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Revealing Synergies, Tensions, and Silences Between Preservation and Planning

Jennifer Minner

Problem, research strategy, and findings: Historic preservation and planning often operate together in the United States within local planning departments, sharing some common roots and a “fragile, uneasy alliance” (Birch & Roby, 1984). Over time, developments in both preservation and planning brought these disciplines and professions closer together, including shared concern for sustainability and common ground in community economic development, revitalization, land use planning, and urban design. Simultaneously, areas of tension and potential conflict emerged. Some preservation-oriented scholars and practitioners call for the expansion of preservation’s sphere of influence and concern, while others caution of negative effects. In this literature review, I identify areas of confluence and friction, as well as silences and gaps, focusing especially on planning and preservation literature since the 1980s.

Takeaway for practice: Few scholars have identified what planners and preservationists (and those who do both) can learn from one another, with some important exceptions. Planning scholarship can benefit from understanding how preservation has changed in tandem and in relation to planning. Preservationists can gain much from incorporating contemporary planning theory, especially with regard to participation and building an equity agenda for preservation that builds from preservation’s strengths and recent advances toward recognizing a wider, more representative set of historic resources. Both planners and preservationists can benefit from stronger alliances in which scholars and practitioners engage in deeper dialogues and exchange. This interdisciplinary collaboration can unite leadership and vision with regard to equity and social justice, with deeper place-based knowledge to improve the social, environmental, and economic health of communities.
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Historic preservation today is widely accepted as compatible with the aims of planning and even integral to it. The APA’s Sustaining Places Initiative includes historic preservation as a strategy in comprehensive plans for achieving the principle of a “livable built environment” (Godschalk & Anderson, 2012; Godschalk & Rouse, 2015). The Congress of New Urbanism, a dominant voice in urban design and planning, recognizes historic preservation as one means of furthering economic vitality and environmental sustainability (Congress of New Urbanism, 2015). The National Trust for Historic Preservation has endorsed smart growth (Benfield, 2010) and is actively pursuing sustainability-oriented research through its Preservation Green Lab. Signs of alliance and common cause abound. This is a significant shift from the 1980s, when Birch and Roby (1984) wrote of a “fragile, uneasy alliance” and planners’ ambivalence toward historic preservation, where each profession pursued “distinct goals, served different populations, and experienced dissimilar patterns of organizational growth” (p. 194). Since the 1980s, historic preservation has grown as both a specialization in urban planning and as a separate professional practice with varying degrees of separation from planning practice (Ryberg-Webster & Kinahan, 2014).

The seeming unity in the goals of the two professions, however, may conceal tensions and silences. In this article, I review literature on historic preservation in the United States and its evolving relationship with urban
planning. I ask: How have planning and preservation evolved together? In what areas do their practices coincide and overlap? What are areas of tension and friction that practitioners and scholars need to examine and resolve in new ways? Where are there silences and gaps in the literature? The international literature offers considerable areas of potential exchange and comparative research that responds to these questions. However, to limit the scope of this review article, I only incorporate references from the substantial body of international heritage conservation where it intersects with the practice of planning and preservation in the United States. I further narrow the review by focusing on literature published after the 1984 Birch and Roby article.

First, I briefly describe historic preservation in the United States and review literature on the shared origins and evolution of preservation and planning in the 20th century and its relevance to the present state of relations between the two professions. I discuss two areas of confluence and tension in following sections: 1) the identification of historic assets as a method of community economic development and 2) areas where preservation intersects with physical and spatial aspects of planning and design. I discuss intersections between preservation and physical planning at three scales: land use planning at the scale of the region and community; urban design at the scale of district, streetscape, and block; and at the scale of individual buildings. In a third section, I focus on gaps in the literature on equity. I propose an equity agenda for preservation that expresses a commitment beyond the inclusion of more groups and histories, to a focus on the distribution of preservation’s benefits and costs.

I conclude that preservation research and practice could gain much from responding to and incorporating contemporary planning research and theory. Planners and planning research could benefit from deeper consideration of the built environment—its physical, social, and cultural aspects—through collaboration with preservation scholars and practitioners. Both planners and preservationists could benefit from deeper dialogues and interdisciplinary exchange and collaboration. Pooling the respective strengths of planning and preservation could lead to deeper place-based knowledge that would improve the social, environmental, and economic health of communities.

The Entwined Evolution of Preservation and Planning in the United States

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 created the National Register of Historic Places and a framework of financial support to State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), which in turn provide incentives, grants, and technical support to local communities. Historic preservation in the United States operates according to the principal of federalism; local governments have the ability to adopt preservation and planning ordinances in accordance with enabling legislation at the state level or as established by home rule authority.

Local ordinances provide the finest grain of preservation regulation, which is potentially much stricter than protection for properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places. It is at the local level that decision makers may choose to prevent the demolition of historic resources, review the alteration of historic landmarks, and regulate new infill development in historic districts. Local elected officials enact preservation ordinances that are typically administered within local planning departments.

However, preservation in the United States is not simply a program of government agencies. Preservation also comprises a network of citizen advocates and nonprofit organizations, such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation, state and local historic societies and preservation groups, and other nonprofit organizations that advocate for the preservation of historic places. Private actors also undertake preservation by investing in older and historic buildings in reaction to market forces, government incentives and regulation, and social and cultural values rooted in local context and community.

Both planning and preservation are place based and oriented toward action. The practice and theory of urban and regional planning has evolved considerably since its origins as a nascent profession focused on managing the externalities and terrible conditions of the Victorian city (Birch, 2011). Planning evolved from physical and sometimes utopian schemes aimed at reforming social and economic conditions (Fainstein & Campbell, 2012; Fishman, 2011) to the advocacy, equity, and progressive planning that reacted against physical planning solutions (Clavel, 1986; Davidoff, 1965; Krumholz, 1982; Krumholz & Forester, 1990). Planning theory and practice grew richer through scholarship on the dynamics of communication and public participation (Arnstein, 1969; Forester, 1982; Healey, 2012; Innes & Booher, 2010), as well as scholarship on power relations (Flyvbjerg, 1998) and social justice (Fainstein, 2010; Manning Thomas, 2012).

Preservation has also gone through significant transformation in practice and theory. Several histories illustrate the shared origins of preservation and planning in managing urban development and change in the face of industrialization and rapid urbanization (Birch & Roby, 1984; Holleran, 1998; Mason, 2009; Page & Mason, 2004). Many of the earliest forms of preservation were
aimed at creating patriotic shrines and house museums; however, experiments in historic preservation were also tied to early-twentieth-century zoning and planning innovations (Hollerman, 1998; Stipe, 2003). These included building height limits in Boston (MA) and Baltimore (MD; Hollerman, 1998) and design guidelines for new buildings in Santa Fe (NM) based on real and romanticized historic fabric (Wilson, 1997). Early preservation efforts share some similarities to the City Social or Settlement House movements (Wirka, 1996) in incrementalist approaches to improvement of community fabric (Talen, 2006). Histories of preservation often discuss women's leadership in the early development of preservation (Howe & Goodman, 2003; Taylor, 2013; Tomlan, 2015) in contrast to many planning histories that overlook the role of women in the early development of the planning profession (Wirka, 1996).

A common narrative about historic preservation is that it was predominantly a grassroots force that developed out of resistance to the excesses of urban renewal in the mid-twentieth century (Mallach, 2011). This is reinforced by the writings of Jane Jacobs that defend older neighborhoods in the great American cities of New York (NY) and Boston from urban blight removal campaigns (Jacobs, 1961) and tout the virtues of older downtowns in cities such as San Francisco (CA), Chicago (IL), and San Antonio (TX; Jacobs, 1958). Many of her observations, once rejected by prominent planning scholars such as Lewis Mumford, have now been widely accepted and still resonate with both preservationists and planners. More than 50 years later, researchers are now using statistical and spatial analyses to test the associations between old buildings and valued aspects of urban life, such as walkable environments and economic vitality (Powe, Mabry, Talen, & Mahmoudi, this issue; Preservation Green Lab, 2014; Sung, Lee, & Cheon, 2015).

Recent historical research also depicts a more complex picture of preservation and its relationship to planning, urban renewal, and market forces during the twentieth century. Ryberg-Webster (2013a) describes how preservationists in Philadelphia (PA) retained a narrow view of what counted as “historic” and identifies how “midcentury planners, facing market constraints, combined demolition and redevelopment, conservation and stabilization, and pristine historic restorations” (Ryberg-Webster, 2013a, p. 194). Scarce resources led local planners to innovate with preservation as an urban renewal strategy. Like planning, preservation has evolved both in tension with market forces and in cooperation with local growth coalitions and real estate interests. Early preservationists were concerned with preserving sacred, patriotic sites, such as Mount Vernon, from the ravages of real estate speculation (Murtagh, 2006), but the scope and mechanisms for historic preservation broadened over the course of the 20th century to include community-based organizations as well as for-profit rehabilitation companies (Greenfield, 2004). Market-based preservation began before the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (e.g., see Morley, 2004), but accelerated during the 1970s and 1980s (Greenfield, 2004; Ryberg-Webster, 2011; Silver & Crowley, 1991). In 1974, the restructuring of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development funding into Community Development Block Grants resulted in the use of federal funding to encourage inner-city reinvestment (Wojno, 1991). New federal policies of accelerated tax depreciation starting in 1976 and the adoption of investment tax credits after 1981 created newfound interest in downtown investment (Abbott, 1993; Birch, 2002). Both planners and developers began to rediscover central business districts as places where small area plans, festival marketplaces, and downtown waterfront planning created “individualized experiences” to attract shoppers and tourists to the central business district as a distinct urban destination (Abbott, 1993). Local government planning also began to focus on community development at the neighborhood scale and saw an increasing role for community-based organizations such as community development corporations and neighborhood groups (Birch & Roby, 1984). This converged with preservationists’ growing focus beyond individual landmarks and increasingly on historic districts and main streets (Birch & Roby, 1984; Hurley, 2010).

During this period, community-based organizations in Pittsburgh (PA) and Cincinnati (OH) had contrasting outcomes in incorporating preservation as a strategy for stabilizing low-income neighborhoods (Ryberg-Webster, 2011). In Pittsburgh, the Manchester Community Corporation worked successfully as an intermediary to support property owners in acquiring and rehabilitating affordable housing, while in Cincinnati, the Mount Auburn Good Housing Foundation acquired properties for communal ownership and management, ultimately failing to manage the financial burden of a large portfolio of rental housing (Ryberg-Webster, 2011).

The 1980s and 1990s brought critiques that historic preservation was a form of gentrification that displaced low-income and minority residents (Fein, 1985; Smith, 1998; Zukin, 1987). Since the 1980s, the definition of and explanations for gentrification have grown more complex, but remains an important area of research (Cohen, 1998; Lees, Slater, & Wyly, 2010) and continues to surface as an issue associated with historic preservation (Rypkema, 2012). The documentary The Flag Wars (Independent Television Service, 2003) movingly depicted conflicts between African-American residents and members of the
had no statistically significant effect on neighborhood change in New York City, and conclude that preservation should be paired with initiatives to preserve affordable housing (Zahirovic-Herbert & Chatterjee, 2012). McCabe and Ellen (this issue) test preservation’s role in accelerating neighborhood change in New York City, and conclude that there are no statistically significant differences in racial composition attributable to historic district designations, but there is evidence of decreasing socioeconomic diversity.

By the 1990s, some preservationists began elevating the importance of expanding historic preservation practices to represent the diverse histories of indigenous, immigrant, racial, ethnic, class, gender identity, and sexual orientation groups that comprise an increasingly diverse populace. This era of scholarship focuses on preserving African-American history (A. Lee, 2004), as well as finding new means of interpreting the underrepresented histories of the working class, women, and ethnic and racial minorities in the urban landscape through public art, public history, and archaeology, in addition to historic preservation (Dubrow, 1998; Dubrow & Goodman, 2003; Hayden, 1995; Hurley, 2010). There were also calls for the population of professional preservationists to become more diverse and representative (A. Lee, 2004), a continual struggle that is shared with the field of planning (Sweet & Etienne, 2011).

In 1996, the influential nonprofit group Municipal Art Society published History Happened Here: A Plan for Saving New York City’s Historically and Culturally Significant Sites, calling for preservation practice to move beyond a focus on buildings deemed significant solely based on their architectural design, and to embrace a focus on cultural values and social history (Kaufman, 1996, 2009). The report encouraged an appreciation for “place attachment” and a new sensitivity to “cultural value,” recognizing a much broader set of sites, including those associated with everyday life, and representing places not as a point in time, but with layers of meaning that have accrued over time. The report called for new partnerships with community-based organizations and urged additional tools of preservation other than reliance on landmarking and other forms of regulation.

The 1990s and early 2000s included a paradigmatic shift that began to embrace “intangible heritage,” or the living cultural practices and traditions of indigenous communities that move preservation beyond a longstanding focus on material artifacts of the past (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, 2016). Intangible heritage has long been excluded from preservation practice because it embodies social values outside of the traditional emphasis on architecture or the representation of Eurocentric histories (Australia ICOMOS, 2000; A. Lee, 2004; Parker, 1993; Stipe, 2003). In this special issue, Buckley and Graves use the concept of intangible heritage in an overview of San Francisco’s efforts to preserve sites of cultural importance associated with ethnic and social minorities.

This widening of concern in preservation is both a theoretical and a practical outcome of new ways of seeing historic resources, including the preservation of places of community history whose significance is not solely derived from architectural design, but a wider set of social and cultural values (Appler & Rumbach, this issue; Kaufman, 2009; Tomlan, 1998). This paradigm shift includes scholarly efforts to recognize the historical and social significance of everyday places (Wilson & Groth, 2003). Broadening concern is also reflected in the Census of Places that Matter, which focuses on identifying and interpreting...
sites of cultural and social history that may not qualify as landmarks according to established preservation criteria (City Lore & Municipal Art Society, n.d.). This census is a part of the Place Matters initiative, which was established by two nonprofits, The Municipal Art Society and City Lore, in 1998. Preservationists, public historians, and archaeologists are also addressing once-narrow interpretations of southern plantations through the preservation and interpretation of enslaved workers’ quarters (Clark, Williams, Legg, & Darville, 2011; Stipe, 2003) and sites such as slave trading markets, internment camps, and other sites of conscience that tell stories of discrimination and violence that are integral to American history (Page, 2015).

Preservation has further expanded with the practice of cultural landscape preservation. This type of preservation involves the close study and management of the interactions between nature and culture to preserve landscapes that range from designed gardens to working agricultural farmland (Alalen & Melnick, 2000; Birnbaum & National Park Service, 1994; Longstreth, 2008). In one collection of essays on cultural landscape preservation (Longstreth, 2008), scholars focus on a broad spectrum of sites from the rural to urban: from an agricultural island in Washington State to urban landscapes such as Los Angeles’ Little Tokyo and New York City’s Cross-Bronx Expressway.

In an emphasis on the relationship between nature and culture, cultural landscapes represent one area of substantial overlap with the environmental movement. However, preservation enjoys a much longer history that is tied to the environmental movement (Cosgove, 2006; Gilderbloom, Hanka, & Ambrosius, 2009; Holleran, 1998; Minner, 2011) and environmental control (Costonis, 1989). Preservationists forged yet another connection to environmentalism through the concept of embodied energy, which is used to describe the value of already expended energy resources in historic buildings (Jackson, 2005; Tomlan, 2015). Recent preservation literature has also drawn connections to sustainability (Carroon, 2010; van Oers & Roders, 2012). Preservationists have made the case for the value of preserving existing buildings as a form of sustainability (Young, 2012), called sustainable design and preservation “natural allies” (Chusid, 2010, p. 170), and claimed that the “greenerest building is the one that is already built” (Elefante, 2012, p. 62). Preservation promotes a conservation ethic that embraces the value of thrift, in which the existing built environment is a resource to be stewarded instead of wasted (Minner, 2013).

The broadening of preservationists’ attention has coincided with the continual movement of the 50-year threshold typically used to assess whether buildings possess historical significance. A larger proportion of each community’s building stock that dates from the mid-20th century is becoming newly eligible for historic designation, reflecting the aging of a building stock from the postwar construction boom. New challenges have surfaced in preserving modern architecture constructed with once experimental materials and architectural systems and in an era when energy conservation was not integral to design (Prudon, 2008). Preservation of some mid-20th century buildings has proven controversial and difficult for some policymakers and the public to support (Bowen, 2007; Goldberger, 2008; Longstreth, 2000, 2012; Shapiro, 2007). Some preservationists even feel challenges when faced with preserving the modern architecture associated with the urban renewal era (Longstreth, 2012).

A 1995 JAPA article articulates perceived threats to planning with preservation’s expansion (Baer, 1995). The author notes the growing number of historic designations in U.S. cities, and encourages examination of the tradeoffs between preservation and economic development. He calls for planners to take a systematic look at the buildings likely to become eligible for preservation protections:

Preservationists have not looked at the long-term effect of their goals for historic preservation. Nor have planners addressed historic preservation in their long-range plans, despite considerable activity in the field of preservation….We can forecast the architectural style and number of structures that will ripen for preservation long before the event. We can also estimate the effects of saving different percentages of the stock from the past and incorporate the implications of these effects into our plans. (Baer, 1995, p. 82)

The article draws a distinction between the concerns of preservationists and planners and asserts that the lifespan of buildings is a threat to planning efforts. A critical response (Robins, 1995) illuminates troubling assumptions in Baer’s (1995) article, questioning the ability of planners to accurately predict what future generations will deem historically or culturally significant. Similar to Baer, Lowenthal (2004) questions the accumulation of history as a potential encumbrance rather than merely a resource for future generations. In this issue, Avrami also questions the sustainability of a growing number of protected landmarks.

Concerns over the quantity of recognized historic resources seem difficult to reconcile with the desire among some preservationists to better represent the underrepresented groups and places of community value that had previously been ignored (Kaufman, 2009). The shift to include more historic resources within preservation’s sphere of concern has been accompanied by suggestions that
preservation activities encompass more than simply designating landmarks and conserving them as artifacts. In fact, Mason (2006) identifies two distinct approaches to preservation. One is based on preservation's roots in “connoisseurship and craft approaches to conserving artwork” (Mason 2006, p. 25). A competing paradigm for preservation is “urbanistic” and “looks outward, seeking to connect historic preservation to the work of other fields and disciplines, such as planning, design, and education, in pursuit of solutions that address broader social goals” (Mason, 2006, p. 25). Recent trends in preservation literature and practice suggest a shift to the more urbanistic approach and offer important arguments for an “expanded conception of preservation that would address ecological, cultural, interpretive, social, political and moral concerns” (Hohmann 2008, p. 126).

**Community Planning With Historic Assets**

Central to preservation practice and its relationship to planning is the idea that historic buildings, landscapes, sites, and districts can be viewed as community assets. Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) use the term “asset-based community development” to contrast grassroots community economic development with early methods that focused on deficits and problems. They encourage community economic development that builds from community assets, from the inventory of skills and knowledge among community members (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993) to the physical attributes of neighborhoods as assets (Green & Haines, 2012). This is similar to how Kapp, Armstrong, and Florida (2012) identify historic resources as a fundamental resource for the reinvention of the postindustrial city (Kapp et al., 2012) and urban revitalization (Ryberg-Webster & Kinahan, 2014). Richard Florida counts architecture among the cultural, built, and natural amenities that are territorial assets that enhance the quality of place, making them more attractive for the creative class (Florida, 2014). Historic resources can be catalysts for economic growth that enhance real estate values and quality of life, contribute to state and local economies, influence the location of businesses, and encourage heritage tourism (Allison & Peters; 2011; Carr & Servon, 2009; Facca & Aldrich, 2011; Mason, 2011; Phillips & Stein, 2013; Zahirovic-Herbert & Chatterjee, 2012).

The addition of historic resources to national, state, or local registers is often a primary vehicle for historic preservation. However, historic resource inventories (also called “historic resource surveys” or “cultural resource surveys”) provide another tool for the identification of historic resources that are community assets (Parker & U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1985). Examples of community-wide survey efforts include SurveyLA, a massive effort in Los Angeles (Bernstein & Hansen, this issue), and the creation and implementation of a participatory online tool in Austin to engage residents in identifying historic resources (Minner, Holleran, Roberts, & Conrad, 2015). The intent in both of these efforts is to include the public in the process of identifying historic assets, possibly widening the range of resources included in historic resource inventories, which are used to support local government decision making and long-range planning. Engaging the public in historic resource surveys provides an opportunity for interaction with preservation. Historical surveys are also a means for members of the public with deep knowledge of local history to contribute information to preservation planning. In essence, the historical resource survey provides an opportunity for public participatory mapping, an area of substantial practice in planning (Sieber, 2006; Talen, 2000) that has received limited attention in preservation (Bertron, 2013b; Minner et al., 2015).

Much of the scholarship on historic assets and community economic development and revitalization is focused on urban contexts (Ryberg-Webster & Kinahan, 2014); however, historic resources also abound in small towns and suburban and rural communities (Murtagh, 2006; Pender, Marré, & Reeder, 2012). The ability to identify assets in the entire continuum of urban to rural settlements is a potentially powerful planning tool. In 1977, the National Trust for Historic Preservation created the National Main Street Center, which has implemented a community-based method of revitalizing the traditional centers in small towns across the country (Robertson, 2004). There has also been movement toward the survey of suburban resources as potential historic assets (Ames & McClelland, 2002). In addition, National Heritage Areas, such as the Erie Canal Heritage Corridor, bring together multiple jurisdictions, often rural and small-town jurisdictions, to protect and promote economic development and preservation of landscapes deemed nationally significant. The contribution of preservation outside of inner cities and within suburban and rural communities is an underevaluated aspect of preservation and its relationship to planning (Avrami, this issue; Murtagh, 2006).

**Three Scales of Intersection in Physical and Spatial Dimensions of Planning**

In the movement from an emphasis on the conservation of artifacts to an urbanistic and community-based movement, preservation increasingly looks beyond the
technical and material aspects of the built environment to the social and economic (Mason, 2006). Preservation’s evolution has parallels to the bifurcation of “design-oriented physical planning and policy-oriented socio-economic planning” (Gleye, 2015, p. 3). A communicative turn in planning recognizes the socially constructed nature of knowledge and the need for communication and collaborative process rather than merely applying technical solutions to problems (Healey, 2012; Innes & Booher, 2010). Even so, planning and design movements from the 1980s and 1990s, such as new urbanism and smart growth, have called for a return to the physical form and design of communities (Hack, 2012). Planning is not simply returning to earlier practices focused on physical design; attention to the social and economic conditions of communities remain central to planning theory and practice.

In this section, I briefly discuss areas of intersection between preservation and the physical and spatial aspects of planning. The three scales of intersection include 1) land use and comprehensive planning at the scale of region and community; 2) urban design situated at the scale of neighborhoods, districts, and streetscapes; and 3) the smallest physical unit where preservation and planning confluence, at the scale of the building.

In the first area of intersection—land use planning at the scale of region and community—preservation and planning exhibit both areas of substantial policy agreement and friction. Smart growth has become a dominant movement within planning (Ingram, Carbonell, Hong, & Flint, 2009; Porter, 2008; Randolph, 2012; Ye, Mandpe, & Meyer, 2005); the APA (2012) issued official policy guidance that accepts smart growth as a fundamental concept for planning. The National Trust for Historic Preservation also actively endorses and promotes smart growth because it supports reinvestment in downtowns and other developed areas, curbs sprawl, and preserves farmland and open space (Benfield, 2010; Tomlan, 2015). Hon (2009) and Jacobs (1958, 1961) point to the value of older buildings that enhance downtowns and commercial districts with architectural qualities and diversity associated with places that have evolved over time. The retention of older and historic buildings with vibrant businesses may attract desired infill and make new, higher-density development more palatable (Hon, 2009).

The relationship between policies that encourage compact development and historic preservation also exhibits significant tensions. Planning policies that require or encourage denser development often use upzoning, which involves modifying zoning regulations to increase allowable density in new construction. Upzoning can encourage demolition and new construction rather than continued use and retrofitting of existing buildings (Chalana, this issue; Frey, 2008; Hon, 2009). Rents in older commercial buildings may be cheaper and more adaptable for smaller businesses (S. Brand, 1994; Jacobs, 1961; Powe et al., this issue), and redevelopment pressure can threaten affordability. Smart growth policies may also encourage replacement of older residential buildings that have long provided affordable housing to low-income and minority communities (Mueller, 2010; Tretter, 2013).

School siting policy is an area of considerable policy agreement between preservation and planning. Both the National Trust for Historic Preservation (Beaumont & Pianca, 2002; Kuhlman, 2010) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2011) have argued against school district policies that mandate or encourage large facilities, which are then built on the suburban fringe. The National Trust for Historic Preservation encourages the preservation of smaller, older school facilities to preserve walkable central city neighborhoods. Several planning articles have focused on the importance of school siting, noting that it is an area of convergence between smart growth, transportation, and historic preservation policies (Ewing & Green, 2003; Gurwitt, 2004; MacDonald, 2010). Yu (2015) adds to these critiques with research on safety consideration: Child pedestrian fatalities are much higher when schools are sited on major arterials and highways, and are lower along street segments that have lower speeds and connected sidewalks. There is growing support for traditional means of siting schools within walkable areas, as well as the maintenance of existing neighborhood schools.

In contrast to this level of consensus, rightsizing initiatives have created friction between preservation and urban policymakers in communities that are losing population (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 2014; Bertron, 2013a; Bertron & Rypkema, 2012; Mallach, 2011). Rightsizing is “the process through which legacy cities address significant physical and social changes to undergo a reduction to an optimal size” (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 2014). A survey of local governments on rightsizing initiatives points to a lack of integration between preservation and planning, despite a considerable inventory of historic resources within many communities (Bertron & Rypkema, 2012; Markowicz, 2013). The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, an independent federal agency that advises the President and Congress on historic preservation policy, has organized a Rightsizing Task Force and has called for assistance from the APA, among other organizations and agencies, to produce preservation planning toolkits. Within the context of vacant and abandoned buildings, planning support systems and spatial analysis methods may aid in identifying either areas where there is
risk of abandonment (Hillier, Smith, Culhane, & Tomlin, 2003) or areas that may be ripe for surveys of historic resources (Bertron & Mason, 2012).

In a second area of intersection, urban design and preservation share common ground as areas of expertise within planning. Preservation has expanded from a focus on individual landmarks to historic districts and cultural landscapes, bringing it closer to a form of urban design that shapes scale, massing, and architectural features at the scales of neighborhood and district. Within the APA, the two professions are grouped together in the Urban Design and Preservation Division (Gleye, 2015).

Seemingly embraced by many planning practitioners, new urbanism has been a dominant voice in planning and urban design (Birch, 2011). The Congress of New Urbanism's charter asserts that “preservation and renewal of historic buildings, districts, and landscapes affirm the continuity and evolution of urban society” (Congress of New Urbanism, 2015). In fact, the appreciation for early-20th century urban fabric inspired new urbanism and transit-oriented development (Fishman, 2012). New urbanist designs and plans often calibrate new infill so that it is compatible with existing historic architecture and urban fabric (Anderson, 2008).

New urbanism is not the only form of design that has synergistic properties with preservation, suggesting additional intersections between preservation and design movements relevant to planning. Everyday urbanism (Chase, Crawford, & Kaliski, 2008) emphasizes design tactics based on an appreciation for existing urban fabric as an asset. This form of design seems quite complementary to scholarship in urban history and preservation that embraces the historical significance of “vernacular” landscapes (see, for example, research in the journal Buildings & Landscapes). Tactical urbanism (Lydon, 2011), which encourages both sanctioned and unsanctioned temporary activities to enliven underused or forgotten public spaces, can be compatible with and include forms of preservation. These design movements share an ethic with preservationists that celebrates and encourages discovery of places. This is a legacy in design that can be traced to Kevin Lynch (1972), who encourages designing with cities as “temporal collage” and to incorporate everyday landmarks that influence people's cognitive maps of urban space into design and planning (Lynch, 1960).

The role of local historic preservation commissions in reviewing building alterations and additions and infill in historic districts provides another point of interaction both at the scale of urban design and that of the individual building or site. Standards for local historic districts often have requirements for new construction to be compatible with the scale and massing of historic buildings (Cox, 2002). These constraints on design have been critiqued for limiting the creativity and expression of contemporary architecture (Baer, 1998; Ouroussoff, 2011). In contrast, Semes (2009) argues that the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, federal standards often used to inform local historic preservation and design review processes, are too strict in enforcing architecture that is contemporary in style. The Secretary of the Interior's standards call for new additions to historic buildings to be “compatible, but differentiated” (Grimmer & Weeks, 2015). Semes (2009) argues for a new traditional approach in which contemporary architects work with traditional design methods and styles when working with historic fabric. Both of these viewpoints critique the design outcomes of current preservation regulations, with one end of the spectrum calling for additional artistic license and change while the other calls for flexibility to design new buildings that look old. I believe officials on planning commissions and local historic preservation boards are likely to find these design disputes familiar problems in the design review process for both new buildings in historic districts and alterations to historic landmarks.

At the scale of the building and in the aggregation of individual buildings, or building stock, collaboration between preservationists, planners, and other allied fields such as architecture and civil engineering can help to deepen planning knowledge of buildings and inform sustainability efforts (Stein, 2010). Interdisciplinary collaboration can take the form of environmental accounting studies that quantify the materials, energy, and waste associated with construction, operations, maintenance, and demolition (Kohler & Hassler, 2002; Preservation Green Lab, 2011). Scholars can undertake additional studies to understand the potential for retrofitting to reduce energy and greenhouse gas emissions (Bullen & Love, 2011; Moffatt & Kohler, 2008). There may be new creative opportunities to build on preservationists' knowledge of historic building types and construction methods to design new buildings that are more climatically responsive.

In scaling from individual buildings to broader considerations of the building stock, there is a risk that data will be divorced from the spatial and contextual aspects of the built environment (Moffat & Kohler, 2008). Preservation and planning can benefit from expanding tools of both spatial analysis and participatory mapping, and by supporting deliberative communication and joint fact-finding to draw on local knowledge that can help to understand and shape actions of the many private, public, and nonprofit actors involved in the continued and adaptive use of the built environment.
As communities plan for a future challenged by climate change, preservation and planning must grapple with climate mitigation and adaptation at each of the aforementioned scales, from the policies and land use at the scale of region and community, to design in downtown districts and neighborhoods, to the design and performance of individual buildings and building stock. The challenge of sustaining urban communities will take interdisciplinary expertise and collaboration at every scale of the built environment, as well as a deep knowledge of the communities in which both professions work.

Equity Planning and Preservation

Any discussion of the creation and stewardship of sustainable communities would be incomplete without discussion of equity. Equity has become central to planning discourse since Norm Krumholz’s groundbreaking work in Cleveland (Cleveland City Planning Commission, 1975; Krumholz, 1982; Krumholz & Forester, 1990). One of the most widely cited articles in planning literature focuses on the triumvirate “Green Cities, Growing Cities, Just Cities,” in which “equity” is one of the three Es of sustainability (Campbell, 1996). Equity has received considerable attention in recent planning scholarship (Brand, 2015; Brennan & Sanchez, 2012; Doussard, 2015; Linovski & Loukaitou-Sideris, 2013; Metzger, 1996; Zapata & Bates, 2015). This attention includes critiques that equity is the missing dimension in many sustainability plans (Saha & Paterson, 2008; Schrock, Bassett, & Green, 2014) and calls to elevate equity relative to economy and environment (Agyeman, 2013).

The focus on equity, its application to the provision of local government services (Lucy, 1981), and its emphasis in socially just planning (Fainstein, 2010) is one of the most significant developments within planning theory and practice. Further, the concept of equity has direct relevance to preservation scholarship and practice. Yet in my review, I could not find a commensurate body of preservation literature on equity. This leads to the question of what might constitute an equity preservation agenda.

Inclusion would be an important element of equity preservation. Preservation has been moving toward greater inclusion and a growing diversity in the kinds of historic resources deemed historically significant (Tomlan, 1998). There have been local, state, and federal efforts to survey historic resources associated with ethnic and cultural groups that seek to better represent groups underrepresented in preservation efforts (Donofrio, 2012; Kaufman, 2009; T. Lee, 2012). The widening of preservation’s sphere of engagement to focus on underserved and excluded groups is an important step that implies the potential for greater equity in terms of whose histories are emphasized in preservation. Participatory survey efforts such as SurveyLA (Bernstein & Hansen, this issue) also suggest that preservation is moving toward the inclusion of more voices in the identification of historic resources. There should be systematic evaluation of these efforts toward representation, inclusion, and public participation.

A case study of preservation in San Diego (CA; Saito, 2009) shows that some groups receive fewer benefits from preservation efforts than more advantaged stakeholders. This suggests the need to understand who benefits from preservation. Are low-income and underserved populations benefiting from access to historic landmarks and to enhanced public spaces? These are questions worthy of more attention.

An equity preservation agenda would focus not only on improving access to preservation, but attending to the distribution of its costs and benefits. Fainstein (2010) argues that planning must assess the distribution of costs and benefits of planning projects, avoiding urban development whose impacts are unevenly distributed. Schweitzer and Valenzuela (2004) write of equity in transportation as related to “distributive justice: who gets what, when, and, to some degree, how” (p. 384). They describe perceptions of injustice as “arising from the imbalance of benefits and costs received for either individuals or groups” (Schweitzer & Valenzuela, 2014, p. 384). Their framework for evaluating transportation equity could be applied to preservation to assess the impacts of preservation activities, positive and negative.10 Rising costs associated with housing and displacement are potential risks of preservation activity for low-income communities (Listokin, Listokin, & Lahr, 1998; Smith, 1998). However, preservation may also yield benefits such as the provision of affordable housing, increased quality of life, and benefits to affordability through tax abatements or the slowing of rising costs associated with new construction (Listokin et al., 2006). There appears to be little research that systematically assesses the distribution of risks and benefits of preservation.

Addressing equity issues may require preservation to continue to expand beyond traditional concepts and boundaries related to historic significance and to reconnect concerns for the historic city to the broader community (Bandarin & van Oers, 2014; van Oers & Roders, 2012). Equity preservation can build from current practices that benefit low-income and minority communities. For example, preservation incentives can act as a bridge in areas where the new construction of affordable housing is otherwise economically infeasible (Ceraso, 1999; Listokin...
Retrofitting multifamily apartments has the potential to offer greater benefits to existing residents at lower cost than new development (Mueller, 2010; Mueller & Stiphany, 2012). Several articles in this special issue (Andrews et al.; Powe et al.) encourage collaboration between preservation and planning to protect existing building stock, which is substantially beyond the scope of most preservation activities. Ordinary commercial building stock often incubates small businesses that are owned by—and that serve—immigrants, ethnic and racial minorities, and low-income populations (Davis, 1997; Linovski, 2012; Loukaitou-Sideris, 2000, 2002). Preservation has the potential to offer insights into the adaptive and continued reuse of ordinary building stock. Preservationists could expand the successful Main Streets program and strategies to other areas and types of building stock. Continuing to broaden preservation’s scope of work in this manner will require new partnerships, dialogue, and leadership toward equitable distribution of efforts and outcomes for historic preservation.

Preservation and Planning: Toward Pooling Respective Strengths

In this literature review, I examine the evolution of historic preservation and planning from the fragile, uneasy alliance of the 1980s to recent movements that have transformed both professions. I find substantial areas of convergence and opportunity. Preservation provides useful methods of identifying historic and cultural assets, which is useful for long-range planning and community and economic development efforts. The potential for historic preservation to contribute to urban revitalization is central to the existing literature; however, the role of preservation in the context of rural and suburban communities is understudied. In addition, the potential for participatory methods of surveying and mapping historical assets remains largely in its infancy within many communities.

The physical and spatial aspects of planning share significant overlaps at multiple scales: that of land use planning at the scale of the region and community; urban design at the scale of district, streetscape, and block in urban design; and at the scale of individual buildings and aggregated as building stock. At each scale, there is both synergy and potential; there is also tension and friction. In comprehensive land use planning, there remain areas of agreement and opportunity as well as largely underexamined tensions with regard to smart growth. Planning and preservation show remarkable policy agreement in the siting of schools. Rightsizing remains an area of friction over policies that encourage demolition and overlook the role historic preservation can perform in communities that are losing population. At the scale of urban design, there is much complementarity between preservation and design movements, although there is sparse literature in this area. With regard to the scale of buildings and building stock, there is much that interdisciplinary collaboration between preservation and planning could gain in the interest of sustainable communities.

In a third section, I apply a legacy of equity planning to preservation. I believe pursuit of an equity preservation agenda would transform the field and has the potential to provide profound contributions to the development of sustainable and equitable communities. An equity agenda could build from the widening of the preservationists’ sphere of influence and evaluations of the distribution of access to preservation and its risks and benefits for low-income and minority populations. Armed with an equity agenda, preservation could more powerfully assist planning in ameliorating inequities while stewarding the historic and cultural assets upon which our communities are built.
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Notes

1. Birch and Roby (1984) note that the third edition of the *Urban Land Use Planning*, considered a definitive text of land use planning, did not mention historic preservation. By the fifth edition of *Urban Land Use Planning* (Berke, Godschalk, Kaiser, & Rodriguez, 2006), there were still sparse, but multiple references to historic preservation. While Birch and Roby report that historic preservation joined the ranks of APA divisions, only to be suspended in 1982 for “nonperformance” (p. 194); now urban design and preservation are again united under the banner of one APA division.

2. Other important federal legislation related to historic preservation includes, but is not limited to, the Transportation Act of 1966’s 4(f) rule and the Federal Environmental Protection Act, which provide processes of review aimed at mitigating potential adverse impacts to historic resources resulting from federally funded projects.

3. Local governments that have committed to historic preservation can become Certified Local Governments (CLGs). CLGs are officially recognized by a SHPO. Once recognized, CLGs must appoint a local historic preservation commission, maintain an inventory of historic resources, and facilitate public participation in preservation (U.S.
Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d.). There were approximately 1,900 CLGs as of 2015 (Asbrock, 2015; National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, n.d.).

4. A case study from Providence (RI) illustrates change in both theories of what to preserve and in response to gentrification (Greenfield, 2004). In the 1960s, preservationists identified single-family houses in the College Hill neighborhood for preservation and supported the urban renewal tactic of “spot clearance” of commercial, institutional, and multifamily buildings to stabilize the neighborhood. These tactics were successful in raising property values and drawing White, middle-class residents to a predominantly African-American neighborhood. Alarmed by the growing displacement of African-American residents, some preservation advocates aligned with affordable housing interests in the 1970s and 1980s and fought for preservation of multifamily homes on the grounds of historic significance. Commenting on the activity of preservationists in the 1990s on issues of “land use, the well-being of cities, social diversity, and the construction of an inclusive history,” Greenfield (2004) provocatively asks: “Will preservationists be able to combine their socially responsible goals with economic growth, or will they, like their nineteenth-century predecessors, find themselves locked in a battle against the market?” (p. 129).

5. This included the case of Larimer Square in Denver (CO), where entrepreneurialism spurred the construction of a Wild West heritage and combination of urban renewal and preservation to spur tourism (Morley, 2004).

6. The 50-year threshold comes from the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. For a property to be deemed eligible as a historic property, it must be at least 50 years old, unless it meets criteria for exceptional significance. Many local governments have also adopted this 50-year threshold in local preservation ordinances.

7. Some local governments have conducted historical surveys and designated historic districts that are associated with suburban development. For example, the City of Olympia (WA) Historic Preservation Office discusses suburban landscape features such as curvilinear streets and architectural forms such as ranch and split-level homes (City of Olympia Heritage Commission, 2008).


9. Methods used to study the lifespan and adaptability of building stock range from assessments of building performance and potential for energy retrofits by building typology, to life cycle assessment (LCA) and life cycle cost models, to material flow analysis (MFA). LCA techniques provide a method of quantifying environmental impacts of buildings and provide support in decisions about reinvestment or demolition and redevelopment. An LCA analysis was central to the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s recent report comparing renovation of existing buildings versus new construction, and provide support in decisions about reinvestment or demolition and redevelopment (Preservation Green Lab, 2011). Material flow accounting is another method used in industrial ecology to understand the flow of materials between natural systems and the economy (Mingming, 2010). MFA and LCA are related to other systems of environmental accounting, such as calculations of embodied energy and carbon, or ecological, footprint. However, this literature appears to remain largely marginal in planning research and has only recently been incorporated into preservation research efforts. These accounting systems can easily be critiqued for what remains outside the models. LCA does not presently incorporate social equity concerns, and it would be difficult to include all of the social and political considerations that go into the decision of adapting existing buildings versus new construction, such as the value of retaining an existing stock of affordable housing or the contributions of building stock to the character and quality of urban fabric. In addition, the LCA process is information intensive, requiring detailed information about building components, and subject to error when particular materials or assemblies differ from assumptions.

10. Similarly, Lake (2015) argues for the centrality of justice not only as a primary objective in urban planning, but as the primary process or subject of planning. Although justice is distinct from the concept of equity, his central thesis relates to recent attention to equity in planning.

11. Affordable housing projects in historic buildings often use the Rehabilitation Tax Credit (Ryberg-Webster, 2013a), among other federal, state, and local forms of aid that are applied in conjunction with affordable housing incentives such as the Low Income Housing Tax Credit and New Markets Tax Credit (Tomlan, 2015). With regard to means of increasing housing supply, Manville (2013) and Bullen and Love (2009) describe how Los Angeles’ (CA) 1999 Adaptive Reuse Ordinance, which implemented exemptions from minimum parking requirements and flexibility in changes of use, resulted in increased housing supply and decreased vacancies among downtown commercial and industrial buildings.
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