does require any proposed alteration be reviewed and approved by the Commission on Chicago Historical and Architectural Landmarks (City of Chicago).

The Tax Reform Act (1976): This established the first in a series of federal tax incentives to preserve historic commercial structures. Its most recent iteration provides a 20 percent federal tax credit to rehabilitations of commercial, agricultural, industrial and rental buildings (www.wvculture.org).

Penn Central Transportation Co. v. New York City (1978): This decision by the U.S. Supreme Court gave legitimacy to local preservation laws and denied that they pose a regulatory “takings” as defined in the 5th Amendment. Among other rights, the 5th amendment holds that “...nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” This “takings clause” is the primary legal fulcrum on which eminent domain and property rights litigation rests. In this case, the Penn Central Transportation Company proposed a 55-story office tower to sit atop Grand Central Station, a New York City landmark. The city denied the project and Penn Central demanded “just compensation” for its loss of development rights. The debate rose to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled that because the property still benefited Penn Central through its initial intended purpose (a rail station), the preservation restrictions were not a takings, and Penn Central was due no compensation. This case, though still evolving in judicial interpretation, recognizes the authority of local landmark ordinances and essentially considers any “reasonable” beneficial use of a landmark property to be a nullifying factor in takings complaints (Stipe, 2003).

History of Historic Preservation in the Chicago Region:

Preservation did not gain a strong foothold in Chicago until the 1960s, a time many experts characterize as promoting indiscriminate demolitions – and an eventual public backlash. Central were Chicago's flagging mid-century economy; the sweeping urban renewal projects that cleared entire blocks in an attempt to spur reinvestment, replace derelict structures and end the mass emigration of the middle class; and the perceived expendability of buildings that would be valued landmarks today (Kamin, 2008).

Among early preservation activists in Chicago, few are as well known as Richard Nickel. Nickel was a photographer and preservationist of buildings by Louis Sullivan, an innovative post-fire architect whose work was all but forgotten by the 1950s. Nickel's passion to save Sullivan buildings was unmatched in the mid-century urban-renewal era, which favored "progress" and new construction over architectural nostalgia. His activism slowly gained attention in the 1960s, especially after a high-profile, though ultimately unsuccessful, demonstration to save the Garrick Theater (Schiller Building) in 1961. But it was not until Nickel's death in the rubble of the Old Chicago Stock Exchange in 1972 (he was salvaging ornamentation as the structure lay half demolished when an upper floor gave way, entombing his body for nearly a month) that his cause – and much of Sullivan's architecture – inspired the mainstream recognition it holds today (Cahan, 1994).

In 1957, the City Council passed an ordinance to establish the Chicago Commission of Architectural Landmarks, an advisory body appointed by the mayor whose primary task was to compile a list of historically significant buildings throughout the city (Cahan and City of Chicago). Unfortunately, the commission was given little authority to protect those buildings, and seven of the 39 landmarks identified during this period were lost (Kamin, 2008). The city gained greater preservation power in 1968 when a subsequent ordinance (see text box above) introduced design restrictions and gave the commission (now called the Commission on Chicago Historical and Architectural Landmarks) permit-review authority.

One expert argues that the early Chicago preservation movement was as much a complement to urban renewal as a reaction against it. He cites the mid-century trend of evaluating landmarks by narrow aesthetic – instead of historical or social – associations. He argues that by favoring buildings of a specific style and era, this framework formalized the "Chicago School" of architecture (of which Sullivan is iconic), and limited the buildings considered distinctly "Chicago" and worthy of preservation (Bluestone, 1994). Downtowns tend to grow concentrically, so reserving "significance" for a single architectural style is like saving one ring of a tree stump and hollowing out the rest. Accordingly, the preoccupation with historic Chicago School structures literally cleared the way toward redeveloping vast, contiguous portions of the Loop, all while hedging against the protests of preservationists (Bluestone, 1994).

In the 1970s, it was preservation – not renewal – that leaders increasingly embraced to ease Chicago's economic decline as industry left the region and residents sought a reason to stay. For many middle-class homebuyers, the mere pronouncement that a neighborhood contained rare and historic architecture became an incentive to invest (Wilson, 2003). Indeed, the growing prevalence of Chicago landmark districts in the 1980s and 1990s came at a time when high-paying corporate jobs were filling the economic void left by shuttered factories. These conditions underscored a clear correlation between late-century landmark designations and the gentrification of surrounding neighborhoods (Wilson, 2003). Ironically, some modern preservation efforts seek to curb that gentrification, and debate continues among academics about preservation's role (if any) in the economic cycles of urban neighborhoods.

In the Chicago suburbs, preservation has a mixed history. In places like Long Grove and Oak Park, historic architecture and cultural sites have long been a defining characteristic. Evanston and Highland Park lead the region in suburban National Register sites with 60 and 33

respectively (National Park Service and the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency). Riverside was one of the first “planned communities” in the country, and largely designed by famed architect Frederick Law Olmstead. Accordingly, the entire city was named a National Historic Landmark in 1970, and Riverside’s local government has a landmark ordinance and an array of initiatives to promote the near-west suburb’s architectural heritage (riverside-illinois.com).

However, in many communities, the importance of historic preservation – as reflected through the adoption of local landmark ordinances or the formation of preservation commissions – is rarely acknowledged; and then, often lightly enforced (Kamin, 2008). There is not widespread recognition that beyond clusters of vernacular housing and “main street” businesses, the suburbs are living museums of industrial, transportation and Native American history. They also present an opportunity for rural farm and barn preservation, a breed of landmark that is often overlooked – but due to the Midwest’s unique (and vanishing) agrarian culture, no less important. More controversially, some suburbs offer “recent-past” landmarks: the cylindrical concrete high-rises, neon-lighted bowling alleys and mid-twentieth-century churches that represent some of the most debated objects of historic preservation.

Outline of a Local Preservation Ordinance:

This February, the Village of Maywood, which boasts 16 National Register listings, convened its first preservation commission. In July, it passed an ordinance that outlines the village’s criteria for landmark status and defines the commission’s role in enforcing and facilitating that distinction. Unlike the largely symbolic distinction of the National Register (Section 106 notwithstanding), local preservation ordinances impose clear legal restrictions on landmark properties. This belies a common perception that National Register listings are more protected (or restricted) than local landmarks.

Maywood’s ordinance (Ord, C0-08-29) is largely representative of municipal preservation law in the region, and can be broken down into four generalizable parts:

1) *The Commission* – In Maywood, the preservation commission comprises five commissioners. Commission size and expertise varies between municipalities, but responsibilities are mostly uniform.

- First, the commission is charged with identifying historically significant properties, either through a formal survey or through the nominations of citizens, preservationists or city officials. Once nominated, the commission decides whether the property will be recommended for official landmark status to the village board. Once landmarked, the group ensures that the historic property’s distinction is visibly recognized through plaques, awards, etc.
- Second, the commission reviews development plans that threaten to alter or demolish an official city landmark. In most cases, the commission’s approval (usually manifested in a certificate of appropriateness) is necessary to proceed with such a project.
- Third, the commission educates residents about the value of preservation generally and individual landmarks specifically. This information is often shared in newsletters, workshops, exhibitions, and through research assistance to constituents. For example, Maywood offers a brief tutorial to residents interested in researching the history of their homes.
- Fourth, the commission ensures that the local zoning code and other land-use decisions account for historic properties in the area, and provide for their protection or reuse. The commission also testifies before any other city board or commission whose activities include a historic landmark or other preservation issue.

2) *The Landmark Designation Process* – Like with preservation commissions, specifics of the designation process can vary from city to city, but they generally follow a procedure similar to Maywood’s.

- First, a nomination application is submitted. The preservation commission reviews the

submission to determine if the nominated property meets the eligibility requirements (workmanship, design, materials, setting, etc.) to be considered further.

- Second, nominations that are approved for further consideration must be presented to the public (in Maywood's case, within 60 days) for review and comment. In Maywood, this public meeting must be publicized through the local newspaper and through mailings to nearby property owners. The public notice must identify the property and state why it merits landmark status. In the meeting, the commission balances the "information, testimony, evidence and other materials presented" to determine whether it will recommend official landmark status for the nominated property to the village board. The village board ultimately confers landmark designation.

- Third, any nomination that is approved by the village board becomes an official village landmark and requires a certificate of appropriateness (COA) from the preservation commission whenever a development project is proposed on the site. In Maywood, if a nomination is refused by the board, the petitioner(s) must wait 90 days to apply again to the preservation commission. Throughout the Maywood nomination process – from the day the application is submitted to the village board's final vote – the nominated site receives the same protection that is provided an official city landmark.

3) *The Landmark Criteria* – Maywood's criteria for historic significance is not unlike most other municipalities. The following are taken directly from the village ordinance:

1. Significant value as part of the historic, heritage or cultural characteristics of the village, county, state, or nation;
2. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the development of the village, county, state or nation;
3. Its identification with a particular movement or event of historic, heritage or cultural significance to the village, county, state or nation, or with a person or persons who significantly contributed to such a movement or event;
4. Representative of the distinguishing characteristics of architecture inherently valuable for the study of a period, type, method of construction or use of indigenous materials;
5. Notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, craftsman or artist whose individual work has influenced the development of the village, county, state or nation;
6. Its unique location or singular physical characteristics make it an established or familiar visual feature;
7. Its character as a particularly fine or unique example of a utilitarian structure, including but not limited to farmhouses, gas stations, or other commercial structures, with a high level of integrity or architectural significance;
8. Area that has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important to history or prehistory.

4) *The Certificate of Appropriateness* – A certificate of appropriateness (COA) is required anytime the owner of a landmark proposes an action that could threaten the historic/architectural integrity of the site. Such actions can include additions, alterations, demolitions, maintenance, rehabilitations, relocations, renovations, or repairs. COA applications are reviewed by the preservation commission, which determines whether the certificate – and by extension, the necessary permit(s) – is granted. In Maywood, landmark owners are exempted from the COA process "if failure to grant the permit will cause imminent threat to life, health or property." Not every municipality with a preservation ordinance requires a COA process, however, most compel a similar review when a historic site is threatened.

Impacts of Landmark Designation:

Housing Values, Property Values, and Housing Mix:

Arguably, the largest area of impact for historic preservation is the residential housing market. This section will cover how historic preservation, in particular landmark designation, affects the price of housing, the possible mix of different types of housing, and any effect on minority and low-income groups.

Historic designation in residential areas usually occurs in one of two ways: 1) designation of an individual property deemed to be historically significant, or 2) designation of an entire neighborhood or a section of a neighborhood as an historic district. Across many studies, a common question has been the effect, if any, of historic designation on the price of land and housing.

Some researchers have demonstrated that the effect of historic designation on price may depend on whether or not a property carries a national or local designation. One study found that a national designation positively impacts the value of the property, while a local designation can negatively impact the property value (Schaeffer and Millerick, 1991). The reasons given are that local historic districts tend to carry more restrictions, while national designations seem to carry more prestige (Schaeffer and Millerick 1991). However, another study found that even though historic designation increased property values of homes inside designated districts in Sacramento, Calif., the designation had an insignificant effect on homes immediately adjacent to historic districts (Clark and Herrin, 1997). A third study rebuts this last point, detecting an external benefit to being near a landmark home or district, even when not sharing the designation (Ford, 1989). In other words, historic designation serves as a “catalyst” for overall neighborhood rejuvenation when households who own homes in a neighborhood adjacent to an historic district restore – or at least rehabilitate – their own homes. These households receive the benefit of living near an historic district without having to incur the regulatory costs that come with a landmark status (Ford 1989). It is this “catalyst” that is seen as the impetus for a wave of restoration and rehabilitation in a given area. (Listokin et al 1999; Rypkema, 1994)

It is important to keep in mind that regional and sub-regional housing markets (and aesthetic tastes) differ across the country, as well as within a region. There is one standard for being added to the National Register – the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. However, there are thousands of different local historic preservation ordinances, some more stringent than others, that contribute to the overall character of any particular sub-regional housing market.

Community Character:

Landmarks define and are defined by community character. This paradox creates frustrations that continually play out in public meetings and the op-ed pages of local newspapers. Should character be strictly aesthetic, or should history and structural function – as illustrated by the “Motor Row” historic district in Chicago’s South Loop – also contribute? Does continuity, as seen along many suburban “main streets,” create character? If so, does a walking tour of the University of Chicago’s Hyde Park campus offend the eyes during the few dozen steps from the Byzantine/Romanesque Rockefeller Chapel to the contemporary Graduate School of Business to the Prairie School Robie House? These are questions that must fall to the individual; and as discussed in other sections of this report, the answers seldom please everyone.

History, aesthetics and function play central roles in defining community character, sometimes to competing or ambiguous ends. In Seattle’s Pioneer Square Historic District, many of the buildings date to the late nineteenth century, a time when exterior fire escapes were mandated. Later

building codes required a secondary interior staircase to replace the iron fire escapes, which would conduct heat during a fire, creating a burn hazard. When local building owners requested approval from the preservation commission to remove the obsolete exterior stairways, they were advised against it because, through the years, the iron fire escapes had become “authentic” elements of the streetscape (Neil, 1980).

Another example of preservation’s uncertain relationship with history and community character comes from a study of public reactions to fake historic architecture in California. Here, the researcher concluded that:

“The findings suggest that when fake architecture is contextual, it adds to community aesthetics by increasing the historic character of a city. Fake architecture was rated as less attractive than historic buildings but more attractive than contemporary architecture. Historic-looking buildings were not viewed as “architectural fakes” but, rather, were viewed as attractive complements to the existing historic buildings in San Luis Obispo. People were able to discriminate between real and fake historic architecture; however, they also viewed fake architecture as more historical than contemporary designs” (Levy, 2005).

An inversion of this example lies in the public buildings of the Jim Crow South, where historic architecture is not forgiven for being fake, but disliked because it, and its symbolism, are real. The segregationist policies that preceded the Civil Rights Movement translated architecturally into separate waiting rooms, restrooms and entrances for blacks and whites. Today, these buildings represent a distinct – and uncomfortable – chapter of American history. But a history professor at the University of South Carolina who studies this “problematical past” argues that the educational benefits of preserving such structures may outweigh the intuitive push to destroy and forget them (Weyeneth, 2005). Sites like the Alamo, where a lopsided battle galvanized Texan secessionism and became a metaphor; the scene of the Haymarket Riot, where an 1886 labor rally just west of Chicago’s Loop devolved into a deadly symbol of organized labor’s precariousness in nineteenth-century America; and the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, where Martin Luther King, Jr. was assassinated in 1968 (now the National Civil Rights Museum) all attest to the power of landmarking the controversial and the tragic.

Examples like those above indicate that “character” and “historic integrity” are terms that must be defined on a sliding scale and administered according to the broadest possible agreement. Donovan D. Rypkema expresses this in an essay for the APA Journal: “Every new building that we add doesn’t have to be the best building downtown; but if it is one more concrete block, Drivit-covered structure, less than the average quality of the whole, the overall physical quality of the downtown can do nothing but decline. Likewise when we are pondering tearing a building down. If it is of a greater quality than the average – and frankly most historic buildings still standing will meet that test – tearing it down reduces the overall quality of downtown” (Rypkema, 2003). Still, the words “historic,” “average” and “quality” present a semantic challenge.

Historic preservation also addresses vacant parcels next to older, pre-existing buildings. Conventional wisdom encourages “sympathetic” development, meaning that new construction should follow the size, scale, and setbacks of the structures around it. This maintains a certain aesthetic, or “streetwall,” that can be more visually appealing than buildings out of scale from each other.

Energy Consumption

With the recent national emphasis on environmentalism, the idea of embodied energy – “the energy required to extract, process, deliver and install the materials needed to construct a

building” – is moving to the forefront of preservation debate (Jackson, 2005). This is challenging the argument that new construction is more energy efficient, and therefore more environmentally friendly. Experts argue that the time necessary for the increased efficiency of some replacement buildings to outweigh the loss of embodied energy on the site is longer than the new structure's life expectancy (Jackson, 2005). When comparing the embodied energy in an existing building and the amount of energy expended to demolish and redevelop the site, it often becomes apparent that the most sustainable route may be to maintain the existing structure (Wilson and Petri, 2007).

The discussion of embodied energy has its genesis in a report published in 1976 by a partnership of University of Illinois academics and New York City architects, *Energy Use for Building Construction*. Using construction industry data from 1967, the group devised a way to quantify the amount of energy consumed in the construction process (Jackson, 2005). This framework is still used to today. Even though the methodology is used for historic buildings, the sentiment among preservation advocates is that the true embodied energy values of older or historic buildings are possibly undervalued. For instance, *Energy Use for Building Construction* was compiled using 1967 construction industry data for new construction. But what about a building constructed in 1910 that typically had more volume, with higher ceilings or wider rooms? Or that same 1910 building that used denser building materials that were subject to very different manufacturing processes that may have consumed more energy? (Jackson, 2005)

In the twenty-first century, as fossil fuel conservation intensifies, we should remember that the existing built environment is a huge resource and can be a great asset in the continued “greening” of society. According to architect Carl Elefante, “The greenest building is the one that is already built.” However, historic preservation advocates must develop a better green-building rating system that uses embodied energy in a more comprehensive manner (Jackson, 2005). Historic preservationists are also attempting to get more credit for reuse projects in the current LEED environmental rating system (Hughes, 2008). Better assessment and understanding of the energy that is embodied in historic buildings can help reach this goal.

Employment:

Historic preservation can be an effective tool for job creation. Some experts argue that the rehabilitation of older or historic buildings has a much greater impact on the local economy than new construction. Rehabilitation, as opposed to new construction, offers employment in key construction capacities. New construction will generally be 50% labor and 50% materials. However, rehabilitation will generally be from 60% to 70% labor, with the remainder of a rehabilitation budget in materials. Consider also the demand in construction jobs created once the rehabilitation is finished. Because components of a building have lives of effectively 30 to 50 years, generally if 2% to 3% of a community's buildings are rehabilitated annually, then the theory is that there would be a continual stream of employment in construction (Rypkema 2003).

An extension of this logic is quantified in a study performed by the Center for Urban Policy Research at Rutgers University. David & Barbara Listokin and Michael Lahr discuss and demonstrate how historic preservation positively affects employment and related categories in New Jersey. First, the study discusses the direct benefits or impacts that historic preservation can have via multiplier effects on many categories, particularly on employment. A *direct impact* is the labor and material purchases that are specifically geared towards historic preservation activities. A multiplier effect known as an *indirect impact* is the spending on goods and services by people and industries that produce the items that are specifically geared towards historic preservation activities. Another multiplier effect known as an *induced impact* consists of purchases made by the households of those who are either directly or indirectly involved in historic preservation activities (Listokin, Listokin & Lahr 1998, 455-456). Listokin, Listokin & Lahr (1998) use the example of lumber to show the multiplier effect historic preservation has. Lumber that is purchased at a hardware store for historic preservation activity is a direct impact. The hardware

store purchasing that same lumber from the mill to be sold is an indirect impact. The workers that benefited from the sale of the lumber, either from the mill to the hardware store or from the hardware store to the customer, is an induced impact (Listokin, Listokin & Lahr 1998, 455-456).

A study of the economic impacts of historic preservation on construction, both in New Jersey and nationwide, shows that the historic rehabilitation of single-family housing, multi-family housing, and non-residential structures, is a "somewhat more potent economic pump primer than is new construction" of the same (Listokin, Listokin & Lahr 1998, 457). For every \$1 million of investment at both the national and state (New Jersey) levels, historic rehabilitation slightly outpaced new construction in the generation of jobs, income, general domestic product (GDP) and general state product (GSP), and state and local taxes (Listokin and Lahr 1997, from Listokin, Listokin and Lahr 1998, 458). (See Table below)

Construction Activity - Historic Rehabilitation and New Construction						
<i>Geographic Level / Economic Effect</i>	Single-Family		Multi-Family		Non-Residential	
	Historic Rehabilitation	New Construction	Historic Rehabilitation	New Construction	Historic Rehabilitation	New Construction
<i>National</i>						
Employment (jobs)	36.7	36.0	36.4	36.1	38.3	36.1
Income (\$000)	1,240	1,206	1,226	1,213	1,302	1,223
GDP (\$000)	1,672	1,604	1,661	1,606	1,711	1,600
State taxes (\$000)	106	102	105	102	110	103
Local taxes (\$000)	89	86	88	86	92	86
<i>State</i>						
Employment (jobs)	18.4	16.4	18.0	16.4	19.3	16.7
Income (\$000)	623	578	623	577	685	600
GDP (\$000)	937	811	915	814	964	827
State taxes (\$000)	65	59	65	59	70	61
Local taxes (\$000)	55	49	55	49	59	51

Source: Listokin and Lahr (1997)

Another consideration of the economic impacts of historic preservation is how it compares to certain non-construction sectors of the economy. For every \$1 million of investment at the national level, historic preservation outpaces pharmaceutical production, electronic component production, and book publishing in its positive impact on the economy, except in GDP, to which historic preservation falls slightly behind book publishing in that category (Listokin, Listokin & Lahr 1998, 459). (See Table below)

Economic Impacts per Million Dollars of Initial Expenditure				
Economic Effect (National)	Residential Historic Rehabilitation (Single-Family)	Pharmaceutical Production	Electronic Component Production	Book Publishing
Employment (jobs)	36.7	28.4	30.9	35.3
Income (\$000)	1,240	1,045	1,018	1,160
GDP (\$000)	1,672	1,546	1,483	1,722
State taxes (\$000)	106	93	87	103
Local taxes (\$000)	89	79	74	86
Source: Listokin, Listokin and Lahr (1998)				

Preservation Strategies:

Downtown Revitalization / “Main Street:”

When visiting any city, large or small, one can visually determine, at least on a surface level, the relative health of its downtown or neighborhood business districts. Are there businesses on the street? Are people walking in and out of storefronts? Are they buying anything? How many vacant storefronts or lots are there? Does it seem like a livable place? Would you take your family?

Historic preservation can be a tool for spurring economic development in downtowns and in neighborhoods. Downtown revitalization is about creating jobs, recruiting new businesses, helping existing businesses to stay and grow, increasing a municipality's tax base, increasing the value of buildings, and increasing overall financial activity in that area (Rypkema, 2003). One of the vital parts to the revitalization of downtown Chicago was an acknowledgement of the unique spaces in and around downtown. Though the city's historic preservation ethic has been debated and analyzed for decades and continues to be so, the city did understand that, by celebrating the rich heritage of such assets as State Street, the elevated Loop tracks, and historic architecture (such as the Reliance Building – now the Hotel Burnham), it was promoting an experience that tourists can only have in downtown Chicago. This thought process has carried over to places like the Prairie Avenue Historic District, which is an historic asset that is important to the beginnings of the city, has been successfully leveraged in the revitalization of the South Loop neighborhood around it.

Successful neighborhood commercial district revitalization, when paired with a progressive preservation ethic, creates strong pockets of economic development because they 1) create jobs, ideally for neighborhood residents; 2) reduce overall transportation costs; 3) increases the overall tax bases; 4) create opportunities for small businesses and expanded “work-at-home” businesses; 5) create business profits, and; 6) create opportunities specifically for minority and immigrant entrepreneurship (Rypkema 2003).

In 1977, the Chicago office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP), in response to the growing decline of traditional historic downtowns, launched a pilot program consisting of three communities (one in Illinois). The purpose of the program was to determine if historic downtowns could become economically viable and simultaneously celebrate its architectural and cultural history. The success of the pilot program gave rise in 1980 both to the National Trust Main Street Center and to a new historic preservation-based economic development strategy, the Main Street “Four-Point Approach.” Main Street is a community-driven, volunteer-based comprehensive revitalization strategy that uses historic preservation and rehabilitation as an economic

development tool. More than thirty years since the pilot program, the Main Street Four-Point Approach can be found in over 2,200 communities, from small to mid-sized downtowns, to urban neighborhood business districts (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2008). Main Street's comprehensiveness comes from its four basic tenets: *organization* of the revitalization effort using volunteers and public-private partnerships, *promotion* of the entire business district as a unique place to shop, play, work, invest, and live, a focus on aspects of *design* that make the business district aesthetically pleasing, and *economic restructuring* of the local economy, which involves knowing the district's market and creating opportunities for new development and job creation (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2008).

Main Street is a proven economic development strategy. For a program that focuses on commercial corridors and small businesses, it packs respectable economic punch. Working from reinvestment statistics tracked by the National Trust Main Street Center and reported by the Center as cumulative statistics, here is a brief look at the economic impact that Main Street programs have made in communities nationwide over a five-year period:

ECONOMIC STATISTICS, NATIONAL TRUST MAIN STREET CENTER, 2003-2007

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Total public/private reinvestment, physical improvements	\$1.3 bil	\$5.0 bil	\$8.2 bil	\$10.1 bil	\$3.3 bil
Net gain, businesses	3,107	6,423	5,387	5,412	5,110
Net gain, jobs	12,861	63,827	23,047	17,731	21,366
Number of building rehabilitations	2,549	10,896	71,548	8,093	12,699

Sources: National Trust Main Street Center; CMAP calculations

Illinois Main Street began to implement this revitalization strategy throughout the state in 1993; shortly thereafter, Illinois Main Street was brought to northeastern Illinois. Illinois Main Street is part of the Office of the Lieutenant Governor and is in partnership with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA). Statewide, Illinois Main Street services 68 municipalities and neighborhoods; currently almost a quarter of Illinois Main Street programs are in northeastern Illinois. (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2008) Through the work of Illinois Main Street, communities in northeastern Illinois have achieved tremendous success in revitalizing their business districts.

One of the benefits of being a part of the Illinois Main Street program is having access to top-notch preservation architects at IHPA. From training committee volunteers on the design aspect of the Main Street Four-Point Approach to design renderings for buildings, IHPA has been a steady partner and a great asset to communities statewide, especially for Illinois Main Street communities. Here is a look at IHPA's work in Illinois Main Street communities in northeastern Illinois from July 2006 to June 2008. It not only speaks to IHPA's commitment to Illinois Main Street, but also especially to the commitment of hundreds of volunteers who decided to take an active part in revitalizing their communities, building by building, business by business.

ILLINOIS HISTORIC PRESERVATION AGENCY Illinois Main Street Design Services for Northeastern Illinois Program Communities Calendar Years 2003 through 2007				
	Site visits	Drawings	Training	
			Sessions	Attendees
Cook	12	12	5	141
DuPage	3	5	4	40
Kane	38	10	10	240
Kendall*	0	0	0	0
Lake	4	8	3	110
McHenry	3	2	4	80
Will	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	60	38	26	611

Market value of service (not including travel)

\$150

\$4,750

\$850

Total market value of services provided

\$9,000

\$180,500

\$22,100

*There are no Illinois Main Street programs in Kendall County.

Source: Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, 2008

Heritage Tourism

The National Trust for Historic Preservation defines “heritage tourism” as “traveling to experience the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present.” (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2008) Heritage tourism may include the promotion of cultural, historic and natural resources as part of an overall tourism and marketing campaign.

Over the years, heritage tourism has been growing with the tourism industry and is increasingly part of economic development strategies nationwide (Rypkema, 2003). One reason why heritage tourism is growing is because one of the greatest assets of different locales is each locale’s historic resources, which generally will be unique from one location to another. Tourists are attracted to unique spaces that are not replicable elsewhere (Rypkema, 2003).

A 2003 study by the Travel Industry Association of America shows that heritage or cultural attractions are rather popular among travelers:

- 56% of the adult population in the United States, or 118.1 million Americans, included at least one of fifteen arts, humanities, historic or heritage activities or events while traveling in 2002.
- 25% of all heritage travelers take three or more such trips a year.
- 40% of travelers in 2002 reported that they visited a designated historic site, such as a building, landmark, home, or monument.
- 41% of heritage/cultural trips are taken by Baby Boomers (ages 35-54).
- 33% of heritage/cultural trips are initiated by households with children.
- Heritage travelers in general are younger, more educated, more technologically savvy, and make \$75,000 or more in income.
- Heritage/cultural travelers spend \$623 per trip versus \$457 per trip of the average traveling household.
- Heritage/cultural travelers are also more likely than average to last seven nights or more and include a stay at hotels, motels or bed and breakfasts.

- The automobile was the most prevalent mode of transportation for heritage/cultural trips (in 2002).
- Of the top ten states visited by heritage/cultural travelers in 2002, Illinois was number seven (Travel Industry of America, 2003; Cultural Heritage Tourism, 2008).

Programs and Financial Incentives

Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits

A **20% Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit** is available for rehabilitating an income-producing building. This dollar-for-dollar Federal income tax credit equal to 20% of the construction costs may be used by the building owner or sold to a tax credit investor. The minimum investment is 100% of the building's "adjusted basis"; that is, the purchase price minus the land cost and depreciation, plus prior improvements. The building must be a certified historic structure. Call the IHPA at 217-782-4836 (Landmarks Illinois, 2008).

A **10% Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit** is available for rehabilitating an income-producing, non-residential building built before 1936. (*This is NOT for properties listed on the National Register of Historic places or in local landmark districts*). This dollar-for-dollar Federal income tax credit equal to 10% of the construction costs. The minimum investment is 100% of the building's "adjusted basis"; that is, the purchase price minus the land cost and depreciation, plus prior improvements. Use IRS form# 3468. Call the IHPA at 217-782-4836 (Landmarks Illinois, 2008).

Other Programs and Financial Incentives

There are many other resources available to those who wish to preserve historic structures and places. Landmarks Illinois, a statewide historic preservation nonprofit, has compiled a comprehensive list of grants, loans, and other incentives and resources that can be used. Available resources run the gamut of opportunities, from bricks-and-mortar projects, to making historic buildings more energy-efficient, to conserving cultural assets. These resources are available to municipal owners, non-profit owners, private owners, and museums interested in preserving the past for the benefit of the present towards a brighter future. This list can be found at: <http://www.landmarks.org/incentives.htm>.

Preservation Policies and Strategies

*****PLEASE NOTE:** (*The following strategies were taken from the CMAP Teardowns strategy report*)

Renovation Zoning

A local non-profit, Preservation Chicago, proposes a unique set of "renovation zoning" requirements for potential teardown properties. According to this group, "...this new classification is to encourage the preservation and renovation of existing housing in neighborhoods that value their older buildings but do not meet the higher standards necessary to qualify as a designated Historic Landmark District." (Preservation Chicago, 2005)

While renovation zoning has yet to be adopted by any local municipalities, it presents a novel concept – applying two zoning classifications to one parcel. Older buildings to be renovated would be given greater zoning flexibility than those properties that are slated for demolition. According to Preservation Chicago, this would restrict the size of redevelopment projects, while not preventing additions and renovations to a community's existing structures. A description of the policy is online at:

<http://www.preservationchicago.org/policy/renovation.html>

Neighborhood Conservation Districts

Like Renovation Zoning, neighborhood conservation districts (NCD) present a useful tool for communities with a distinct historic character, but no formal claim to (or public support for) local landmark status. NCDs attempt to preserve the character of an entire community rather than focus on the design of individual buildings. This helps prevent new construction that is incongruous to the established structures of a neighborhood while not being so rigid as to suffocate development.

NCDs are often implemented as “overlay districts,” or special zones that are subject to additional land-use regulations than the underlying zoning code requires. Often, they are drafted in conjunction with a city's comprehensive plan, and seek to protect a unique resource like a watershed, natural area, or in the case of NCDs, community character (Church). Developers and property owners in an NCD must first adhere to the underlying zoning ordinance, and then abide by the guidelines of the overlay district.

While local historic landmark districts are regulated according to specific criteria that are unique to each district, properties in NCDs are usually addressed more generally. This can be a key point of contention between those favoring design flexibility and those demanding historical integrity (Stipe). Some other key differences between NCDs and conventional preservation districts, as outlined in a study of NCDs for Brookline, Mass, are as follows:

- NCDs allow the public to determine what characteristics of a neighborhood should be preserved (and how strictly), instead of relying on the framework of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards or the language of a local landmark ordinance.
- NCDs emphasize collective neighborhood attributes rather than the details of individual buildings.
- Buildings in NCDs are less often the subject of thorough architectural design reviews. Instead they are evaluated by their size and orientation relative to the rest of the neighborhood.
- NCD reviews are typically left to local planning staff instead of formal, volunteer-staffed historic preservation commissions (Duffy, 2005).

There are many other variables within the NCDs themselves. Some are mandatory, and others are incentive-based – occasionally both. Some are reviewed by municipal staff, and others are reviewed by volunteer boards (the former tends to be more popular and effective, according to the literature). According to the Brookline, Mass. study, “Incentives for neighborhood conservation fall into two main categories – financial benefits and relief from zoning restrictions. Financial incentives include outright grants, tax credits for rehabilitation work that meets local requirements, and in some cases freezing property tax assessments for a period of time. Zoning incentives may allow for a reduction of required setbacks” (Duffy, 2005).

While gaining in popularity throughout the country – and in cities downstate – NCDs have yet to catch on in the Chicago metropolitan region. According to the Brookline study, Lake Forest once

considered establishing a NCD, however, the North Shore community has not done so to date. There is a push by some preservation experts to establish these districts locally. They believe that neighborhood conservation districts would effectively maintain much of a community's character, while not being so restrictive as to be unpalatable to owners of historic property or the community at large.

Community Surveys

As stated previously, community character is difficult for municipalities to define. Sadly, many communities do not discover what makes them unique until demolition and redevelopment have relegated those traits to the local historical society. Therefore, some of the interview respondents recommended community surveys. These surveys would quantify the architectural styles, types of local business, open space, and many other attributes that define a community. The tally could then be used to better inform public policy and decisions regarding demolitions and new construction. In the 1980s, Chicago commissioned a survey of its historic resources in what was fittingly dubbed the Chicago Historic Resources Survey (CHRS). (City of Chicago) The CHRS evaluated every city building constructed before World War II, detailed its historic or architectural contributions and imbued it with a color designation. From red to blue, the colors correspond to the buildings level of historic importance. While this survey is stunning in its breadth (17,371 properties were initially identified as having potentially significant qualities) and level of detail (each "historic" property has a corresponding write-up that details the history, architect, and often, the community context of the building), it is often given only token consideration in zoning and demolition decisions. A recent ordinance requires a 90-day demolition delay for all "orange"- rated properties, but this often is not enough to stave off the wrecking ball. Information on these programs is available online at: <http://www.ci.chi.il.us/Landmarks/CHRS.html>.

Permitting Review or Delay

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

In 2003, the Chicago City Council passed a 90-day delay on demolition permits for structures deemed "significant" (rated orange or red) in the Chicago Historic Resources Survey. According to the city, the ordinance will "provide time to explore development alternatives" when a non-landmarked, historically significant building is threatened. It also helps ensure that neighbors and preservationists are informed of potential demolitions before the bulldozers arrive. Structures that present clear health and safety hazards are exempted from the ordinance (City of Chicago, 2003).

Conclusion

As repeatedly demonstrated in this paper, uncertainty is the only constant in historic preservation. From local landmark laws to the sites themselves, historic preservation is an imprecise science, susceptible to the whims of the surrounding community. However, this subjectivity should not

invalidate preservation's importance – if anything, it should reinforce it. Architectural landmarks openly reflect aesthetic, historic, and cultural values in a way that other media cannot. Consensus is rare in preservation projects, and the agency required to save some structures can undermine popular sentiment; but ultimately, what a community once was – for better or worse – is seldom as telling as what it elects to keep. Sentimentality aside, preservation has proven itself a valuable economic development tool and an eco-friendlier way to adapt to changing markets than continual demolition and reconstruction. However, there will always be tension between history and progress, and properly mediating the two will usually require more than a development pro forma, an environmental impact statement, or an angry public meeting.

References

- Bhatt, Sanjay. "Surprise: Denny's Declared Landmark," *Seattle Times*, Feb. 21, 2008.
- Bluestone, Daniel. (1994). "Preservation and Renewal in Post-World War II Chicago." *Journal of Architecture Education*, 47:4, 210-223.
- Cahan, Richard. They All Fall Down: Richard Nickel's Struggle to Save America's Architecture, John Wiley & Sons, 1994
- Church, David. "Overlay Districts" The Community and Economic Development Tool Box, Published Online: http://www.cdtoolbox.net/development_issues/000191.html
- Clark, David E. and William E. Herrin. (1997). "Historical Preservation Districts and Home Sale Prices: Evidence from the Sacramento Housing Market." *Review of Regional Studies*, 27:1, 29-48.
- Cultural Heritage Tourism. "Cultural Heritage Visitor Profile." Accessed October 28, 2008, from <http://www.culturalheritagetourism.org/resources/visitorProfile.htm>
- Duffy, Robert J., Jeff Levine, Greer Hardwick and Roger Reed. "Neighborhood Conservation District Study for the Town of Brookline," Larson Fisher and Associates, Woodstock, NY, 2005
- Hughes, Keenan. "Reuse vs. Tear Down." *Planning*, January 2008, pp. 40-42.
- Illinois Historic Preservation Agency. "Main Street Reports." Accessed October 28, 2008, from http://www.illinoishistory.gov/ps/mainstreet_report.htm
- Jackson, Mike (2005). "Embodied energy and historic preservation: A needed reassessment." *Journal of Preservation Technology*. 36:4, 47-52.
- Kamin, Blair. "Chicago's Landmarks Law 40 Years Later: The City That Wrecks Does a Better Job of Preserving its Past, But Challenges Loom." Retrieved July, 2008 from <http://featuresblogs.chicagotribune.com/theskyline/2008/05/chicagos-landma.html>
- Landmarks Illinois. Retrieved October 30, 2008, Web site: <http://www.landmarks.org/incentives.htm>
- Levy, Daniel J. (2005). "Does History Matter? Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Fake Historic Architecture and Historic Preservation." *Journal of Architectural Planning Research* 22:2, 148-159.

- Listokin, David, Listokin, Barbara, & Lahr, Michael (1998). "The contributions of historic preservation to housing and economic development." *Housing Policy Debate*. 9:3, 431-478.
- National Park Service, "Antiquities Act of 1906." Retrieved June, 2008 from <http://www.nps.gov/history/history/hisnps/NPSHistory/antiqu.htm>
- National Park Service, "Department of Transportation Act." Retrieved July, 2008 from http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/fhpl_dotact.pdf
- National Trust for Historic Preservation, "National Trust Main Street Center: About the Main Street Center." Retrieved October 30, 2008, from <http://www.mainstreet.org/content.aspx?page=2§ion=1>
- , "The Four Points." Retrieved October 30, 2008, from <http://www.mainstreet.org/content.aspx?page=47§ion=2>
- , "Heritage Tourism," Retrieved October 28, 2008, from <http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/heritage-tourism/>
- Neil, J. Meredith (1980). "Is There a Historian in the House? The Curious Case of Historic Preservation," *The Public Historian* 2:2, 30-38.
- Rose, Carol (1981). "Preservation and Community: New Directions in the Law of Historic Preservation," *Stanford Law Review* 33:3, 473-534.
- Rypkema, Donovan (2003). *Planning for the future, using the past: The role of historic preservation in building tomorrow's Washington, DC*. Washington, DC: Place Economics.
- Rypkema, Donovan (2003). "The Importance of Downtown in the 21st Century." *APA Journal* 69:1, 9-15.
- Schaeffer, P.V., and Millerick, C. (1991). "The impact of historic district designations on property values: An empirical study." *Economic Development Quarterly*. 5, 301-312.
- Stipe, Robert E. A Richer Heritage: Historic Preservation in the Twenty-First Century, The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 2003.
- Travel Industry Association. "Executive Summaries - The Historic/Cultural Traveler, 2003 Edition." Accessed October 28, 2008, from http://www.tia.org/researchpubs/executive_summaries_historic_cultural.html
- Village of Riverside, "Riverside Community Website: History" Retrieved August, 2008 from <http://www.riverside-illinois.com/History.htm>
- Waite, John G., Clay S. Palazzo, Chelle M. Jenkins (1997). "Watching the Evidence: An HSR to Guide the Preservation of George Washington's Mount Vernon" *APT Bulletin* 28:1, 29-35.
- Weyeneth, Robert R. (2005). "The Architecture of Racial Segregation: The Challenges of Preserving the Problematical Past" *The Public Historian*. 27:4, 11-44.
- Wilson, Adele, and Gary Petri. "Trash or Treasure." American School & University, July 2007, pp. 14-16. Accessed October 28, 2008, from http://asumag.com/Furniture/university_trash_treasure/

Wilson, David (2003). "Making Historical Preservation in Chicago: Discourse and Spatiality in Neo-Liberal Times." *Space and Polity* 8:1, 43-59.

Acknowledgements

CMAA would like to thank the following people listed below who assisted by providing data and/or gave useful insight on the topic of historic preservation. The contents and recommendations contained herein do not necessarily reflect their opinions or the policies of the organizations they represent.

Nicholas P. Kalogeresis, AICP, Vice-President, The Lakota Group
Anthony Rubano, Project Designer, Illinois Historic Preservation Agency