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“Does he really think that keeping this neighborhood "black" is worth the crime and destitution that plagues it? Does he really think that keeping a neighborhood "black" is any way morally superior to those who try to keep a neighborhood "white"? In this passage, [he] is a community activist that has spoken against the project.

“We are talking about folks who have lived near each other their entire lives, their parents have lived near each other most of their lives. When your family history can only be traced back to your great grandparents those ties are everything”. In response to the quote noted above. “Now what’s your plan for the neighborhood? Just leave it like it is and hope that the residents show some gumption and community spirit and turn things around? Good luck with that”.

The remarks noted above are taken from a comment section posted online of a News Gazette article title Is it time to wipe the slate clean in Bristol Place? (Wade, 2012). The article provides commentary of a current neighborhood redevelopment process occurring in Champaign, Illinois. These particular comments illustrate community perceptions of a predominately African-American, low-income neighborhood slated for redevelopment. Although this may be the narrative of Bristol Place from an outside perspective, it doesn’t tell the story of the many families that call this neighborhood home. In many ways, these comments speak volumes to the systemic and underlying issues affecting the neighborhood, and reinforce of the single narrative told for many years. Based on outside perceptions, redevelopment should be its fate. Many believe including local decision makers that the only way to revitalize this neglected and often forgotten neighborhood is to wipe the slate clean. Bristol Place redevelopment is not a singular event reflected in this research but serves as a case study in examining a process involving perception and conflict. These factors influence the participation involved in neighborhood processes and in turn, their outcomes. Grounded in the exploration of the individual participant, their perceptions, conflict and actions, the research asks if these expressions inform a collective vision for redevelopment and why it matters who participants and at what stage during the process. This basic understanding is important in developing of a visioning process that is inclusive and has the ability to produce sustainable outcomes.

This paper examines how individual expressions determine if sustainable outcomes are possible within neighborhood redevelopment projects. Focusing on Bristol Place neighborhood, it explores various perspectives related to the intent and purpose of redevelopment. Using evidence from observations from stakeholder and neighborhood meetings and semi-structured interviews, it analyzes the extent to which individual stakeholder’s positions can shape a vision for the neighborhood. On the basis of this analysis, it outlines a framework of sustainable principles focused on inclusive and collaborative approaches to neighborhood visioning.
Bristol Place has visible and visceral signs of neglect, however this does not describe the neighborhood in its entirety. Visibility of neglect can be seen in the presence of vacant lots and scattered dilapidated houses. Beyond the physical deterioration, social stigmatization, poverty and crime are the results of years of neglect and disinvestment. In 2011, the City of Champaign conducted a planning process to address housing and public safety, two concerns for residents. In January 2012, the City designated a Steering Committee to examine strategies for improving both housing conditions and public safety within the neighborhood. At present, redevelopment of neighborhood is the housing strategy endorsed by the Steering Committee and was approved by City Council in December 2012. This strategy includes the relocation of all residents and demolition of structures within the neighborhood. Although the City and the Steering Committee have not approved any development plans for the replacement of housing, new infrastructure and amenities, only the mention of LEED-ND certification, it is assumed that New Urbanism design elements with mixed-income housing and mixed land uses will be incorporated in some fashion. Much of the current process has been focused on the relocation of residents, potential purchase of property and redevelopment procedures. At this point, it is uncertain what the physical plan will consist of and if the new housing construction will be affordable enough for residents who want to return.

![Figure 1 View of Neighborhood Park in Bristol Place](image)
Housing strategies have shifted from construction of public housing to mobility or dispersal programs and mixed-income developments to alleviate the concentrations of poverty in inner cities. Mixed-income housing is usually associated with redevelopment public housing or very-low income neighborhoods. Dispersal strategies attempt to relocate poor residents into more affluent neighborhoods, while mixed-income housing attempts to attract higher income households to developments that are also occupied by the poor. (Schawrtz and Tajbakhsh, 2005).

Although the causes of concentration of poverty in the inner cities of the U.S. are widely debated, two principle theories have persisted in the sociological discourse. In Wilson’s 1987 book, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, he argues that economic restructuring created spatial mismatch of inner city residents arising to social transformation within inner city neighborhoods. Decentralization of manufacturing firms and other economic changes significantly impacted young black men resulting in high levels of unemployment. He asserts that this mismatch, contributed the exodus of the black middle class and high numbers of single mothers, leaving a disadvantaged underclass (Wilson, 1987).

The spatial environment influences employment locations, which in turn impacts the labor market. The location of businesses and manufacturing that have historically offered low skill jobs have disproportionately shifted away from inner cities reducing employment opportunities for low-income households. Spatial mismatch hypothesis can be described as (1) residential segregation affects the geographical distribution of black employment; (2) residential segregation increases black unemployment; and (3) the negative effect of housing segregation on black employment is magnified by the decentralization of jobs (Ihlanfeldt and Sjoquist, 1998).

Massey et al argue in *American Apartheid* that Wilson discounts the role of racial segregation contributes to concentration of poverty in inner city ghettos. He and his colleagues contend that black Americans, historically have experienced residential segregation not only by intentional discrimination but also by economic structuring. Massey et al describes the development of the ghetto as a response to urban renewal or “Negro removal” policies. Many black neighborhoods adjacent to white neighborhoods were razes to make way for new uses. The construction of public housing was required to house many displaced residents. The legacy of urban renewal policies expanded the as many pubic housing units, because of political reasons could not be constructed elsewhere. The researchers posit that two forms of segregation lead to poverty concentration, racial segregation and segregation of the poor within race. Based on an empirical analysis, researchers corroborate that segregation and minority poverty rates interact or intensify, resulting in concentrated poverty (Massey, et. al, 1993).
Jargowsky’s (1997) empirical analysis of census data, economic opportunities at the metropolitan level influence ghetto poverty. His analysis suggests that economic segregation has influence poverty levels since 1990 and economic segregation among blacks (flight of the black middle-class) effect poverty levels between 1980 and 1990. However, he found no evidence to support the interaction effect between segregation level and changes of income. He posits that racial segregation does have indirect influence on income distribution within the black community due to poor access to capital and participation in areas of job creation. Wilson cites census tracts consisting of 40 percent of residents living below the federal poverty line as a neighborhood of concentrated poverty which has become the most widely used baseline in determining high levels of poverty. Based on this threshold of 40 percent, Jargowsky found a decrease in concentrated poverty levels from 1990 to 2000. Although, these results seem positive, the standard method for determining the poverty level is debatable and may exclude a portion of population that is deemed as the underclass (Jargowsky, 1997, Wilson, 1987).

Segregation is most commonly manifested in housing. Housing as a resource can determine the general quality of life for individuals, but its uneven distribution demonstrates aspects of inequality, especially within urban cities. Advantages and disadvantages in housing are linked to social divisions of class, race, ethnicity and other socio-economic characteristics. Inequality includes issues pertaining access to housing, security of tenure and opportunities for mobility (Morris and Winn, 1990). Market driven economic has perpetuated these inequalities. Neoclassical economic theory dominates housing through the self-regulating supply and demand model. It assumes that individual producers and consumers meet in the marketplace where voluntary transactions are carried out, constrained only by housing preferences and financial limitations of the buyers (Squires, 1994, Glazer 1975, 134-35). Housing differs from other products in the market by three factors. First, housing is considered heterogeneous with each dwelling unit offering a different bundle of services. Second, housing is durable and can deteriorate over time, at a rate determined by maintenance of the owner. Third, relocation is expensive so when income or housing preferences change, consumers do not automatically adjust their housing consumption (O’Sullivan, 2009).

The housing industry has influenced the uneven spatial development within cities and limiting individual housing consumption (Squires, 1994). Practices such redlining by banks, real estate and insurance companies has exacerbated racial inequalities by designated particular neighborhoods as risky investments. This practice contributed to the deterioration of inner city neighborhoods and lead to the flight of middle-class residents to the suburbs (Harrigan, 1994). Government has also played role in the production and distribution of housing. The allure of increased tax revenue offered by wealthier consumers resulted in communities adopted exclusionary zoning ordinances, which required houses to have expensive amenities and large lots. Other public subsidies and tax incentives have been oriented to homeownership that has benefited
wealthier consumers rather than low to middle income. In contrast, local control of housing policy has led to location and construction of public housing in already low-income neighborhoods, as the political implications of locating these units in wealthier areas of communities are too great.

Neighborhood attributes are significant in the choice of housing while neighborhood preferences may vary among different types of households. The selection of home may be dependent on the neighborhood and the amenities that that it possesses or not. The choice of housing can determine the quality of schools children will attend and other public services including police and fire protection, recreation and transportation. Moreover, the choice of housing determines the proximity to employment centers and accessibility to jobs. Neighborhood choices include other, more abstract indicators such as social status and personal identity. Preference of neighborhoods is attributed to more enigmatic factors such as educational attainment, crime rates and racial composition. The racial mix of neighborhoods often contributes to household preference. Research found that blacks prefer to live in integrated neighborhoods; a majority of whites prefer segregated neighborhoods. However for black households, integration of the neighborhood pertains to an equal distribution of white and blacks within neighborhood, whereas for a small number of whites, integration is includes a neighborhood of 80 percent of residents are white and 20 percent are black (O’Sullivan, 2009). A neighborhood racial composition preference study found that whites are always the most preferred out-group neighbors but prefer a neighborhood that consists of all-same race. Conversely, blacks are the least preferred out-group neighbors but are more open to integration with other groups (O’Conner et al, 2001). These results imply that racial composition is an important factor in public policies that focus on mixed-income, dispersal or integration.

In relation homeownership, minority populations own their homes but tend to be of lesser value, even when other socioeconomic status indicators are equal. White homeowners have overwhelming located in the suburbs for new housing, better services and amenities. It has been argued that increased minority concentration is associated with neighborhood deterioration and declining property values and not necessarily race. Minority homeownership on the other hand, are likely to live in the neighborhoods that whites have left behind within the city limits, in older housing stock, with lower-quality services and amenities. Property values in these neighborhoods are usually lower, making them more easily accessible to minority populations. Stagnant or declining property values make it difficult for mobility among homeowners even when other social indicators such as income and occupational status improve. Minorities are overwhelmingly renters rather than homeowners (O’Conner et al, 2001).

**HISTORIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING POLICY**

Public policies in poverty reduction and social welfare have evolved throughout American history. Federal policies beginning with the New Deal instituted welfare reform and programs to address widespread poverty as a result of the greatest economic
depression in US history. Public housing was originally developed to provide housing assistance to middle and working class people who had been temporary displaced by the depression. The New Deal policies of Federal Housing Administration (FHA) through the Housing Act of 1934 was created for the purpose to bail out the home building and financial industries that had collapse during the Great Depression. It wasn’t until the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 that construction of low-income housing began to take shape (Harrigan, 1994). The goal the act was “to remedy the unsafe and insanitary housing conditions and the shortage of decent, safe and sanitary dwellings for families of low income rural and urban communities that are injurious to the health, safety and morals of the nation” (Squires, 1994).

Between 1929 and the end of World War II, very little housing was constructed which created a shortage supply. In response, the 1949 Housing Act was adopted which called for “the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family” (Squires, 1994) Low-interest loans from the VA and FHA to returning soldiers from WWII which lead to a housing construction boom in the suburbs. Despite the economic prosperity of the post war growth era, nation’s economy began to slump by the early 1960s. The supply of middle-class housing had caught up with demand but the inner city was experiencing high-rates of poverty. The Housing Acts of 1965, implemented by Johnson’s “Great Society” provided rent assistance to low-income residents by administering direct subsidy to private developers and landlords (Harrigan, 1994). Amendments to the Act included The Federal Fair Housing Act of 1968 sought to “replace the nation’s ghettos with truly balanced and integrated living patterns” (Squires, 1994). The Fair Housing Act also made the discrimination of for sale and rental housing illegal.

By the early 1970s both the public and the public-private programs had become highly controversial at the local level as many cities and local officials opposed “housing projects” in their communities. In addition, President Nixon’s New Federalism policies turned over control of federal programs to state and local governments. In 1973, Nixon placed a moratorium on funding new public housing and introduced legislative reform through 1974 Housing and Community Development. The Act instituted the Section 8 Rental Assistance Program to replace much of the traditional public housing construction. This program provided low-income families with a rent certificate, which contributed a portion of the rent in any private rental housing as long as the landlord participated and meet certain HUD criterion. HUD funded the program, but local housing authorities were created to administer the program. Rental assistance for tenants whose total family income is less than 80 percent of the median income of the area. An eligible family is required to contribute 30 percent of their income toward the rent and utilities while the federal government paid the balance up to a HUD-designated maximum level (Harrigan, 1994). The Section 8 program is still in effect, although its program has changed over the years. Currently, the program is referred to as the Housing Choice Voucher Program in which a voucher may be” tenant based” or “project based”. In a “tenant-based” voucher, a tenant may choose a unit in the private sector. Project-based
vouchers can be used in specific housing units that a local Public Housing Authority has designated. Local PHAs can authorize 20 percent of the vouchers to project-based housing units if the owner agrees to either rehabilitate or construct the units, or the owner agrees to set-aside a portion of the units in an existing development (HUD, 212).

HOUSING STRATEGIES

Housing policy has shifted away from public housing development, mainly as a result of the high social costs of concentrated poverty in which public housing has been considered as a contributing factor. It is widely believed that poverty deconcentration will effectively reverse the social problems connected to poverty. Current housing policy focuses on dispersal programs and placed based redevelopment programs that integrate economic mixing (Joseph, 2007). Target redevelopment programs such as Hope VI, redevelops and then returns residents from the former site with new residents of higher income. Dispersal programs such as the Housing Choice Voucher program (formerly known as Section 8) provide rental assistance to eligible families. Vouchers are given to families in which they are responsible for finding units provided by the private market and not in subsidized housing projects. There are no locational requirements, however, the units must meet specific criteria and landlords are required to participate in the program (HUD, 2013).

Perhaps the most influential case in the transformation of public housing is the landmark Gautreaux project in Chicago. In 1969, the court ruled against the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) claiming these administrations discriminated against black tenants by concentrating them in large-scale public housing developments located in poor, black neighborhoods. This ruling became the impetus to policies that would disperse residents to “scattered sites” located in predominately non-minority and suburban locales with mixed-incomes. This has resulted in federal policy that focuses on the demolition of public housing and redevelopment of mixed income (HOPE VI), tenant-based programs rather than project based, enforcement of “one-strike and you are out” and the placement of low-income in Section 8 (Popkin et al, 2000).

Dispersal programs such as Gautreaux and the experimental Moving to Opportunity (MTO) were similar in design as both were voluntary but the implementation had distinct characteristics. Gautreaux explicitly focused on race by promoting mobility of residents out of poor, segregated housing projects while MTO focused on income, moving residents to nonpoor neighborhoods without consideration of race (Clampet-Lundquist and Massey, 2008). Because these dispersal programs were voluntary, families that participated may have been more motivated than others. The administration of the program was criticized because it required screening which influenced the selection of families to participate. Overall, mobility programs have not been successful at deconcentrating poverty because of the political implications of low-income residents moving into suburban, affluent communities.
MIXED INCOME DEVELOPMENTS

Mixed income developments differ in ‘income mixing’, the tenure of housing (rental v ownership) and the financing. The term is defined as development that is comprised of housing units with differing levels of affordability with some market-rate housing and some housing that is available to low-income occupants below market-rate (HUD, 2003). Mixed incomes vary from place to place, as high-income in one development may be seen as low-income in another, affordability is typically calculated on the basis of Area Median Income (AMI). Mixed income covers a broad spectrum of levels of economic integration but typical developments include incomes ranging below 30 percent of AMI, 30 to 50 percent, 50 to 80 percent and above 80 percent (Joseph, et al, 2007).

Theoretical rationale for mixing incomes believes that economic integration would lead to more accountability of social norms and enhance collective leveraging of external resources. Researchers posit benefits of mixed income will lead to information sharing and behavioral changes. This includes more self-regulation, better use of time, job search methods and promotes aspirations. The presence of higher-income neighbors will influence role modeling and promote individual changes that lead to greater self-efficacy. It is believed that the influence higher-income residents will create new market demands and stimulate political capital that would not otherwise be known. There is no empirical evidence that supports this rationale and very little research has been conducted that regards the role of higher-income residents in leveraging resources. Interviews with developer and property managers found some evidence that higher-income neighbors are more likely to insist on maintenance of properties (Joseph, 2007).

It is believed that mixed income communities offer increased social capital for residents within disadvantaged areas (Joseph et al 2007). However, in examination of mixed income communities that greater the income gaps within mixed income housing; the more difficult is for residents to bridge their differences. This was particularly evident in areas where language and racial composition was diverse (Vale, 2006). Joseph et al (2007) argues that people are more likely to network with others in similar income brackets. This may conflict with the objectives of providing affordable housing and stable mixed income housing. Proportionality of incomes is key factor in the success of these developments therefore it important to include a middle-income tier that would bridge the gap.

“A key assumption of mixed income development is that proximity will lead to relationship building” (Briggs, 1997: Joseph, et al, 2007:382). Interactions are determined by a variety of factors. There is greater physical integration of residents when income levels are mixed on every floor and building In contrast, where subsidized housing and market housing were segregated there was less interaction among neighbors (Joseph et al, 2010). Resident’s social interactions may also be influenced
by factors such as neighborhood design and layout, fear of crime and the management of the development (Tach, 2009).

New Urbanism design features have been incorporated in mixed-income development to include more organized community facilities; however, Kleit (2005) emphasizes that informal spaces are needed to build significant ties. Cultural, educational, race and ethnic differences may promote or constrain social interactions. Moreover, her findings show that when housing tenure (rental v homeownership) is not integrated, residents are less likely to interact. Tach (2009) studied a single-site HOPE IV redevelopment in Boston where she found that newcomers rather than long-time residents are less likely to form social ties and conduct social control within the neighborhood. She found the apprehension of these residents was not necessarily based on their aversion to being friendly neighbors but rather fear of crime or reporting crime within this particular neighborhood. She also indicates that the revitalized neighborhood was designed as townhomes with private backyards and small common areas between apartments. Management implemented a strict housekeeping policy, policing of common areas and residents must have good credit. Tach provides a disclaimer as to the findings of the study. She notes that this particular redevelopment suffered stigmatism prior to its redevelopment, and included higher rates of affordable housing units than market rate. She questions what is the optimal mix if social benefits are to be achieved, concluding that it will depend on more than just the income mix of the residents but also on their acclimation toward the neighborhood. The newcomers in the redevelopment primarily consisted of ‘subsidized units who moved there in spite of the neighborhood, because they had few available options in the expensive Boston housing market’ (Tach 2009:293). Clampet-Lundquist and Massey (2008) revisit results from the MTO program. They indicate that prior results found that MTO had a significant effect in improving neighborhood conditions for those in the experimental treatment group, but had a limited influence on individual outcomes, which raises concerns on the importance of neighborhood effects. Their findings indicate that families that initially moved to nonpoor, segregated neighborhoods rather than integrated ones, eventually returned to poor neighborhoods.

Because many mixed-income developments have only replaced public housing and not improved the economic vitality of residents by addressing deteriorating employment centers, spatial mismatch continues within inner city neighborhoods as distance and commuting cost contribute significantly more to black labor markets. Studies indicate that despite proximity to employment among low-income residents who have relocated to mixed income housing, there is no guaranteed access to these jobs or indication that jobs will provide higher wages (Briggs 1997). In a study of the Gautreaux mobility program, Rosenbaum and Popkin (1991) found that although relocated residents had greater employment gains than their inner city counterparts, they did not receive higher wages than the residents who remained. Other studies indicate that residents that relocated to higher income neighborhoods did not improve their economic security. This
was more apparent to residents that relocated to neighborhoods where the racial composition was predominately white (Briggs 1997). While the causes of poverty are widely debated, it is generally accepted that families living in neighborhoods with concentrations low-income face serious social and economic challenges. Strategies to alleviate poverty have evolved over time to include redevelopment and dispersal programs. Although these strategies differ, they both rely on economic integration as the predominant mechanism to confront poverty and promote upward mobility. Economic integration in these terms assumes proximity to higher income residents will advance lower income residents. The reliance on mixed income as a theory undermines the real need for economic improvement and development among low-income residents.

Strategies should consider more sustainable approaches to include a combination of place-based development with a human development focus. This exceeds the notion of poverty alleviation through the construction of new housing. Community-based processes and development should include approaches that have the capacity to connect and relate the underlining issues of poverty and then works towards collective action.

CHAPTER 3-WHAT IS SUSTAINABILITY?

Our perceptions of “sustainability” evoke images of electric cars, CFL light bulbs and bicycles. These perceptions limit our comprehension of what sustainability really means and perpetuates a narrow definition that focuses on green products, and actions to conserve and protect the natural environment. While this is an important aspect in the conversation of sustainability we should consider system integration, as the concept is rooted in systems thinking, the interconnection of ourselves to the world. The problems we face are complex and serious that cannot be resolved in the same way they were created.

The concept of sustainability is multifaceted and has been discussed and debated for decades. The definition of sustainability is usually linked to a 1987 UN Conference and defined by the Brundant Report as to “meet present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.” (WCED, 987). Documents from the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), more explicitly states, “Human beings are at the center of concerns about sustainable development and are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature” (UNCED, 1992).
DIMENSIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability was further refined at the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, (United Nations, 2002) which introduced the three-pillar model of sustainability. This model requires the reconciliation of the environment, social equity and economic demands (see figure 1). Sustainability can be thought of as a philosophy that guides planning and development in a more integrated way, improving quality of life today and for future generations.

The three pillar model is also referred to as triple-bottom line, 3 E’s (equity, economics and the environment) or the planner’s triangle. Inherent in the pillar model is conflict as it is based on integration; it assumes that each pillar is of equal value. In considering the environment, it does not need to society or the economy to be balanced and productive. Society is dependent on the environment and the economy is dependent on both the environment and society to thrive. Although the definition of sustainability is debatable, there is consensus that it is emphasizes both comprehensiveness and strategic approaches (Dushenko, 2012).

A key challenge in the sustainability discourse is to put concepts into practice. In Green cities, growing cities, just cities, Scott Campbell describes the inherent conflicts of sustainability in its implementation and challenges the planning profession to integrate the three dimensions into practice. The difficulty to the planning practitioner is incorporating abstract ideas of sustainability, i.e. environmental, economic and social aspects, into a process that involves conflicting interests. Essentially, planners must balance the ability to "grow" the economy, distribute this growth fairly, and in the process not to degrade the ecosystem” (Campbell, 1996). Sustainability attempts to utilize limited resources wisely and efficiently but conflict arises when there is competition for these limited resources. Campbell wrote this article sixteen years, just as the concept was emerging into the profession. Today, sustainability has become the new buzzword in the profession. In practice, the terms sustainability and sustainable development have been stamped on many planning documents, touting ‘green’ initiatives and LEED certified designs. However, these plans often lack the fundamental elements of sustainability, such as social and economic integration, particularly for residents within the lowest socio-economic strata. The role of the planner is to find this balance.

Campbell suggests that planners should incorporate social theory parallel to environmental consideration, while resolving conflict, to achieve economic prosperity and environmental justice (Campbell, 1996). The question is to how to facilitate a visioning process that integrates sustainable principles using social theory? Other challenges are rethinking development and how to focus on economic prosperity of vulnerable populations while ensuring protection of natural resources. Planners have the unique position in not only understanding these conflicts but can work with the players that ‘act out’ these conflicts and to convey to the public vague ideas of sustainability to concrete examples. Perhaps planners should employ social science,
such as conflict theory to better understand just where the apex of where conflict lie. Conflict theory is described as “society in a state of perpetual conflict and competition for limited resources” (Hammond and Cheney, 2009). It involves a dynamic power struggle, in which the elite typically win out to the common person. This could be described in comparison to economic dimensions typically winning out to environmental and social dimensions. Applying this theory should consider how conflict could be used in a positive manner, one that narrows the gap between winners and losers or finds the center of the elusive triangle.

In evaluating the economic dimension, it is useful to understand the dynamics of our current economic system. Economics is the study of efficient allocation of scarce resources among competing uses in human society. While our model of neo-classical economics is firmly based on resource allocation it fails to take into account environmental and social costs by relying on finite resources. Economic prosperity is most associated with growth and modeled on the unlimited amount of resources both human and ecological. It fails to consider the carry capacity of our planet. This is an ecological term that relates to the size of a population that can be supported indefinitely by the resources and services provided by the supporting ecosystem (Rees, 1992). Society also bears a cost from our economic model. In a time of unprecedented economic prosperity, the gap between rich and poor has widened.

The World Bank has been a leading institution in the promoting sustainable development, particularly, in the realm of economic growth as a mechanism for alleviating poverty (Johnson, 2008). The World Bank has recently devised new green growth policies to achieve to sustainable development resources. The 2012 report, Inclusive Green Growth: The Pathway to Sustainable Development, World Bank economists advocate for increased factors of production (physical capital, human capital, and natural capital), accelerated innovation through correction of market failures and enhanced efficiency through correction of non-environmental market failures (World Bank, 2012). Other scholars seek for a reevaluation of economic values altogether, particular as it relates to ecological systems. Market driven forces have worked to deplete the world’s natural resources but should be thought in terms of economic investments and cost saving systems (Constanza et al, 1997).

Herman Daly, a former economist for and long-time critic of the World Bank, has continuously repudiated the neoclassical views on economic growth within the context of sustainability (Daly, 1996, Johnson, 2008). In Daly’s book Beyond Growth, he asserts that the economy is a subset of the larger environment and provides an alternative to unlimited growth through the steady-state economic model. Steady state economics argues for qualitative improvement by way of development, contrary to growth, where “development means qualitative improvement and growth means a quantitative increase" (Daly, 1996).
Environmental sustainability “seeks to improve human welfare by protecting the sources of raw materials used for human needs and ensuring that the sinks for human waste are not exceeded, in order to prevent human harm” (Goodland, 1995: B. Moldan et al, 2012). The term recognizes that communities need to reduce their ecological footprint by producing less material and energy demand and reducing less waste. Within the sustainable discourse, much of the focus has been on environmental protection, energy conservation and non-renewal alternatives. Environmental sustainability concentrates on six areas (B. Moldan et al, 2012):

- Climate systems (climate change, climate risk management, mitigation and adaptation)
- Human Settlements and habitats (cities, urbanization and transport)
- Energy systems (energy use, energy conservation, renewable energy, energy efficiency and bioenergy)
- Terrestrial systems (natural and managed ecosystems, forestry, food systems, biodiversity and ecosystem services)
- Carbon and nitrogen cycles (sources and sinks, feedback processes and links to other sources)
- Aquatic systems (marine and fresh water ecosystems, fisheries, currents and biodiversity.

As Anderson notes, examining sustainability within metropolitan landscapes requires a theoretical framework that has measurable goals, and argues that resilience theory within the context of urban environments, works well because it refers to ecological resilience, defined by Folke et al (2004) as the 'capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change to retain essentially the same function, structure, identity, and feedbacks' (Anderson 2012, Folke 2004).

As it relates to the three-pillar model, social sustainability is becoming a relevant aspect in recent dialogues, although the term is still widely debated (Brown and Barber, 2012). Jarvis et al extends that social implications has been excluded from the mainstream discussion of sustainability (Jarvis et al, 2001: Manzi et al 2010). Social sustainability as a concept includes principles of social equity, access to resources, participation and social capital (Manzi, et al, 2010). Social sustainability considers social values, social identities; social relationships and social institutions that should continue into the future (Manzi et al 2010). This dimension Social sustainability takes on a more exclusive notion as defined here, the relationships between individual actions and the created environment, or the interconnections between individual life-chances and institutional structures. (Jarvis et al, 2001:127).

Within the planning profession sustainability is an emerging concept that includes livability principles for the current population with the proclivity to meet the needs of future generations. This paradigm has emerged out of the growing concern of the Earth’s ability to meet the demands of a growing human population, as natural resources are polluted and depleted. Moreover, social and economic disparities continue to widen, creating a need to address inequalities with more consideration with
other processes, as they are interrelated. Although the origins of sustainability arose from the international community, it has been integrated within national policies and local plans (Ling, 2005; Johnson, 2008). Many U.S. cities are developing climate action plans as the strategies for implementing their sustainable goals (Pitt, 2010). Local plans examined at the city level but often integrate international policies and benchmarks set by the Kyoto Protocol, Bali Roadmap and Local Agenda 21 (ICLEI, 2012). These plans begin with vulnerability and risk assessments based on location factors, susceptible populations, environmental and ecological, and economic damages.

“Sustainability at the local level also depends on the integration of social, economic and environmental systems. It is believed that the most successful approach to sustainability is broad-based citizen participation in planning and implementation. This includes citizen engagement and collective visioning for the future. Issues such as job creation, energy use, housing, transportation, education and health are considered complementary parts of the whole, are interconnected and must be addressed as a system” (Sustainable Communities, 2012). In relation to sustainability in affordable and low-income housing, much of the literature pertains to the construction of “green” housing. This is an important part of sustainability however this is only one dimension of the concept. Typically lacking in the sustainability discourse is the provisions for social and economic equity for all residents, including residents within the lowest income brackets. Housing policy has become increasing oriented toward the development of sustainable neighborhoods. Goals of sustainable neighborhood initiatives include fostering communities that are compact, walkable and transit oriented with accessibility to a variety of services and facilities. The intent of sustainable neighborhood development is to reduce vehicle miles traveled, in an effort to lower transportation costs while reducing carbon emissions. It also encourages energy efficient housing that includes mixed income and mixed uses. It is believed that design and density will help promote a sense of place, which in turn will create social cohesion. For instance, HUD has created a new office of Sustainable Housing and Communities and in conjunction with the Department of Transportation has implemented Sustainable Communities Initiative and the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, an interagency partnership of HUD, EPA, and DOT. The partnership agencies incorporate six principles of livability into federal funding programs, policies, and future legislative proposals with goals of environmental, economic and social equity. These principles as stated, include “provide more transportation choices, promote equitable, affordable housing, enhance economic competitiveness, support existing communities, coordinate and leverage federal policies and investment and value communities and neighborhoods” (Partnership for Sustainable Communities, 2012).

The most widely known program for neighborhood sustainability is the LEED-ND rating system that was devised by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), the Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU), and the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). LEED neighborhood assessments are based on smart growth and New Urbanism design principles and the integration of green infrastructure and energy efficient building
construction. Although the rating system specifically addresses affordable housing to jobs proximity, the criteria does not capture the types of jobs that are located close to residents and if the residents qualify for these jobs. The LEED-ND rating system awards the most points if the development includes a “residential component equaling at least 30% of the project’s total building square footage (exclusive of parking structures), and locate and/or design the project such that the geographic center (or boundary if the project exceeds 500 acres) is within 1/2-mile walk distance of existing full-time-equivalent jobs whose number is equal to or greater than the number of dwelling units in the project; and satisfy the requirements necessary to earn at least one point Mixed-Income Diverse Communities” (CNU-LEED-ND, 2012:31). Mixed-income and affordable housing is based on variation of housing types and units priced for households earning below the area median income (AMI). Sustainability in LEED-ND offers well-connected designs, but doesn’t go far enough in addressing necessary social and economic provisions required to fully sustain a neighborhood. Much like the theory behind mixed-income developments, LEED-ND relies on location and proximity to assets as an indicator for success.

A study conducted by Johnson and Talen surveyed developers that build communities which incorporate new urbanism design, to examine why affordable housing was included or not. The findings indicate that a majority of the survey respondents, 55.6 percent, reported that they included some moderate-, low-, or very low-income affordable housing in their projects, while 44.4 percent did not. Even in the majority of developments reporting the inclusion of affordable housing, the actual amount of affordable housing was small. The researchers hypothesized if area median incomes influenced the inclusion of affordable housing, if projects in areas with higher median incomes had greater probability to include that affordable housing. The empirical findings compared AMI range and the developers’ perception of the need for affordable housing which indicated a strong correlation. Developers perceived the need for affordable housing was greater in areas with higher AMI. In the low AMI range, the perception of the need for affordable housing was likely to be moderate. These relationships are consistent with the cost of living in these areas (Johnson and Talen, 2008).

The researchers attempt to explain these perceptions as lower-income areas, market-rate housing tends to be less expensive, so developers do not perceive a strong need to designate housing as affordable. However, in higher-income areas, affordable housing may still command a high price. Such housing can be constructed at a profit and still be considered affordable, in relative terms, for many households, especially those with moderate incomes (Johnson and Talen, 2008). Developers may also take into consideration the provision higher market rate units to offset the inclusion of affordable housing in order to retain a profit. If these developments are located in the low AMI, where affordable housing may be needed the most, the pay back on development could be out of reach.
MEASURING SUCCESS

Indicators are used to measure either quantitatively and qualitatively the amount of progress. Sustainability indicators provide interconnections between changes in the economy, the environment and society. An indicator that measures changes only one aspect of sustainability is considered one-dimensional indicators. These indicators may show progress where there is no actual progress or encourage decisions that one area at the expense of another and work at cross-purposes with each other. Traditional indicators measure changes in a particular sector independently from the remaining the community (Hart, 1999).

Sustainability is not necessarily abatement for existing problems but considers actions that do not create problems for the future. It is critical for indicators to have a long-range view. Effective indicators should be relevant, understandable, reliable and timely and must meet five criteria (Hart, 1999):

- Address the issue of community’s carrying capacity
- Provide links among economic, social and environmental well-being
- Be usable by the people of the community
- Focused on long-range view
- Measure local sustainability that is not at the expense of global sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Sustainable Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example of Sustainable Housing Indicators</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of housing units available at different price ranges compared to number of families able to afford those price ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of renters paying more than 30 percent of income for housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of affordable housing throughout the community compared to distribution of jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat loss from residential buildings and number of housing units meeting energy efficiency standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number or percent of owner-occupied housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of housing units within walking distance of exiting schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of housing units built using</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Traditional One-Dimensional Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of housing starts</td>
<td>One-dimensional measure; does not make connection between cost of housing being built and ability of people who need houses to pay for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median value of houses in community</td>
<td>One-dimensional measure that does not take into account other factors about the community such as economy, land use and transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting time for subsidized housing</td>
<td>Measure of a problem that does not show links to other aspects of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax rate</td>
<td>One-dimensional measure of money unconnected to other aspects of the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 4- ROLE OF COMMUNITY, VISIONS AND PARTICIPATION

The rational decision-making model remains popular in the planning practice because it provides a strong rationale for professional expertise. The model uses a modified scientific approach to solving problems, 1) define the goals, 2) identify the problems that are barriers to these goals, 3) identify alternative solution to these problems, 4) compare each alternative. Rational planning may be optimal to problems that have a causal relationship however most issues in urban planning do not have this relationship, as most problems are complex (Hoch, 2000).

Traditionally, practitioners have relied on rational thinking and processes to carry out community plans in resolving problems and issues. Early in the profession, this rational sensibility may have been appropriate in responding to the ill effects of the industrial revolution or providing basic sanitary services but planning today involves a new approach. Our centralized modes of planning, still prevalent in current practice, mainly focus on physical aspects of the city and lacks assessment of social and economic inequalities in place. Because of the complex urban environment, a more critical response is needed, one that includes ways to empower citizens in the decision-making process and addresses equitable allocation of resources.

PARTICIPATORY PLANNING
Historically, it’s been believed that the rational planning model could articulate goals and speak on the behalf of the community without direct involvement from planners. The lack of public input came under scrutiny with the implementation of urban renewal policies of the 1950s and 1960s. This lead to the formation of federal policies to require public participation however the role citizen involvement in policy making was vague and what was considered as public participation amounted to little or no real involvement. (Hoch, 2000). Public participation, in this sense of the term, is a legal requirement in a planning process but doesn’t offer real engagement.

The role of citizen participation was emphasized in an article written by Sherry Arnstien, The Ladder of Citizens Participation, which offers a typology of the levels of public participation (see figure 2). Her basic argument is that the lower rungs of the ladder are shams and procedures used by those with power to avoid citizen input and that real citizen participation occurs only when citizens are given power and control over decisions. The lowest rungs of the ladder are non-participation, referred as manipulation and therapy. This results in manipulation as representatives are placed on advisory boards with no power and are asked to vote on decisions that have already been made. Moving up the ladder, Arnstein coined the term tokenism, which occurs when citizens are informed of decisions and may even be asked for input but their interests will not be considered. On the top of the ladder is citizen power. This involves some transfer the power from governmental agencies to citizens. This results in true empowerment but in reality the ladder only reaches to partnership and delegated power, which allows for sharing of power and not full citizen control. In practice, most public participation is still at the lowest rungs of the ladder (Arnstein, 1969, Peterman, 2000).

Public participation is still regarded as a legal requirement for most public processes. State constitutions and legislation regards public participation as vital in the course of enacting public policy but it is at the discretion of local communities to decide on the solicitation of community input. The State of Illinois declares, “the public policy of the State of Illinois that the constitutional rights of citizens and organizations to be involved and participate freely in the process of government must be encouraged and safeguarded with great diligence. The information, reports, opinions, claims, arguments, and other expressions provided by citizens are vital to effective law enforcement, the operation of government, the making of public policy and decisions, and the continuation of representative democracy. The laws, courts, and other agencies of this State must provide the utmost protection for the free exercise of these rights of petition, speech, association, and government participation” (State of Illinois § 735-110, 2007).
In accordance with state law, public participation does not give specific directives on participation. Typical citizen participation is conducted through public meetings where citizens are invited to comment on plans crafted by planners or agents of the government. Relatively few people attend these meetings, which may indicate that citizens do not believe their participation is worthwhile in the process of developing plans. The questions that planners asks citizens during public meetings or other methods of seeking opinions, do not take into consideration local knowledge. Questions are devised by planners and only make sense to planners. Different questions might result in better answers and allow citizens to have interest in participating (Ford, 2010).
VISION PLANS

"Vision is the art of seeing the invisible."

- Jonathan Swift

The art of visioning allows communities to see beyond the present, reaching new a potential for the future. The process facilitates the recognition of shared values and purposes. However, in order for visioning to occur it requires a process to bring diverse actors together, and should be early in the process. The effectiveness to visioning requires four essential elements 1) shared leadership and power, 2) a process to work together (collaboration and consensus), 3) the ability to articulate a direction (vision) and 4) the ability to implement a plan of action (Walzer, 1996).

Visioning is participatory and can allow citizens to share in the knowledge and power as active participants. The process for developing vision plans is through collaboration and consensus building. Collaboration develops relationships between individuals and organizations. It broadens the discussion from narrow, special interests to wider concerns of the community. This is a fundamental shift from traditional roles of advocacy and hierarchy to one that relies on trust, inclusion and engagement. Consensus is a decision-making tool. There are many ways communities make decisions. The traditional way includes experts advising leaders and leaders asking for input from citizens on the decision. A consensus process is when separate interests work together to reach a decision that everyone can accept. This does not mean everyone will be enthusiastic about the decision but it allows voices to be heard in the process (Walzer, 1996).

CHAPTER 5- BRISTOL PLACE NEIGHBORHOOD CASE STUDY

The Bristol Place neighborhood is approximately 12 acres and is situated in North Champaign. It is a smaller neighborhood unit in the larger area known as Bristol Park that includes the Garwood and Shadow Wood neighborhoods. The neighborhood is located about one mile north of the downtown Champaign and is less than one mile from the Market Place Mall. Bristol Place physical boundary includes Market Street, to the west, Shadow Wood neighborhood to the north, east by the Canadian Railroad and south by Bradley County Road. The neighborhood consists of single-family residences, Bristol Park, which includes part of the Boneyard Creek greenway, the Apostolic Faith Church and other non-profit institutions such as the Metanoia Center. In recent times, the neighborhood has been characterized by the abundance of vacant parcels due to property demolition, fire, and/or acquisition by the City of Champaign (City of Champaign, 2011).

The demographic composition of the neighborhood includes residents that are diverse and young. The demographic profile consists of large majority of African-American population, at 75.5 percent and about equal amounts of Latinos and Whites. When compared to the City of Champaign, the African-American population is 15.6 percent. The median age for the neighborhood is 26.2. The population under five consists of 14
percent of the total population while the oldest population (65 and over) is 6.8 percent. The largest age groups include 25 to 54 at 31.3 percent and the 15-24 age groups at 27.6 percent. This indicates a large percentage of family-aged individuals living in the neighborhoods. By gender, the neighborhood residents are about equal but the female population is slightly older.

Bristol Place is characterized mostly as family households with many with the average size of 3.38. This is slightly larger than the average family size in Champaign at 2.97. The neighborhood consists of tenants rather than homeowners, at about thirty percent. A majority of homeowners in the neighborhood do not carry mortgages on their homes, 55.6 percent. This indicates that residents have either paid off their mortgage or have received homes through inheritance.

Table 3 Population and Race Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population by Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black:</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native (American Indian, Alaska Native, Hawaiian Native, etc.):</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Race, Other:</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census 2010 data

Table 4 Population by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population by Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census 2010 data
For many years there has been discussion of revitalization of the neighborhoods of Bristol Park (see figure 4 for timeline). In 1985, the neighborhood wellness program was launched to develop a citywide initiative to tailor services, improve coordination and delivery of services for Champaign neighborhoods and to foster citizen participation. In 1991, the City of Champaign developed a Neighborhood Wellness Action Plan to respond to the program objectives. The Wellness Program was instituted to promote healthy and stable neighborhood which gauged neighborhoods needs based on a set of existing conditions. The objective of the program was to prevent blight and to identify neighborhood problems. Designated planning areas included neighborhoods that were experience deterioration and abandonment. The plan included fifteen neighborhood-planning areas; Bristol Place neighborhood was designated in Planning Area 1.

The plan provided wellness indicators to assess the existing conditions of neighborhoods, as shown in table 7.
Table 7. Neighborhood Wellness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Conditions</th>
<th>Physical Conditions</th>
<th>Economic Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Change</strong></td>
<td>Conditions of Housing</td>
<td>Property Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Population</strong></td>
<td>Age of Housing Units</td>
<td>Lending Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(under 18 and over 65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployment</strong></td>
<td>Condition of Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership Patterns</strong></td>
<td>Land Use and Zoning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neighborhoods in the planning areas were classified into four categories: Healthy, Conservation, Preservation and Restoration. Planning Area 1 was identified as an area for restoration. These categories were used as framework along-side the indicators to measure the level of wellness of neighborhoods. The description of Restoration Neighborhood includes the following (City of Champaign, 1991):

“The Restoration Neighborhood has reached a level of physical deterioration requiring major reinvestment to prevent further decline. Housing conditions generally are poor and major infrastructure improvements are necessary. Property maintenance is a significant problem in the neighborhood and private investment in neighborhood restoration is low. The population is unstable and socio-economic conditions are well below citywide average. Land uses in the neighborhood are incompatible and there are several significant land use conflicts. Major improvements must be made in the Restoration Neighborhood to encourage private reinvestment in the neighborhood.”

In 1992, Neighborhood Services Department was created to implement the Neighborhood Wellness Action Plan. The department consists of three divisions: neighborhood services coordination, property maintenance, and program services. According to the Neighborhood Services Department, the Coordination Division is responsible for neighborhood organizing and citizen outreach. Property Maintenance promotes works on blight and nuisance abatement programs and the Program Services administers housing and community development programs (City of Champaign, 2012).

The Wellness Plan was updated to include goals, indicators and strategies. The indicators were revised to include more specific metrics to measure the success of housing, infrastructure, and programs. The plan includes additional indicators but they continue to measure traditional, one-dimensional conditions of neighborhoods. For instance, housing indicators rely on property values as a measure of success for neighborhood wellness. See appendix 1 for a list of housing indicators. Once the wellness plan was in place, an attempt to address crime was done through the demolition of the “green apartments”. Locally these apartments were known to be a
haven for prostitution, drug use and trafficking. Other functional changes included the conversion of one-way street to two-way streets. New infill housing was constructed by Habitat for Humanity and the Metonia Center, a local community development organization. Although

As part of the implementation of the revised Neighborhood Wellness Plan implementation, Champaign City Council directed Neighborhood Services Department to “Develop a Redevelopment Plan for Bristol Place Neighborhood.” Although Council gave direction to City staff, it did not include any specifics. This led to the existing conditions report and formulation of the Bristol Place Neighborhood Plan, which was adopted in 2011. The purpose of the plan is to provide guidance to the City and specific actions on how to revitalize the neighborhood.

The neighborhood plan included public input from resident’s, a SWOT analysis and developed a vision to address physical issues, such as vacant lots and declining housing stock as well as social issues, such as the need for more activities for children in the neighborhood and public safety. The plan was based on two major elements, physical and people. The physical component addresses landuse, housing, property maintenance and infrastructure. The people component of the plan addresses more social aspects of the neighborhood such as programming, activities, neighborhood groups and economic opportunities.

The plan indicates redevelopment strategies to include infill opportunities. The long-term goal as stated in the plan is to “Redevelop underutilized properties (vacant or blighting).” Specifically it recommends as an expected outcome that new infill construction on formerly vacant lots and underutilized properties. Specific recommendations for infill development on vacant lots include the construction of single-family homes in the interior of the neighborhood and low-density multi-family homes along Market Street.

The plan designates several strategies to facilitate infill development. These include:

- Creation of targeted rental inspection programs,
- Designation as a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area from HUD.
- Seek programs to encourage home ownership in the area, complete a Neil Street Corridor Plan that would establish beautification and redevelopment strategies,
- Promote NSD’s home rehabilitation programs to residents,
- Determine viability of a Choice Neighborhoods Project for the area.

At present, the redevelopment process has been initiated by the City of Champaign. Although the neighborhood plan called for different strategies for all the neighborhood of Bristol Park, Bristol Place is the priority for redevelopment. The City designated an ad hoc Steering Committee in the beginning of 2012 to examine strategies for redevelopment, and relocation of residents. The Committee is composed of various that include City staff, neighborhood liaisons, commercial landowners, representatives from neighborhood institutions (religious and non-profit), an advocate for neighborhood renters, and representatives from the University of Illinois and the Champaign County
Housing Authority. The redevelopment area is delineated for the Bristol Place neighborhood (see figure 3).

Bristol Park Neighborhoods

* Red dash indicates the project area for redevelopment.

Figure 4 Redevelopment Area
BRISTOL PARK/PLACE REDEVELOPMENT TIMELINE (1991-PRESENT)

Figure 5 Timeline of Redevelopment
CHAPTER 6- RESEARCH ANALYSIS

The research methodology is a mixed of primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are based on two main of qualitative methods: observational and survey methods. Observational methods include attending public and neighborhood meetings informing the nature of the current process and participation among stakeholders and neighborhood residents. It is meant to understand the group behavior and dynamics of the Steering Committee, an advisory group formed to address housing strategies for Bristol Place neighborhood and their interactions with each other and the residents. Observations also include the interaction with the neighborhood residents from Neighborhood Services Department, the city department tasked to implement strategies. The purpose of assessing meetings through observation is to understand the framing for redevelopment by decision-makers, and the level of public participation and civic engagement throughout the process. It also documents the steps taken during the process, which gives understanding to the rationale for how certain decisions are made. Understanding personalities,

The survey is designed to engage neighborhood residents, city officials, community leaders, property owners, and business owners in order to better understand various perspectives on the neighborhood and the proposed redevelopment process. Stakeholders were asked how they perceive their level of involvement in the redevelopment decision-making process, their views on sustainability, how they perceive the neighborhood and what concerns they may have regarding the process. The purpose of gathering this information is to identify the key barriers impeding sustainability to understand the influence perception in the process and how it motivates certain actions.

STAKEHOLDERS DEFINITION

The traditional definition of a stakeholder is “any person, group or institution with an interest in the project. A stakeholder may not necessarily be involved or included in the decision making process. In this research stakeholders are identified in terms of their roles and not individual names. Key stakeholders identified in the research are Bristol Park Steering Committee members but also include other public officials, neighborhood residents and community members (see figure 4). The Steering Committee membership includes City staff, neighborhood, residential and commercial landowners, representatives from neighborhood institutions (religious and non-profit), and an advocate for neighborhood renters, and representatives from the University of Illinois and the Champaign County Housing Authority.
My involvement in the Place redevelopment process began in February 2012 by participating in a neighborhood survey conducted for the Bristol Place Steering Committee. From March 2012 to February 2013 I attended a total of seven Steering Committee meetings, four neighborhood meetings, two City Council meetings and one community symposium. In all cases with the exception of the City Council, the meetings were highly managed by Neighborhood Services Departmental staff.

Framing for neighborhood redevelopment has been around the need for stabilizing property values, increasing public safety and improving of housing for neighborhood residents. This has largely been a consensus from City staff, Steering Committee members and residents that these issues must be addressed. The need of redevelopment from a public safety concern was amplified by the occurrence of violent crime in the summer of 2012. The common narrative of neighborhood is it regularly experiences drug related crime but over the summer at least one shooting
occurred which exacerbated not only the neighborhood’s residents desire for change but strengthened the argument for redevelopment from City officials.

The Steering Committee is an advisory body that is composed of mostly experts in fields of housing, and representatives from various agencies. There are two resident representatives from the Garwood neighborhood and the representatives from Bristol Place include member and pastor of the Apostolic Faith Church, which is located in the neighborhood but neither representative lives in the neighborhood. Resident representation from Bristol Place and Shadow Wood neighborhoods are not included on the Steering Committee. This Committee was formed to advise the City, primarily Neighborhood Services as to the best strategies for redevelopment. The Committee does not have the final decision making authority on strategies, as this is the function of the Champaign City Council.

During the months leading to the submittal of the Relocation Plan to the City Council, Steering Committee members raised questions about other redevelopment alternatives. One question related to the retention of housing in good condition, and the demolition of poor condition. This would include the rehabilitation of housing of good condition and the infill and redevelopment of the remaining neighborhood. Overall it would cause less disruption in the neighborhood and lower acquisition costs to the City. In a prior meeting, a neighborhood resident had expressed to the Steering Committee that she had undergone extensive housing improvements would like to stay in her house. The Steering Committee member brought the resident’s concern up in the discussion however, the discussion continued on the neighborhood reconstruction option. It was sternly expressed that neighborhood reconstruction was the only feasible option because the previous attempts to improve housing did not resolve other neighborhood issues.

The relocation plan was submitted to the City Council in May 2012; however, questions arose as to the funding of the project, particularly the contributions of the Housing Authority. Part of the funding package for acquisition includes an intergovernmental agreement between the City and the Housing Authority for about one million dollars in housing choice vouchers, to help fund relocation of residents impacted by the redevelopment project. The relocation plan was presented to the City Council in May 2012 but was postponed until the Housing Authority approved their portion of the funding.

Because of the high demand of housing vouchers in Champaign County there are about 400 low-income families on a waiting list to receive these vouchers. In order to facilitate this agreement with the City, the Housing Authority amended the local preference list to include residents displaced by the redevelopment proposal. Local housing authorities have the discretion to prioritize eligibility by creating a preference list. Preference list categories include (1) homeless or living in substandard housing, (2) paying more than 50% of its income for rent, or (3) involuntarily displaced. Families meeting local
preferences rank higher on the waiting list than families that do not meet any preference (HUD, 2013).

There was criticism from low-income housing advocates institution regarding the preference list because it was perceived that priority would be given to residents of Bristol Place rather to homeless or extremely low-income individuals. The resolution to create a preference list was approved by the Housing Authority on November 15, 2012 and included all categories for preference. The Champaign City Council approved the relocation plan on December 18, 2012. At the meeting, no one spoke in opposition of the plan.

My observations of public participation began shortly after the administration of a neighborhood survey that was conducted in February 2012, which generated some interests among residents. The purpose of this survey as to assess the needs of the Bristol Place residents in regards to income, and housing status, family size, school attendance, and desire to return to the neighborhood. The findings were presented at the March 2012 Steering Committee meeting in which several neighborhood residents were in attendance. At this meeting, the relocation plan was presented as the most viable option and the strategy moving forward for the consideration of the City Council. Questions from the residents were related to the specifics of the plan, which included worth of property, purchase price and timeline for acquisition and relocation. In answering these questions, City staff responded that residents could contact them directly or meet with them after the meeting. Residents were usually interested in the direct impact of relocation.

Steering Committee meetings were held at Human Kinetics and involved discussion around updates regarding the relocation plan and process, public engagement activities and other Committee business. Public participation was the last agenda item. In
general, a handful of residents attended the Steering Committee meetings and generally asked about if anyone asked questions it would be related to the relocation plan. Since October 2012, the Neighborhood Services Department holds informational meetings with the neighborhood residents. These meetings are at the Apostolic Faith Church located within the neighborhood. Neighborhood Services Department staff manages the meetings in which updates are given and then time is allowed for neighborhood residents and property owners, to ask question about the process of the relocation plan. Many questions are related to the timeframe of acquisition, and allocation of relocation benefits.

The first neighborhood meeting was highly charged because of a recent shooting. Residents were emotional and expressed frustration with delays in the relocation plan to City Council. Residents were encouraged to attend City Council meetings to

Two months after the adoption of the relocation plan, Neighborhood Services Department staff announced at a Steering Committee meeting that the next steps in the process include visioning for a redevelopment plan. Staff indicated that several neighborhood residents have volunteered to be on a vision subcommittee. Because it is the intention to redevelop the neighborhood as a LEED certified development, the City hosted a symposium to present the fundamental elements of the program to neighborhood residents, members of the public and Steering Committee members. At this symposium, City Planning officials explained LEED-ND ratings and visiting planner from Normal, Illinois attested to the benefit of the program in her community. The discussion did not include how LEED-ND would exactly work for Bristol Place, address affordable housing or how it is relevant to neighborhood residents. It did not include engagement but rather a sales pitch for a vision that has been constructed by the City of Champaign. Councilman Kyles was in attendance of the meeting in which he stated that if the residents support it then he supports it. Later he was quoted in the News-Gazette as saying, "In the future, as we incorporate these kinds of things [LEED], I believe it will increase the property values in the neighborhood (Mitchell, 2013)." As of March 2013, it is uncertain as to the next phase of the visioning for Bristol Place redevelopment.

**STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS**

The research included interviewing members of the Steering Committee members. In total, eight interviews were conducted. The rationale for interviewing these subjects is to gain insight about individual visions and their anticipated stakes for redevelopment of the neighborhood. The interviewees were asked five questions that were related to his or her perspective of the process and stakeholder role. The interview questions were designed to allow participants to reveal in their own words how they feel about the city-initiated redevelopment process. Individuals were asked to participate in the survey after Steering Committee and neighborhood meetings, if they were interested, a subsequent interview meeting was scheduled. Although some residents expressed interests, after several attempts I was unable to secure interviews with residents or property owners.
WHAT IS YOUR ROLE IN THE REDEVELOPMENT PROCESS?

Each respondent in the interview recognized his or her distinct role in the redevelopment process. This varied from neighborhood and resident advocate, facilitator of the process, and implementation of departmental/agency interest. Four typologies have been constructed based on the responses of the interviewees (see figure 6). These categories represent what stakeholders perceive as their role in the redevelopment process. A stakeholder who sees their role is to facilitate improvements means to support a process that generates benefits to the greater community. Their role helps improve the neighborhood therefore the community receives improved benefits. This may result in increased property values, greater aesthetics and economic development. Stakeholders who perceive themselves as advocates for the neighborhood, desire improvements in the quality of life for the neighborhood residents but believe the entire community will benefit. These stakeholders sense a need for economic improvements and social stability for the neighborhood, and that redevelopment should be integrated into the city. Other stakeholders represent specialized interests within the community therefore they advocate for these needs. This may include advocacy for open space, government or representing the needs for neighborhoods within the area. Some stakeholders perceive their role to represent the neighborhood residents of Bristol Place, to be a voice at the table that might not otherwise be there.

![Figure 7 Typologies of Role as Perceived by Stakeholders](image)

IN YOUR OWN WORDS, DESCRIBE THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

The respondents had similar and common answers to this question. Most describe the neighborhood as an area in need of help. In the description of its physical state, the
neighborhood is “run-down” or has the appearance of deterioration. Socially respondents viewed the neighborhood with problems such as violence, drugs and public safety. One responded noted, a feeling of being uncomfortable within the space. Most agreed that the neighborhood had a rich family history and tradition but lacked the opportunity for advancement and mobility. The neighborhood was described as strong willed community and residents deserve a clean and safe place to live. Similar answers were given as to the disinvestment within the neighborhood. This includes property devaluation, neglect in neighborhood appearance and infrastructure. However, another interviewee indicated that there was a mix of conditions. Some houses were in good condition such as the ones located on Roper Street.

Several respondents spoke to the isolation of the neighborhood from other neighborhoods in the area and the disconnection from the rest of the City, noting that it is close to things but no services or opportunities within the neighborhood.

WHAT IS THE VISION FOR REDEVELOPMENT?

There were mixed responses to this question. Respondents characterized as advocates responded to the needs of the neighborhood and should be based on the input of the current residents. The demographics include young residents and seniors; the redevelopment should allow for rental and owner occupied, single family residences. Besides housing, the redevelopment should have resources that provide neighborhood support or upward mobility, need for jobs and transportation. The neighborhood should include a family resource center but also include a financial opportunity resource center. One respondent answered very intently that the redevelopment should be single family residential to match current housing types of the neighborhood. This was also based on the opinion of the over saturation of rental housing in Champaign. Others had a more broad answers, for instance, “My vision is more concept rather than detail, a need for mixed income, if we looking at giving an opportunity for upward mobility, then it would be good that residents have an opportunity to stay within the neighborhood at what ever income. That there are more choices”. Another respondent said that the residents should be asked what is their vision and what do residents want to see built.

Because of the neighborhood physical constraints of the railroad, Market Street and Bradley Road, the redevelopment should provide more economic opportunities for live/work spaces inside the neighborhood. It should allow for more entrepreneurship for neighborhood residents and offer better transportation options. It was expressed that flexible zoning could be tool used to ensure these options become a reality. Several answers were related to what the City intentions will likely be in response to implementing the vision of the neighborhood. One response was based on the market feasibility of redevelopment. Basically what will the market support in the way of new housing construction, more than likely rental homes. Several respondents said that this would have to be answered by the City because it’s their vision.
WHAT DOES SUSTAINABILITY MEAN TO YOU?
When asked what does sustainability mean to you, the respondents answered based on individual perspectives and varied. This included the need for different income levels for housing so that when residents are increase financial mobility, the can remain in the neighborhood. There should be opportunities for residents to be supported but also support each other. In these opportunities, it was expressed that for in order for the neighborhood to be sustainable then residents should be empowered. Programming should find opportunities that help people in crisis with income support, manage finance through coaches, resource tools, match savings account, micro loans, employment opportunities, career development, circle of influence and support.
Economic sustainability was a major focus in the responses. Some of the answers related to the generating enough wealth to support itself (tax base) through business development and entrepreneurship. A similar response included the neighborhood should have the ability to carry its own and pay for itself. It was expressed that place making creates spaces where people want to stay but also attract more people. In this interview, the respondent noted, “it is the people that make it sustainable. It is not necessarily about recycling building materials, although that is important, but about providing economic opportunities”. Two respondents indicated that the sustainability gets used a lot, which one noted, “I’m not sure.” Although after further consideration, the interviewee noted that the root word of sustain means to support and maintain.
From one perspective, sustainability involves multi-modal transportations options such as biking, walking and riding the bus that helps to reduce our carbon footprint. The same respondent said that sustainability also means providing for energy efficient appliances and houses but also in a broader context, build housing that will last and provide public buildings.
Another response related to the financial sustainability of the project. In this response, it was expressed that the government does not have the financial capacity to fund the entire project. Ownership from the residents and others will be needed to make the redevelopment sustainable. Sustainability will not be achieved from top-down and bureaucratic processes.

WHAT QUESTIONS DO YOU HAVE ABOUT THE PROCESS?
This purpose of this question was to allow the interviewee an opportunity to express uncertainty, if any, of the process. Every participant but one expressed some concern or had questions. The following are the responses to this question.
One Steering Committee member indicated that if we are going to it anyway then what exactly is the Steering Committee steering? What is the plan? How does the neighborhood interface with the rest of the planet? One question resonated as to the leadership of the neighborhood. Who will step up and be part of the visioning process. This related to some of the anxiety that residents must be feeling in the redevelopment process, particularly elderly homeowners. Is there a way to include them in the process? How can the City reach out in a sensitive way? On the other side of relocation, where will be people going and what will be the response from the neighborhoods that receive
displaced residents? There will need to be support for both incoming residents and neighborhood.

One respondent wants to know more about creating affordable homeownership as a reality for residents that currently live in the neighborhood. Is right of return a reality for residents of this neighborhood. There should be priority given for homeownership for existing residents, to create value and stake in the neighborhood and to ensure gentrification doesn’t happen.

There was concern about the redevelopment plan, what will be proposed and who will be the developer? There should be a concerted effort to retain local developers so the economic benefit can remain in the local economy. How much of the redevelopment will be sourced outside of the community? The interviewee also expressed concerns about the neighborhood residents and their participation in the visioning process. The residents should be asked what they want to see redeveloped.

Another interviewee expressed similar concerns. What will the redevelopment look like and how will it be funded. There seems to be a lot of focus on the present but not the big picture. There is a basic overview of timeline but no indication on how we will get there. The vision of redevelopment is the City’s vision, how can the Steering Committee shape a vision and what are the roles of the Steering Committee. How can the Steering Committee have a voice in the process? A third respondent conveyed concerns regarding the relocation benefits for residents. There was some concerns as to the including an uncertainty of the benefits and include and how will the process occur. This interviewee asked, “What is the vision for redevelopment?”

Conversely one respondent said that the process has been very clear as it relates to redevelopment in Bristol Place but had concerns about what was to occur in Garwood. This interviewee expressed enthusiasm on the behalf of Neighborhood Services Department in providing many informational meetings and provided a visioning and planning process. The concerns for Garwood neighborhood relate to unfinished infrastructure such as the lack of curbing and poorly maintained properties. This respondent would like to see programs adopted to help property owners despite income.

SURVEY RESULTS
After interviewing several Steering Committee members, the redevelopment is based on the need to overcome economic and social constraints possessed by the neighborhood in its current state. Overall the neighborhood is perceived to have apathy of the neighborhood redevelopment process.

In the first question, Steering Committee members viewed themselves as either advocates or facilitators. Advocates maintain a sense of responsibility to represent the best interests of neighborhood residents or subgroups impacted by the redevelopment process.
process. As an advocate, they desire to be the voice of residents that may not be present at Steering Committee meetings. Similarly advocacy in this context includes specific interests such as the inclusion of open space, and cultural sensitivity throughout the process.

Respondents related their responsibilities as facilitators in two different ways. One was to facilitate the process in which redevelopment could occur and how it might improve the overall community. This relates to the benefits that increase property values in generating income for the City. It also includes improving the aesthetics of neighborhood and redevelopment should be integrated into the City. The other was to facilitate redevelopment for the specific needs of the residents. The respondents seek to facilitate a process that will improve quality of life for residents and provide an opportunity for upward mobility and economic prosperity.

Individual perceptions of sustainability varied but cumulatively the answers integrated the core concepts of sustainability that included social, economic and environmental aspects. Several responses viewed ways to implement sustainability is to support and empower the neighborhood residents. Social aspects of sustainability are emphasized. There seems to be concern on the role of the Steering Committee in the redevelopment process and how it might work more effectively. These concerns relate to the vision of the redevelopment. A common perception is that the vision for redevelopment is known to the City but is relatively unknown to the Steering Committee members. Individual visions varied but included common elements such as affordable mixed housing, neighborhood employment opportunities, safe and attractive spaces and good transportation.

Overall, stakeholders believe they have an important role in improving the quality of life for residents that currently live in Bristol Place. They also believe that the sustaining the social fabric of the neighborhood is important and have concerns of displacing residents. Stakeholders are concerned of the actual role of the Steering Committee as they feel the City has already made decisions about redevelopment.

**STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS**

Stakeholder attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, and knowledge can have a profound effect on project development and implementation. Different experiences, capacities of understanding and support of an agency can influence support or alter the way decisions are carried out. The purpose of a stakeholder analysis is to identify interests of stakeholders in relation to the Bristol Place redevelopment objectives. This includes stakeholders who will be directly affected by the redevelopment or who could directly affect the redevelopment. In a typical project, actors that are directed impacted by the projected may be more visible and active than those who are only indirectly affected. Although in this process the largest group with the highest stake, the residents of Bristol Place, are not very visible or active.
Understanding stakeholders also gives insight in the way projects are managed. In this context, it is helpful to understand the relationship of how the redevelopment process has been managed and the role of the stakeholders involved. When stakeholders were asked of their role, the answers varied but had common themes. Four typologies describe how stakeholders perceive their role in the redevelopment process.

- A stakeholder who sees their role is to facilitate improvements means to support a process that generates benefits to the greater community.
- Stakeholders who perceive themselves as advocates for the neighborhood, desire improvements in the quality of life for residents but believe the entire community will benefit.
- Stakeholders perceive their role is to represent neighborhood residents in the process.
- Other stakeholders represent special interests.

Stakeholders on a continuum illustrate the level of stakeholder power or influence. On one end of the continuum, stakeholders are not meaningfully involved and are only informed of an agency decision or action. On the other end of the continuum, stakeholders are the primary decision-makers and play a role in implementing their own decisions (Fontaine and Schmid, 2006). As figure 6 show the four typologies as described in the neighborhood redevelopment process on this continuum. When placed on the spectrum, the roles as expressed by stakeholders themselves, are closer to the stakeholder-controlled end. This is based on how the stakeholders view their role but in reality, the process is closer to agency control (City of Champaign). In this analysis, the perceived attitudes of each stakeholder (or stakeholder group) are assessed to determine allegiance or opposition of the redevelopment project. Figure 7 provides five
categories that describe the relationship of stakeholders to the redevelopment project (Fontaine and Schmid, 2006).

Figure 9 Stakeholder Relationships to Redevelopment

**ADVOCATE**
Advocate in this term is very different than in reference to advocate in the survey findings. In this context, the advocates are champions for the redevelopment project. The assessment, based on observations and surveys, advocacy or leaders of the redevelopment process is from the City of Champaign, particularly staff from the Neighborhood Services Department. The City Council moved forward with

**FOLLOWER**
Stakeholders in this category include individuals or agencies that fully support the relocation plan and redevelopment process as it has been carried out. Again, it is uncertain as to the motivation for support as most of the followers have deep ties to the neighborhood. Although, the individuals that fit into this category are not residents of Bristol Place. Their allegiance to the cause for redevelopment may be out of genuine concern of the neighborhood or vested personal interests.

**INDIFFERENT**
In assessing stakeholders in the Bristol Place redevelopment, several Steering Committee members do not vocalize any agreement or disagreement to the agenda items or housing policy, such as the relocation plan. It is difficult to ascertain if these committee members support the relocation plan. Some members do not attend meetings.

**BLOCKERS**
In the redevelopment project, blockers are not in agreement the process, have vocalized their concerns but may be not committed to directly opposing or may feel disenfranchised from the conversation. Blockers may see a need for redevelopment but may not agree with the process in which it has been carried out.

OPPONENTS
Similarly to blockers, opponents may not be opposed redevelopment but are more likely be frustrated with the process. Different from blockers, opponents are committed to changing the process and are active in steering actions in a different direction.

STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS RESULTS
Each individual stakeholder influences the process in ways intended or unintended, and can have a direct bearing on outcomes and, the livelihood of many local and neighborhood residents. In the redevelopment process stakeholders perceive their role as important to outcomes such as increased quality of life for residents. However, when given the opportunity to express their concerns of the process, stakeholders specifically Steering Committee members, admit they may not have a voice in the decision-making process.
Options regarding housing strategies were presented to the Steering Committee from the City. The Committee did not help design the options and when asked to comment on the three alternatives, their input was disregarded. From an observer’s perspective, it seems evident that decisions about redevelopment were already made before the involving of the Steering Committee. The Committee was devised to essentially put a “public involvement” face on an intergovernmental agreement on how to proceed with redevelopment of Bristol Place.

When stakeholder are merely consulted in a process or informed of a decision, there is a much greater chance of stakeholder discontent with the process and outcome. Several stakeholders have expressed discontent with the process but continue to be active, attempting to steer better outcomes. While other stakeholders are discontent, their participation is inactive. These stakeholders may feel that their participation is meaningless, as decisions will be made regardless of their involvement. Stakeholders should be actively and meaningfully involved throughout the process and their input should guide decision-making.

CONCLUSION
The Bristol Place neighborhood redevelopment process is focused on improved quality of life for residents, the need to increase investment opportunities, and public safety concerns. City staff and members of the Steering Committee have used these concepts to establish and justify a redevelopment plan that will ultimately demolish seventy households, which will also displace residents from the neighborhood. Local discourse has also been constructed around the inclusiveness of the process. This sends the message that residents and the community believe that this approach to redevelopment is a good strategy.
The intent of redevelopment places a great emphasis on the investment opportunities of private development into the neighborhood. The feasibility of these investments is hinged on the need of the neighborhood to wipe clean of its existing state. Although a previous plan called for infill development on selected parcels, the city’s strategy shifted to demolition and reconstruction thirteen months following the plan’s adoption. Arguments for this change are founded on the meaning and interpretation of infill. It is widely discussed that improved housing and living conditions justifies the need for redevelopment. Renters comprised the majority of the neighborhood but there has been little accountability of the role of landlords, private investors or the City’s code enforcement in the proliferation of housing neglect and maintenance.

For nearly twenty-two years of planning and discussion about neighborhood investments have resulted in little to no real transformation, other than the construction of new housing from Habitat and other organizations, conversion of one-way streets and the demolition of the “green apartments”. Decades of discussion with no action and the lack of investment have led to a neighborhood that is more disenfranchised than empowered. Over time, neighborhood neglect has devalued property to the point that it is easier for property owners to accept a buy-out from the City. Although tenants will receive relocation benefits much of the discourse has caused tension between owner-occupied residents and renters. Many of the renters are considered culprits for criminal activity and redevelopment is the mechanisms for weeding the “bad seeds”. Their voices have been relatively unheard or overshadowed by self-interests occurring inside and outside of the neighborhood. Despite the City’s belief that public participation was a successful part of the process, it is believe that residents, particularly renters, are apathetic to redevelopment. The role of apathetic citizen benefits the City’s redevelopment process. If residents are disengaged and disinterested long enough, offered money to leave the neighborhood because conditions are so bad then the redevelopment process is relatively effective. This approach justifies a need for redevelopment and allows efficient use of tax dollars to acquire property because it negates the use of eminent domain as residents volunteer to sell their property. The process reflects neighborhood dispossession of both property and power by virtue of neglect.

To facilitate redevelopment, an advisory committee was formed that utilized both professional expertise and local knowledge in advising the City on appropriate housing strategies. Involving stakeholders was well intended however the Steering Committee was given no decision-making power. Any objections expressed by stakeholders were virtually ignored or suppressed by domineering individuals in control of the process. The largest group with the highest stakes, the residents of Bristol Place, had no residential representation on the Steering Committee. Residents were informed throughout the process but were not an active participant or engaged in the process. The City has relied heavily on a few public meetings and a resident survey administered as residential contributions to the participation. Participation in this sense asked residents on their desire on the returning back to the neighborhood. This gives the impression
that decisions have already been made and presents a challenge for an open dialogue of other redevelopment options. The process has been highly managed by the City of Champaign and dominated by actors with influence and power. This portrays redevelopment positively and helps quiet any naysayers.

Much of the attention throughout the process has been directed towards the roll out of the relocation plan but no deliberation on plans for reconstruction except for mixed-income and LEED-ND certification. The lack of a redevelopment vision leaves uncertainty to the right of return for residents. Throughout the process questions have been raised about plans for income and tenure mixing, affordable housing and where residents are to be relocated. These questions were never answered because no one seemingly knows. This is a fundamental flaw of the process. Visioning is now being discussed only after relocation has been finalized and approved by the City Council. Neighborhood visioning should have been the initial step in the redevelopment process. Visioning asks for the consideration of what the future could be. It has the ability to build trust and capacity for neighborhood empowerment and perhaps rewrite the single narrative of the neighborhood. It is unclear if this misstep in the process was intentional or just hopeful it would come later. The concern for visioning is that it will be an opportunity for the City to sell their ideas of a sustainable neighborhood plan. In my assessment, improving quality of life for residents has been pivotal in the justification for redevelopment. The single narrative discourse of a troubled neighborhood has reinforced the justification giving way to a self-fulfilling prophecy of redevelopment. Positive aspects of the neighborhood were never publicly discussed. Only in a few instances of one on one time with residents and stakeholders did anyone express neighborhood life other than drive-by shootings and open drug markets. The neighborhood assets include multi-generational wealth, social and cultural and family networks. Some residents have lived in the neighborhood half their lives. The stakeholders interviewed agree these social networks are important and are worth sustaining. However, the redevelopment of the neighborhood, as proposed, will essentially dissolve these networks. Stakeholders perceive having an important role in the providing sustainable outcomes but have essentially no decision-making power to make it happen. Their collective visions of neighborhood redevelopment addresses affordable housing, employment opportunities, environmental well being but the lack of a redevelopment vision prohibits full integration of sustainability. Stakeholder perceptions of sustainability do not match the reality of the current redevelopment process.

Previous plans have narrowly focused on housing conditions and lack financial investments. Previous approaches to resolve neighborhood issues of crime and issues of poverty have been addressed through demolition and policing. While the City has intervened in some aspects, it has been relatively hands off in the matters of providing social services. The function of Neighborhood Services is to coordinate City services and facilitate housing rehabilitation. A more sustainable approach is to facilitate in removing the barriers impeding individual economic development and accessibility to
services. This cannot be achieved insolation or by the City alone. It requires coordination with the entire community and to build trust until the focus is redirected towards true holistic measures, the problems that plague the neighborhood will only persist. The demolition housing and displacement of people will scatter the problem to other neighborhoods and only serve as temporary means to fix deep-rooted problems. The bricks and mortar approach can no longer be thought as a sustainable way of development. The progression of neighborhood revitalization has entered into a new phase by considering mixed-income and LEED-ND. The concern is that it will strictly rely on old superficial approaches wrapped in a new package.

CHAPTER 7- LESSONS LEARNED: WHAT A REDEVELOPMENT PROCESS CAN TEACH US ABOUT SUSTAINABILITY?

Redevelopment is a tool that many communities employ to revitalize blighted and derelict properties. Motives for redevelopment range from economic development to abatement of public nuisances. Some cities see redevelopment as a viable sustainable solution in preserving open space, restoring the environment and combating urban sprawl. Redevelopment is a powerful tool in urban planning but if it is misused, the impacts could be devastating to neighborhood residents. Then why is sustainability important to consider for neighborhoods, especially for neighborhoods undergoing transformation? In neighborhood redevelopment processes the stakes are high and questions of sustainability should be examined. Unlike its “greenfield” counterpart, redevelopment processes occur within an urban context. This is met with on the ground problems of poverty, economic disparity, drugs and crime. Drastic interventions usually come from outside of the neighborhood, which enunciates the power dynamics between political system and its constituency. Moreover, the legal system gives authority to states and municipalities to seize property for redevelopment once areas are identified as blighted.

The juxtaposition of redevelopment to the concept of sustainability is difficult because both they mean different things to different people. Likewise, the need for redevelopment may be based on perceptions, difference in values and a real economic need. We broadly define sustainability as a paradigm that seeks social justice, environmental integrity and economic vitality, but as professionals we should ask ourselves if our current redevelopment model is capable of achieving these goals. In a redevelopment process, the convergence of these ideas is critical, as it is designed to facilitate revitalization of areas consisting of poor and vulnerable populations. The real consequence of redevelopment is the displacement of residents either by force or

VALUING A NEIGHBORHOOD: MORE THAN PROPERTY VALUES, MORE THAN UNITS

In our current political system, the success of neighborhoods is defined by their economic performance, and the costs and benefits in relation to the entire community. This leaves open the question of how neighborhoods should be valued. Municipalities are faced with the need to recapture lost revenues through increased property values. Because of this need, redevelopment is used as a tool for economic development that
may only benefit a few. The impact of redevelopment can have a direct impact to residents by displacement. Unintended consequences of tax increases, elevation in property values and rents, all the reasons municipalities and agencies bolster redevelopment; usually drive long-term residents and small locally owned businesses out of revitalized areas. Social networks, cultural and family ties, sense of place and community are all in jeopardy of being lost either by direct impact of redevelopment or by way of gentrification. If we are using redevelopment as a way to promote sustainability then we need to ask ourselves is it only for citizens that can afford it.

Neighborhoods as viewed by urban planners consider traditional neighborhood design as a means to creating a sense of place. These neighborhoods consist of a geographic area that contains residential dwellings, employment, retail, and civic places and their immediate environment that residents and/or employees identify with in terms of social and economic attitudes, lifestyles, and institutions. Clarence Perry’s Neighborhood Unit and new urbanism defines a neighborhood as a center surrounded by civic uses, parks, residential uses, a school, and retail at the edge, all within one-quarter mile, which equate to about a 5-minute walk. These models only consider the physical functionality of neighborhood. At the heart of these spaces and places are people. In sustainability we should consider preserving at every change the existing fabric of neighborhoods. The intangible sense of what a neighborhood consists of can never be fabricated through mass new building construction.

PROVIDING AN INCLUSIVE PROCESS: UNDERSTANDING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

As planning professionals and other experts, we can generate a number of outcomes that are perceived to be sustainable. Although in order to create sustainable outcomes, a sustainable process first needs to be in place. Process is not just a means to an end but is key to well-defined outcomes (Grant, 2008 and Friedman, 2011). Essentially, planners, stakeholders and administrators play a role in deciding the outcomes by defining who participates and at what stage of the process. An important part of both redevelopment and sustainability is the role of community engagement. This does not involve public relations strategies or an opportunity to sell citizens on visions already formulated but is an honest attempt to engage residents and stakeholders in change making. This happens by maintaining long-term relationships that builds capacity for communities to move toward change themselves. As practitioners we need to be willing to seek knowledge and experience of citizens, residents (property owners and renters) community and grassroots organization and others. This also requires us to also accept criticism from those who may not agree.

DON’T IGNORE THE INTERRELATEDNESS OF ISSUES

The concept of sustainability adopts system thinking as an approach to solving complex problems. This relates to an approach of understanding how things, regarded as systems, influence one another within a whole rather than analyzing problems in
isolation. The sustainability discourse founds itself on the ability to reconcile the three pillars but we are still faced with the inability of reconciling social and economic dimensions. We need to move beyond the superficial ways of planning and confront socio-economic problems while considering the environmental consequences. Our reluctance to truly resolve socio-economic disparities will only be compounded by that fact there are limited resources and competition will only exacerbate inequalities. The prevalence of inequality continues in our political, economic, social and educational institutions. At the same rate, we discount the causal relationships between the persistent of poverty and the accessibility to quality education, financial capital, employment and social services. On a neighborhood scale, these problems are difficult to define and even harder to resolve because they stem from a much larger economic, political and social institutions. On the ground planning in the context of sustainability requires first the acknowledgement and understanding of this interconnections but then requires action to integrate

**UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL AND SPATIAL CONTEXT AND CONFLICT**

Social conflict manifests itself in the spatial form, mostly in neighborhoods. Instead of addressing the root cause, we find a more readily available solution such as demolition. For example, crime occurs in neighborhoods, impacting families, and innocent people but is the solution to tear down neighborhoods. If it is then we may be tearing down a lot of neighborhoods. In urban planning we addressed urban problems with rational and linear solutions resulting in the creation of other problems. Redevelopment occurs disproportionately to minority, low-income neighborhoods. We first have to consider why low-income, minority neighborhoods are at a disadvantage. This requires us to search deeper to address poverty and to recognize the impacts of years of discrimination, isolation and the disparity between incomes and opportunity has a direct bearing.

**NEIGHBORHOOD SUSTAINABILITY APPROACHES**

Neighborhood planning processes have the ability to engage residents, and stakeholders. However, implementing these plans can fall short of maintaining engagement. Council directives, city staff and experts usually take the plan and devise way to put into action broad and vague ideas. This leaves room for personal and subjective interpretation of goals and objectives that may be inconsistent with the intention of the plan.

A neighborhood sustainability plan should combine the traditional physical and land use plans with a community needs approach and citizen empowerment. If a neighborhood is struggling with issues of crime, poverty and unemployment, more than likely it is a neighborhood with abundant vacant lots, dilapidated housing, broken sidewalks, problems with accessibility to transportation, education and employment. A neighborhood sustainability plan must balance the needs of the existing residents, improving their quality of life with the foresight to think about the next generation of residents. Although problem solving may be at the neighborhood scale, the effort should be made to connect these solutions with other parts of the community.
VISIONING FOR SUSTAINABILITY

The start with any plan should include visioning. Visioning is an opportunity to readjust views, attitudes and perceptions about the “problems” of the neighborhood. It should have the goal to revitalize the physical attributes but to also rejuvenate the people and the spirit of the neighborhood. It is the time to view negative characteristics as assets rather than liabilities. It takes a concerted effort to keep the vision. It is imperative to keep momentum, it shouldn’t be thought of as an end but a beginning for action. Often times when a visioning process ends, nothing happens and residents are frustrated which can lead to distrust. Conversely, if an agency is to quick to act, this can lead to missteps and poor planning giving the perception of transparency and accountability problems.

Steps toward action should start small. Similar techniques to participatory budgeting, neighborhood residents should identify and prioritize smaller projects in the neighborhood and then put it to a vote. Depending on the scale of the project, it may require government assistance or fund raising from other organizations or the residents themselves. This not only engages citizens but ensure that local governments are serious about improving neighborhood conditions.

Creating the vision also includes resolving conflict. Engaging multiple stakeholders with very different visions and priorities will absolutely create tension and disagreements. It also generates ideas and understandings that might not be realized. Facilitation of the process is essential for extracting these ideas in a manner that is open, safe and comfortable but allows equal time for those willing to participate. City staff is often directed to find pragmatic and feasible solutions, and may inject their professional opinions and be defensible about therefore the facilitation of this process should include someone outside of the organization. Local government is a stakeholder and should be included in the process but not necessarily driving it.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSESSMENTS

A needs assessment should identify social needs at an individual level but should include needs at the neighborhood scale. This includes proximity jobs but extending it to identifying the barriers in accessing good jobs. Is it transportation, lack of skills/education or resources? This is a time-intensive process that requires both resources and sensitivity. Some information is personal and confidential so it requires professional competence and ability to garner and maintain trust.

Assessment should also include inventory and survey of physical conditions such as housing, streets, sidewalks, sewer, water and stormwater infrastructure and natural systems. Analysis of the social, economic and physical aspects of the neighborhood should be used to engage residents and community members in finding solutions.
RESIDENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Neighborhood engagement should include residents that are renters and homeowners, landlords and local business owners. In sustainability we talk about future generations, and in neighborhood engagement it is critical involve youth in all aspects of planning and implementation. There are community members already working on the ground to support many of the ongoing programs. Representatives from social service based organizations, school districts, community colleges, universities, civic and grassroots organizations, transportation and housing authorities, faith based organization, criminal justice and police officers, public works, public health and environmental agencies should be involved in the process. It is also crucial to build relationship with businesses and banks. However, financial institutions and private enterprise should also be at the table but not driving the process or the outcomes. The role of experts should facilitate in bridge the gap of unmet services by bringing together organizations and agencies that are working on community issues in isolation. Key to this engagement is not to merely inform everyone of what’s going to happen but provide the space for decisions to be community-based rather than top-down.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

The implementation has to be strategic. If the physical plan requires new sidewalks then it might not be a good idea to implement a neighborhood-based project of planting street trees beforehand. A major difficulty in implementation is finding the resources to construct projects and provide services. Building a strong vision in the beginning opens the door to communication to help find and secure resources that may already exists. The collaboration process is not only good for connecting outside organizations and citizens together but it has the ability to create interdepartmental cohesion. There are limitations to not only financial resources but to our natural resources. Finding strategic solutions such as reusing vacant lots in a multi-purposeful way can provide both social and environmental benefits to a community. The potential may include community gardens, stormwater management and projects that will promote connectivity between existing amenities, residents and businesses.

Creating connectivity between existing assets is place making and central to the building of an efficient network that increases accessibility to existing transportation systems and green infrastructure. Place making in existing neighborhoods can provide a renewed sense of place and increases the livability of current residents by providing economic and social opportunities.

HOUSING STRATEGIES

Housing strategies should include matching people to affordable housing. In the context of neighborhood sustainability, it should seek housing revitalization but in way that is disruptive for residents. Critical to housing is the understanding of needs of the neighborhood residents as it relates to affordability and tenure. Many experts believe
that mixed income development will improve resident’s economic conditions and quality of life. Although this is debatable, the key in mixed-income is to find the right ratio that provides mobility within the neighborhood. In an established neighborhood, effort should be made in keeping as much as the existing fabric (houses, parks, trees, etc) as possible. There are ways to redevelop sections of neighborhoods without displacing short-term or long-term residents but this requires thoughtful and strategic planning. It may be feasible rehabilitate some units, infill on vacant lots or redevelop existing structures. Phasing of redevelopment can ensure occupants can move from existing units to newly secured units. An important consideration in phasing of the development is the staging of land acquisition, if necessary.

However, the units the new units built have to be affordable. This requires working with local housing authorities to ensure housing vouchers are available for units and identifying non-profit or for-profit developers willing to construct a mix of affordable and market rate units. This may be an opportunity to change housing policy and local zoning ordinances to require a percentage of affordable units.

Energy efficiency should be considered in new and existing buildings. However, these improvements can be costly to homeowners either directly or through the cost of new housing. Low-income residents typically pay proportionately more in energy bills than others. More assistance should be available in accessing energy efficient improvements. There are tax rebates and incentives available for homeowners and landlords but tax forms may be too cumbersome to prepare or require additional costs. This is an opportunity for the City to provide technical assistance and education about energy use and conservation.
APPENDIX 1: HOUSING GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND MEASUREMENTS FROM WELLNESS PLAN

Housing and Property Maintenance:
Adequate, safe, and affordable housing is available throughout the City where residents have a wide range of housing choices. Property owners maintain their property and benefit from stable property values.

Goal 1: Preserve and expand the supply of adequate, safe and affordable housing throughout the city. It is important, when promoting healthy neighborhoods to provide a range of housing choices. These choices should include such factors as price, style, location and tenure to accommodate residents within the community. Additionally, there should be a supply of housing stock that is accessible as well as visitable for persons with disabilities.

G1 Success Measures:
1. Housing is in good condition.
2. There are opportunities to both own and rent a home.
3. Housing costs are not a burden to the household.

G1 Strategies:
1. Identify new approaches for funding housing programs and activities. Potential programs may include developing residential TIF districts (Tax Increment Financing), providing property tax rebates, and creating trust funds.
2. Identify individual lots and areas that can be acquired by the City and packaged with redevelopment incentives to develop new affordable housing.
3. Promote mixed income neighborhoods using techniques such as zoning, impact fees, and property tax rebates.
4. Provide incentives to encourage the preservation of historic housing stock.
5. Conduct home maintenance workshops for residents. Expand current programs to residents who are not participating in City housing rehabilitation programs.
6. Increase homeownership and housing rehabilitation programs throughout the City.
7. Provide additional education to housing developers, architects, builders, City governments, and the general public about the importance and practicality of adopting universal design standards to meet the growing need for more affordable, accessible home building.

Goal 2: Encourage investments and improvements that will positively affect property values. To promote a wide range of housing choices, maintaining the existing housing stock and reversing deterioration are important factors to positively affect property values within neighborhoods.

G2 Success Measures:
1. Property values increase at the same rate or at a greater rate than the City’s average.
2. Homes are sold at a pace comparable to the citywide average.
3. All residents have equal access to private and public capital for home purchases and improvements.
4. Increasing private loan approval rates.
5. Vacancy rates are consistent among all neighborhoods.

G2 Strategies:
1. Provide programs to encourage reinvestment and promote improvements to existing housing stock.
2. Work with the financial community to eliminate barriers to credit and expand lending activity in low and moderate-income areas.
3. Provide credit counseling and education programs to residents in partnership with other agencies such as banks and non-profit agencies.
4. Develop programs that partner with other agencies such as banks, employers, and non-profit organizations that assist low and moderate income households with home purchase and home improvements. Potential programs may include lease to purchase, private activity bonds, down payment assistance, and employer assisted housing.

Goal 3: Improve and maintain the appearance and condition of property (land and buildings) in all neighborhoods. In addition to new housing, attention must be given maintaining and upgrading the appearance and condition of property within neighborhoods to achieve community standards and code compliance.

G3 Success Measures:
1. Housing is in good condition.
2. Accessory structures are in good condition.
3. Properties are free of nuisances.

G3 Strategies:
1. Expand property maintenance enforcement by developing a systematic rental inspection program.
2. Maintain information on building conditions through periodic surveys to detect and document condition changes over time. Incorporate the data collected into the City’s Geographic Information System.
3. Identify and work with non-profit, volunteer, and other agencies to provide services/support with home improvements and property maintenance to special needs populations.
4. Identify new funding sources specifically for the City or housing developers to purchase dilapidated properties and rehabilitate or replace.
5. Expand housing rehabilitation programs to renter occupied properties with requirements that units are rented to low to moderate-income households.
6. Develop educational programs and literature media to help property owners and other organizations interact with local government as well as inform residents of City programs.
7. Utilize a range of penalties for repeat property maintenance code offenders such as court, classes, and community service.
8. Assign inspectors to monitor areas on a regular basis to identify potential property maintenance problems and violations.
9. Continue to be involved with housing organizations, such as the Champaign County Apartment Owners Association, campus area apartment owners, and
10. Encourage registered neighborhood organizations to routinely canvass neighborhoods and forward information regarding code violations and potential problems to the appropriate City official.

11. Expand neighborhood clean up activities to non-targeted planning areas.

12. Continue the “Move-In; Move-Out” program in the University District to discourage and reduce inappropriate dumping of trash at the end of the semester.

13. Develop a vacant/abandoned building ordinance to address building conditions and include actions for acquiring vacant structures for rehab, demolition, or redevelopment.

14. Assist property owners in the demolition of dilapidated secondary structures such as sheds and garages.
APPENDIX 2: RELOCATION PLAN ANALYSIS

The Relocation Plan included three options for the option includes the demolition of neighborhood buildings and the relocation of residents out of the neighborhood. Neighborhood Services staff formulated three options for both the consideration of the Steering Committee and City council which include the following:

- **Baseline Services/Status Quo** – Baseline services would focus on maintenance rather than new investment, property code compliance, and existing housing rehabilitation programs.
- **Neighborhood Revitalization** – In addition to current housing rehabilitation programs, new non-federally funded housing rehabilitation programs would be developed to encourage property owners who don’t qualify for federal assistance, to qualify for funding to bring their properties into City code compliance and would allow for voluntary City acquisition of properties for infill new construction or rehabilitation as needed.
- **Neighborhood Reconstruction** – This would allow for voluntary and involuntary City acquisition of all properties and demolition of the properties, in order to make the site available to a developer for new housing construction. The new housing development would be designed to meet the vision of a complete neighborhood as outlined in the City’s Comprehensive Plan. This would follow the guiding principles of well planned mix of uses, well designed density, range of housing types, connectivity, and the presence of neighborhood elements integrated into the neighborhood.

The justification for neighborhood redevelopment is based on the following principles of the Relocation Plan:

- Housing values and condition are the lowest in Champaign.
- Properties with deterioration and neglect exceed properties in good condition.
- 93% of homes in the Bristol Place subdivision have a market value less than $60,000 (based on assessed value) compared to the City median of approximately $136,000.
- Disproportional balance of rental vs. owner occupied (70%-30%).
- Property owners are not able to receive a return on their investment, and as a result many refrain from making necessary maintenance improvements.
- It is not possible to stimulate private investment in the area under existing conditions.
- Infill redevelopment, which has been used for the past decade, has not been adequate to increase home values in the area.
- Public investment options are extremely limited under existing conditions.
- Baseline services would result in continued deterioration of the area.
- Site clearance and reconstruction is supported by some property owners, local lenders, Realtors®, and the Champaign County Housing Authority.
• City has had success in the past with the redevelopment of Douglass Square, Taylor Thomas, and the MLK subdivision.
• Maximum effort would be made to acquire all properties on a voluntary basis and any recommendation of eminent domain would be reserved as a last resort.

The relocation plan provides a series of frequently asked questions for residents as it relates to the process of relocation. In this document, the City indicates that purchase of property would occur through voluntary acquisition, if the homeowner were interested in selling his/her property. It describes the process of negotiating and purchasing homes with the City. As it states “the City would have the home appraised and present an offer to purchase based on the appraisal. The homeowner would have the option to seek his or her own appraisal to use to negotiate the sales price with the City. Once a sales price is agreed upon a closing date will be set. The time period from when the letter of interest is sent to the homeowner until the closing date must be at least 90 days. If the homeowner is not interested in selling, the City would not pursue the purchase”. The second FAQ describes involuntary acquisition otherwise known as eminent domain. The document defines eminent domain and notes that it is a process only used as a last resort however it is not explicit that if homeowner’s are not interested in selling their property if the City will exercise its eminent domain powers.

In the relocation process, the City is required to pay Fair Market Value for the purchase of property. The purchase price is determined by a home appraisal by a qualified/licensed real estate appraiser. In the event the tax assessment is greater than the appraised value, the City Council will give direction as to determine the value of the property. In phasing of the relocation, the City will negotiate with property owners of vacant parcel first. It is only noted that the City will meet with each family to determine their needs. Without a clear phasing plan of the relocation, it is uncertain as to when the actual move will occur and where their new residence will likely be. As to the right of return for neighborhood residents, the City has indicated that opportunity is availability if residents desire to return. However, this does not give a guarantee to residents that right of return is truly possible, as a redevelopment plan has not materialized designating affordable units. In the relocation plan, the City indicates that the redevelopment will include mixed-use/mixed income. Although it mentions mixed-income housing, it does not propose or recommend housing or income mixing as percentage of market-rate vs. affordable housing, owner-occupied units vs. rental.

The City has provided a schedule of benefits based on a tenant’s income status. The language provided in the relocation plan includes the following:

For non-low income tenant displacement:
For a non-low income tenant, the monthly rent and estimated average monthly utility cost for a comparable replacement dwelling is considered to be within your financial means if, after receiving rental assistance, this amount does not exceed the base monthly rent (including average monthly utility cost) for the dwelling from which the
tenant is displaced. Any rental assistance payment made by the City will be for 42 months for a non-low income household.

For low income tenant displacement:

For a low income tenant, the monthly rent and estimated average monthly utility cost for a comparable replacement dwelling is considered to be within your financial means if, after receiving rental assistance, this amount does not exceed the base monthly rent (including average monthly utility cost) for the dwelling from which the tenant is displaced, or would not exceed 30% of the total monthly gross household income. The rental assistance payment made by the City will be computed using the lesser of the current tenant rent or 30% of total monthly gross.

In February 2012, the Steering Committee administered a door-to-door survey to identify housing characteristics including monthly rental and utility costs. Other information was collected to understand socio-economic conditions and ownership status of residents within the neighborhood. The survey and other City studies report the neighborhood consists of more renters than homeowners. Based on the survey results, the average amount a renter pays a month in Bristol Place is $536, including utilities the costs increase to $968. The findings also indicate that the average reported monthly household income is $1,977.

Basic market research was conducted to determine availability of comparable housing units. Most units in the neighborhood including rental units consist of single-family homes, and as indicated in the survey findings, many rental units are 2 bedrooms. Housing research in December 2012 and January 2013 found that the median listing price for 2 bedroom units available is $750 and $860 for three bedroom units. The median price fluctuates depending on the time of year as many units may be are priced higher based on the return of college students. For single-family homes listed for sale in Champaign, the median price for two bedroom homes are $110,00 and $119,000 for three bedroom houses (Zillow, 2012).

Based on the formula that he City provided in the relocation plan, comparable units may not be available on the market. If the median rental price is $536 and the median available price is $750, and the thirty percent of monthly income is $593 the formula may result in the following:

To my knowledge the City has not conducted an extensive analysis of available rental or
owner occupied units currently on the market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current rent + utilities = $800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparable unit provided by City = $1000 (if this includes utilities costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of total monthly gross household income = $600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental assistance paid by the City = $200 x 60 months = $12,000 paid to the tenant monthly (current rent is the lesser amount)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

return in the relocation plan mainly addresses residents that are homeowners. In the case of tenants, the City is only obligated to follow procedures under the Federal Uniform Relocation Act. This process provides counseling to tenants to determine relocation benefits and assistance based on eligibility and current listing of comparable properties. This assistance will not be determined until a counselor has met with a tenant. Again, this gives no assurance as to where comparable units are located until a tenant meets with a counselor. When residents were surveyed if they would like to return to the neighborhood after redevelopment, 57 percent of renters and 47 percent of owners indicated they wanted to return. The survey asked residents if they preferred to return as renters or as homeowners. The current owners who responded to the question all wished to return as homeowners, and 32 percent of renters stated a desire to return as homeowners (Greenlee, 2012). Realistically, the duration of redevelopment process will be long. Renters who desire to return as homeowners may not be willing to wait five or more years and the current homeowners will likely purchase property elsewhere once relocation benefits are allocated.
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