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ABSTRACT

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION PROJECTS IN PORTSMOUTH, VIRGINIA, 1960-1990

Robert Brooke Albertson
Old Dominion University, 1993
Director: Dr. Leonard Ruchelman

The study describes and analyzes the implementation of federally-funded neighborhood conservation programs in two of Portsmouth, Virginia's oldest urban neighborhoods by addressing four research questions: (1) To what extent is there variation in the implementation of neighborhood conservation projects in differing neighborhood settings? What are the factors that account for such differences?, (2) To what extent are the neighborhood conservation projects distributive or regulatory programs, and what forms of conflict and/or cooperation result from this?, (3) What is the intergovernmental context of neighborhood conservation projects, and how does this affect the nature of bargaining and negotiation among governmental units?, and (4) To what extent has implementation of these projects been successful?

Comparing the experiences in the two projects, the study found that the level of technical difficulties and the range of behaviors to be regulated were factors which consistently facilitated implementation. The inability to recruit
implementing officials consistently impeded it. Differences in implementation was primarily due to six factors: the initial allocation of financial resources, the extent of behavioral change required, the degree of public support, the attitudes and resources of constituents' groups, the innovative leadership of implementing officials, and socioeconomic conditions.

Although the federal rehabilitation loan program was reduced and the housing inspection program was terminated, implementers were partly successful in providing alternative local resources. As implementation procedures became routinized over a long period of time, no differences in implementation could be discerned between the two projects. The projects were successful as measured by the improvement in measures of neighborhood conditions, especially in median housing value.
To the memory of Jim Barry of Massachusetts and of over 58,000 other men and women who gave their lives in the service of their country from 1945 to 1975 in Viet Nam.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

This study describes and analyzes the implementation of federally-funded neighborhood conservation programs in two of the oldest neighborhoods in Portsmouth, Virginia. Because the Olde Towne and Park View conservation projects were created at about the same time, administered by the same agencies within a single city, and started as the first two conservation projects in Virginia, this study provides an unique opportunity for learning how such projects can be implemented more effectively.

The topic is of particular concern today because of the trend to conserve existing housing stock in neighborhoods rather than to destroy it as the land is cleared for new development. Carmon observes that

there are common lines of thinking in the urban planning profession which cut across nations. In the U.S., as well as in Britain and Israel, planners have succeeded in convincing the decision makers to substitute programs to improve the existing housing stock for slum clearance."

The new focus on conserving neighborhoods replaces "one of the most widely-discussed and perhaps the most controversial" forms of domestic governmental programs--the federal urban renewal approach that resulted in the massive destruction of neighborhood

1
dwellings in order to clear areas for new construction. Keyes has observed the reversal of opinions that took place during the first two decades in which the massive clearance projects operated:

Launched in 1949 with the blessings of Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, big labor and big business, the [urban renewal] program is today attacked from the political left as legalized exploitation of the poor for the benefit of the middle class and from the political right as an unconstitutional prerogative to seize private property for federal use.³

Attacks on the competence and motives of city planners by Jacobs,⁴ Gans,⁵ and Wilson⁶ were accompanied by Anderson⁷ calling for an end to urban renewal programs and by Gans suggesting that the solution was "not to repeal urban renewal, but to transform it."⁸ The transformation came not from Gans’s ideas, however, but from a growing trend towards saving the existing housing that became "a national ‘urban revitalization’ movement beginning in the 1970s."⁹ Silver has traced the emergence of this strategy at the local level in the American South from the 1920s to the present,¹⁰ and Chapter IV of this study traces the transformation of national housing policy from one of massive clearance towards one of neighborhood conservation.

The change toward housing conservation strategies brought greater problems of implementation.¹¹ With a clearance project, the government administrators control almost the entire process from obtaining title to the property through the clearing of the land and selecting the type of new construction to be built in the urban renewal area.¹² With a conservation project, however, the administrators have to induce private home owners to improve their
properties, to determine on a case-by-case basis what housing is to be cleared, to assist with multiple small loan applications by rehabilitators, to work with many developers on relatively small projects that are time consuming and sometimes controversial, and to deal with many other problems which are not present with the standard clearance project. The differences between the newer approach and the earlier urban renewal approach raise important questions.

**Research Questions**

The study addresses four research questions:

1. To what extent is there variation in the implementation of neighborhood conservation projects in differing neighborhood settings? What are the factors that account for such differences?

2. To what extent are the neighborhood conservation projects distributive or regulatory programs, and what forms of conflict and/or cooperation result from this?

3. What is the intergovernmental context of neighborhood conservation projects, and how does this affect the nature of bargaining and negotiation among implementing governmental units?

4. To what extent has implementation of these projects been successful?

**Methodology**

To answer the research questions, the study provides an intensive case study of the implementation of two neighborhood conservation programs in the same city. Since "most implementation studies have been of the case study variety..." and since the value of this approach has been demonstrated in studies of urban...
renewal programs such as Meyerson and Banfield’s Chicago study, *Politics, Planning, and the Public Interest*, this methodology is particularly promising. Noting that “public administration theory could not have developed as it has without the theory building derived from case studies,” Bailey notes that each agency, bureau, or city hall has similarities and dissimilarities, and thus:

> The only way that empiricists can study these problems and organizations is by adjusting the research design to exclude the uniqueness as much as possible. It is more likely through some form of case methodology, however, that the variables which make these organizations work can be identified and examined. It is through cases, carefully developed and rigorously analyzed, that academicians and practitioners can jointly work to advance the knowledge of the field.

To guide the development and analysis of the study, the implementation factors identified by Mazmanian and Sabatier provide a framework for orderly and comprehensive consideration of the case study material. Chapter II indicates the way in which the factors help assess the implementation experience, and Chapter III presents the content and context of their work within the evolving field of implementation studies.

**Need for this Study**

Recognizing the "near-vacuum of federal leadership," "the budgetary pressures and uncertain public support" which probably preclude large neighborhood programs in the future, and other factors, Frieden and Kaplan recently noted that it was time to learn the lessons of the past in dealing with governmental efforts
Carmon concluded that "neighborhood decline is reversible and neighborhood programs can work, providing that planners and residents learn from the accumulating experience and take advantage of current economic and political changes, instead of knocking their heads against them." More effective implementation of neighborhood conservation projects will allow cities to adjust to the changed economic and political realities by learning better ways to help their neighborhoods during times of fiscal constraint. The purpose of this study is to provide greater understanding of the processes associated with the implementation of neighborhood conservation projects.

The Implementation of Public Policy

Despite its significance to the policy process, the implementation of policy has often been ignored. Williams has noted that "there is a Kafkaesque aspect to the implementation area...It is a crucial area, yet people act as if it didn't exist." Hargrove described it as "the missing link" in social policy. Alterman characterized implementation as a "black box" (Figure I-1 on the next page) which was often ignored until fairly recently.

Berman has noted that "hardly anyone spoke of implementation" when the Great Society social programs were being launched in the 1960s, but disappointment over the results of these policies and frustrations over the conduct of the Vietnam War had spurred
researchers "to focus on implementation as the main problem."\textsuperscript{23} Berman identified the importance of the shift:

The earlier works had the fatal flaw of examining policy without being relevant to policy-makers....Some studies were so preoccupied with the workings of government that they neglected to relate governmental machinations to policy outcomes; others were content to relate policy inputs to outputs without investigating the intervening institutions. The hope of the new breed of analysts is that systematic investigation of implementation—the "missing link" between policy input and output—can provide more direct, more useful, and more readily generalized advice to policy-makers.\textsuperscript{24}

\section*{FIGURE I-1}

IMPLEMENTATION AS A "BLACK BOX" IN THE POLICY PROCESS

\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node [block, pin=0:start] (context) {CONTEXT};
  \node [block, right of=context, xshift=2cm] (program) {PROGRAM};
  \node [block, right of=program, xshift=2cm] (resource) {RESOURCE INPUTS};
  \node [block, right of=resource, xshift=2cm] (outputs) {OUTPUTS};
  \node [block, below of=outputs, yshift=-2cm] (implementation) {IMPLEMENTATION, DECISION-MAKING, PROCESS (THE 'BLACK BOX')};
  \node [block, right of=outputs, xshift=2cm] (outcomes) {OUTCOMES};
  \draw [arrow] (context) -- (program);
  \draw [arrow] (program) -- (resource);
  \draw [arrow] (resource) -- (outputs);
  \draw [arrow] (outputs) -- (outcomes);
  \draw [arrow] (context) -- (implementation);
  \draw [arrow] (implementation) -- (outputs);
  \draw [arrow] (outcomes) -- (implementation);
\end{tikzpicture}

Pressman and Wildavsky defined implementation in the following way: "Implementation, to us, means just what Webster and Roget say it does: to carry out, accomplish, fulfill, produce, complete." Since their 1973 study, the scholarly literature has been marked by an effort to establish parameters, to evolve a comprehensive theory, and to gain a clearer understanding of the policy process as a complex, dynamic, and interactive function. This study of implementing neighborhood conservation projects incorporates these insights and follows recent theorists by defining implementation as the set of actions and/or decisions by lower-level administrators of a public policy either in ways that comply with the intent and directives of that policy as interpreted by upper-level administrators or in ways that alter, amend, modify, or oppose the intent and directives of that policy as interpreted by upper-level administrators.

Commenting on the evolution of perspectives from the late 1960s to the present, several scholars have noted:

That there is keen interest in both implementation theory and implementation practice is widely accepted. This interest is likely to grow during the 1990s and continue well into the twenty-first century. In fact, the field of public policy in the next decade will very likely be defined by its focus on implementation. The nineties are likely to be the implementation era.

**Rationale for Studying Portsmouth, Virginia’s Olde Towne and Park View Conservation Projects**

Since they became the first two federally-funded neighborhood conservation projects in Virginia when they were approved in 1968, the Olde Towne and Park View projects are particularly
worthy of being studied. Studying the implementation of these two conservation projects on a comparative basis is logical for several reasons.

First, the two conservation projects were considered together for federally-funded rehabilitation from 1960 through their establishment in 1968. Since they have similar beginnings, differences in their implementation experiences cannot be attributable to altered conditions due to beginning at different times.

Second, the two neighborhoods' proximity within the same city helps to increase confidence in the study's findings. Because they were administered by the same governmental agencies within the same urban setting, they assure greater consistency than otherwise would occur in tracking the implementation of the programs. Moreover, studying implementation of conservation projects in the two neighborhoods within a single city means that potential difficulties of comparing data from different cities will be eliminated. For example, DeGiovanni noted that his study of six American cities might be flawed since the real estate values might not be strictly comparable because of differing assessment practices in the cities. The proposed comparative case study within a single city by the same governmental entities eliminates many sources of error in making comparisons.

Third, the conservation projects were marked by different treatments. Creation of the Olde Towne Conservation Project was accompanied by establishing an Historic District with its own
Commission of Architectural Review (CAR) to administer high standards for the exterior appearance of dwellings. The borders of the conservation project were never changed significantly, although the Historic District was expanded to cover the entire conservation project's area in the late 1970s. By contrast, none of the Park View Conservation Project was included in an Historic District with CAR oversight until a relatively small area was included with the "core" neighborhood in an Historic District that was created in 1984. A further difference was that Park View was changed from a "Conservation Project" to a "Conservation and Redevelopment Project" in 1973, and the area designated for conservation was reduced by amendments in 1973, 1974, and 1976. The differences invite comparative investigation.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I indicates the purpose, basic methodology, and definitions used in this study. Chapter II explains the research design, discusses the research questions and hypotheses, and indicates the method used to derive conclusions. Chapter III portrays the development of major theoretical perspectives developed in the field of public administration concerning the implementation process. Because the implementation of the two neighborhood conservation projects occurs within the context of federally-funded programs, Chapter IV traces major changes during this century in the funding and philosophy of governmental programs which have attempted to improve neighborhood housing. The findings
are presented in three chapters (Chapters V, VI, and VII), each one providing a ten-year comparative study of the implementation of federally-funded neighborhood conservation programs in Olde Towne and Park View. A final chapter (Chapter VIII) provides conclusions and recommendations for future research.

Definitions of Terms

Definitions of key terms to be used in the proposed study are provided below. Additional specialized terms used by governmental agencies are presented in the glossary (Appendix A).

Distributive Policies and Programs: Governmental policies and programs are "distributive" if they induce non-governmental activities which are considered beneficial to society as a whole and if, at least theoretically, these private actions would not be carried out unless there were governmental assistance.30 Government benefits in the form of grants, low-cost loans, tax credits, or franchises are examples of distributive subsidies, and these are often explicitly linked to specific outcomes. For example, grants to localities to build airports must be utilized to fund the specified facilities because of the perception that society benefits from the improved transportation. Similarly, low-cost loans must be made only to people or groups who meet certain eligibility criteria and must be utilized only for specified purposes such as bringing properties up to stated standards so that the locality benefits from improved housing.
**Implementation:** This term refers to the set of actions and/or decisions by lower-level administrators of a public policy either in ways that comply with the intent and directives of that policy as interpreted by upper-level administrators or in ways that alter, amend, modify, or oppose the intent and directives of that policy.

**Neighborhood Conservation Projects.** Neighborhood Conservation Projects are those public programs which were designed to improve neighborhood conditions while saving the majority of structures in the treated areas and which employed federal funds to finance some or all of the projects.

**Protective Regulatory Policies and Programs:** Governmental policies and programs are "protective regulatory" when they are designed to protect the public by regulating activities and conditions which are considered to be harmful to the public. Examples are programs which regulate unsafe working conditions, unfair labor practices, and minimum housing conditions.
NOTES
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CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Rationale for the Comparative Case Study Methodology

As Yin defines it, "a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used."1 The study collects and analyzes appropriate data from different sources (interviews, newspaper accounts, government records such as minutes, correspondence, and contracts, etc.), examines the complex interplay of factors associated with the implementation process over three decades, and investigates the implementation record up to 1990. It thus meets the requirements for a case study and is the most appropriate means of investigation since, as Yin summarizes, "the case study methodology has a distinctive advantage over the other methods when a 'how' or 'why' question is being asked about a contemporary set of events, over which the investigator has little or no control."2

The study shows how implementation took place and finds reasons why it was carried out in that fashion. Although it tests no hypotheses and uses no statistical methods to establish causality, it provides a comparative case study that explores the
relationships between changes in implementation of the conservation projects and subsequent changes in relevant neighborhood conditions. The study also provides an embedded case study, that is, it examines the interactions of implementing units at different levels (the City of Portsmouth, the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development).

Bailey supports the view that case studies can "produce valuable information about the richness of human interaction" and argues that case studies "properly structured, may actually come closer to the physics model than does conventional social science, at least for the field of public administration." She explains:

Case-study findings, because they deal inherently with time and space, can be examined in their own context. These conditions can be made explicit in the same way that a physicist reporting research results makes the laboratory conditions explicit. Any interpretations or conclusions drawn from these studies can be studied in other contexts to determine if, in fact, commonalities are to be found in different places with different groups of people....

The laboratories of public administration are the offices of practitioners....

Validity

The study has construct validity, that is, the measures used validly reflect the concept, because it employs implementation factors derived as a result of the combined scholarly studies by Mazmanian and Sabatier between 1979 and 1983 and of the continuing studies by Sabatier. Because these factors have been developed and refined in light of empirical research and of academic criticism
over an extended period of time, confidence can be placed in the use of these factors to analyze the implementation process.

This study has low internal validity because case study research deals with a phenomenon within its real-life context and the dynamic, complex nature of relationships makes it extremely difficult to rule out competing hypotheses that could account for results. For example, some variation in the findings could be due to differences in the size or population of the two project areas.6 Conducting a comparative case study of two contiguous neighborhoods within the same city during the same study period, however, does increase the level of validity for the study because the close geographical similarity of the two study areas (making them subject to roughly the same housing demand, environmental factors, tax rates, etc.) and the identity of the main implementing authorities (same city council, redevelopment and housing authority, etc.) makes it more likely that differences can be imputed to implementation differences than to other unspecified factors which might account for differences if two neighborhoods in different areas were being studied.

Similarly, this study has very low external validity. Bailey discusses the problem of external validity in terms of a study being transferable and generalizable. Because of the wide variation in conditions of other urban implementation settings, the findings of this study have a very low degree of transferability. The proposed study also has very limited generalizability because of the potential extraneous and intervening neighborhood conditions
which may affect implementation and which may not be controlled for in the study.

Although this study is very limited in the sense that its findings are not widely generalizable to other implementation situations, it possesses value in being generalizable to implementation theory. Yin explains that

case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense, the case study, like the experiment, does not represent a "sample," and the investigator's goal is to expand and generalize theories (analytic generalization) and not to enumerate theories (statistical generalization). 7

By comparing the actual implementation experiences in the two study neighborhoods with those which would have been expected according to the literature on implementation, support or non-support for the literature is derived from the study. By drawing conclusions about which factors seemed to help account for the success or failure of implementation efforts in the two study neighborhoods, greater insight into the implementation process within an urban setting promotes a better understanding of the phenomenon and can assist the development of implementation theory.

**Reliability**

Reliability is enhanced because explicit guidelines are given for the gathering and analysis of data to derive answers to each of the four research questions. This allows replication, which means that "given the same conditions and using the same methods, the same or similar results should be obtained in other studies or with
other organizations. However, it should also be noted that reliability in this research approach is limited because of unanticipated extraneous or intervening factors. Differential effects of waterfront and downtown development projects on the two study neighborhoods, differing lending practices and possible "red-lining" by financial institutions, altered perceptions of the desirability of living in the historic Olde Towne area in the years near the U.S. Bicentennial as the city promoted the neighborhood as a tourist attraction, and a host of possible other factors could help explain differences in the neighborhood conservation projects.

**Study Period**

Beginning the study period in 1960 is sensible for two reasons. First, the initial proposal for federally-funded urban renewal projects in the study neighborhoods was initiated in that year. Second, comparable census data from 1960 through 1980 is available since census tract areas were developed in 1960 and used since then with little change (Appendices B, C, and D).

Ending the process in 1990 is reasonable because it is the most recent date for which partial census data is available. Moreover, examining implementation through 1990 fulfills Yin's requirement for a case study to be contemporary and adds to the relevance of the study.
Definitions of "Olde Towne" and "Park View"

The boundaries of the Olde Towne and Park View Conservation Projects are defined as those which were established by the Portsmouth City Council when it voted to establish these projects in 1968. These neighborhood conservation project area boundaries comprise selected areas of the neighborhoods in which they were established. Thus, the Olde Towne neighborhood is defined in this study as that portion of land identified as Census Tract 109 in the United States Bureau of the Census U.S. Census of Population and Housing reports for 1960, 1970, 1980, and 1990. Similarly, the census tract area of Park View is defined as Census Tract 107 in the U.S. Census of Population and Housing for those years.

The First Research Question

The first research question asks "to what extent is there variation in the implementation of neighborhood conservation projects? and "what are the factors that account for such differences?" This question is based on two scholarly reports: Berman's 1980 study which suggested that implementation is not uniform in all situations and Goggin et al.'s 1990 book which argued that implementation of federal programs varies across states. These studies suggest that implementation varies according to differing neighborhood contexts in an intra-urban environment. By exploring this, the proposed study increases the understanding of the implementation process by determining whether implementation in two neighborhoods of the same city results in different
implementation experiences. To answer the question, the research methodology examines the records of implementation in the two study neighborhoods.

The factors examined are those derived from the 1983 Mazmanian and Sabatier model of implementation, as amended by Sabatier in 1986. Although their model has correctly been critiqued for being most applicable as a top-down model, this study utilizes fourteen factors which Mazmanian and Sabatier have identified as key elements of the implementation process. Each implementation factor is evaluated and presented using comparative tabular arrays (Figure II-1 on the following pages). Although most of the criteria are clear from the explanations given in the table, some require additional clarification.

When the causes of a problem are thought to be understood and ways of solving the problem (i.e., a "technology") is known, there are minimal technical difficulties (factor #1). When implementors have control over the mechanisms that can affect the causes of the problem, there is jurisdiction over causal linkages (factor #5). To help evaluate these factors, the enabling legislation and underlying theory are reviewed in Chapter IV.

Implementation is easier when a relatively low number of people must be dealt with, so having a small population in the conservation project areas facilitates implementation (factor #3). When the population within the project areas supports the conservation projects (factor #11, implementation is improved even though this is unorganized support. When organized groups exist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer technical difficulties is a factor which favors successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Range of Behaviors Regulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A smaller range of behaviors targeted for action by implementors for people subject to the regulations of conservation projects is a factor which favors successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Target Group as a Percentage of the Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A smaller percentage of the population designated for coverage by a project is a factor which favors successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of Behavioral Change Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lesser extent of behavioral change being required by projects is a factor which favors successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jurisdiction over Causal Linkages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An implementing agency having control over the resources to affect the causes of a problem is a factor which favors successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Initial Allocation of Financial Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The availability of financial resources to implementors for carrying out a project is a factor which favors successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Integration Within and Among Implementing Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More integration of implementing institutions is a factor which favors successful implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clarity of Decision Rules of Implementing Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater clarity of decision rules used in carrying out a project is a factor which favors implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Recruitment of Implementing Officials
   More hiring or assigning of implementing officials specifically to implement projects is a factor which favors successful implementation.

10. Formal Access by Outsiders
    More formal access to implementors by non-governmental personnel is a factor which favors successful implementation.

11. Public Support
    More public support is a factor which favors successful implementation.

12. Attitudes and Resources of Constituents' Groups
    More support from organized groups which represent those who live in or own property in the project areas and who have greater resources is a factor which favors successful implementation.

13. Support from Sovereigns
    More support from sovereigns (i.e., powerful individuals in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of government) who intervene in the implementation process to support it is a factor which favors successful implementation.

14. Innovation by Implementors
    More innovative leadership skill by implementing officials is a factor which favors successful implementation.

15. Socioeconomic Conditions
    Improving socioeconomic conditions is a factor which favors successful implementation.

NOTE: The decision rule is given in terms of determining the success of each implementation factor. Although only the positive statement is given, the rule for interpreting the factor otherwise is implied. For example, lack of support from sovereigns would result in the thirteenth factor cited above being interpreted as a factor that does not characterize successful implementation.

Favorable effects on implementation are shown with a plus sign (+), negative effects on implementation are shown with a minus sign (−), and either neutral effects or a lack of sufficient data with which to evaluate the factor is shown by a zero (0).
within conservation areas, their attitudes of support or opposition affect implementation, especially when they have resources (expertise, finances, etc.) with which to exert their influence on the process (factor #12).

The socioeconomic conditions (factor #15) of those living within the conservation projects also influences the process. As Mazmanian and Sabatier explain,

> Although the precise linkages are not always clear, few people would argue that such conditions can affect the perceived needs of local populations and officials, the strength of competing interest groups, the financial resources of various jurisdictions, and many other factors.\(^6\)

This study evaluates changing socioeconomic conditions by evaluating changes in household income and in racial composition of the conservation project areas.\(^7\) If either shows deterioration,\(^8\) the factor is defined as showing deterioration.

Since a preliminary investigation showed that the conservation projects did not regulate services, only the behaviors of those living in or owning property in the project areas is evaluated (factor #2). Additionally, it is the behavior of these people which is measured when evaluating the extent of behavioral change required (factor #4).

The behavior of implementing officials is evaluated only insofar as leaders find innovative new ways of dealing with the problems which they encounter (factor #14). The degree of integration among implementing institutions is evaluated in terms of the cooperative "horizontal" working relationships as well as in terms of the formal "vertical" structural integration. This
differs from Mazmanian and Sabatier's way of looking only at formal hierarchical integration.

Data on the fifteen major factors which describe the implementation process were compiled on a comparative basis for the two neighborhood conservation projects and analyzed in terms of the literature on implementation. The basic steps have been:

1. Collect data for each conservation project regarding the implementation process and neighborhood conditions before collecting additional information through interviews.

2. Assess each of the fifteen factors. If the factor facilitated implementation, enter a plus sign ("+"). If the factor impeded implementation, assign a minus sign ("-"). If the factor had no effect on implementation or if the factor cannot be evaluated due to a lack of information, assign a zero ("0").

3. Assemble the assessments of the factors for each study neighborhood in a comparative manner.

4. Determine which factors facilitated the implementation process and which factors impeded it.

5. Compare the experiences between the two projects and analyze the extent of variation in the implementation processes.

The Second Research Question

The second research question asks: to what extent are the neighborhood conservation projects distributive or protective regulatory programs, and what forms of conflict and/or cooperation result from this? Ripley and Franklin's 1982 study suggested that distributive programs (i.e., those programs by which the government give benefits such as grants or low-cost loans) are characterized by low levels of conflict and that protective
regulatory programs (i.e., those programs by which the government protects the public by regulating such things as working conditions or minimum housing conditions) are marked by high levels of conflict. This study examines the effects associated with program type to determine if patterns of conflict and cooperation match Ripley and Franklin's predictions.

Because federally-funded neighborhood conservation projects involve participation from several administrative levels and because it is possible that the same type of program could vary at different levels of the administrative hierarchy, the study identifies the different levels of government and assesses the type of programs (i.e., distributive and/or protective regulatory) being administered at each level. It determines the level of conflict or cooperation through a content analysis of newspaper accounts as well as PRHA, Planning Commission, and City Council records (minutes, files, and correspondence) before conducting interviews to gather additional information. The data produced by this approach make it possible to draw conclusions about the actual relationships between program types and conflict level and about the implications of those conflict levels for the implementation of the neighborhood conservation projects by the governmental units.

The Third Research Question

The third research question asks: what is the intergovernmental context of neighborhood conservation projects, and how does this affect the nature of bargaining and negotiation among
implementing governmental units? Because Ripley and Franklin's 1982 book concluded that intergovernmental programs function without a designated central, coordinating authority and that this situation create a fragmented mix of multiple agencies which interact in ways characterized by "bargaining, coalition-building, and flux," the study explores relationships among implementing entities in two ways. First, the study determines whether the intergovernmental implementation process is marked by fragmentation of authority among several administering agencies, departments, or groups which function without direction from a single, unified authority. Second, it determines how the presence of or lack of a central authority affects the nature of the relationships between implementing units in this situation.

To make these determinations, the study examines PRHA, Planning Commission, and City Council records (minutes, files, and correspondence) as well as newspaper accounts and interview information. It discovers whether there was a central authority for the conservation projects, and it presents charts to show the formal relationship between governmental units. The study then finds whether interactions between the implementing units were marked by conflict, bargaining, and flux.

The Fourth Research Question

The fourth research question asks to what extent has implementation of these projects been successful? It does this by examining the outputs and the impact of the implementation process.

26
In doing so, it follows Pressman and Wildavsky's study, which analyzed a program's output in the form of promised funding and its impact in terms of new job creation.

To assess the outputs, the study analyzes data on the two major elements of the neighborhood conservation projects. First, the study examines the number and amounts of loans from the low-cost Section 312 program which was meant to help homeowners finance the rehabilitation of housing in the project areas. Second, it reviews the records of the inspections program which was intended to compel compliance with the federal housing standards that were established for the conservation areas. Information has been collected from the records of implementing agencies, from newspaper accounts, and from interviews with people who were involved with the implementation of the projects. In this way, the researcher was able to determine if the planned outputs were actually provided.

To assess the impact of the projects, the study measures neighborhood change. Although the study is not a controlled experiment, it does explore the relationships between the success or failure of implementation and the goal-related changes in neighborhood conditions. Since the neighborhood conservation projects were created by the provisions of several federal housing acts and of the Virginia Neighborhood Conservation Act of 1964, it is reasonable to assess the actual housing quality and neighborhood stability achieved by these projects since these are two of the goals of the enabling legislation. Although quality and stability

---
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deficits may not be solely attributable to implementation success or failure, for example, the projects could not be said to have been successful if the neighborhood conditions deteriorated following the implementation of the neighborhood conservation projects.

To measure neighborhood change, the study uses eight descriptors which Coyle found to be statistically significant estimators of neighborhood conditions.\textsuperscript{24} By displaying the percentage of change in census data for each of the five estimators of housing quality (housing age, housing value, multi-family units, housing condition, and overcrowding) and of the three estimators of neighborhood stability (owner occupancy, length/change of residency, and vacancy rate), the study draws conclusions on neighborhood change according to explicit guidelines (Figure II-2 on the page after next).

New construction (as measured by housing age, descriptor #1) is included as a descriptor in a housing conservation program because the programs cleared dilapidated structures as part of the conservation plans in both neighborhoods. Had the land remained undeveloped throughout the period, that would have been an indicator of neighborhood deterioration. Alternatively, new construction is an indicator that neighborhood conditions had improved to the point of inducing the private market to invest in the improving area.

Tables V-3, VI-3, VII-3, and VIII-3 present the assessment of change in each descriptor by the use of a plus sign ("+") to
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indicate improvement in neighborhood condition, a minus sign ("-") to indicate deterioration, or a zero sign ("0") to indicate that there is either no change in the descriptor or that there is insufficient information by which to evaluate it. For example, a decrease in the percent of vacant year-round units means that the change in the vacancy rate shows an improvement in neighborhood condition. Based on the indicators of change, the study draws conclusions on the relationship between the success or failure of implementation of the two projects and the subsequent changes observed in the neighborhoods in which they were located.
FIGURE II-2
CRITERIA FOR INTERPRETING CHANGES IN THE DESCRIPTORS WHICH INDICATE NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
<th>CENSUS DATA INDICATOR</th>
<th>CHANGE SHOWING IMPROVEMENT</th>
<th>CHANGE SHOWING DETERIORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing Age</td>
<td>Percent of housing built before 1939; Percent of housing built after 1960</td>
<td>More new housing</td>
<td>Little or no new housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Housing Value</td>
<td>Median value of housing</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multi-family units</td>
<td>Percent of multi-family units</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing Condition</td>
<td>Percent of housing units lacking some or all plumbing facilities</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Over-crowding</td>
<td>Percent of housing with more than 1.01 persons per room</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Owner Occupancy</td>
<td>Percent of owner-occupied units</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Length/Change of Residency</td>
<td>Percent at same address two years or less; Percent at same address ten years or more</td>
<td>Relatively more at same address</td>
<td>Relatively more at same address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>Percent of vacant year-round units</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Improvement in neighborhood condition is shown with a plus sign ("+"), deterioration is indicated with a minus sign ("-"), and either neutral effects or a lack of sufficient data with which to evaluate the descriptor is recorded with a zero ("0").
NOTES

1. Yin, op. cit., 23.

2. Ibid., 20.

3. Ibid., 49, 58.


5. Ibid., 51.

6. Among other differences, the Olde Towne project area was smaller and had more professional people living there. (Interview with Gordon E. Wheatley, PRHA Director of Operations for Development, December 18, 1992.)


8. Ibid.

9. This is established by the comments of W. T. Goode, Jr., Chairman of the Portsmouth Planning Commission: "Through efforts of its Planning Commission, the City of Portsmouth was, in 1956, divided into official U.S. Census Tracts. In the 1960 decennial census, these statistical areas were first utilized by the United States Department of Commerce." (U.S. Census Tract Address Index, Portsmouth VA: City Planning Department, December 1961, Preface.)

10. The major boundary change was caused by establishing a major east-west thoroughfare (originally called the London-Glasgow Expressway and now known as London Boulevard) at the south of both neighborhoods. There is no map available of 1990 census tracts, but there has been no indication of changed boundaries for it.


12. Goggin et al., op. cit.

13. Sabatier states that empirical research shows that critics were correct in saying that it was a mistake to include "clear and consistent policy objectives" as a factor. See Paul A. Sabatier, "Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research: A Critical Analysis and Suggested Synthesis," Journal of Public Policy, 6 (1986), 29.

15. Mazmanian and Sabatier's model also identified socioeconomic conditions as a factor. Because that item measures impacts in this study, it is not included as a causal agent. In addition, they focused on the degree of hierarchical integration as a factor which influenced implementation and reflected their "top-down" values by arguing that greater formal integration was a factor which facilitated success. This study examines both the formal vertical integration and the horizontal integration among implementing organizations at the same level of the implementation hierarchy.


17. Both of these are among the descriptors which have been found to be valid descriptors of neighborhood change. See Coyle, op. cit., 90.

18. By Coyle's guidelines, an increase in minority population is a factor which indicates neighborhood decline. However, an increase in median household income is a sign of neighborhood improvement. Similarly, a either a decline in minority population or a decrease in median household income is a sign of neighborhood decline, according to Coyle. See Coyle, op. cit., 111, 116, 119, and 123 for his guidelines.


20. They also found that competitive regulatory programs are marked by moderate levels of conflict and that redistributive programs are marked by high levels of conflict. Because neighborhood conservation projects do not involve redistributive or competitive regulatory elements, the study does not explore these additional situations.

21. Ibid., 220.

22. Pressman and Wildavsky, op. cit., xi. Although $23 million dollars in federal funds had been promised in 1966, only $3 million had actually been spent at the end of three years. On that basis, they concluded that the program had failed.

23. Ibid., 5. They also concluded the EDA had failed in producing new jobs. Of nearly $1.1 million in business loans made to create jobs in Oakland, only 45 jobs had been created by 1969.

24. Hugh F. Coyle, Jr., The Validation of a Scale for Measuring Neighborhood Change (Ph.D. dissertation: Case Western Reserve University, 1979). Coyle used component analysis with orthogonal rotation to determine the valid estimators of neighborhood condition. Especially useful tables summarizing his research are on pages 90, 111, 116, 119, and 123 of Coyle's dissertation.
CHAPTER III
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Early Studies of Implementation

Because the people who devise public policies are usually not the same people who carry them out, the potential exists for public policies to be administered in ways that alter, oppose, or fulfill the intent of those who originated the policies. Despite this crucial role, the implementation process was not studied as a separate, complex phenomenon until about two decades ago.

Arguing that "there is no analytic literature on implementation," Pressman and Wildavsky presented a case study of six years (1966-1972) during which the Oakland, California, Economic Development Administration (EDA) implemented a federal program for depressed areas which had been launched in the atmosphere of crisis which followed the Watts riots of 1965. Utilizing documents and interviews, they focused on "the difficulties of translating broad agreement into specific decisions, given a wide range of participants and perspectives; the opportunities for blockage and delay that result from a multiplicity of decision points; and the economic theories on which the program was based" and how a combination of factors such as local difficulties with engineering and financing combined with a lessening of federal favor for the
Oakland project resulted in frustrating the attempts "in trying to avoid the institutional fragmentation, multiple and confusing goals, and inadequate funding that had characterized previous federal-city programs." They cautioned against resorting to the "false messiahs" of (a) designating special bureaucratic arrangements such as creating new agencies or specialized arrangements, personnel etc. because these conditions could not automatically give programs the priority status needed for success or (b) seeking better coordination because:

Everyone wants coordination—on his own terms. Invocation of coordination does not necessarily provide either a statement of or a solution to the problem, but it may be a way of avoiding both when accurate prescription would be too painful.

To function within the "inherent features of political life," administrators must realize that "the apparently simple and straightforward is really complex and convoluted" due to the complexity of joint action in an intergovernmental context, and they suggested guidelines for successful implementation:

1. "Implementation should not be divorced from policy... and...must not be conceived as a process that takes place after, and independent of, the design of policy."

2. "Designers of policy [must] consider direct means for achieving ends...." Hence "a second way of joining policy more closely with implementation would be to pay as much attention to the creation of organizational machinery for executing a program as for launching one."

3. "Consider carefully the theory that underlies your actions."

4. Continuity of leadership is important to successful implementation.

5. "Simplicity in policies is much to be desired.... Simplicity can be ignored only at the peril of
breakdown....If policy analysts carry bumper stickers, they should read, "Be Simple! Be Direct! or PAYMENT ON PERFORMANCE."9

Although this 1973 study did not result in a new theoretical model and its guidelines sometimes border on being platitudes,10 it uncovered elements used in later models. While Pressman and Wildavsky accepted the classical assumption that policy flows downwards from leaders through intermediaries, they challenged the classical model by explicitly calling for the integration of policy implementation with its formulation.

Also accepting the top-down classical model were Van Meter and Van Horn, whose 1975 study emphasized the ways in which behavior was influenced in order to "alert policy makers to variables that can be manipulated to improve the delivery of services."11 They developed a model which identified six variables that could be manipulated: two within the realm of policy (standards and objectives, resources) and four within the realm of linkage (interorganizational communication and enforcement activities, characteristics of the implementing agencies, economic, social, and political conditions, and the disposition of implementers).12 They thus challenged the classical notion of neutral implementation by emphasizing the complex interplay of forces which shape implementation.

Like Van Meter and Van Horn, McLaughlin's 1975 study of federal programs for educational change focused on the implementer's role in carrying out policy changes. Her study of education that found that the success of a policy change depended
on the implementation process rather than on "the educational treatment, level of resources, or type of federal funding strategy,"13 that the implementation process was "a dynamic organizational process that was shaped over time by interactions between project goals and methods and the institutional setting,"14 and that there were three general ways that implementers interact with policy-makers:

One, mutual adaptation described successfully implemented projects. It involved both modification of the project design and changes in the local institutional setting and personnel during the course of implementation. A second implementation process, co-optation, signified adaptation of the project design, but no change on the part of the local staff or the institutional setting. When implementation of this nature occurred, project strategies simply were modified to conform in a pro forma fashion to the traditional practices the innovation was expected to replace, either because of resistance to change or inadequate help to implementers. The third implementation process, nonimplementation, described the experience of projects that either broke down during the course of implementation or simply were ignored by project participants.15

Successful projects are thus described as those in which implementers modified the projects to meet their local needs and interests. What would have been seen as a malfunction in the classical model was now hailed as the key to success.

Incorporating this complexity of the implementation arena in his 1977 book, The Implementation Game, Bardach defined the implementation process as "(1) a process of assembling the elements required to produce a programmatic outcome, and (2) the playing out of a number of loosely interrelated games whereby these elements are withheld from or delivered to the program assembly process on
particular terms." He focused on:

bargaining, persuasion, and maneuvering under conditions of uncertainty. "Control," therefore, resolves into strategies and tactics—hence the appropriateness of "games" as the characterization of the "control" aspects of the process.  

Identifying the players as well as the stakes, the rules of play, the nature of uncertainty, and the degree of uncertainty concerning outcomes were key steps in making a better implementation "machine." He suggested ways of dealing with problems such as assigning priorities, working around missing or imperfect program components, or establishing powerful project managers in order to overcome the delays inherent in the program-assembly process.

In general, Bardach recommended both limiting policy goals because "government ought not to do many of the things liberal reform has traditionally asked of it," and planning around the various implementation games by anticipating problems through written scenarios so that better policy design can be achieved as keys to successful implementation. However, he noted that "unfortunately, designing implementable policies is scarcely less difficult than finding a fixer to repair damage as it is detected. This is not an optimistic book." Bardach thus replaces the classical model with one in which successful implementation is a function of managerial gamesmanship that recognizes the factors of human motivations and drives and utilizes the means necessary to induce subordinates to cooperate in order to achieve "control."

At about the same time that Bardach’s book appeared, Radin’s 1977 study of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare’s
implementation efforts in 1964 to 1968 provided examples of games similar to those defined by Bardach and of difficulties similar to those described by Pressman and Wildavsky. She tried to convey "the climate of ambiguity, confusion and political intrigue that characterized Title VI activities." Rather than the technical execution of unambiguous rules posited by the classical school, she found further evidence that implementation is more complex and undefined than previously thought and, like Bardach, found a politicized, bargaining environment rather than the neutral, rationalistic milieu of classical thought.

These insights were incorporated into Rein and Rabinovitz's definition of implementation as:

(1) a declaration of government preferences (2) mediated by a number of actors who (3) create a circular process characterized by reciprocal power relations and negotiations...[in which] the actors must take into account three potentially conflicting imperatives: the legal imperative to do what is legally required; the rational-bureaucratic imperative to do what is rationally defensible; and the consensual imperative to do what can establish agreement among contending influential parties who have a stake in the outcome. The implementation process "is not one of a graceful, one-dimensional transition from legislation to guidelines and then to auditing and evaluation. Instead it is circular or looping," and they describe this relationship by "the principle of circularity." For Rein and Rabinowitz, the politics of implementation may be best understood as an attempt to resolve conflicts among these imperatives.

The way in which conflicts are resolved is a function of the purposes (their clarity, saliency, consistency), the resources (kind, level, and timing), and the complexity of the administrative process of implementation.
"Bottom-Up" Theories of Implementation

Rather than study implementation as it proceeded from the top policy-makers through lower levels of administrators, Lipsky's 1978 study argued that:

The best recent studies of policy implementation demonstrate that various actors and agencies in a policy "chain" have such widely differing stakes in the outcomes of policy and are motivated so differently that the results diverge sharply from the stated intentions of policy declarers. This perspective, however obvious once it has been stated, contributes significantly to understanding the overarching general conclusion that emerges from implementation studies, namely, that federal policies, at least those that have been brought to our attention by detailed analysis, cannot be put into place or do not work. These studies also call into question the assumption that stated objectives of policy declarers can usually be considered authoritative.28

Because of this situation, Lipsky suggested that an "alternative approach to the study of policy implementation is available if analysis focuses on those who are charged with carrying out policy rather than those who formulate and convey it"29—a view that inverted the classical approach and would result, as the title of his study stated, in "Standing the Study of Public Implementation on Its Head." In another study which appeared in the same year, Lipsky joined with Weatherley to study how the bottom-level "street-level bureaucrats"30 hindered, helped, altered, or made policy in a dynamic setting.

Appearing independently in 1978, Berman's study seemed to support Lipsky's argument. As programs reached the local institutional level (the "micro-implementation" level), he argued, the policy directives devised by superiors (at the "macro-implementation" level) are altered by institutional factors which
the central policy-makers cannot change because they "are relatively independent of federal or state control, and, worse yet, have their own implementation problems." Because implementation is a function of policy with its setting, these differing local contexts account for the local variations in national programs as they are administered by implementers, and it gives rise to three conclusions:

(1) macro-implementation inevitably involves politics;
(2) the federal government typically has limited leverage to influence the behavior of local implementers, who have the effective power in the system; and (3) micro-implementation cannot be effective unless local delivery organizations undergo an adaptive process that can neither be predicted accurately nor controlled from the outside.32

Indicating the reciprocal relationships and circularity of the implementation process, Nakamura and Smallwood’s The Politics of Policy Implementation provided a paradigm33 that integrated the stages of the policy process and showed how they mutually affect one another within a political context. Policy Formation (Environment I), Policy Implementation (Environment II), and Policy Evaluation (Environment III) were seen as interconnected elements with communications and compliance linkages where "there appear to be many situations in which implementers possess a considerable degree of independent discretion and authority to exercise their own political judgments in order to influence and shape the policy process."34 They also noted that besides the policy-makers and formal implementers there are important influences from lobbies and constituency groups, recipients and "consumers" of services, the
media, evaluators and intermediaries (when intergovernmental agencies or private firms provide services under government contracts). While recognizing the existence of classical relationships where implementers only carry out policy, they identified a continuum of five implementation linkages that ranged from that "Classical Technocracy" through "Instructed Delegation," "Bargaining," "Discretionary Experimentation," and "Bureaucratic Entrepreneurship" which allowed implementers to formulate policy goals. Implementation, they concluded, was "far from being institutionally neutral and isolated from political pressures," and thus policy-makers must match their preferred methodologies with political realities, understand potential sources of blockage or opportunity, be prepared to identify the actors who will carry out their goals, and "be prepared to monitor, intervene in and adjust program activities so that they remain consistent with policy goals."

Berman in 1980 observed that it was a mistake to believe that implementation was uniform for all situations because "the context or policy situation matters, it varies from delivery system to delivery system, and policy makers ought to choose implementation strategies to match the different situations." Hjern and Porter in 1981 found that "almost no programme is fully implemented by a single organization" but is "implemented by a cluster of parts of public and private organizations, i.e., implementation structures." Hjern and Hull in 1985 argued that the importance of implementation studies "is precisely to link
politics and administration" by looking beyond the political system's relationships to identify relevant actors. In 1986, Baier, March and Saetren observed that "official policy is likely to be vague, contradictory, or adopted without generally shared expectations about its meaning or implementation" and that this "encourages administrative autonomy, which in turn encourages more policy ambiguity." Thus, these empirical studies all found that there was a complex pattern of interrelated organizations which defined power relationships and policy meanings as they carried out policy.

Ripley and Franklin's view of implementation challenges the classical model by indicating that it "is no less political than any other set of policy activities" and that it takes place amid a lack of hierarchy that "promotes competition, bargaining, and compromise among actors." Utilizing a fourfold typology which they derived from Theodore Lowi, they categorized programs as being distributive (providing subsidies such as tax advantages or low-cost loans), competitive regulatory (regulating scarce goods or services in which the public has a stake such transportation or communications activities), protective regulatory (defending the public from harm by private activities such as by setting fair labor practices or environmental controls) or redistributive (transferring valuable items from one group to another such as by providing food stamps to the disadvantaged or establishing progressive tax rates that require the affluent to pay higher percentages than do the less-affluent). Ripley and Franklin
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utilize this typology as a model which explains differing implementation conditions and prospects of success. Since a major feature of the neighborhood conservation projects was the provision of low-cost Section 312 loans, their theory concerning distributive programs can be recast as a question for the proposed study to investigate.

Additional insights into each situation are included throughout their study for each of the four typologies. For example, they conclude that the distributive programs are characterized by a low level of conflict between bureaucrats, beneficiaries, and even restricted clients, and by little interest in less bureaucracy or deregulation. Based on their study, they conclude that implementation is marked by:

- a strong but not dominant role for multiple governmental bureaucracies; federalism that multiplies the number of actors and the access points for influence, and the bargaining norm...routines for the smooth and efficient implementation of policies and programs are very hard to establish and maintain....

Finally, the result of all of the above factors is that no single authority appears to be in charge of the implementation of any major single policy, let alone any clustering of policies.....There are instead many governments....Bargaining, coalition-building and flux characterize the governments during implementation.

One criticism of this bottom-up approach is that it runs counter to democratic theory. The elected representatives who frame most public policy speak for their constituencies, and the will of the people as enunciated in their legislative mandates should be carried out by public employees. While it is true that street level bureaucrats often have flexibility and autonomy in
discharging their duties, making this discretionary power the basis for designing public policy and empowering lower-level bureaucrats to subvert policy directives is a "misplaced prescription" that leaps to normative statements from limited empirical observations.56

A second criticism is that the bottom-up methodology underestimates the degree of control which is exercised by superiors over their subordinate administrators and service-delivery populations. Legal sanctions, employment regulations and promotional practices, resource availability, and institutional structure can be employed by central controllers in ways that have substantial impact on the behavior of lower-level administrators. Sabatier argues that even when it appears that the target populations of service delivery are exceptionally able to influence policy formation (for example, when environmental suits are brought by organizations on behalf of individuals), it is because this influence and method of influence was incorporated into the policy design by central legislators.57

A third criticism can be brought against the bottom-up theorists because their work has had limited benefits. Despite the general suggestions for a flexible strategy which allows adaptation to local conditions and contexts and the observation that policy changes should coincide with those of implementers, this view has led to "few explicit policy recommendations."58
Top-Down Theories of Implementation

Top-down theorists recognize the existence of lower-level administrators and of service-target groups in the implementation process, but they view greater congruence of these groups' actions with those envisioned by policy-makers' goals as being the indicator of successful implementation. This normative approach was utilized, for example, by Van Meter and Van Horn in 1975 and by Mazmanian and Sabatier in 1981.

The view was promoted by Edwards' *Implementing Public Policy* in 1980, a work which identified four key variables (communications, resources, dispositions, and bureaucratic structure) in the implementation process and attempted to present them in a workable model. Communications must be clear, accurate (but not so inflexible as to block adaptability), consistent, and transmitted to implementers. Resources of personnel in adequate numbers with appropriate expertise, information which is both adequate and relevant, authority which is sufficient to insure compliance, and facilities (including buildings, equipment, and supplies) are needed. Because implementers usually have considerable discretion in carrying out policies (due to the administrators' autonomy and the complexity of the policies) and must want to carry out a policy if it is to be successful, decision-makers must be prepared either to work around implementors' dispositions (i.e., their attitudes towards policies) or to reduce implementors' discretion. If the bureaucratic structure is characterized by organizational fragmentation,
standard operating procedures (SOPs) may be a remedy—but they can also hinder new policies by causing "resistance, delay, waste, or unwanted actions" which hinder rather than promote implementation. All four of these factors interact with each other.  

Edwards goes on to identify those policies most apt to face implementation problems: new policies, decentralized policies, controversial policies, and policies which are complex, crisis-driven, or judicially originated. Although "follow-up" is his general technique for improving implementation by those who understand what barriers exist and why they exist, his final conclusion is gloomy. Communications are unclear due to bargaining and compromise inherent in the political system and the lack of time and expertise of policy-makers for framing explicit statutes; resources of authority are restricted because of fear of big government and material resources are limited due to increasing scarcity; dispositions of administrators are hard to change because of insulating regulations (such as civil service) which restrict forcing compliance and because of the lack of rewards available which could induce compliance; and a disunified bureaucratic structure:

serves important functions for powerful political forces. The proliferation of programs and agencies increases the ability of legislators to affect the implementation of programs, and it distributes "turf" and accompanying influence to committees. Similarly, agencies, at least partly due to parochialism, want program responsibility and do not want to consolidate or coordinate their activities with other organizations. Interest groups enjoying special access to bureaucratic units with narrow jurisdictions fight changes in existing
structures. In addition, provisions in many state constitutions and local government charters and the broad nature of many policies ensure that government will be fragmented. 71

Sabatier and Mazmanian developed an even more comprehensive model of implementation in 198172 which they then elaborated in 1983.73 Although they reduce the number of main factors to three (tractability of the problem, ability of statute to structure implementation, and non-statutory variables affecting implementation), they defined these constructs by identifying the variables which affect compliance. Their outlook is more optimistic than Edwards's viewpoint, for they indicate that policy can be more likely to achieve its goals if there are clear and consistent objectives incorporating a sound theory in a well-structured process that is executed by leaders with strong managerial and political skills, backed by organized constituency groups and a few key legislators (or a chief executive) when there are not conflicting policies or changes in socioeconomic conditions that emerge and alter statutory objectives.74

An optimistic outlook is more characteristic of the top-down approach, and its theorists often conclude with prescriptions that identify factors which can be manipulated by central authorities in order to increase compliance with policy directives. Matland observes that:

Common advice in top-down strategies are: make policy goals clear and consistent (Van Meter and Horn, 1975; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983), minimize the number of actors (Pressman and Wildavsky, 1973), limit the extent of behavioral change necessary (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975; Mazmanian and Sabatier, 1983) and place responsibility for implementation in an
agency which is sympathetic with the policy’s goals (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975; Sabatier, 1986). While these suggestions may seem obvious, their importance should not be underestimated.75

Matland also notes three critiques of the top-down approach.76 First, top-down theorists start their analyses with the origination of the policy. However, Nakamura and Smallwood’s 1980 study indicates that not only is the policy formation environment reciprocally influenced by the other two environments (policy implementation and policy evaluation)77 but the policy formation environment contains cues such as the strength of coalition building and the willingness of legislators to be associated with programs that may have preceded policy formation and that can influence the implementation process.78

Second, top-down theorists have been accused of ignoring the political aspects of implementation and treating it as the neutral, technical function envisioned by the classical theorists. Calls for consistent, clear statements of policy are consistent with the guidelines for an ideal mechanistic bureaucracy, but Nakamura and Smallwood have noted that the lack of clarity in policy statements is widespread and due to such factors as technical limitations, the lack of clear-cut information on what solutions will work, the conceptual complexity in defining the problem to be solved, and the need for ambiguity in order to promote coalition building so that legislation can be passed.79 Even Edwards, a top-down theorist, notes that lack of clarity is widespread and due to factors such as the complexity of policymaking, the desire to avoid alienating
politically influential groups, and the need to use vague language to achieve consensus.80

Third, top-down theorists have been criticized for viewing the policy-makers rather than the implementers as the key actors. As Matland observes:

The criticism has had two primary variants. One argues the local service deliverer has expertise and knowledge of the true problems, and therefore is in a much better position to propose purposeful policy. Top down models, however, treat local actors primarily as impediments to successful implementation, agents whose "shirking" behavior needs to be controlled. The second variant argues that regardless of an agents' superior expertise or knowledge, discretion at the local level for street level bureaucrats is so great that it is simply unrealistic to expect policy designers to be able to plan for all contingencies and, more importantly, to control the actions of these agents. The argument that policy is really determined by the service deliverers is one of the major tenets of bottom-up models.81

Converging Models of Implementation

Top-down and bottom-up approaches obviously created confusion. For the top-down theorists, successful implementation is defined by administrators' full compliance with statutory goals and methods, and their recommendations stress ways of manipulating variables that promote such congruence by the implementors of public policy. For the bottom-up theorists, successful implementation is defined in terms of the flexibility and adaptability allotted to implementers to reinterpret statutory goals and methods to meet the contextual demands of street-level bureaucrats and of those meant to be served by the legislation, and their recommendations stress ways of promoting creativity, innovation, and discretionary action
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by the implementors of public policy. It is no wonder that O'Toole's 1986 assessment of the literature found that it was full of conflicting recommendations.

Only a few of the theorists explicitly indicated the conditions under which their findings were most applicable. For example, Lipsky had specified that the "bottom-up" approach was recommended when assumptions of hierarchy and systems linkage were relatively inapplicable, when implementers have multiple objects or work tasks, and when shifts in ongoing policies are being implemented.

Elmore's 1978 study of social program implementation argued that the dichotomy between the two views was best solved by recognizing that the different models applied to different types of problems. Rather than determining which approach was correct, it was a matter of determining the situation in which each approach was correct.

Berman developed a specialized vocabulary in his 1980 study which attempted to identify the parameters which described the contexts which dictate which is the most appropriate approach. The first step is to identify the "situational parameters," i.e., the contexts which cannot be changed, such as the scope of the change which the policy attempts to effect, the validity of available technology in achieving the desired goals, the degree of goal conflict, and the amount of control in the institutional setting. For incremental changes when technology is certain, the environment is stable, goal conflict is low, and there is tightly connected
institutional setting, the top-down "programmed" approach is best. If the opposite parameters exist (i.e., change is major, technology is uncertain, etc.), a bottom-up "adaptive implementation" approach is best. When considering the three stages of carrying out policy-mobilization, implementation, and institutionalization:

One type of implementation strategy might be appropriate during mobilization, whereas other strategies might be more suitable for other stages. If so, policy makers would need to learn both to match their implementation strategy to the situation and to switch strategies according to the stages of the implementation process.86

A different, specialized vocabulary was devised by Elmore when he attempted to specify the appropriate contexts for the two major approaches in his concept of mapping, which he originated in 1982 and refined in 1985.87 "Forward mapping" is a top-down approach that is based on clearly-stated policies, detailed methodologies, and explicit outcomes being enunciated at each stage of the implementation process. Alternatively, "backward mapping" is a bottom-up approach which progresses from the desired outcomes to the specification of means to accomplish them before proceeding to the central level and the actual formation of policy, thus allowing street-level bureaucrats and target groups to influence the process of policy formation. The correct approach is that one that best matches the target groups' incentive structure.

The search for synthesis led some theorists of the opposing approaches to recognize situations in which the alternate view was legitimate. For example, Nakamura and Smallwood's 1980 study recognized that there was a continuum of five major implementation
linkage scenarios. Although their work emphasized the bottom-up approach, it explicitly recognized the existence of implementation situations similar to those envisioned for "classical" technocrats when policy-makers delineate clear goals, when there is a hierarchical command structure, and when implementers possess the technical means to achieve the goals which have been set by policy-makers. 88

Sabatier, in studies which he has authored 89 or co-authored with Pelkey, 90 uses the top-down approach to identify those parameters which tend to remain stable over lengthy periods (legal instruments, socio-economic conditions, etc.) and the bottom-up approach to identify the "advocacy coalition" of public and private groups that work together in order to have their views on policy problems and solutions accepted. He also suggests a paradigm that helps illuminate the "structure of belief systems of policy elites." 91

A recent attempt to incorporate both perspectives is the "Communication Model" elaborated by Goggin et al. 92 As they explain:

State-level implementors form the nexus for the communications channels. These implementors are the targets of implementation-related messages transmitted from both federal- and local-level senders. As recipients, state-level implementors must interpret a barrage of messages. The potential for distortion exists. Structuring the interpretation process are the form and context of the message and legitimacy and reputation of the sender. 93

Replacing both the "first generation" of theorists who presented detailed accounts of implementing single major decisions and the
"second generation" of theorists who developed hypotheses and models concerning implementation, they argue that the time has come for a "third generation" of researchers who will test those hypotheses and models in a more scientific manner.  Despite their call for a better methodology and the presentation of a comprehensive paradigm, the new model is limited because it focuses primarily on the state role of implementation in an assumed federal, state, and local relationship best exemplified by the metaphorical "layer cake" of federalism. For studies where the state does not play a major role in policy implementation or in situations where the "layer cake" relationship is not appropriate, however, the model may not be applicable.

Matland's 1991 "Ambiguity-Conflict Model" attempts to simplify the preceding perspectives and derive a comprehensive model of the implementation process. By analyzing implementation scenarios in terms of their degree of policy ambiguity (i.e., lack of clarity in specifying goals and means) and of conflict (i.e., disagreement over goals and means), he identifies four implementation situations, specifies the key element in the implementation scenario for each of the four situations, and thus helps the "policy designer who is pondering where the most important problems are likely to lie." Although the model has the virtue of being simple and predictive, no studies have been conducted to support it.
Implications for this Study

No single complex, comprehensive model of implementation has emerged thus far. However, the literature review shows that Mazmanian and Sabatier enumerated the factors which measure implementation and that their 1981 list of relevant factors was revised by both writers in 1983 and by Sabatier in 1986. Because their list of implementation factors is the only one which has been revised over several years as the result of both scholarly criticism and empirical research, this study evaluates the success or failure of implementation by measuring changes in implementation factors derived from their research (Figure II-1 on page 21).
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CHAPTER IV
REVIEW OF PUBLIC PROGRAMS

Changes in the Governmental Role

Since the neighborhood conservation programs were implemented within the context of changing federal programs and priorities, this chapter provides a basis for interpreting local changes in relation to national shifts. First, it describes relevant federal programs by examining them in five time periods which reflect changes in presidential administrations: (1) before 1961, (2) from 1961 to 1969, (3) from 1969 to 1977, (4) from 1977 to 1981, and (5) from 1981 to 1993. A further survey examines pre-1961 and post-1961 state and local programs which were implemented in the two study neighborhoods. The study then discusses the theoretical basis for the conservation projects.

Federal Programs Before 1961

Until the reform movements near the beginning of the twentieth century, the federal government did not intervene in neighborhood conditions. The decline of housing units and of the neighborhoods in which they existed was seen as part of a benign process which allowed housing units to "trickle down" to poorer residents until the dwellings became so dilapidated that they were torn down so the land could become available for new uses.
With the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt as president in 1932, a new faith in massive federal action to solve national problems resulted in New Deal programs aimed at specific areas such as housing. Following the passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) on June 16, 1933, the United States Congress established a Public Works Administration,¹ and "a PWA tradition of building and running its own projects was already established"² by the time that the United States Housing Act of 1937 established the United States Housing Authority (USHA) in order to help communities to remove slums and to provide housing for low income families. This 1937 law promoted state laws that enabled housing authorities to build, own, and run public housing projects by providing that housing built under the act’s provisions was to be locally owned.³ Whereas the 1933 act "stimulated the creation of local housing authorities with powers to receive federal assistance,"⁴ the 1937 act "established a permanent housing program and led to the expansion of local housing authorities and their activities."⁵ These two acts helped spur the creation in 1938 of the Portsmouth Housing Authority, which became the Portsmouth Housing and Redevelopment Authority in December of 1949⁶ and was to have a major role in implementing the conservation projects in the Olde Towne and Park View neighborhoods of Portsmouth, Virginia.

The faith in major federal programs' abilities to solve national problems continued as president Harry S. Truman’s administration (1945-1952) continued major policies of the
Roosevelt years. In the optimistic aftermath of having won World War II, the nation adopted the goal of "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" with the Housing Act of 1949 which continued the federal government's involvement with building housing while authorizing slum clearance as well. The goal was still to remove slum properties and replace them with new housing of higher quality rather than saving the housing units or the social structures in the neighborhoods in which they were located. The power of the government to remove blighted dwelling units was to play a part in efforts to revitalize Olde Towne and Park View.

The election of Republican president Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952 brought changes in federal programs but did not challenge the perspective that the federal government had an important role in solving federal programs. The 1949 "slum clearance and redevelopment program" was replaced by a "slum clearance and urban renewal" approach under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1954, which allowed non-residential projects in addition to the housing projects. More significantly, Section 220 of this law enabled the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to insure mortgages that provided funds for rehabilitation of housing in urban renewal areas. Section 220 mortgage insurance was a major element of the treatment proposed for the Park View core area in 1968.

An indirect effect of the law was seen in the mid-1950s as Portsmouth began examining its minimum housing codes and
comprehensive zoning ordinance subsequent to the passage of this act. Other localities also were stimulated to act because new contracts for federal urban renewal assistance could not be approved until the locality had an approved workable program.

The 1954 law required municipalities to include building and housing codes as part of their workable program in order to qualify for urban renewal funding. The law, however, did not define a workable program other than as a plan of action for dealing with problems of blight and community development, nor was the content of such codes specified. However, the law was instrumental in stimulating the passage of local housing codes. Ten years after passage of the law, more than 650 cities had adopted housing codes.

In Portsmouth, the attention to developing new codes and to examining blighted neighborhood conditions indirectly helped lead to the development of programs for Lincolnsville, Park View, and Olde Towne. Since the initial planning for the city’s first urban renewal project began in 1956, the passage of the 1956 Housing Act may have spurred new urban renewal activity in Portsmouth.

The Housing Act of 1956 established relocation payments for people and businesses which were displaced by urban renewal projects. It also promoted large scale planning through General Neighborhood Renewal Plans (GNRPs) which allowed large areas to be studied together and then divided into smaller urban renewal projects (See the definitions in Appendix A.). Relocation payments were utilized in both Olde Towne and Park View, and the two study neighborhoods were originally part of a broad GNRP planning initiative proposed in 1960 for a large area that included the two study neighborhoods.
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Federal Programs from 1961 to 1969

The election of John F. Kennedy in 1960 sparked renewed efforts by the federal government to solve national social problems as part of the New Frontier. The Housing Act of 1961 allowed local governments to sell housing units as part of renewal projects if the buyers would rehabilitate the dwellings, and it authorized the Federal National Mortgage Authority (FNMA) to buy rehabilitation loans from private investors. The sale of housing units for rehabilitation by PRHA to private buyers was practiced in both Olde Towne and Park View.

Following the death of President Kennedy in 1963, Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society continued and expanded the emphasis on large federally-funded social programs as a way of tackling national problems. Section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964 provided low-cost rehabilitation loans to eligible homeowners or businesses. Section 312 loans were the major element in the Olde Towne and Park View conservation projects.

Despite the changes in governmental housing programs to provide more support for rehabilitation, urban renewal continued to be associated with demolition and displacement. The growing criticism of this governmental approach was perhaps best typified by Martin Anderson's 1964 study, The Federal Bulldozer:

There are clear indicators that the program is not fulfilling the goals set forth by Congress; after more than a decade of experience, urban renewal has not yet produced significant benefits.

Against the background of burning cities and urban riots in American cities, a more massive and more comprehensive federal
involvement in renovating cities was undertaken. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 called for "maximum feasible participation" of residents in target areas and involved residents in the decision-making process.\textsuperscript{15} Although the intent of this participation requirement has been much challenged,\textsuperscript{16} the establishment of formal access to implementors through Project Area Committees (PACs) reflects the perceived intent of this provision.

The next year, new funding for rehabilitation was also part of the Housing Act of 1965.\textsuperscript{17} This act

authorized the federal government to pay up to three-quarters of the costs incurred by a local government in undertaking a code enforcement program. Grants up to $3,500 and low interest, long-term loans (3 percent over 20 years) were authorized to homeowners for rehabilitation.\textsuperscript{18}

In 1971, the federally assisted code enforcement (FACE) program (Section 117) was proposed for use in the Park View core area\textsuperscript{19} but was never utilized because of program changes by the time that it was being considered by HUD. The Section 115 grants to the elderly for rehabilitation and the continued Section 312 loans were both made available to Olde Towne and Park View residents, and Section 116 funds for demolishing unsound structures were available to PRHA.\textsuperscript{20}

Also in 1965, President Johnson enhanced the importance of urban renewal efforts by creating a new Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which was overseen by a cabinet-level officer.\textsuperscript{21} This replaced the Federal Housing Administration
(FHA), and HUD became the major federal agency involved with the implementation of the two study projects.

Citing "the social and psychological effects of relocating the poor" in slum clearance projects, President Johnson sought a different approach with the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, a comprehensive, coordinated effort to solve the economic, physical and social problems of blighted areas. The federal government for the first time took an active role in saving neighborhoods' physical and social structures. As part of that effort, this became the first urban assistance program to require citizen participation of residents from the program's target areas. The creation of a Project Advisory Council (PAC) for Olde Towne and for Park View was an outgrowth of this movement towards greater citizen involvement in the revitalization process.

The Historic Preservation Act of 1966 enabled the Department of the Interior to work with the National Trust for Historic Preservation to create a Grants-in-Aid Program for rehabilitation in addition to loans in support of an urban renewal program with flexible guidelines. Because loans had to be in accordance with a comprehensive statewide preservation plan, this act encouraged the Commonwealth of Virginia to recognize Historic District designations through the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission. Most of the Olde Towne neighborhood became a state-recognized Historic District in 1970, and some of Park View became recognized by the state in 1984.
The Olde Towne and Park View conservation projects were created in 1968, just as the belief in large federally-funded programs to solve some national problems was being challenged in a national presidential election. Unprecedented internal conflict and violence,27 "the assassinations, Vietnam, the calamity of the Chicago Democratic Convention, the defeat of Hubert Humphrey [in the presidential campaign], all cut short the Great Society."28

Federal Programs from 1969 to 1977

For the next eight years (1969-1977), Republican Party presidents Richard M. Nixon and Gerald R. Ford capitalized on "a dissatisfaction with intrusive, bureaucratic, centralized government and a desire to build (or preserve), small, local communities...."29 In particular, "the Nixon and Ford administrations...emphasized the shift of authority from Washington to state and local governments through revenue sharing and block grants."30 A key element of President Nixon's New Federalism was the General Revenue Sharing (GRS) program begun by the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 to provide direct funding to local units with few "strings" attached.31

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 created the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program which replaced five "categorical" programs.32 Although perhaps best known for creating "Section 8" federally assisted housing payments, the act initiated a major departure from previous programs by making federal payments directly to state and local governments.33 The
overall significance of this act was that:

With the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, federal housing and neighborhood preservation strategy has come full circle. The responsibility for program development, for codes enforcement, for neighborhood preservation is local. Cities must prepare Housing Assistance and Community Development plans. The federal government provides funds but little policy direction. This represents a massive challenge to localities to implement those lessons that have been demonstrated....34

Funds provided by this act became the major funding source for the Olde Towne and Park View conservation projects from 1975 to the present.

**Federal Programs from 1977 to 1981**

Despite the Republican Party's themes of fiscal responsibility and local control, Watergate and other scandals led to the return of the presidency to a Democrat. However, this new president from the Democratic Party did not share the faith in large government programs which earlier Democrats had held:

Ford was ushered from office by a man who charged that the Republicans had, rhetoric notwithstanding, permitted the federal government to become bloated and inefficient. Jimmy Carter promised, by contrast, a new emphasis on local community. He insisted during the 1976 campaign that "our neighborhoods and families can succeed in solving problems where government will always fail," and the only way that we will ever put the government back in its place is to restore the family and neighborhood to their proper places.35

As an indicator of governmental growth, "by 1977 $1 out of every $6 spent by the federal government was a grant to a state or local
government, and grants had risen to equal 3.7 percent of the gross national product—two and a half times the ratio that existed at the beginning of the Great Society.\textsuperscript{36}

President Carter continued General Revenue Sharing, but the level of spending was reduced and provided direct payments to localities, "excluding the states as recipients."\textsuperscript{37} The Community Development Block Grant program continued, but it remained at modest levels. (See Table IV-1 on the next page for details of funding changes for both programs.)

A more direct impact from the Carter years resulted from a program which was not directed at revitalizing neighborhoods. The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973\textsuperscript{38} provided job-training for low-income or unemployed people. CETA workers were utilized to lay the brick sidewalks which were part of the public improvements made to Olde Towne in the late 1970s.

\textbf{Federal Programs from 1981 to 1993}

An unsettled national economy marked by slow wage growth, high inflation, rising federal taxes, and waning faith in government's ability to solve problems\textsuperscript{39} were among the factors which helped return the White House to the Republican Party when Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980. "The Reagan administration read this unsettled environment as one conducive to revolution rather than reform and proposed a radical New Federalism initiative"\textsuperscript{40} by curbing block grants and shifting service responsibilities from the federal government to the

\textsuperscript{70}
### TABLE IV-1

CHANGING FUNDING FOR GENERAL REVENUE SHARING AND FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, 1972 - 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>GENERAL REVENUE SHARING</th>
<th>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>6,636</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>6,106</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>6,130</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6,758</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>6,823</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>6,848</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>6,829</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5,137</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4,584</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All amounts are in millions of dollars.

**SOURCES:**
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states and localities. Some changes were dramatic:

The effort of New Federalism (and Reaganaomics) to reduce federal aid succeeded in achieving a static growth in grant outlays from 1981 to 1984, in reducing the number of grants to a little above 400 (from 537 in 1980) and in bringing the proportion of federal aid down to 20 percent of state and local revenues (the 1973 level).

When it came to funding programs, "Reagan then continued the trends under Carter, but with more flair, more force, and greater success." General Revenue Sharing funding was maintained for a while, but then it was discontinued. The Community Development Block Grant program survived at modest levels, and it remained the prime source of federal funding for neighborhood redevelopment activities throughout the Republican presidencies of Ronald Reagan (1981-1989) and George Bush (1989-1993). (See Table IV-1 on the previous page for data on funding levels for both programs.) No new federal programs affecting neighborhood conservation were initiated during this period for use in either Olde Towne or Park View.

Federal Neighborhood Conservation Projects

Federally neighborhood conservation projects were based on elements from a number of different federal programs. (See Figure IV-1 on the following two pages.) Changes in the Olde Towne and Park View conservation projects occurred within the context of shifting national priorities.

The massive expansion of large federal programs in the 1960s was reversed as the national government became less and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGISLATION/PROGRAMS</th>
<th>APPLICATION IN PORTSMOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING ACT of 1937</strong></td>
<td>*Creation of Portsmouth Housing Authority in 1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Authorized states to create Housing Authorities to provide public housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING ACT OF 1949</strong></td>
<td>*Change of name to the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority in 1949; start of Portsmouth's first urban renewal project (Lincolnsville), 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Authorized removal of structures in slum areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING ACT of 1954</strong></td>
<td>*Proposed for the &quot;Non Assisted Project&quot; in the Park View core area in 1967 but never approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Authorized issuance of relatively low-cost mortgage insurance [Section 220]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOUSING ACT of 1964</strong></td>
<td>*PRHA bought blighted properties in the Olde Towne and Park View Project areas and then sold them to private buyers to rehabilitate them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Authorized selling of property taken by government to private buyers for rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Allowed low-cost rehabilitation loans [Section 312]</td>
<td>*These loans were a central part of the planned rehabilitation of Olde Towne and Park View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT of 1964</strong></td>
<td>*Established an approach which later led to creating the Olde Towne and Park View Project Area Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Provided for formal access and &quot;maximum feasible participation&quot; of those covered by this federal program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOUSING ACT OF 1965
*Authorized grants to needy for rehabilitation [Section 115]
*Provided rehabilitation funds in both the Olde Towne and Park View Project areas

*Authorized federal funding to finance intensive enforcement of housing codes in selected areas
*Proposed for the core area of Park View and for the Mount Hermon Project in 1971 but never approved because the guidelines were changed to require program completion within a one-year period

HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT of 1966
*Created grants and loans for preserving historic structures to be saved in accordance with a comprehensive statewide preservation plan
*Spurred interest in historic designations, spurring new legislation in Virginia to create Historic Districts such as the one in Olde Towne

STATE AND FEDERAL LOCAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972
*Created General Revenue Sharing as a replacement for many existing programs to fund urban renewal
*Provided funding for the Olde Towne and Park View Conservation Projects

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT of 1974
*Created Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) to replace urban renewal funding programs
*Provided funding for the Olde Towne and Park View Conservation Projects
less involved in direct interventions during the 1970s and 1980s. A lasting legacy of the 1960s, however, was an increased focus on the neighborhood as a unit of focus and a greater emphasis on conserving neighborhood housing instead of clearing the land for other uses.

Most of the 1970s and 1980s federal "programs" affecting neighborhood change were primarily different ways of altering the funding procedures. Most types of funding were either eliminated, reduced in dollar amounts or, in the case of Community Development funds which remained fairly level for a long time, reduced in terms of the effects of inflation. Thus, cities and states have been faced with the need to finance their urban renewal activities with a smaller amount of federal financial assistance.

The recent record and the indication for the 1990s is that this trend of reduced national involvement will continue in response to philosophical and fiscal considerations. Although state and local governments will continue to have a need to conserve their urban neighborhoods, it is probable that they no longer will have the access to the large governmental funding that was available previously. A disenchantment with large governmental interventions means that

if Reagan's New Federalism is not the wave of the future, then a "federalism with a human face," or some other Democratic equivalent is. Both parties seem to be trying to address speech and action to the growing "small republic" sentiment, and they will probably continue for some time to come. What is least likely is a return--by either party--to
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the grand vision of the Great Society, with its
ringing affirmation of the centrality of the
federal government in American life.44

State and Local Programs before 1961

The Commonwealth of Virginia created at least two programs
before 1961 which affected at least one of the proposed study
neighborhoods. One authorized the creation of officially
designated historic sites, and another allowed the creation of
redevelopment and housing authorities.

State recognition of the importance of Virginia’s historical
heritage was promoted by the state’s Department of Transportation
between 1930 and 1961 when several State Historical Markers were
erected to mark the historic significance of some sites in Olde
towne. The presence of these recognized sites helped spur the
recognition of much of Olde Towne as a historic district during the
study period.45

The state of Virginia and the city of Portsmouth both worked
together to combat blighted neighborhood conditions in the New Deal
era by establishing the Portsmouth Housing Authority, the first
housing authority created in Virginia, which was formally chartered
on September 14, 1938.46 The organization became the Portsmouth
Redevelopment and Housing Authority in late 1949, a change which
"provided for redevelopment by private as well as public
enterprises."47 Although the Authority had been very active since
creating the first two housing projects in Virginia,48 there was
no emphasis on rehabilitation or
revitalization until planning for the first urban renewal project began in 1956.\textsuperscript{49}

\textbf{State and Local Programs from 1961 to the Present}

Renewal activities began with the Lincolnsville Project in 1960, a significant action because it marked the first clearance project in the city that could allow redevelopment to be followed by private investment rather than by the erection of public housing.\textsuperscript{50} It also was significant because it directed attention to the neighborhoods west (Park View) and east (Olde Towne) of this urban renewal project.

The Virginia legislature passed the Virginia Neighborhood Conservation Act of 1964 to allow spot-removal of blighted property rather than widespread demolition in urban renewal areas.\textsuperscript{51} The conservation plan for Olde Towne was presented in May of 1968\textsuperscript{52} and approved for funding by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in December of 1968,\textsuperscript{53} becoming the first federally-funded conservation project in Virginia.\textsuperscript{54} The Park View conservation plan was presented in June of 1968\textsuperscript{55} and also approved for HUD funding in December of 1968,\textsuperscript{56} making it the second such conservation project in Virginia.\textsuperscript{57} Without the passage of the 1964 law, neither federally funded neighborhood conservation project would have been possible.

The Virginia Historic Landmarks Act of 1966 created a commission with the power officially to recognize sites and structures with historic or architectural merit.\textsuperscript{58} Historic
districts were recognized by this commission in Olde Towne in 1970 and in Park View in 1984.

The Virginia Rental Rehabilitation Program (RRP) began in 1985, and it provided inexpensive loans for landlords to rehabilitate their properties.59 This provided a way of inducing owners of rental property to make improvements, and thus it has filled a need that was not met by earlier rehabilitation efforts that primarily benefitted homeowners.60

Before applying for state recognition, the city of Portsmouth had exercised its powers to create special zoning districts and established the Olde Towne neighborhood as a locally designated Historic District in 1968,61 and it created a Commission of Architectural Review (CAR) in order to help maintain high standards for the external appearances of dwellings in the Olde Towne Historic District.62 It was not until April of 1984 that a portion of Park View was included in a historic district supervised by the CAR.

The city also continued to utilize its powers to establish and enforce minimum housing codes. Because this approach depends upon case-by-case violations being reported, Ahlbrant and Brophy have noted that it tends to be severely limited in practice but:

Despite these shortcomings, adequate codes and enforcement machinery must serve as the basis for any neighborhood preservation strategy. The codes are the standard and the areawide enforcement machinery is the stick required to bring owners in compliance with the standard.63
To overcome some of the limits, the city turned to the federally-funded conservation projects which seemed to offer housing standards higher than the "minimum" ones required by the city, an inspection program that was systematic and focused on the target project neighborhoods, and a source of funding to increase the financial capabilities of residents in Olde Towne and Park View so that they could rehabilitate their properties.

To pay for its one-third share of the cost of undertaking the neighborhood conservation projects, the city of Portsmouth primarily contributed Capital Investment Program (CIP) projects instead of disbursing cash to HUD. Annual CIP outlays financed such things as parking lots and flood-control in Olde Towne, playgrounds in Park View, and improvements to streets and curbs in both neighborhoods. Exact improvements to be undertaken were specified in the Project Expenditures Budget for each conservation project.

Theoretical Foundations of Conservation Projects

The projects in this study were based on the "carrot" of low-cost loans and the "stick" of code enforcement for the higher housing standards set for the neighborhood conservation projects. The Section 312 loans charged a low interest rate in order to induce "the invisible hand" to promote revitalization by making renovation more financially attractive. The increased code enforcement reduced the benefits of maintaining substandard properties by increasing the costs (whether imposed as fines or
extracted by confiscation of nonconforming property after the year-
and-a-day waiting period imposed by Virginia law). The two
programs thus increased the utility of rehabilitating property
while decreasing the utility of maintaining substandard property.
In theory, the "invisible hand" of economic incentives and
disincentives would promote neighborhood conservation in the two
project areas.

Since one of the factors which affects implementation success
is the level of technical difficulties, this analysis of the
underlying theory shows that the neighborhood conservation projects
were marked by a minimal level of technical difficulties since they
were based on the very simple "technologies" of providing low-cost
loans and conducting housing inspections. Furthermore, both the
underlying theory and the enabling legislation target housing
quality as the primary focus for governmental interventions.

The changing federal, state, and local roles provide the
context within which the Olde Towne and Park View conservation
projects were implemented. Changes in priorities and resource
allocation at the federal level may help account for variations in
the implementation experience. With an understanding of the
legislative and theoretical foundations of the projects, the record
of their implementation experiences can be assessed more
meaningfully.
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CHAPTER V

IMPLEMENTING THE CONSERVATION PROJECTS, 1956-1970

Urban Renewal Begins, 1956-1960

Following the August 24, 1956 special meeting of the Planning Commission when Planning Director Paul S. Dulaney outlined "an approach to planning for urban renewal" for eight Portsmouth areas, the City Council formally requested the Planning Commission to "make a preliminary report and analysis of the blighted areas in the City of Portsmouth." Subsequently, "it was the consensus of Council that the Planning Commission should carry this study further and make a recommendation setting forth the priority among the eight areas." In October, the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council request the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority (PRHA) "to submit an application for a planning advance looking toward an urban renewal project" first for what would become known as the Lincolnville Project and second for an area that included much of the old northeastern part of the city.

In February of 1957, the City Council endorsed a PRHA resolution requesting federal funds to design the Lincolnville project. Providing technical data slowed the process, but a consultant was hired in the fall and the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA) approved the application in December.
Meanwhile, the Planning Commission had been "requested to submit a second priority to be considered for urban renewal funds—this priority to be broken into sub-priorities that the Council may consider the same." It responded that it could not set immediate priorities due to the necessity of developing a comprehensive cost-benefit approach that considered the likely impacts of the interstate highway and mid-town tunnel to Norfolk which were being planned.

Three other factors helped delay pursuing additional urban renewal projects in the late 1950s. First, Paul Dulaney, the Director of City Planning who had envisioned the new urban renewal projects, resigned in February of 1958 to teach at the University of Virginia, and the position was not refilled until late 1960. Second, the city's increasing deficit hindered financing its share of more projects "if a second application is made before the Lincolnville urban renewal [project] was underway. Third, HHFA's new funding requirements increased the burden on the small Planning Department, reducing the time available to work on new projects.

A supporter for urban renewal took office in the fall of 1958 as the retiring City Manager was succeeded by Aubrey P. Johnson, Jr. At that time, though, the City Council members were bitterly divided over urban renewal due to concerns over the federal influence which would accompany funding. One council-man observed later that there was "a cold war in Portsmouth."
The war of words heated up at the first public hearing on the Lincolnsville Project, but the argument that the project would "help rejuvenate downtown and Park View" and the announcement by PRHA Executive Director Balzer that the funds reserved for federal urban renewal had just been increased by $170,000 for "an appropriate school facility extension" in Park View were among the factors that prompted City Council approval of the project in late 1959.

Work began promptly. Despite an administrative change in April of 1960 as George W. Price Jr. succeeded Donald Balzer as PRHA Executive Director, demolition in Lincolnsville had begun by August of 1960. After a suit by Lincolnsville residents and landlords to stop the project was lost by them in September, the clearance of housing continued.

At the city Planning Department, work with consultants continued on a new comprehensive Master Plan. No further urban renewal efforts were started until J. Brewer Moore became Planning Director on November 1, 1960.

Conservation Planning Begins, 1960-1964

In its June 1960 "Declaration of Workable Program Policy," the City Council had noted that:

Urban renewal activity will intensify during the 1960s. Possibilities of a general neighborhood conservation program to supplement the Lincolnsville redevelopment project for that historic waterfront section, in which, incidentally, is situated the U.S. Naval Hospital and upon which abuts the new City Hall and municipal stadium are under investigation.
That fall, City Council passed a formal resolution "for the elimination of and prevention of slums and blight."\footnote{30}

In November of 1960, the new Planning Director went to Philadelphia to discuss the programs and possibilities for neighborhood renewal with the Urban Renewal Administration,\footnote{31} and this meeting reinforced Moore's commitment to using a federally-funded planning program which would cover the older, northeastern part of Portsmouth.\footnote{32} December was marked by two Planning Commission meetings in which the Park View General Neighborhood Renewal Plan (GNRP) proposal was considered as the "basis for central city renewal."\footnote{33} It also was presented to residents of the affected areas\footnote{34} before it was disclosed to the general public.

In late January of 1961, Planning Commission Chairman W. T. Goode, Jr. noted that it was "important to the entire city...that the Lincolnsville urban renewal project not be surrounded by blighted areas," and he unveiled the 300-acre Park View General Neighborhood Renewal Plan (GNRP).\footnote{35} Although named the Park View GNRP, it covered Park View, the downtown area north of High Street, and much of the oldest residential part of the city, a section which Planning Director Moore designated as the "Olde Towne" neighborhood.\footnote{36}

Just hours before the Planning Commission was to vote on the proposal in February of 1961, a telegram from President John F. Kennedy was delivered to Portsmouth Mayor R. Irvine Smith. President Kennedy urged the adoption of the plan:
Our efforts to improve the employment situation can be helped considerably by increased urban renewal activity.

I have directed the Housing and Home Finance officials in Washington DC [sic] and in regional offices to eliminate all delay and to cooperate with local authorities in beginning construction of these programs at the earliest possible time and in maintaining steady efforts to complete them.

After a high-level meeting "to discuss the next local urban renewal undertaking," the Planning Commission then "unanimously agreed to recommend GNRP to City Council as [the] #1 [sic] step in central city renewal." Despite this recommendation and the unprecedented presidential message of support and the endorsement of the Planning Commission, the City Council deferred action until after a conference with the City Attorney could be arranged. Meanwhile, the Downtown Portsmouth Association endorsed the GNRP proposal.

When the GNRP proposal was presented at the March 14, 1961, City Council meeting, a representative of the Chamber of Commerce joined a number of Park View residents in speaking for it. The proposal passed its first reading with the only dissenting vote being cast by Councilman George Walker.

At the second reading Councilman Walker charged that proponents had been manipulated to support a program which, like Lincolnville, would lead to another round of seizures of land and property...to another round of heartbreaks for those old, those retired and those unable to chart an effective defense of their rights, to another round of speculation and investment of public funds sorely needed for public service and facilities which is the prime responsibility of an American government, and eventually, as certain as
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night follows day, to another Ghetto of Federal slave quarters to house the displaced persons....

However, "the council said the planning stage won't compel acceptance of any plan, that the degree of revitalization necessary depends on the extent of blight, that the people would make their own mortgage loan arrangements, and that the plan is not a clearance program." George Eastes, President of the 300-member Park View Improvement League, testified that the program had been endorsed with no dissent at a meeting with over 100 members present. The resolution passed on its second reading with only the vote of Councilman Walker in opposition. City Manager Johnson later noted that the GNRP proposal "had experienced local opposition, but it was in no way comparable" to opposition of the Lincolnsville Project and that "fully answered questions at a City Council public hearing prompted many opponents to change their opinions openly and support the program."

After PRHA formally received the "Parkview GNRP" ordinance on May 2, 1961, along with Mayor Smith's notation that "it is the desire of the City Council that the Housing Authority expedite this program as quickly as possible," PRHA speedily approved the application. Later that month, the consulting firm of Harland Bartholomew & Associates was selected to help prepare the GNRP proposal, and the application to fund initial planning of the project was completed in June after reworking it to meet federal requirements for three technical amendments.
That summer of progress and cooperation was brought to a halt when HHFA refused the application for the Park View GNRP in August of 1961. Because the proposed GNRP area covered included a large area that was not severely blighted, the HHFA "suggested the city seek a non-assisted project for the area north of Ann St. and resubmit the balance...for federal renewal assistance" for the Park View neighborhood. Mayor R. Irvine Smith observed that "the whole area will be a slum in five years if something isn’t done," and action was taken by submitting a new application in late September which split the neighborhood into two differing treatment areas just as HHFA suggested. In discussing the failed original application, however, it was revealed that federal officials had informally encouraged the approach and that neither the city manager nor the city attorney saw copies of the application before it was submitted by PRHA. When PRHA Executive Director Price stated that "we thought the Planning Commission was set on having" the GNRP cover so large an area and suggested that placing blame was pointless, the Mayor responded that "I don’t think this is water over the dam....I think you should have known how to present it."

PRHA began preparing a new application for the Park View neighborhood’s blighted section while the city began the work of applying for a Non-Assisted Project that would be accompanied by increased city inspections of housing codes and federal [Section 220] mortgage certificates. By late December, the Urban Renewal Administration’s Housing and Home Finance Agency approved
a $29,000 grant for preliminary planning which was to be conducted by PRHA as the "Local Public Agency" (LPA) to oversee the project as assisted by the firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates, which had accepted the contract to prepare a "Northside General Neighborhood Renewal Plan." By the time of making its 1960-61 annual report, the Portsmouth Planning Commission had adopted plans calling for the renewal of the city's commercial downtown area in addition to its "PARKVIEW plan covering the restoration of values in a 'high density-high value' downtown neighborhood." Planning Commission Chairman Goode noted that:

Lacking resources to develop a local pilot project neighborhood conservation program, the City has turned to Federal aid and outside consultants; whose labors will permit local technicians to synthesize residual policies and plans pertinent to our central business district, waterfront, and civic center. Our staff is ready to work with Harland Bartholomew's technicians as soon as the "GNRP" studies are launched by the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority.

During the time when this new approach was being developed President Kennedy was speaking of increased aid to cities, and locally "everyone felt that the Planning Commission must take out time to acquaint itself fully with the Urban Renewal Program which seems destined to expand nationally if President Kennedy's proposals are adopted by Congress." The Lincolnsville Project—which had now been renamed the Fort Nelson Project—was 99% complete, and new plans were discussed for redeveloping the southeastern area of the city and for widening Effingham Street.
In February of 1962, City Planning Director Moore "noted that the [Northside] GNRP effort was about to be launched and promised to pursue the matter vigorously so that the Planning Commission could fulfill its promises made to City council when the GNRP was first proposed a year ago."

In March, the Planning Commission communicating to PRHA "reminding them of the year-old agreement on how the Northside General Neighborhood Renewal Plan would be prepared." As more time passed without the production of a plan:

The Planning Director reported that he had met with Mr. J. Ross of Harland Bartholomew & Associates to discuss the current status of GNRP activities. He reported that Mr. Ross said the GNRP studies to date had been confined to certain building and population surveys and that the consultant firm would soon be engaged in the study itself. Mr. Ross had requested and received a vast amount of material compiled by the Planning Commission staff. The Planning Director remarked that he hoped the availability of this material would enable the consultants to spend more time on outlining various proposals than gathering basic data.

At a special meeting on April 12, 1962, Mr. Fred Robinson of the consulting firm met with the commission members and with observers from each of seven citizens' organizations. Unfortunately the meeting was not open to the public and no minutes were kept, but "it was again agreed that no further action would be taken until another similar conference could be arranged sometime in late June or early July."

During this break in the efforts to establish a federally funded project, progress seemed to be being made on getting help for the unblighted core area of Park View which had been eliminated from that project. At the May 4th Planning Commission meeting, it was announced that
City Attorney Korb is now preparing the Parkview Non-Assisted Project Application and that work was nearly complete on the base map needed for this undertaking. He stated that it now appears probable that the Planning Commission will be able to review this application at its July meeting so that the Council may follow through later in the month prior to receiving GNRP proposals the following month.76

In the following month, the Northside GNRP was extended "thus including all High Street frontage from Effingham Street west to the Portsmouth Stadium at Williamsburg Avenue to the GNRP area,"77 and the promised summer meeting on GNRP plans was set for June 29, 1962.78 As the year of 1962 drew to a close, the promised mid-year plan for the Park View Non-Assisted Project for the core area had not been completed although "City Attorney Michael Korb has been working on this matter and studying the Ghent effort in Norfolk. He stated that the city would be able to file a report on this area when City Council took formal action on the General Neighborhood Renewal Plan."79 The plan was received by the Planning Commission from PRHA on December 18th, and it empowered the Planning Director to hold hearings "if the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the Urban Renewal Administration can reach general agreement on this Northside General Neighborhood Renewal Plan."80

Planning Director Moore and City Manager Johnson in late 1962 developed "Colonel Crawford Common":

a modernized retail commercial area bounded by Crawford, London, Effingham, and County Streets, a Community Civic Center on the waterfront east of Crawford Street, a restored "Olde Towne" north of London Street in the Northside General Neighborhood Renewal Plan, supporting
commercial areas south of County Street, and a primary heavy commercial-light industrial area west of Effingham Street between High Street and the London-Glasgow Highway in the Northside GNRP area.81

To complement the work in the Northside GNRP, "Operation Amidships" was originated in early 1963 for the southeastern portion of the city bounded by the Naval Shipyard and the new interstate I-64 complex.82 Planning continued on the north-south thoroughfare,83 and hearings were held in March of 1963 on that plan to widen and extend Effingham Street.84 A sense of urgency for urban renewal projects was engendered by the dismissal of Portsmouth's annexation suit of the Western Branch section of what was formerly Norfolk County, and this prompted an editorial in the Ledger-Star which observed that "there is no question that Portsmouth has reached a moment of decision unlike any it has encountered"85 now that it was "pretty well sealed within"86 its borders. Despite this concern, the city had still not applied for federal certification of the non-blighted core area of Park View as a non-assisted conservation area.87

At the June 18, 1963, Planning Commission hearings on the proposed Northside GNRP proposal, the plan was supported by most Park View88 and Olde Towne89 residents, but the proposed widening and merging parts of London and Glasgow Streets into a new east-west expressway 90 raised objections about the displacement which it would cause.91 The GNRP proposal was passed unanimously at that June 18th meeting by the Planning Commission92 and subsequently by the City Council that same day,93 but it was not until August 18, 1963, that the City Council applied for federal planning funds.94
Among other things, the enabling resolution designated PRHA as "Local Public Agency" and delegated some tasks to the city. An appended memorandum discussed plans for the Park View core area.

By September of 1963, the Northside GNRP was refined into five urban renewal projects, including two conservation and rehabilitation areas: Project Four (100.4 acres of Park View including both the "core" and "non-assisted" areas) and Project Five (29.6 acres west of Middle Street, which excluded "several graceful homes" that had been placed in Project Number Two for demolition). The conservation projects were given the lowest priority because existing Virginia law allowed only block-by-block bulldozing of blighted housing.

At about the same time that these proposed boundaries were announced, the report by the consulting firm of Harland Bartholomew & Associates was released which suggested that "preliminary investigation of the Eastern area [of the Northside GNRP] confirms...that the concentration of historic or architectural interest offers a priceless opportunity to retain, exhibit and effectively use an authentic representation of old Portsmouth" by creating a special historic area that "in many respects follows the plan now underway by the Portsmouth Historical Association."

Two indicators of internal strains caused by the planning process for a GNRP became evident in 1963. First, tension between the city and PRHA became evident when Planning Director Moore
attended a two-week course at Yale University and "said that the Planning Department has stuck its neck out for the GNRP when the Housing Authority and its consultant advised against it" but that people at the course believed it was the best approach and had been "shocked" that urban renewal activities in Portsmouth were the responsibility of the Planning Department. Second, the difficulties of completing paperwork to satisfy federal requirements and continue with the GNRP project seem to have been a hindrance to quick accomplishment of the project because in a November meeting "the Planning Director noted that it has been impossible to obtain to date certain preapplication approvals from the FHA-URA, but he would have an application ready for City Council consideration as early as possible."

Hopes for a city-directed Northside GNRP which included both the blighted and non-blighted areas of Park View in its Project Number Four were dashed by HHFA representatives that met with PRHA and City representatives during a special conference in February of 1964:

This program serves a narrower function than envisioned by Portsmouth; "only thing a GNRP does is to safeguard your non-cash credits over a longer period of time." Messrs. Gallagher and Levin saw no relationship between a GNRP and Workable Program element "Neighborhood Analysis." Mr. Levin reiterated a URA view that localities are discouraged from GNRP undertakings.

Moreover, "Mr. Gallagher said he would report back in writing on why a GNRP cannot include a Non-Assisted Urban Renewal Project" such as the one for the Park View core area.
Further bad news for city plans was disclosed at the same conference. In a discussion of "conservation; assisted, non-assisted or otherwise," the visiting officials noted that:

Assisted conservation is currently out of the question in Virginia because of State law deficiencies.... Eligibility of GNRP and Proposed Title I Project I were discussed with doubts expressed that either could qualify as a blighted area.\(^{107}\)

Later Conservation Plans, 1964-1966

Barely a month passed from that time until the passage of the Virginia Neighborhood Conservation Bill of 1964 recognized that fighting blight served the public welfare and allowed localities which had adopted a "Conservation Plan" to acquire, rehabilitate, clear properties, to make acquired properties available to the public or private sector, to make public improvements, and to assist property owners in the conservation area.\(^{108}\) In late October, the City Council employed the new Virginia law by unanimously approving both the Park View (Project #4) and Olde Towne (Project #5) GNRP conservation projects,\(^{109}\) and in November of 1964 the City Council authorized PRHA to proceed with a feasibility study for the projects.\(^{110}\) Although PRHA Executive Director Price said that the two areas needed new studies before applications for federal funding could be submitted and that he was "unable to say how long they will take,"\(^{111}\) the report was presented just a few months later at the March 9, 1965 City Council meeting.\(^{112}\) Following a motion by Councilman Dillon, the Council unanimously passed this:
resolution determining that a portion of the City of Portsmouth located near Scotts Creek, is deteriorating and may be eligible for conservation and requesting Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority to investigate such portion of the city and, if conservation of any eligible area therein is deemed by said authority to be feasible, to prepare a conservation plan therefor.\textsuperscript{113}

Immediately afterwards and as part of the same order of business, the City Council again unanimously passed a similar motion which was put forward by Councilman Jack Barnes\textsuperscript{114} authorizing the preparation of a conservation plan by PRHA for Olde Towne.\textsuperscript{115}

The action of the city council in April of 1965 authorizing PRHA to submit the two plans for federal approval drew unexpected criticism from R. T. Etheridge, President of the Park View Improvement League, who argued that adopting a plan for Park View that excluded the core area "would merely perpetuate the mistakes that had its origin in the ill-conceived non-assisted project."\textsuperscript{116} City Manager Johnson defended the "non-assisted" approach by noting that although FHA approval had not been obtained the city was "hopeful and approval may yet come."\textsuperscript{117} In response to Mr. Etheridge's requests that no action be taken that night, that the League be allowed to examine the plan before a federal application was made, and that the League be allowed to discuss the plan before final action, the City Council agreed to allow the League to see and discuss the plan subsequently but also authorized PRHA to go ahead with the application—"which means the league chances of influencing decision on the application are practically nonexistent."\textsuperscript{118}
Olde Towne Historic District, 1964-1965

Although Park View citizens were not successful in extending the proposed project area to include the core area or in otherwise amending it, citizens in Olde Towne were successful in extending their proposed project area in part because of efforts made earlier in the decade. The Portsmouth Historical Association’s commissioned survey of historic homes by Professor O’Neal in 1963, the September 1963 suggestion by consultants calling for a historic district, and a subsequent symposium by experts on historic architecture had created a raised awareness of historic structures in Olde Towne. More direct influence was exerted by the actions of the Historic Association and its associated Portsmouth Historic Foundation (formed to hold property) both insofar as they spurred the formation of the Olde Towne Corporation which restored a historic nineteenth century home and as they acted to assure that Olde Towne should be established with specific emphasis on its historic heritage and distinctive character.

When a new zoning district was being considered by the City in April of 1964, the Portsmouth Historic Foundation opposed removing the residential zoning designation from historic homes in the 400 block of Crawford Street because "the pilot block is essential to the overall plan for the preservation of Old Town" and because of the economic potential of preserving the area as a tourist attraction. Further efforts to save these homes and additional ones nearby on London Street resulted in a Waterfront
W-1 District which did not include the historic homes. Having preserved the homes in the short term, new efforts were undertaken to preserve them in the long term by including them in the proposed project area.

In response to the fall 1965 publication of the original plans for revitalization efforts in Park View (Project 4) and Olde Towne (Project 5), the chairman of the Portsmouth Historic Foundation wrote to the city manager that:

Project 5 includes the area our Corporation feels should be designated as a "Historic Zone".... It has been noted, however, that Project 5 as originally proposed did not include the area bounded by London St. on the South, Water St. on the east, Glasgow St. on the north and Middle St. on the west and we feel this area must be included in any future conservation or historic restoration area.

Additionally, he noted that the homes in the 400 blocks of London and Court Street should be preserved "in the opinion of the Portsmouth Historical Association and the members of this Corporation." Following presentation of this letter to the Planning Commission, the Planning Director "was directed to show on a...map all of the structures deemed worthy of preservation by the Portsmouth Historical Society."

Additional efforts to promote the historical nature of Olde Towne were made the following month when "a copy of the Historical Association's Preservation Committee Report, dated 30 April 1963 for use by the Planning Commission in preparing a map identifying all those houses in the City reviewed by our Committee and its consultant" was sent to the city. A copy of the resulting "Historic Inventory" map sent in reply elicited a response from
John Paul Hanbury to correct some errors and to observe that:

The only other thing which should be noted at this point is the Foundation’s interest in several other houses which are not necessarily of great age, or historic and/or architectural importance or merit. They do, however, serve as "street furniture" and serve to give the area its own distinctive character. A primary interest in the properties listed in the "Heritage Inventory" does not preclude an interest in the total impression created in this section of the City. Too many demolitions of buildings, I fear, will create many holes which could destroy this impression. I think the variety of architectural styles herein represented in this section accounts to a large measure for the area’s charm.  

The result of these efforts was not only to have historic sites recognized but to have the proposed Olde Towne project area extended to include homes which had formerly been marked for clearance in the Northside GNRP Project Number Two.

Change and Controversy, 1965-1966

Despite the April, 1965, resignation by PRHA Commissioner Seaborne Flournoy in protest of "absurd" government rules, initial signs were that PRHA was getting along well with URA and city officials. In July of 1965, PRHA Executive Director Price reported that URA funding was available and praised Mayor R. Irvine Smith for his lobbying the Legislature to change Virginia law to allow the conservation projects.

In the meanwhile, the consulting firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates was preparing the two conservation plans. The first plan was revealed with great fanfare at the press conference called on July 19, 1966, when it was announced that Northside
Number Five—the Olde Towne Conservation Project—could go into execution in early 1967. Fifty-eight structures were to be eliminated for playgrounds and off-street parking, parts of Dinwiddie, Middle, Court, and Glasgow streets would be transformed into pedestrian thorough-fares, and access to homes would be made through the rear of structures "as is the case in historic Williamsburg." Waverly Boulevard would be eliminated, and London Boulevard would be widened into a two-way facility—causing the destruction of six historic homes on its south side. The limits of government authority were noted, and historic zoning district was suggested by the consultants:

Mr. Siff said the Redevelopment Authority can only exercise control in this urban renewal area over properties it acquires. He said he did not want two levels of control and the plan would recommend a new zoning district along the lines outlined in the Colonel Crawford Common report. He said this zoning district would be unique because what might be a blighting influence elsewhere, in Portsmouth could actually be a blessing in this area. Messrs. Siff and Leasles said this new zoning scheme would be forwarded to the Planning Commission for action and that the City’s best interests would be served by enactment and enforcement of this new district at an early date. Mr. Siff agreed with Mr. Goode that the letter of transmittal would contain references to successful historic zoning district programs elsewhere. He said all Harland and Bartholomew and Associates’ research on the subject to date would be included.

In response to a question, the consultants agreed that minimum housing code enforcement would not help at this time, but that a combination of new standards and 3½ FHA loans would stimulate overall improvement.
Amid the excitement over the released plan, however, came the
disclosure that the plan had been shown to citizens’ groups and to
the Planning Commission but no copy of the plan had been released
by PRHA.\textsuperscript{142} City Council unanimously directed PRHA to give copies
of the Olde Towne plans to the Planning Commission and complained
that the Council itself had not seen the site plans for Olde
Towne.\textsuperscript{143} When later asked if he would provide copies to the
city, PRHA Executive Director Price’s reply of “no comment”\textsuperscript{144}
prompted an editorial which observed that:

Legally, it seems the authority [PRHA] is not required
to consult with the Planning Department, which may well
be an oversight. But legal compulsion should not be
necessary in the first place. On any given point,
planners and renewers may not always see eye to eye;
but they ought in any case to be able to get their
heads together.\textsuperscript{145}

Dissatisfaction with PRHA’s handling of the GNRP planning
increased. In September of 1966, the Park View Improvement League
complained that only the outlines of the plan for Project Number
Four (i.e., Park View) had been shown,\textsuperscript{146} as “privately councilmen
have said they were unhappy over the slow progress in the Northside
urban renewal project.”\textsuperscript{147}

A boost to the proposed revitalization effort was the release
of the feasibility study which was completed October 3, 1966. The
consulting firm found found that:

The Project Area lends itself nicely to
conservation. Many of the owner-occupants of
residences in the Project Area are interested
in preserving Olde Towne which has been their
home for many years. These persons, although
enjoying lower than average incomes, do not
have the obligations of many young families, and
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can finance renovation. Two conditions should be noted, however: (1) The prescribed minimum standards for renovating the homes must be reasonable and (2) some of the persons need the special financial helps available through the Redevelopment and Housing Authority.148

Demand for Housing in the Project Area is strong. If judgment could be made solely on the basis of occupancy rates, it must be concluded that a very strong demand exists for housing in this area....

Renovation of a number of the old homes in the Project Area has sparked a great deal of interest in the Area on the part of young (and older) couples who are employed near the area or who prefer the convenience of downtown living to suburbia.149

Because of the interest in apartment living in the Area, it is felt that if land parcels result from clearance large enough to support multi-family structures, such land should be devoted to that use, provided the need for playground or small-park space is also met. Demand is also strong for parcels for construction of single family residences.150

As the year drew to a close PRHA produced A Decade of Renewal Progress, 1956-1966,151 which showed its successes in managing six major projects. PRHA had acquired 184 parcels for the London-Glasgow Expressway, planned to submit the request for funds for survey and planning in January of 1967152 and hoped "the Olde Towne and Park View conservation programs will be in the execution stage by spring [of 1967]."153

Zoning Problems, 1966-1967

Rehabilitation standards for Park View property were prepared in February of 1967,154 but the difficulty of establishing appropriate standards for the Olde Towne project and its historic district came to the forefront in March. PRHA Conservation
Director John Winters discussed problems with the Planning Commission, and a proposed revised zoning ordinance that had been prepared by Harland Bartholomew and Associates was "discussed at length." Authorization to hold hearings was granted once the PRHA and City Attorney were in agreement. When the public hearing on the ordinance was held on May 2nd, an irregularity of not having the proposal available for inspection resulted in the matter being postponed until the public could consider the language.

Further action was delayed, however, as other considerations arose. For instance, the Planning Department requested clarification on how PRHA "intended to proceed in the matter of upgrading Olde Towne areas not be included in the historic district." Also, other areas within the city were now being considered for historic district status and there was planning for a Commission of Architectural Review to help administer this broader base of historic districts.

On September 5th, the Planning Commission approved the PRHA petition to establish historic zoning in Olde Towne by changing the designation from R-60-A to R-60. The Historic District was authorized officially on October 24, 1967 when the City Council unanimously passed "an ordinance to amend the zoning ordinance of the city of Portsmouth, 1961, by adding thereto a new article numbered 9, establishing a historic zoning district, creating a commission of architectural review there-fore, establishing building and parking regulations for said district and regulating
the use and occupancy of property located in such a district"\textsuperscript{162}
and the ordinance became effective in November of 1967.\textsuperscript{163} The
Committee of Architectural Review was established to deal solely
with structures located in the Olde Towne Historic District,\textsuperscript{164}
and five commission members were appointed in May of 1968.\textsuperscript{165}
Technical standards for property rehabilitation were published.\textsuperscript{166}

\textbf{Optimistic Beginnings, 1967-1970}

"The Park View Conservation Project was launched officially
Wednesday with the filing of an application for urban renewal
funds"\textsuperscript{167} for Part I (Survey and planning) of the project,
announced PRHA Executive Director Price as one of his last major
duties in August of 1967. "Dissatisfaction with the progress of
Portsmouth's urban renewal projects apparently led City Council to
ask for the resignation of George W. Price, Jr., as Executive
Director of PRHA\textsuperscript{168} in September.

The Olde Towne Conservation Project got a boost from HUD in
early 1968 as it approved the Part I application for $4.25 million
for surveying and planning.\textsuperscript{169} A newspaper writer observed that
"indeed, Federal aid will accentuate a revival which has already
seen property values triple in ten years"\textsuperscript{170} in the Olde Towne
neighborhood.

On May 14, 1968, the City Council approved without dissent the
cooperative agreement with PRHA to administer the Olde Towne
Conservation Project, VA-R-49 (Plate V-1 on the next page).\textsuperscript{171}
NOTE: The "core" section of Park View is the area within the "C" shaped project area that was excluded from the conservation project.

SOURCE: Conservation Plan for Park View Conservation Project (Portsmouth VA: Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority, June 1968), unpaginated exhibit.
On June 25, 1968, a similar cooperative agreement with PRHA was signed to administer the Park View Conservation Project, VA-R-48 (Plate V-2 on the previous page).\textsuperscript{172}

In September, Leo V. Shocklin succeeded PRHA Chairman Euclid M. Hanbury.\textsuperscript{173} In October, the news was released that funding of $2.2 million for the Olde Towne Neighborhood Conservation Project had been approved by HUD, and it was announced that a Project Area Office was being established at 435 Court Street in anticipation of beginning operations officially at the start of 1969.\textsuperscript{174} In December of 1968, a similar announcement of $2.89 million for the Park View Neighborhood Conservation Project was made, making it "the second of only two such projects approved in Virginia under enabling legislation passed in 1966 by the General Assembly."\textsuperscript{175} Although the operation of an office on North Street was begun that December, the beginning of operations was slowed because the Loan and Grant contract which freed funds for operations was not signed until June of the next year.\textsuperscript{176}

In late 1968, the residents of the conservation projects were helped to start their Project Area Committees (PACs), created "to have a two-way channel of information between the community and the Housing Authority as a means of effectively involving citizens in the development and execution of policies and programs necessary in carrying out conservation and programs in the project area...."\textsuperscript{177} When a late 1968 response to HUD's inquiry about how Park View PAC members were chosen was questioned,\textsuperscript{178} PRHA responded to HUD in early 1969:
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In accordance with the LPA letter 458, a PAC Committee was formed in Parkview....

The Parkview Citizens Committee now numbers sixteen and is an integrated committee which contains a cross-representation of income and employment groups. Two members will be displaced, and yet they are willing to serve on the Committee and support the Parkview project....

The Committee is "open-end" in the sense that it is unstructured and thus free to pursue any programs that it believes are needed in Parkview. The PAC Committee has already indicated that they will be in opposition to some aspects of the plan. However, the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority welcomes this form of constructive criticism as it makes the Authority more responsive to the needs of the citizens of the project area.179

The recently appointed new Executive Director of PRHA, Caroll A. Mason, Jr., began 1969 with pronouncements meant to heal the rift between PRHA and both the city council members and the residents of the two conservation neighborhoods. He said that he considered PRHA to be "another branch of city government" and asserted that if City Manager Aubrey Johnson would offer him an office near Johnson's that that's where he would like to be.180 He praised Olde Towne as "the glamour project" because of its distinctive architecture and promised Park View residents that "we want to get something started because in a conservation project such as this it is important for people to see progress."181 Former City Manager Johnson recalls that relations between PRHA and the city immediately improved, and this close working relationship lasted for some time.182

Federal funding of $96,000 was received in January of 1969 for appraisals and title searches in Olde Towne, and the city's Committee of Architectural Review soon walked the area to identify
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significant structures to be saved from demolition and made review for such significance part of the process needed in order for a Certificate of Appropriateness for undertaking action to be granted. Action seemed to be forthcoming as the PRHA Conservation Coordinator announced that inspections of housing for Olde Towne would begin in late March of 1970.

Optimism was heightened by residents' interest in the two conservation project neighborhoods. In July of 1969, the first 3%, 20-year Section 312 loan was being processed for a home in Olde Towne where "a young couple bought the house on Glasgow Street in anticipation of the Olde Towne project," and eight more loan applications were being processed and there was more demand for property than available homes could supply. Although final approval by HUD for the Park View project had not been received yet, it was expected by early November and PRHA began processing a loan application for a Holladay Street home in Park View. Unfortunately, by late October HUD had no more money available for such loans and new funding by Congress was needed before new loans could be made.

At the meeting of the newly formed "Park View Citizens Committee" (the Project Area Committee), a remark that morale in the Park View area was at an all-time low prompted PRHA assistant director Arthur G. Meginley, Jr. to say that "it is true that an unusual amount of time has been required to decide on the funding and approval of the Park View Conservation Project" but now
gradual progress would be seen as work began on the waterfront park, marina, recreation area, and other amenities.\textsuperscript{189}

Staffing had increased at the Park View site office on North Street since it was opened in December of 1968, and by the end of 1969 there was a Clerk Typist, a new Conservation Officer, and a Cost Estimator and Financial Advisor on hand.\textsuperscript{190} In January of 1970, a Cost Estimator and Financial Advisor were hired and began their training.\textsuperscript{191} Although a broken heating system caused a slight delay,\textsuperscript{192} the staff moved to the new permanent site office at 1217 Ann Street in February.\textsuperscript{193}

By contrast the Olde Towne project office had opened on Court Street in October of 1968, and its Loan and Grant contract had been signed in December of 1968.\textsuperscript{194} Its staff was trained and began work during 1969. While 28 inspections of buildings were conducted in Olde Towne in 1969, none were conducted in Park View.\textsuperscript{195} Although there would be 84 inspections in Park View in 1970 and only 45 in Olde Towne,\textsuperscript{196} the Olde Towne project began showing signs of progress before the Park View project did.

**Conflict over Zoning, 1969-1970**

Although initial difficulties of beginning the federal program were resolved by the end of 1969, implementation problems at the local level continued to occur. A clash over the rules regulating the new conservation areas versus those envisioned by the city code developed involved city and PRHA officials in conflicts from 1969 through 1970.
A proposal to redefine single-family dwellings was defeated by the Planning Commission because "of the degree of non-conformity which its approval would create in areas such as Park View, Olde Towne, Prentis Park, and Port Norfolk." Consideration of allowing greater densities spurred John Winters, Coordinator of Conservation for PRHA, to observe:

Historically, if you'll excuse the play on words, the desire to maintain some sort of orderly control over the direction and pace of growth in our cities has resulted in the development of sweeping programs of codes, subdivision control and zoning. Generally, subdivision and zoning controls have tended to be more quantitative than qualitative in nature. Historic districts with their special needs and potential offer a chance for such controls to be more qualitative and thus flexible in nature. The historic district zoning for Olde Towne has been designed to effect such qualitative flexibility. The Northside area with the Olde Towne and Parkview Urban Renewal Projects should facilitate more flexible zoning and higher density due to proposed public improvements in the form of open space, playgrounds, and, in Olde Towne, public off-street parking.

Although the Planning Director observed in May of 1970 that "the Olde Towne project is not suffering at this time from any lack of manpower," new zoning for Olde Towne was not forthcoming. One problem was the difficulty in developing coordination between governmental agencies so that the housing code could reflect the actual situation in the older neighborhoods, as the Planning Commission minutes of July, 1970 show:

[PRHA] Attorney Donald Kilgore said that the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority is plagued by lot size problems in the Historic District, which hamper the whole restoration program....[Planning Director] Mr. Moore said that his office was aware of the problem and pointed out that the Planning Commission had been waiting for some
recommendation for many months from the Redevelopment Authority and its staff and consultants....Attorney Kilgore said...their most recent survey found that 77% of Parkview does not conform. On motion...staff was authorized and instructed to prepare a zoning ordinance amendment relative to the old city as soon as practicable.200

The PRHA reply in the following month was not what had been anticipated, for it said:

It has come to the attention of the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority that various lots in the Olde Towne Conservation Project failed to meet the requirements of the historic zone set up under Section 9 of the present zoning ordinances. This is particularly critical in view of the fact that a major portion of all the rehabilitation work to be accomplished under the conservation program would require a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals where applicable in order to comply with the project standards.201

The proposed solution of providing an automatic variance for applications made in the Historic District elicited a less than positive response, for "Attorney Kilgore was questioned by [Planning Commission] Chairman Goode as to why no one from the Redevelopment Authority, its staff and/or its consultants had contacted the Office of Planning and/or Assistant City Attorney William J. O'Brien about the matter."202 The result was a motion for the Planning Director and the City Attorney to work with PRHA and a request for a solution by mid-August:

Yesterday the Planning Commission resolved that you folks at Redevelopment, our Law Department, and this Office of Planning should put our heads together and come up with an acceptable amendment to the Historic Districts portion of the Zoning Ordinance--and possibly an amendment [that] could cover non-historic areas being rehabilitated with officially designated renewal projects such as Park View.

Our next hearing, at which such alterations could be considered is slated for Tuesday, the 1st of September
which means that the task must be completed before Friday, August 14th.

The deadline passed without action, for at the September 1st meeting of the Planning Commission the correspondence was disclosed which showed that the Assistant City Attorney felt he "did not have sufficient background nor expertise in the area of planning to carry out the revision of said ordinance" and had written to Mr. Kilgore for assistance. Although a conference was set by Mr. Kilgore in September to resolve the confusion, the work of revising Article 9 was continuing in November of 1970.

An indicator of the level of confusion was the situation that one city agency regards certain sections as being in one or both areas, while another does not and that the verbiage of the existing ordinance and maps held by various city agencies do not agree as to the boundaries. Coordinating information, resolving conflicts, and determining appropriate standards for the new conservation project areas were to be major concerns in the next decade.

Implementation Summary, 1960-1970

Comparing the implementation experiences in the two neighborhood conservation projects (Table V-1), the similarities and dissimilarities are readily apparent by examining the patterns of the indicating signs. After discussing the patterns, the study assesses the success or failure of the neighborhood conservation projects in providing program outputs and in affecting neighborhood conditions.
### TABLE V-1

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS FOR THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW CONSERVATION PROJECTS, 1960-1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Olde Towne</th>
<th>Park View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical Difficulties</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Range of Behaviors Regulated</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Target Group as a Percentage of the Population</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of Behavioral Change Required by Target Group</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jurisdiction over Causal Linkages</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Initial Allocation of Financial Resources</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Clarity of Decision Rules of Implementing Agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Integration Within and Among Implementing Institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recruitment of Implementing Officials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Formal Access by Outsiders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public Support</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Attitudes and Resources of Constituents’ Groups</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support from Sovereigns</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Leadership of Implementors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Favorable effects on implementation are shown with a plus sign ("+"), negative effects with a minus sign ("-"), and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero ("0"). For further details, see Figure II-1.*
Implementation was facilitated by seven factors in the 1960s. Minimal technical difficulties aided implementation because the problem of neighborhood blight was understood in terms of the basic economic model and the cure was based on the relatively simple "technology" of providing funds for low-cost loans and sending inspectors to examine properties for compliance with the housing codes established for the conservation project areas. Similarly, implementation was aided because there were no services and only a small number of behaviors to regulate: namely, the physical conditions of structures as set by the conservation standards in both project areas and the exterior appearances of buildings controlled by the Commission of Architectural Review in Olde Towne. The influence of these two factors was enhanced because only a small percentage of the city's population lived in either Olde Towne or Park View.\textsuperscript{209}

As evidenced by the total lack of opposition to the loan program in both neighborhoods and by the limited expression of concern over "federal" inspections in Olde Towne, a fourth facilitating factor was the low level of behavioral change required. A fifth favorable factor was the relatively high degree of control over crucial program elements as HUD controlled the loan-approval process and PRHA hired and trained its own inspectors to administer housing standards it established for the project areas. Two other factors assisting implementation were the public support for the conservation projects by individuals in the project areas and by President Kennedy in 1961.
Four factors consistently impeded implementation. Because there was confusion over whether city-wide zoning standards, project area conservation standards, or Historic District CAR standards prevailed as well as confusion over the meaning and adequacy of some of these standards, decision rules lacked clarity. Because of the relative autonomy among implementing units (Figure V-1 on the next page), low levels of coordination and communication sometimes created conflict that impeded implementation.

Because no new officials with power to make policy or allocate resources were recruited specifically to administer the conservation projects, implementation was hindered. An additional impeding factor was the lack of formal access by outsiders. Although PACs (Project Area Committees) were formed for each of the two project areas late in the decade and given formal access, there was no such formal access during most of the study period. The lack of access to PRHA planners by Park View residents and city officials when the conservation plans were being devised increased conflict and made implementation more difficult.

In addition to factors which uniformly helped or hindered implementation, four factors differ and thus help explain differing implementation experiences. (Table V-2 on the page after next). These factors indicate that implementation during the 1960s was more successful in the Olde Towne project than in the Park View project.
FIGURE V-1
ORGANIZATIONAL CHART OF IMPLEMENTING INSTITUTIONS
FOR THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW
NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION PROJECTS, c. 1968

* HUD *
* National Headquarters *
* Washington, DC *

* HUD *
* Regional Headquarters *
* Philadelphia, PA *

* HUD *
* District Headquarters *
* Richmond, VA *

* City Government *
* of *
* Portsmouth VA *

* Portsmouth *
* Redevelopment *
* and Housing *
* Authority *

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
TABLE V-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLDE TOWNE</th>
<th>PARK VIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Initial Allocation of Financial Resources</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Attitudes and Resources of Constituents’ Groups</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Innovation by Implementors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, Olde Towne received federal funding before Park View did. Funds for Park View were delayed for six months while the city’s Workable Program was recertified, and this delayed implementation until the Loan and Grant contract for the Park View project was signed in June of 1969.

Second, Park View’s major representative group (the Park View Improvement League) lacked resources of funds and expertise during the time that Olde Towne’s de facto major representative group (the Portsmouth Historical Association together with its semi-autonomous Portsmouth Historic Trust) possessed both sufficient financial resources to finance an inventory of historic homes in 1963 and adequate expertise to successfully lobby for changes in the borders of the Olde Towne project area as well as for the creation of an Historic District within Olde Towne. Although Project Area Committees were organized in each neighborhood project by PRHA,
they began functioning so late in the decade that they had no influence on implementation during the decade. All of these groups were supportive of conservation efforts during the 1960s, but the superior resources employed by Olde Towne's constituency groups resulted in better implementation in that project area.

Third, no innovative programs were developed especially for Park View by implementing officials during the period. However, an innovative new approach was undertaken in the Olde Towne project area as the city adopted an Historic District with a Commission of Architectural Review to regulate exterior appearances.

Fourth, the socioeconomic conditions changed in a positive fashion uniformly in Olde Towne while the pattern in Park View shows deterioration. This accords with the observations of PAC and PRHA officials made during and after this period about the changes in the two project areas during the decade.

In addition to the factors identified by Mazmanian and Sabatier which have been explored above, two additional factors are suggested by the findings. One may help explain an impeding factor, while another may help account for differences in implementation.

First, the length of time between the announcement of projects and the approval of the projects may hinder successful implementation. From the time that renewal efforts were first begun in 1956 to the start of widely-publicized efforts to begin the GNRP plan in 1960, it is possible that expectations were increased only to be disappointed by the continuing delays which
slowed official HUD approval of the two projects until December of 1968.

Second, marketing and promotion may influence the success of implementation. The press conference held in 1967 to announce the Olde Towne conservation plan was not matched by a similar effort for Park View. The additional interest and excitement created among implementors and residents by such efforts is difficult to evaluate, but the conduct of a major publicity effort for the conservation project in which implementation appears to have been more successful suggests that this could be a factor that affects the process.

Having analyzed the implementation experiences and the factors which helped explain their similarities and differences, the question that remains is whether the neighborhood conservation projects succeeded during the decade. From the information on PRHA activities in the previous narrative and in Appendix E, it is clear that many actions were being taken to achieve results but other data in the last pages of Appendices E and F indicates that few outputs were provided.

Although the narrative has indicated that the first Section 312 loan applications were initiated in the summer of 1969, it also indicates that funding for the low-cost loans was unavailable just at the projects began. The lack of Congressional funding reflects the shift of national priorities which accompanied the change in presidents in early 1969 as the Great Society's well-funded
programs were beginning to be pruned by the new Republican administration.

As indicated by the same sources, the inspections program also faltered. Even though the inspection program began for Olde Towne in 1969 and for Park View in 1970, each neighborhood had fewer than 100 structures inspected by the end of 1970. (See the last pages of Appendices E and F.) Although implementers were more successful in providing inspections for Olde Towne than for Park View, they were unable to provide these outputs as originally planned.

Since there was better implementation (Table V-2) and better provision of outputs in Olde Towne than in Park View, it is not surprising that the Olde Towne neighborhood improved more than did Park View during the 1960s (Table V-3 on the page after next). While Olde Towne shows improvement in twice as many indicators as Park View does, the differences are even more dramatic when the percentages of change in the descriptors are considered.

In the 1960s, Olde Towne showed improvement in four of the eight indicators. With an increase of over a hundred percent in median housing value and household income, an even more dramatic increase in new construction, and improvements in other measures (overcrowding and housing lacking plumbing), Olde Towne improved significantly as measured by half of the estimators. On the other hand, deterioration is shown by declines in owner occupancy and long-term residency and by increases in multi-family units and vacancy rates. Although the increase in multi-family units could
in part be due to the development of more rental property such as the Rountrey feasibility study had suggested for Olde Towne, the neighborhood shows mixed signs of improvement.

By contrast, Park View showed improvement only in new construction and housing lacking plumbing. The other six descriptors indicate a deteriorating neighborhood condition.

These findings confirm perceptions of residents and administrators that Olde Towne showed more improvement in this period than did Park View. Although the improvement in Olde Towne was not an unqualified success, the major increases of most descriptors of housing quality in that neighborhood contrast with the decline of most of the same factors in Park View. The more successful neighborhood change in Olde Towne (Table V-3) is due in part to the more successful implementation (Table V-2) of its neighborhood conservation project.

In conclusion, these findings show that Olde Towne's conservation project succeeded while Park View's failed to improve neighborhood conditions. Although there were few program outputs during the period, the better implementation in Olde Towne was a factor which helps account for this difference.
### Table V-3

**Comparative Analysis of Changes in Neighborhood Conditions, 1960-1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Olde Towne Change</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Park View Change</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing Built Within the Past Ten Years</td>
<td>+1,935.7%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 4.35%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Median Housing Value</td>
<td>+ 158.7%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- 4.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multi-family Units</td>
<td>+ 45.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 5.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing Lacking Some or All Plumbing Facilities</td>
<td>- 93.9%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>- 73.4%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overcrowding</td>
<td>- 83.5%</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ 1.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Owner Occupancy</td>
<td>- 8.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 7.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Residency At the Same Address for Five Years Or More</td>
<td>- 13.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 25.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>+ 173.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ 55.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The percentages of change are derived from the 1960 and 1970 U.S. Census of Population and Housing. Improvement in neighborhood condition is shown with a plus sign (+), deterioration with a minus sign (-), and either no change or lack of data by a zero (0). For further details on evaluating changes in neighborhood conditions, see Figure II-2.
NOTES

1. Planning Commission Minutes, August 24, 1956, 1.

2. Planning Commission Minutes, September 19, 1956, 2. This action (item #56-271) was moved by Councilman Frank L. Kirby and passed without dissent. (See City Council Minutes, September 19, 1956, Minute Book 11, page 325.)


5. Lincolnsville, was that area which the Planning Commission minutes define as being bounded "on the west by Cedar Grove Cemetery and Fort Lane, on the north by the Naval Hospital, on the east by Washington Street, and on the south by North Street." (Ibid., 2.)

6. The area in question covered almost all of the land east of the Belt Line Railway tracks and north of the U. S. Naval Shipyard. See page 2 of the Minutes of November 12, 1956 for a more precise listing.

7. City Council Minutes, February 12, 1957 (Minute Book 11, page 370, item #57-50). Lincolnsville was defined as that area "bounded on the north by the U. S. Naval Hospital grounds, on the east by Washington Street, on the south by North Street and Cedar Grove Cemetery and on the west by Fort Lane." The PRHA commissioners had approved the application on January 31st for $61,440 in federal funds under Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949 for the "Part I" Surveying and Planning design work that preceded the "Part II" Loan and Grant application for funds to carry out the urban renewal project.

8. Planning Commission Minutes, October 24, 1957, 1. The PRHA Director of Development reported that a consultant had been hired to work with the Planning Commission staff and PRHA.


12. Planning Commission Minutes, February 2, 1958, 1. Although that February 2nd meeting was Paul Dulaney's last meeting as Director of City Planning, he returned to Portsmouth in March of 1959 to advise PRHA on the best of four alternative urban renewal approaches to undertake. (Lloyd H. Lewis, "Lincolnsville Urban..."
Renewal Decision Expected March 24, "Ledger-Star, March 10, 1959, sec. 2, 11.) He revisited the Planning Department on June of 1959 as a guest, where he was identified as Professor of Planning at the University of Virginia (Planning Commission Minutes, June 12, 1959, 1). As late as 1964, he was still working with the City in the capacity of a consultant on revising the zoning ordinances (Planning Commission Minutes, February 18, 1964, 4).

13."That Million-Dollar Deficit," Ledger-Star, April 21, 1959, sec. 1, 4. A former City Manager recalls that the fiscal constraints had been a major factor in the city not implementing many suggestions of the 1947 Comprehensive Plan, and he noted that concern over paying for new projects was a major consideration hindering undertaking neighborhood rehabilitation projects. (Interview with Aubrey P. Johnson, Jr., December 8, 1992)

14.Planning Commission Minutes, October 24, 1957, 2. Mr. Balzer, PRHA Executive Director, made this observation and noted that the planning costs would ultimately be "absorbed" in the total project costs and thus, it may be inferred, be reimbursed.

15. The previous years' certification for federal funds by the Housing and Home Finance Agency had to be renewed by annual updates to the Workable Program for Urban Renewal.(Planning Commission Minutes, February 12, 1958, 3.) Unless supporting evidence showing conformance to schedules in the previous year's application was provided, the city's certification to receive federal funding under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 was scheduled to expire on April 1, 1958. (Planning Commission Minutes, March 6, 1958, 1.)


17.Interview with Aubrey P. Johnson, Jr., December 8, 1992.

18."Diggs and Hamilton Renamed to Development Authority," Star, September 30, 1959, sec. 2, 13. The occasion of the remark was the reappointment of these two men to the PRHA Board of Commissioners by a four-to-three vote.

19.Chris T. George, "Council Has Little More than Month to Decide on Urban Renewal Project," Ledger-Star, September 25, 1959, sec. 2, 13. The newspaper reported that the hearing was attended by 750 people, an incredibly large turn-out for that time.

21."Urban Renewal Funds For City Increased," Ledger-Star, September 25, 1959, sec. 2, 13. The reservation of funds for urban renewal had been increased from $1,150,000 to $1,320,000, but would be lost if the City did not accept the reserved funds by November 20, 1959, according to Balzer's announcement.

22.City Council Minutes, November 22, 1960 (Minute Book 13, page 51), item #60-341. The motion passed by a five-to-two vote.


24."George W. Price Jr. Succeeds Balzer as Housing Director," Ledger-Star, April 13, 1960, sec. 2, 11. Price was the former Executive Director of Charlottesville, Virginia's Housing Authority and a past Assistant Executive Director of the Norfolk Housing and Redevelopment Authority for fifteen years. Balzer left his position as Executive Director after only about one year in order to enter private business.


27."Portsmouth's Master Plan Resembles Patchwork Quilt," Virginian-Pilot and Ledger-Star, April 10, 1960, sec. H, 4. The two-year project was begun under Paul Dulaney's term as City Planning Director, and it was being completed with assistance from Harland Bartholomew and Associates, which had devised the 1947 Comprehensive Plan.

28.City Council Minutes, November 22, 1960 (Minute Book 13, page 51, item #60-340). He immediately succeeded the Mayor as the City's representative on the Southeastern Virginia Planning Commission as soon as he was confirmed that November 22nd.

29.Planning Commission Minutes, August 1, 1961, 9. Since the City Hall was located on Crawford Street southeast of the Olde Towne neighborhood and the old municipal stadium was situated on Glasgow Street southwest of the Park View neighborhood, it is clear that the two study neighborhoods were being considered for revitalization efforts by early 1960. These are roughly the same boundaries that were later used for the "Park View General Neighborhood Renewal Plan."

30.City Council Minutes, November 22, 1960 (Minute Book 13, page 51), item #60-341. The resolution was made in order to conform with new regulations for funding from the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Although annual recertification for funding had been required previously, annual formal City Council approval of
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the "Workable Program" was needed to requalify for funding.


32. Interview with J. Brewer Moore, December 1, 1992.

33. Ibid., 9. The Planning Commission meetings considering this were held on December 2nd and 16th of 1960.

34. The Park View Improvement League had not formally started until mid-October (although residents had started a Garden Club in January and had taken steps in July of 1960 to start this civic league), and on December 8th the group heard the new Planning Director explain his GNRP plans and announce the start of a pilot survey of the area. ("Park View to Push Study of Its Needs," Ledger-Star, December 9, 1960, sec. 2, 11.). Early in the next year, Planning Director Moore sought additional meetings "with the Parkview Civic League and residents of 'Old Portsmouth'" in a January meeting at the Planning Commission office. (Planning Commission Minutes, Special Meeting, January 20, 1961, 1.) The area referred to as "Olde Portsmouth" is the neighborhood subsequently called "Olde Towne."

35. "Major Revitalization Plan for North Side Presented," Ledger-Star, January 31, 1961, sec. 2, 7. The area for the Park View GNRP stretched from Oak Grove Cemetery eastward along the waterfront in a southerly direction to the City Hall building at High Street, north along Water Street to London Street and then west on London Street to Chestnut Street, where the boundary turned south along Chestnut to High Street before turning west to 2nd Avenue and returning north to Oak Grove Cemetery.


38. Planning Commission Minutes, February 14, 1961, 9. The Planning Commission Chairman, the Planning Director, the PRHA Executive Director, and the PRHA Chairman met with Urban Renewal Administration field representative Harold Heller at the PRHA offices.

39. Ibid., 9.

40. Ibid., 9. The resolution urged preparation of a "General Neighborhood Renewal Project for an area flanking the (VA-R-6) Lincolnsville Urban Renewal Project" generally known as "PARK VIEW....prepared by the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority, using funds available to it under provisions of Public Law 1020, Section 102(d), 84th Congress...." (City Council
Minutes, February 14, 1961 in Minute Book 13, page 77), item #61-26.


42. City Council Minutes, February 28, 1961 (Minute Book 13, page 79), item 61-39. The group of businesspeople in the central business district indicated its members' "approval on behalf of such a program and for your willingness to assist property owners in preserving this desirable neighborhood."

43. City Council Minutes, March 14, 1961 (Minute Book 13, page 88). These speakers were George D. Eastes (President, Park View Improvement League), William T. Murcer, Mrs. Josephine Wilkinson, Mrs. Marian Rawls, Louis Whitehead, L. H. Edmondson, Mrs. R. M. Anderson, and Joseph E. Wallace. The representative of the Chamber of Commerce was E. Saunders Early.

44. Ibid. City Council motions must be passed by majority vote on two separate occasions, usually referred to as the "first reading" and the "second reading."

45. City Council Minutes, March 28, 1961 (Minute Book 13, pages 94-95), item 61-32.

46. Ibid.


48. Ibid.

49. City Council Minutes, January 23, 1962 (Minute Book 13, page 207), item 62-11. The City Manager's comments were part of the 1962 "Workable Policy for Neighborhood Improvement."


51. Planning Commission Minutes, August 2, 1961, 10. PRHA had worked out details with Mayor Smith on the same day it officially received the request, May 2nd.

52. Joe Phillips, op. cit.

53. Planning Commission Minutes, August 2, 1961, 10. The need to revise the application was received June 14th.

55. Ibid.

56. "PRHA Told to Change Renewal Approach," *Virginian-Pilot*, September 20, 1961, sec. G, 1. See Plate V-1 for the borders of the "core" area which was excluded from the project.


63. Ibid., 10. The report was prepared in July, 1961.

64. Ibid., 11. The observation was made in an August 1, 1961 letter to the City Council, included in the Planning Commission Minutes. The "technicians" are the consultants referred to earlier (Harland Bartholomew and Associates of Atlanta, Georgia), and the fact that the outside expertise of consultants was now needed to fill out the increasingly complex governmental applications is significant.


66. "Lincolnville Officially Fort Nelson Place Now," *Ledger-Star*, November 22, 1962, sec. 2, 21. PRHA Executive Director Price stated that the project needed "a name with a different connotation," and Portsmouth Historical Association President Mrs. W. B. Spong, after consulting with others such as historian Marshall W. Butt, had suggested the new name. Later, the Historical Association also helped in deciding to keep the name of Effingham Street. (Letter from Mrs. William B. Spong, Sr., President, Portsmouth Historical Association, to Mr. J. Brewer Moore, Planning Director, January 26, 1967, in Planning Commission Minutes, February 7, 1967, 6.)

68. Planning Commission Minutes, November 7, 1961, 1. This area is near the Norfolk Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth.

69. Planning Commission Minutes, November 7, 1961, 13. The widened street would link Route 58 and Interstate 264 to the U. S. Naval Hospital.


71. Planning Commission Minutes, March 6, 1962, 11.


73. Ibid. The seven organizations were the Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Merchants Association, Mayor's Committee on Urban Renewal Policy, Park View Improvement League, Portsmouth Civic League, Portsmouth Historical Association, and Swimming Point Corporation.

74. Ibid.


78. Ibid. As with the first meeting, this was apparently an informal discussion at which no minutes were kept.


80. Ibid.

81. Planning Commission Minutes, April 17, 1964, 4. The plan was unveiled at a Kiwanis Club meeting just after Christmas, 1962, and it drew its name from Colonel William Crawford, who founded the city of Portsmouth in 1752. When the plan was formally published, it contained provisions for a Committee of Architectural Review and included a map showing a "Historic Inventory and Historic Preservation Zone." (Colonel Crawford Common, Portsmouth VA: City Planning Department, December 1964, 7-13)


83. Interview with J. Brewer Moore, December 1, 1992. The widening of Effingham Street was to increase traffic flow to and from the new I-64 Interstate Highway and connected the Norfolk
Naval Shipyard at the southeastern limit of Portsmouth with the Portsmouth Naval Hospital at its northeastern terminus.

84. Planning Commission Minutes, March 5, 1963, 3.


86. Ibid.


88. Planning Commission Minutes, June 18, 1963, 2. Mr. Thurlow Etheridge, President of the Park View Improvement League, raised some technical questions but observed that the "League looks with favor upon" the plan.

89. Ibid. Several Olde Towne residents spoke either in favor of the plan or to ask technical questions. Mr. Robert Reed asked for clarification of some terms used in the document, and he later expressed concern over displacement of residents. Mrs. Marshall Butt and Miss Octavia Parrish both spoke in favor of efforts to revitalize the area.

90. The throughfare was first called the London-Glasgow Expressway, but now it is named London Boulevard.

91. Ibid. Mr. M. T. Mercer expressed concern over the displacement of many people by the new throughfare. The Rev. Mr. C. H. Jordan, Pastor of the Third Baptist Church, echoed this concern by adding "that this proposal is not such a fine idea in that it will lead to the eventual removal from this section [of] many" parishioners. The church had an Afro-American congregation.

92. Ibid.

93. City Council Minutes, June 18, 1963 (Minute Book 13, page 36, item #63-132).

94. City Council Minutes, August 13, 1963 (Minute Book 13, page 378-380, item #63-186 and #63-187). PRHA was authorized to apply for $171,149 in federal funds under Title 1 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to pay for planning and survey for the Northside General Renewal Plan, Contract No. Va 4-22 (GN) (A).

95. The original draft of the application had designated the City Planning Department as LPA, but this was changed by the time the resolution was passed by City Council.
96. Planning Commission Minutes, August 6, 1963, 7-8. The resolution instructed the Planning Commission to deal with (1) data gathering on the area, (2) pursuing federal financial aid programs, and (3) providing information and technical advice to residents and property owners, and it instructed the City Manager to begin systematic code and ordinance enforcement of dwellings as well as with reinspection and maintenance of public facilities in the Project area.

97. Planning Commission Minutes, August 6, 1963, 8. The memorandum stated that "it is felt that this Park View Non-Assisted Urban Renewal project can be undertaken if $3,000 is appropriated and expended at the rate of approximately $1,500 per year over the two-year period."

98. Richard R. Cobb, "Northside Plan Needs Virginia Law," Virginian-Pilot and Ledger-Star. September 15, 1963, sec. H, 1. Project Number One, the north-south "London-Glasgow Expressway" would displace 928 families (81 white and 847 black), thus confirming earlier concerns over widespread displacement. Project Number Three developed the area north of the Expressway and west of Effingham Street as a commercial area.

99. Ibid. The area began at the back of the City Hall building at the corner of Queen and Water Streets and went north to Crawford Street before turning west to London Street until the intersection with Middle Street, where it turned north until it reached Glasgow Street. It extended east along Glasgow Street half-way down the block before turning east to the north side of North Street and headed east to the waterfront, where the boundary extended south to the back of the City Hall building. Thus, project Number Two included a large number of residences which were later included in what became known as Olde Towne.
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105. Planning Commission Minutes, February 4, 1964, 3. The two representatives were the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Field Representative, Herb Levin, and its Southern Area Coordinator, Thomas V. Gallagher. The main purpose of the conference had been to discuss the planned "Project Amidships" in southeastern Portsmouth.
106. Ibid.
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112. City Council Minutes, March 9, 1965 (Minute Book 13, page 154-155, item #65-54). The name Park View was not used in the resolution, but it was defined as "that portion of the City of Portsmouth bounded generally as follows: On the north by Scotts Creek; on the east by Park View Avenue, south to Bay Street, thence west to the rear property line of Webster Avenue, thence south to Ann Street, thence east to Fort Lane, thence south to the rear property line of Holladay Street, thence west to the Oak Grove Cemetery, thence north along Oak Grove Cemetery and Scotts Creek to the point of beginning."

113. Ibid.

114. Ibid. These two motions were passed on the first reading on March 9th and the second reading on March 25th, 1965.

115. Ibid. The resolution did not mention Olde Towne by name. It referred to "a portion of the City of Portsmouth located near the Elizabeth River," but it went on to define it as "generally as being bounded on the north by the Elizabeth River, on the east by the east side of Crawford Street, on the south by London Street, and on the west by Washington Street." The eastern boundary had thus been moved to include the historic homes indicated by Harland Bartholomew and Associates and thus to reduce Project #2 to the waterfront area east of Crawford Street.
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Letter from Mrs. Anna McGinnis, Director, Portsmouth Historic Foundation to the City Council, City Council Minutes, April 28, 1964 (Minute Book 14, page 48, item #64-89).
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130. Planning Commission Minutes, December 16, 1964, 2. See Figure 6 of Colonel Crawford Commons (Portsmouth VA: City Planning Department, December 1964).
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CHAPTER VI
IMPLEMENTING THE CONSERVATION PROJECTS, 1970-1980

The Conservation Projects, 1970-1971

An editorial in the Ledger-Star in the spring of 1970 noted that changes in the Olde Towne and Park View conservation projects would not be as dramatic as those seen in familiar urban renewal undertakings but that "some indicators are already apparent and they suggest that both projects have a good chance to produce the hoped-for results in better inner-city living."\(^1\) Although they had been originated in the 1956-1960 period and created in 1968, extensive efforts to begin large-scale efforts in the two projects did not begin until 1970.

In Olde Towne, a "great deal of misunderstanding and misapprehension among Olde Towne residents over the manner of planning the program's implementation" surfaced at a small gathering between PRHA officials and area residents held in late January of 1970.\(^2\) That feeling resurfaced when about 200 residents packed the Elks Club on March 10th\(^3\) and April 8th\(^4\) to raise questions about benefits the project offered and concerns about the inspections. In regards to potential penalties for declining inspections, former PRHA commissioner Seaborne J. Flournoy asked "if entrance was refused, my wife would like to know in what jail she would be placed."\(^5\)
As bulldozers cleared the first blighted houses from Park View's blighted area in March of 1970, R. Irvine Smith voiced the wish that the project could have started one or two years sooner. At about the same time, PRHA opened its project office in the area, mobilized neighborhood support for beautification, and clean-up projects, established a temporary playground, and involved City agencies in intensive inspections of housing. From this experience, "it became quickly evident that any effort at compliance would be limited to homeowners. Most of these wanted to rehabilitate." PRHA Executive Director Mason noted that Park View was a large project with 505 buildings, but progress on acquisition already was being made by July of 1970. Moreover, Mason reported that his staff was already processing 31 loans "as rapidly as possible in order to assume that Park View maintains its character as a stable and desirable neighborhood," and PRHA Conservation Director John Winters reported initial progress on rehabilitation. In October of 1970, Frances K. Worrell, Conservation Coordinator for Park View and Olde Towne, announced further progress as she observed that "the Park View project, which began early this year, has been moving slowly, but steadfastly." In Olde Towne, property acquisition was underway (Appendices E, F, G, and H), and a "Demonstration House" in a "Demonstration Block" was selected "for the Authority to rehabilitate it as a guide and incentive to the program." A further boost for Olde Towne came as the neighborhood was officially designated as an
historically significant area by the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission in July of 1970. That October, Conservation Coordinator Worrell reported that the Olde Towne project could be completed within its seven-year contract period because it would be 28% complete by December of 1970.

Four additional events were to have important influences on the implementation of the two conservation projects. First, Executive Director Mason left PRHA for Richmond after being appointed Director of the Federal Housing Authority for the Virginia Region in October of 1970, and was succeeded by Acting Director Arthur G. Meginley, Jr. To advise PRHA during the transition period, Lawrence J. Cox, a former Executive Director of the Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority (1941-1969) and past Assistant Secretary of HUD (1969-July 1970) was hired as a consultant.

Second, financial funding for the two conservation projects was provided. HUD approved $2,223,886 for Park View and $2,217,120 for Olde Towne in November of 1970. Shortly thereafter, the City began 1971 with healthy General Capital Improvement Fund appropriations for both Park View ($50,000) and Olde Towne ($175,000) in the January 26, 1971 City Council meeting. The CIP budget authorized funds for underground wiring to replace unsightly utility poles and lines in Olde Towne, and a formal agreement with Virginia Electric and Power Company (VEPCO) was signed September 28, 1971.
Third, rapid inflation in the construction industry was increasing costs. Evidence of this is shown in the escalation of costs to rehabilitate the "Demonstration House" in Olde Towne, which originally had been estimated to cost $52,000 but for which the only two bids received were $95,500 and $96,072—bids so much over budget that they "left us with quite a dilemma."^{22}

Fourth, intergovernmental tensions between the local city and federal agencies began to appear. Because people applied to PRHA for funding for projects which did not conform to City codes, the City Building Inspector complained about the lack of a coordinated effort in his letter to PRHA:

We recently had a request for a Building Permit to convert a two-family house to a four-family house on which the owner claims he has been working for approximately one year, has approval of all Federal agencies including his loan where the property does not meet the Zoning Ordinance nor do his proposed plans meet the Building Code. From one or two newspaper stories I can foresee other problems unless plans are presented for review before all applications to other agencies are made.^{23}

PRHA Under Fire, 1971

At the first 1971 PAC meeting, Mrs. Raymond M. Anderson charged that she couldn't see that PRHA was "doing anything to help" and suggested more clearance of dilapidated houses, but Alan Siff of Harland Bartholomew and Associates replied that extensive clearance was forbidden in a conservation project and that "to gain clearance, the area would have to show 50% dilapidation which it did not have in 1967"^{24} when the project
was being designed. In response to Mrs. Anderson's charge that only 82 houses had been inspected in Park View and to the complaints of others, Mr. Siff and Mrs. Worrell “both suggested that Park View residents should step up pressure for faster PRHA inspections, get more residents to ask for inspections, and press city government for fuller participation.”

Within a week, the City Council asked the City Manager to report on the progress in Park View. PRHA Acting Executive Director Meginley responded that inspections had been underway since March of 1970, that twenty-two residents had sought financial assistance, and that:

> For the past several months there has been a complete halt by HUD in all regions in the processing and approval of 312 loan applications. This is due to the complete lack of funds. The lack of funds was brought about by the tardiness of the President of the United States in signing the 1971 Housing Bill. Mr. Nixon was approximately six months late. We have been assured by Philadelphia that this money will be available in the Regional Office in the next several weeks....

> The chairman [of PRHA] and other members of this staff have recently met with representatives of the Park View Project Area Committee and certain agreements were reached, and it was the feeling of all in attendance that the Authority was doing everything that it could do to expedite the implementation of this Project and also make it a complete success.

When City Manager Johnson reported to City Council that Park View residents were happy after having met with PRHA officials concerning their complaints, this provoked strenuous objections by Park View PAC officers in early February of 1971 that such a view was "misleading" and that they would not "be happy until we can see that the deterioration that is eating way at this area is
reversed...."\textsuperscript{30} The PAC statement also charged:

Without a doubt, the blight in this area has spread much more rapidly since the conservation project was planned to save the area. In the past two years many homeowners left the area who would have liked to have stayed here.

Vacated properties have been bought by realtors or put in the hands of rental agents who are not interested in spending a dime toward beautification. They will rent cheaper as they fall apart, destroying the friendly neighborhood concept for homeowners.

We don't believe that PRHA is moving fast enough or in the right direction to deal with these landlords.

Removal of abandoned automobiles and condemnation of [dilapidated properties by] the health department were on the list of PRHA accomplishments. We know that there are city ordinances and agencies being paid by the taxpayers who have these assigned duties.\textsuperscript{31}

In response, PRHA chairman Shocklin responded that he was sure the staff were doing all that could be done and stated that he was "certain that they are not happy with the speed. That's something we cannot control. Neither are we pleased with the slowness of governmental bureaucracy."\textsuperscript{32}

At the PAC meeting later that month, further discord emerged. When asked about getting a second inspector to speed the process in their neighborhood, PRHA Building Code Specialist Louis Wilson responded that doing this "would leave cost estimators further behind.\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, he pointed out that reinspections might be necessary "if there is too much delay between the time that a dwelling is inspected and the time a cost analysis is made" and urged residents to have the process finished "within the next few months before the [Section 312] money runs out again."\textsuperscript{34} A resident noted that the slow process of approving loans was especially difficult in a period of rapidly rising prices because
"if a home owner goes back to a contractor with a loan approval for his estimate six months or more after he made it the contractor is going to be forced to make a higher bid to meet rising prices and the loan application must start over."35 Another resident argued that the blight was spreading faster than the conservation efforts, and Mrs. R. M. Anderson concluded that "at the rate we are going the administrative costs of the [PRHA] office [in Park View] are going to eat up the money before the neighborhood can be improved."36

At that same meeting, discussion turned to PRHA's ability under the Virginia law to take property after a year and 30 days had passed without compliance and PRHA Redevelopment Coordinator Lindsay Waters responded that PRHA could not force the sale of property. When asked by PAC president Clinton Butler about PRHA buying properties if landlords were willing to sell, Mr. Waters responded that "the agency had a policy discouraging its getting into the real estate business."37

In late February of 1971, the City Council intervened in an attempt to speed implementation. In response to Mayor Smith's suggestion that the city send its own inspectors into the conservation area, City Manager Johnson responded that the city housing inspectors could not replace PRHA inspectors because inspections within a conservation project must be made by the Authority. The City Council then took action to change the city housing code so that the health department inspectors could immediately post substandard housing as such instead of waiting
thirty days and the director of public health could then schedule hearings. Mayor Smith noted that the delays in getting federal approval of the conservation project and the subsequent delays in starting it had some people suspecting a conspiracy: "a deliberate policy to let things go to pot."38

At a subsequent informal conference between City Council and PRHA inspectors, Mayor Smith again raised the idea of augmenting PRHA inspectors with those of the city housing department, but PRHA Acting Executive Director Meginley responded that it was "unheard of for city inspectors to go into a designated project area," that violating the rules would make it impossible for residents to get federal low cost loans or grants, and that PRHA had not condemned any substandard property because the conservation project had been in operation for less than a year and Virginia law required that a year and thirty days pass before such action could be taken.39

In response to a City Council request, City Manager Johnson reported in March of 1971 on the confusion over inspection policy and rebutted Meginley's view on acquisition procedure:

The city manager in his report said that the city's minimum housing code inspectors have the authority to work within a conservation project such as Park View, but that their role is fixed by the city code rather than the federal regulations.

In other words, William O'Brien, an assistant city attorney said, city inspectors may check for violations that make structures "hazardous to human life or health."

However, Johnson said, they may not become involved in inspections leading to acquisition of dilapidated property in federal programs.

The city manager reported also that the authority is not bound by federal regulations which allow it to acquire property a year and thirty days after notifying owners that property is deficient.
"Should the housing authority take no action on the property it will then be necessary for the city to enforce its minimum housing code, and if the property deteriorates to the degree that it is unsafe in the opinion of the building official, the city can require the property owner to demolish the building," Johnson said.

Meginley released his report that showing progress, and he disclosed the exact procedures for getting loans and grants (Appendix I). City Council voted to ask for an official investigation by its senators and congressmen.

In March, Acting Executive Director Meginley wrote to HUD asking for a representative to help explain PRHA's position on not acquiring dilapidated properties and its difficulties in providing loan money:

The Project Area Committee is under the assumption that under a Conservation Project, the Housing Authority is under the real-estate acquisition business, which we all know is not the intention of conservation. The Committee also does not fully understand inspections and the slow tedious processing of 312 loans.

In June, PAC president Clinton A. Butler charged a lack of progress, called for the PAC and Park View Improvement League to work together, and predicted that "together, not even the gates of HUD shall prevail." Later, he charged PRHA inaction in at least thirteen situations where dilapidated buildings had not been condemned despite no response or rehabilitation after the passing of a year and thirty days since they were inspected.

At the July PAC meeting, member Kenneth I. Griffith reported his committee's finding that delay in the project had led to a speed-up in neighborhood decline and introduced a resolution asking for "PRHA, city, and congressional aid in halting and revamping the
so that the representation which was denied them in the initial design phase could be restored and the core area of Park View which had been removed from the project could be restored now that blight was spreading in it. At the August meeting, PAC Information Officer Griffith reported that only six residences among more than 350 in Park View had been repaired with PRHA loans during the same time that "some 200 houses" in the area "went bad," that the PRHA excuse of having to wait a year and thirty days before beginning condemnation proceedings was "a myth" because it had no intention of beginning proceedings even after that period had expired, argued for including the core area, and said that "99.9 per cent of the blame for failure of the project should go to PRHA."

In August, the City Council also acted in response to a petition signed by 350 residents of Park View which declared that the conservation project was not workable in its present form. Approving the motion of Vice Mayor Burrell R. Johnson by a vote of 7-0, the council "proposed a workable program in Park View with the City assisting PRHA in a block-by-block program to be presented with 60 to 90 days" and called for including the core area of Park View from Ann Street to Bay Street within the project boundary.

Problems with city efforts also arose at that same August meeting. Vice Mayor Johnson publicly called for the demolition of a house which had been condemned for over a year and which the city council had previously directed to be demolished. Former mayor R. Irvine Smith noted the lack of enforcement of laws concerning
litter and overcrowded housing and suggested a special police
detachment be established to deal with the problem.\(^5\)\(^2\) The city
council voted to send the City Manager to Alexandria, Virginia to
study its way of coordinating rehabilitation efforts under a city
department of urban renewal.\(^5\)\(^3\) Further decisive action was taken
in September, as the city approved the making of an application for
a $2 million project to finance code enforce-ment in both the Mount
Hermon conservation project and in the core area of Park View.\(^5\)\(^4\)

By the middle of September, resignations were turned in by
Acting Director Meginley\(^5\)\(^5\) and by Chairman Shocklin, who was
succeeded by Vernon E. Wimbrough.\(^5\)\(^6\) At the same time, PRHA's
controller for the past 12 years was suspended\(^5\)\(^7\) and soon HUD's
Office of Investigation was asked to begin an investigation\(^5\)\(^8\)
despite the controller's protestation of no wrongdoing concerning
the missing $14,235.01.\(^5\)\(^9\) With a charge of financial impropriety,
with a revolt by the citizens of one of its conservation projects
continuing to express their displeasure with the agency's efforts,
and with City Council publicly calling an investigation of PRHA
operations by its Congressmen, the Authority was faced with a
tarnished image and a major crisis.

A July report by consultants urging organization changes was
released in late September.\(^6\)\(^0\) In early October, the new Executive
Director was named as Don Barton Frye, Jr., a 27-year-old former
administrative assistant of Lawrence M. Cox at the Norfolk
Redevelopment and Housing Authority (NRHA) who had joined NRHA in
1966 and became its assistant program development director in
1969. Cox was shifted from his position as consultant to the PRHA Board to the position of consultant to the Executive Director. A new controller was appointed, and the executive director promised improved and open operations in the future.

During the summer of 1971, reports on each of the two conservation projects had been prepared (Appendices F and G). In October of 1971, a more extensive and evaluative Report on Conservation Projects in Portsmouth was prepared by the Conservation Coordinator for the two projects (Appendix H).

As to inspections in Olde Towne and Park View, Worrell suggested that a lack of understanding of the differences between conservation and clearance had led to a lack of anticipating the legal and procedural difficulties of executing the housing inspection program—a function "which is the backbone of the conservation procedure." Ambiguity over defining the roles of each governmental entity created problems. Acquisition of private property for public reuse had met with difficulty in both Olde Towne and Park View.

Concerning financial assistance, Worrell found that the low-cost loan assistance programs had not had much impact on the conservation efforts. The two major reasons for this were "lengthy processing and nit-picking of individual applications at the Federal level; and the unavailability of funds for [Section] 312 loans."

In Olde Towne, efforts had been underway since December 1968 when the Loan and Grant Contract for the Project had been signed.
and both property acquisition and demolition had stayed on schedule. Personnel turnover among employees and "a lack of understanding for and fear of the program" among residents had been hindrances. After undertaking a dynamic series of actions in early 1970, "progress in Olde Towne has slowed to a serious degree" since March of 1971 because, among other reasons, high costs had stopped work on the "Demonstration Block" and "Demonstration House," HUD had blocked the PRHA contract for City inspection services, and work on a procedural manual had to be suspended pending work on the Management Survey which would provide clarification of inspection procedures.

In Park View, Worrell found a bleak situation. She reported that there had been a rapid decline both in home ownership and in the area's racial and socioeconomic composition. Although most homeowners wanted to rehabilitate their homes, "because of low equity and high rehab costs could not qualify for a [Section] 312 loan large enough to complete the job." Despite City and resident support for conservation efforts, a major set-back resulted when "the public was informed that the Authority would not condemn property for failure to comply in most cases but would request the city to enforce the Minimum Housing and Building Codes" and both PACs "interpreted this as a reversal of past statements of policy." In Park View, the result was that the PAC "has sponsored a petition requesting the City Council to stop the project and re-plan it...."
Meanwhile, the city council was working to effect its own remedies. It unanimously approved the motion of Councilman Raymond B. Smith "requiring approval of the city council of all expenditures by PRHA prior to their being expended" in an obvious attempt to increase fiscal controls that might prevent future financial scandals. It also directed the City Manager to report on progress in Park View for the third time in 1971, and in late November he announced that PRHA would increase its staff (including cost estimators, financial advisors and supervisory personnel), that demolition and capital improvements would be carried out according to a timetable which he provided, and that project coordinators would be hired for each conservation project and would be responsible for determining smooth functioning of city and PRHA authorities.

While friction between the city and PRHA seemed to be getting resolved, a number of administrative difficulties were hampering the implementation effort during the crucial first years of the neighborhood conservation projects. Since the conservation effort was primarily based on the "stick" of enforcing the higher conservation area standards for housing and the "carrot" of low-cost loans, these areas are of major importance and each is discussed in the following sections.

Section 312 Loans, 1971-1973

In January of 1971, PRHA Acting Director Meginley had announced that loan money was then available although it had been
held up due to Congressional delay and that few people in Park View had applied for the loans. Following the 1971 City Council's call for a congressional probe into the problems with the Park View project, PAC president Clinton A. Butler responded that "a key stumbling park has been the unavailability of low-interest loans designed to help property owners improve their homes." Despite efforts to increase loan availability by PAC, City Council, and Congressional means, HUD informed PRHA in July of 1971 that a loan application had been approved but "there are no funds available at this time for Section 312 loan reservations." PRHA sought to increase its control over the loan-approval process early the next year by requesting "an audit of [the] Park View and Olde Towne Projects [to] be conducted. The purpose of this audit is to evaluate the Authority's capacity to approve such loans at this time...." Evidence of irritation of PRHA with HUD control over the loan process is evident in the following memorandum:

On April 19, 1972, I spoke with Mr. Jerry Wilson concerning his letters on...[two] loan applications.... [and] I pointed out that one item, according to our attorney, Donald Kilgore, was contrary to the Virginia State law [and this was] replied to by his statement that "HUD was above Virginia State Law." I pointed out that the conservation programs in Virginia were funded under Title 36 of Virginia State law and that this law was the one by which we must abide by [sic]. I asked him if he had checked matters out with Mr. John Amos, HUD Area Counsel, and he said that was not necessary, as the Handbook and administrative decisions superseded any legal opinions insofar as 312 loans were concerned. He further stated he had checked all matters out....I further asked that the administrative decisions be placed in writing, so that they could be implemented before the preparation of a loan and not after and he stated that it was our job
to implement his decision[s] and to put them forth to the residents. I stated that we were being placed in the middle between HUD and the residents and that it would be helpful if we had things in writing. He then stated that the HUD Area Office did not have to make any 3% loans to anyone, and that we could enforce the Property Rehabilitation Standards without any 3% loans or 115 grants.

The situation has become untenable because of lack of experience and know how in the HUD Area Office insofar as 312 loans were concerned. We can only prepare these loans according to the HUD Handbooks and any written instructions we have before loans are prepared. Also, it has been our experience that administrative decisions have been changed once the loans are submitted for approval, thus it takes a great deal of additional paperwork. The only solution to our problem is local loan approval where administrative decisions, such as are being made in the HUD Area Office at the present time, can be made on a local basis and in relation to our local problem.86

Early 1972 had been marked by further protest about the loan program which had been envisioned originally as the central element for fuelling revitalization. In February, PAC member Clinton A. Butler's protest that funds had not been available for a long time was echoed by PRHA official William Rudko's observation that about thirty residential rehabilitation projects were being held up for lack of funds, and PAC officials urged residents to write to their Congressmen.87 Four changes were about to occur, however, to improve the situation.

First, HUD approved eight Section 312, 3%, 20-year loans (six for Olde Towne totalling $120,500 and two for Park View totalling $5,050).88 Carrol A. Mason, director of the Richmond-area HUD office and past PRHA Executive Director, announced that the loans "constitute 100 per cent requested for everyone who has applied to date" but noted that "it is not representative of the investment
needed to make the concentrated efforts in these two neighborhoods successful within a reasonable time frame" and observed that:

the success of conservation projects was originally predicated on the availability of 3 per cent loan money to attract property owners to remain and rehabilitate their homes. Now, when the projects are in execution and their success is totally dependent on the availability of loan money, the Office of Management and Budget has found it economically prudent to withhold these funds and put the success of the projects across the country in jeopardy.

Second, federal funds were restored for Section 312 loans. In May, PRHA announced that the Richmond HUD office would receive additional funding within two weeks and that more money would be available in the next fiscal year, beginning July 1.9 In February of 1973, PRHA announced that $250,000 in loans and over $50,000 in grants for Park View and Olde Towne had been approved during 1972 and that these funds had been augmented by private investments of about $50,000 in the two neighborhoods during 1972.90 Executive Director Frye announced that 1972 had been the best year for rehabilitation efforts to date, bemoaned the action of President Nixon's Office of Management and Budget in impounding an estimated $60 million in Section 312 Loan Rehabilitation Loan Funds, and stated that "an inadequate supply of federal low-interest loans has seriously affected rehabilitation in the Olde Towne and Park View conservation projects."91

Third, PRHA received a clean bill of financial health from its auditors and its Board of Commissioners voted to request local control over the Section 312 loans to reduce paperwork and speed up
the approval process.92 Although HUD approval was not given, the
good audit report and desire to have more control over the loan
process were to lead to an innovative step.

Fourth, local initiatives were taken in 1973 to assuage
concerns over federal funding for the program amid reports in
February that President Nixon had called for "an end to urban
renewal and suggested that special revenue sharing programs be
substituted in its place."93 Reiterating his view that PRHA
efforts in Olde Towne and Park View "had been severely hampered" by
the lack of loan money and observing that the availability of funds
was getting "worse, not better," Executive Director Frye
announced that PRHA would raise $500,000 by selling bonds to six
local banks and use the funds for loans of up to 25 years at 5.5%
rate of interest—roughly half the going commercial rate.94 The
program had been prompted by the reductions in the loan program and
the subsequent elimination of it except for persons of low income
by HUD, had required six months to organize, and would allow PRHA
to increase the size of loans from $15,120 per building to a new
ceiling of $17,500 in order to cover rising construction costs.95
Frye again observed that the loan program "was a key element of the
authority's conservation effort and the promise of these funds was
in fact a prerequisite to the initiation of the affected
projects."96 At the same May meeting where Executive Director Frye
noted the cut-off of federal Section 312 funding set for June of
1973, he announced the first loan from the local fund had been
approved, predicted loans of $100,000 would be made by June 30th, and promised faster loan processing for these funds.  

Inspections, 1971-1973

The lack of an active inspection program had prompted heavy criticism of PRHA by the Park View PAC and the City Council in 1971 as the "PRHA Under Fire" section of this chapter has already shown. The reasons for the relatively slow implementation are explored in this section.

Although initial inspections had been conducted by PRHA employees, it had proved to be impossible to keep inspectors. In April of 1971, the PRHA attorney raised the issue of having the City "to provide the necessary inspection officials... for the purpose of inspection of the various conservation projects by the PRHA." A copy of the proposed contract went to HUD for approval in early May, and a revised contract based on HUD suggestions was resubmitted later that month. However, by mid-June the matter had not been resolved, and a Norfolk official provided a copy of the contract used in that nearby city "for the use of City employees to carry out building inspections of the Ghent Conservation Program." HUD stipulated that fees "in no event exceed $25,000." In late December, PRHA prepared for an active new year by seeking increases in HUD funding and by setting goals for its conservation area personnel.

While 1971 had been spent trying to establish a new source of inspectors by forging an agreement between PRHA, HUD, and the city,
much of the next year would be spent in completing that effort and in establishing a working relationship between PRHA and other governmental units. In January of 1972, the Commission of Architectural Review attempted to assist the inspections project by sending PRHA a list of eleven houses "which need some kind of action" and noting that "the Commission of Architectural Review is getting increasingly concerned about the number of properties in the Olde Towne area [needing action], and they would like to follow through the project in some coordinated fashion." A PRHA official responded by indicating a much broader scope of inspections was intended, by attaching a list of the only twelve houses which had thus far received compliance certificates, and by noting potential conflict conducting inspections in Olde Towne:

We may assume that every house in Olde Towne needs "some kind of action" even if that means that the house receives an inspection and is found in compliance. To date the only houses which no longer require action by the Authority are those where the property owners have been issued "Certificates of Compliance"

It is obvious that there are many houses in Olde Towne which are well-kept and exceed the Property Rehab Standards requirements. Action thus far has not been focused upon these buildings, but the staff anticipates that by the close of 1972 the majority of buildings which appear to be up to standards can be inspected and officially issued certificates. It is felt that many of the property owners who fall into this category are "reluctant" to receive any visitor who has the trappings of a federal government inspector, and we would appreciate the Commission's comments and suggestions on this delicate point.
Although the Commission of Architectural Review did not present a formal answer on that "delicate point," it did ask that four Olde Towne buildings which had been boarded up at the request of the CAR not be demolished by PRHA under the provisions of a new city ordinance allowing the destruction of such buildings.\textsuperscript{109}

The delay in beginning inspections brought conflict again to the surface. A letter from the Assistant City Manager to PRHA complained that no monthly listings of inspections in the Park View project had been forwarded to him since November 4, 1971 despite an agreement that monthly reports would be made.\textsuperscript{110} The duties and sources of these inspectors were still being defined in February of 1972:

\begin{quote}
As you probably know, these contracts will not only cover the inspection of properties to determine their compliance with our property rehabilitation standards in Olde Towne and Park View, but will also include enforcement of the revised Minimum Housing Code on structures and vacant lots in these areas. Considering the enforcement of the minimum housing code, it is assured that these inspectors will be personnel from the Department of Public Health.\textsuperscript{111}
\end{quote}

Thus, the PRHA inspectors responsible for ensuring the standards for the federally-funded conservation project became Public Health Department Environmental Specialists who were employees of the Commonwealth of Virginia that reported to the City Manager.\textsuperscript{112} PRHA approved the payment for inspectors in February of 1972,\textsuperscript{113} but the new PRHA Executive Director made an attempt to have the city absorb the inspection costs.\textsuperscript{114}

It was not until mid-March of 1972 that the first list of Olde Towne and Park View properties to be inspected was communicated.
from PRHA to the Department of Public Health for action.\textsuperscript{115} In June of 1972, regular meetings on the first Friday of each month between city department heads and PRHA officials were begun to improve communications, with emphasis "being placed on keeping current on inspections in such projects as the Park View and Olde Towne conservation projects."\textsuperscript{116}

Later that month the city manager reported that the city had abandoned its application for a federally assisted code enforcement program in Mount Hermon and Park View because of new federal regulations.\textsuperscript{117} The next month, a PRHA response to HUD clarified its existing code enforcement methods:

Since the latter part of 1971, the Authority has been emphasizing the rehabilitation of properties in the aforesaid areas. The City Health Department, in conjunction with their city-wide responsibility for enforcement of the Minimum Housing Code, has been enforcing these regulations....

The Authority has been working closely with the Health Department and with the Project Area Committees....it should be emphasized that no structure has been acquired and demolished following a request by the Authority....On the contrary, this course of action can only be taken when buildings are determined by the City to be structurally unsafe and then only after a referral by the Health Department, in some instances, to the Director of Inspection for the City of Portsmouth. Following a lengthy hearing process, the building can then be demolished, a lien issued against the property owner for the cost of this work. It should be pointed out that the property owners, in those instances where demolition occurs, maintain title to the land.

Another course of action which may be followed in similar city circumstances is the refusal by the Health Department to issue the required Certificate of Occupancy for rental properties. This regulation has been in effect in the City since February 2, 1972, and has already proven to be a very effective tool in the improvement of properties within Portsmouth.

It should be mentioned that, although we have developed a very close relationship with the Health Department over the past six months, they are an agency of the Commonwealth of Virginia which act independently of the Authority and the
City; little or no actual control can be exercised over their enforcement of the Minimum Housing Code in the City of Portsmouth and in our project areas.118 A later memorandum to PRHA officials disclosed the limitations of the inspectors' powers:

when a property owner refuses inspection or ignores a one year violation notice, there are no enforcement powers the Authority has other than non-compliance acquisition, and this cannot even be accomplished if the property owner refuses inspection. Non-compliance acquisition does not always promote conservation since other project area property owners frequently will try to "bail out" and sell to the Authority rather than to rehabilitate.119

Changes in Park View. 1972-1973

As 1972 began, the Park View PAC elected Frank B. Griffith as its new chairman, met its new Project Coordinator (Eleanor Woolard) and heard protests from members that PRHA was again delaying progress despite assurances of reform and that in particular four dilapidated properties which PRHA officials had assured PAC officials last April would be torn down were still standing.120 Woolard replied that the new executive director had built back the morale of the staff but that she was "in confusion as much as you are"121 concerning the delays. Against the backdrop of Horace Johnson decrying the closing of the last two drugstores in Park View, the PAC once again approved efforts to have the core area of the neighborhood included in the project and urged PRHA to set a "time table" for completing various phases of the project, and the PAC urged PRHA to halt HUD's delay in processing loan applications
pending the results of its investigations of the 1971 PRHA financial scandal—an allegation PRHA denied.\textsuperscript{122}

Some positive actions occurred in early 1972, however. The city recreation department started work on the six acre play area as promised in January,\textsuperscript{123} and six new city employees were hired to help enforce the new minimum housing code.\textsuperscript{124} The new PRHA executive director reversed his predecessor's stand and welcomed the assistance in Park View, stating that "the utilization of city inspection personnel will expedite considerably the conservation program in the neighborhood by allowing the authority's rehabilitation staff to concentrate entirely on the process of rehabilitation loan and grants in the area."\textsuperscript{125} Executive Director Frye released data which indicated that the Park View project was 2.9% complete while the Olde Towne project was 4.8% complete as of June in the previous year.\textsuperscript{126}

In February of 1972, Project Coordinator Woolard reported to the Park View PAC that the procedures for moving against dilapidated housing had been streamlined and a list of twenty-four houses had been sent to the Health Department for action.\textsuperscript{127} Despite PRHA assurances that the pace of activity was accelerating in Park View and reports that seven structures were currently being rehabilitated and another thirty loans were being processed in February of 1972, the closing of the last drugstore in the neighborhood and uncertainty over keeping the commercial block which had been planned in 1968 were negative factors.\textsuperscript{128} When prior Park View PAC complaints were criticized by a HUD official in
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April, PAC Chairman Butler responded:

The very reason that the Park View PAC has been taking pot shots at PRHA for the past year and a half is because it hasn’t done its job in Park View. Apparently HUD feels that it is wrong for citizens to complain when millions of dollars of taxpayers’ money is being wasted on programs that are failing to help the people that they are designed to help.

HUD is constantly coming up with new guidelines and changes in programs, making it impossible for housing authorities and cities to carry them out to a successful conclusion.129

While conflict between HUD and the Park View PAC was flaring up, relations between HUD and PRHA were being strained that April of 1972 as HUD refused to approve the renewal of the consulting contract with Lawrence J. Cox to advise PRHA’s Executive Director.130 Theodore R. Robb, HUD Region III administrator in Philadelphia, asked rhetorically "how long do they need a consultant" and explained that the recent audit indicated that PRHA "has turned the corner and is ready to go."131

Some highly visible implementation progress was seen shortly thereafter in Park View. In early May, PRHA donated 4.1 acres for what PRHA Chairman Wimbrough indicated would be the largest park in the eastern part of city and would include basketball courts, a softball diamond, and other recreational facilities when scheduled for completion in July of 1973.132 Although City Recreation Department Director John Campbell had stated that the Park View playground was his top priority and work had already begun in January,134 it was disclosed in late May that the opening of the $90,000 Park View playground would be delayed pending installation of proper drainage.135 At the end of August, Executive Director
Frye announced that work had resumed on the playground complex and that work was nearing completion on a tot lot in Park View. By the end of September, work was to begin on public streets.

**Diminished Conservation in Park View, 1972-1973**

On April 22, 1972, the PAC formally requested Councilman Burrell R. Johnson, the Vice Mayor of Portsmouth who had been appointed to act as liaison for urban renewal projects, to seek amendments to the Park View plan. Amid renewed conflict sparked by a letter from Executive Director Frye which had lectured Park View property owners about being uncooperative and suggested newspaper accounts made the situation worse, City Council approved the resolution of Vice Mayor Burrell Johnson calling for a meeting between PRHA commissioners and Park View PAC members. Tensions were increased when an issue of the PAC newsletter was canceled by PRHA Executive Director Frye on the grounds that it contained inaccurate information.

Meanwhile, Horace Johnson, chairman of a special PAC committee to meet with PRHA on proposed changes to the Park View conservation project reported in April that PRHA had rejected most of the group's suggestions. These suggestions included eliminating the green spaces called for in the original plan, having housing replace a proposed boat ramp on Scott's Creek, and transferring about $100,000 which was saved from these changes so that it would pay for demolition of two blocks of dilapidated housing. These suggestions were taken to the City Council
along with a request for strong enforcement of the minimum housing code for rental units.\textsuperscript{143}

In September of 1972, the City Council voted 6-to-1 to endorse Councilman Burrell Johnson's motion to "approve in principal" the changes which the Park View PAC had been promoting and asked PRHA to report on the proposed changes within sixty days "in an effort to get the project moving again."\textsuperscript{144} When the PAC and PRHA resolved their differences later that year, the Park View PAC wrote to City Council praising the work of Burrell Johnson and observing that "after three years of struggling with a plan that just would not work for Park View, we now believe that the housing authority can move forward and the people of Park View will see the progress needed to stimulate individual interest."\textsuperscript{145}

Almost all of the PAC suggestions were accepted in the amended plan, the sole major exception being that the plans for a large waterfront park with boat ramps was maintained because the associated improvements "represent a very substantial portion of the local financial contribution in the project and their elimination would required that the City make up the noncash amount tentatively approved by HUD for this work with other eligible noncash items or with an additional cash payment to the Authority."\textsuperscript{146} The PAC had been in favor of removing the mud flats in Scott's Creek but opposed the building of a park and playlot (both of which would have been built on low adjacent land filled in by the dredged mud).\textsuperscript{147} PRHA agreed that the amenities were unnecessary but felt that the elimination of the mud flats
would be beneficial for the community and suggested hiring an independent engineer to analyze the problem and its costs.\textsuperscript{148}

Although Park View Project Coordinator Woolard stated in May of 1973 that PRHA officials were still optimistic about having the amendments approved, she stated that HUD's Richmond area officials had delayed consideration of project amendments "until money plans were clarified first."\textsuperscript{149} This communication and the disclosure that additional funds were being sought instead of just a reallocation of funds as the PAC had suggested brought a heated communication from the PAC's chairman:

\begin{quote}
We have been told many times that no additional funds would be needed for these plan changes. In fact we were asked to hold off on the changes so that HUD could work the projects that required money first. We were fools. Since I have been associated with this [PAC] committee, I have been constantly told half-truths instead of the whole truth on all important matters and this is very frustrating.\textsuperscript{150}
\end{quote}

HUD's Richmond office approved the amendment in late August without reducing the funding of the $2.97 million project\textsuperscript{151} Amendment No. 1 for the Park View Conservation Project was passed by the City Planning Commission on October 2,\textsuperscript{152} and a public hearing was held jointly on October 9th by the City Council and PRHA.\textsuperscript{153} After PRHA Vice Chairman Minor presented it,\textsuperscript{154} former councilman George Walker opposed the amendment, charging that Park View was "being used to provide relocation areas for those that you tear out of other areas"\textsuperscript{155} but it was supported by former mayor R. Irvine Smith, "on behalf of the Park View Improvement League, which has long been dormant,"\textsuperscript{156} and by Park View PAC representative Horace
Johnson, who stated that:

The program as such just didn't work. People, instead of going down and borrowing money and fixing up their houses, most of them were running.

Between the time that the project was planned and the time that work actually got started in the area, blight moved in at such a rapid pace until when work did get started, things were going in the opposite direction. People were running. Blight was overtaking it, and the project just couldn't be made.

So, after about three years of following this lack of progress, the Project Area Committee's concern brought about a suggestion for a change in the project... So this project... was prepared in March of 1972, and it took until November to get it approved in the Authority and with some of the city's officials. It has since been approved to some extent by HUD.157

The amendment was approved by the PRHA commissioners on October 9th, 1973 158 and by the City Council later that month.159 New "Property Rehabilitation Standards" were developed.160

Amending the conservation plan for Park View had the unanticipated consequence of invalidating earlier planning for improvements in the area. The City Engineer observed that "several projects in the area have been surveyed and plans prepared in accordance with the original Park View plans. Several of these plans are now useless."161 He noted that "it is our feeling that survey and design work should be done only for those improvements which are certain to be done," and said that "it will come as no surprise...that both my staff and myself have been put in a frustrating position by reason of the many changes brought about by the PRHA and P.A.C. Committee."162
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Changes in Olde Towne, 1971-1974

In late 1971, the plans for the Demonstration Block in Olde Towne were revised. Despite the argument that rehabilitating the proposed "Demonstration Project" would be worth its likely $80,000 cost since this would provide "tangible evidence of progress and commitment" by PRHA that could "do wonders for the project," PRHA sold the house.

Off-street parking in Olde Towne was allowed by an amendment to the zoning ordinance. An unanticipated problem arose over the proposed parking lot on Glasgow Street:

The property was formerly used as a burial ground and there is every likelihood that there are graves still located within the boundaries of the site....and movement of the graves would require a petition to the court.

P. Stockton Fleming succeeded Vernon Kimbrough as chairman of PRHA in September of 1973. That month, new conflict between the city and PRHA erupted because of conflicts over appropriate city zoning code in the PRHA-supervised conservation area of Olde Towne. Although the Flynn Home for recovering alcoholics had operated in the 400 block of Court Street for the past ten years, it was discovered that it might not be allowed under the conservation project’s regulations.

Although PRHA’s attorney stated that the Flynn Home complied with land use in the Olde Towne project area, his report was approved with two abstaining votes. At a City Council meeting later that month, Assistant City Attorney Daniel R. Hagemeister stated an opposing opinion. When some citizens sought to
express opposition, however, they were told that conservation project matters were up to PRHA and not the city.\textsuperscript{173}

The awkward relationship between PRHA and city jurisdiction became apparent as PRHA Attorney Thomas Fennell requested the city planning commission to allow the continuation of non-conforming uses if the extension were approved by the CAR.\textsuperscript{174} He stated that the problem was disclosed as people in the city Building Inspector’s office found that most of Olde Towne was covered by the Historic Residential district rather than by the high density residential district shown on old zoning maps, and he urged rapid action because the grant reservation for the Flynn Home would expire shortly unless it could be shown that grant funds could be used to renovate the structure.\textsuperscript{175} Although Olde Towne residents were split over the issue,\textsuperscript{176} the City Council passed the ordinance to "grandfather" the Flynn Home.\textsuperscript{177}

Olde Towne residents were united and successful during the summer of 1973, however, in blocking the plan to widen London Boulevard between Effingham and Crawford Streets into a four-lane thoroughfare as part of Northside Project Number One. Following PAC President Richard Gill’s letter asking for a "an immediate change to the present plan,"\textsuperscript{178} PRHA agreed that "these improvements would be of little benefit without the simultaneous widening of the right-of-way for Effingham St. to Court St."\textsuperscript{179}

As 1974 began, Olde Towne Project Coordinator Pat Collins announced that 60\% of the 218 structures in Olde Towne had been remodelled with $1 million of investment and that the project was

\textsuperscript{176}
due to be closed in October 1977. As evidence of the success of the project, she said:

There are very few homes for sale in Olde Towne. If any become available they sell in a minute. There are about two dozen people on a waiting list who want to know when a house goes up for sale...." 

In the spring of 1974, beautification projects increased and plans were made to complete the public investment in Olde Towne by the city over the next three years. Plans for off-street parking were refined, and, because it was to be the "only parking facility planned for this section of the project," renewed efforts were made to acquire the former cemetery area owned by Monumental United Methodist Church on Glasgow Street for use as a parking lot. The Olde Towne PAC requested the City Manager to "apply to City Council for an ordinance restricting long-term on-street parking to Olde Towne residents only" as was done in Richmond’s Fan District.

The city indicated that the brick wall in the Demonstration Block would be built to the dimensions approved by PAC and that "this work should begin shortly after July 1, 1974." In the fall of 1974, PRHA determined that the Harbor Court Hotel building at 312 Court Street would have to be demolished.

Further Turmoil in Park View, 1974-1975

The lack of Section 312 loan money continued to be an irritant to Park View residents. To answer the concerns expressed through the PAC, Project Coordinator Woolard responded:
As you are aware, Federal funding of 312 loans has been and still is very sporadic. At the present time, there is a limited amount of funds available in the Richmond Area Office for 312 loans. However, since the Department of Housing and Urban Development does not set aside these funds for certain cities or specific conservation projects, there is no assurances that this money will be available at the time the Authority does submit applications for property owners in the conservation projects. It should be noted, however, that money is available to be loaned to property owners in our conservation projects at 5 1/4% interest for owner occupants and 6 1/2% interest to investor-owners for rehabilitation purposes through the Authority’s Local Rehabilitation Loan Program.189

As work began on sidewalks in Park View in early 1974, a reference to possible work stoppage unless vandalism was halted resulted in a fiery letter from a PAC leader to the City Manager observing that "until the sidewalk improvements started a few weeks ago the city had taken a do nothing attitude towards Park View and frankly we are in no need to be given ultimatums or be put on notice by any city department."190 The charge of inaction was evidently referred to PRHA, for a statement from the Project Coordinator was soon made which asserted that progress had been made in conducting PRHA activities191 and in providing financial aid.192

Two public challenges to PRHA soon arose. In a meeting of the Park View PAC with city council candidates in April, most of the candidates were critical of PRHA, and councilman Burrell R. Johnson, "speaking for a 3-man ticket he heads," stated that "we should remove urban renewal from PRHA and put it under City Council, which can do the job. I want to be responsible if I’m going to be blamed."193 Further criticism emerged at a later
April Park View PAC meeting when its chairman said from 1969 when the first residential inspections were made to 1972 only 16 houses were reworked under the [Section 312] low-interest loan program. But from 1972 to the spring of 1974, there were "no houses rehabilitated" through the program, thus leaving the total at 16 houses reworked in 5 years, for an average of 3 houses per year.

If that rate continues, "and there is no indication that this rate will increase," 100 years will be needed to update the 300 houses in the project area, Butler explained.

Former mayor R. Irvine Smith charged that PRHA had let the slum­lords take control from the residents, asserted that "all our problems stem from PRHA, and suggested that the solution would be for the authority to get out."

PRHA Director of Development Hugh E. Forehand responded by providing slightly different figures and stating that PRHA "certainly has not been pleased with the rehabilitation program in Park View, but it has not been as bleak as Mr. Butler stated."

Finally, Mr. Forehand stated that "the most important aspect of success of any conservation project is strong citizen support of area residents. This has not been the case in Park View," and without such support the problem in Park View would continue despite PRHA efforts to work with the city to develop viable solutions.

Mr. Butler argued that one of the two major reasons for the problem was the reduction of resident homeowners to only 30% as absentee landlords increased their holdings to 70% of Park View homes. The second major reason was that the tenants of many of these structures owned by absentee landlords were:
certain classes of people that cannot live with anyone. The slum landlord with the cooperation of his best customer, the Portsmouth Welfare Department, has taken a heavy toll in Park View. We are overcrowded and unclean because of it, Butler declared. 199

As the controversy raged, the newspaper interviewed PRHA Executive Director Frye (Appendix J). Citing a lack of resources to buy and rehabilitate dwellings, a lack of Morale in Park View, the establishment of a Historic District and a CAR in Olde Towne, and higher income and physical conditions in Olde Towne as reasons why more seemed to be being done in Olde Towne than in Park View. 200

PRHA's Glenn James noted "the present recessionary economy" which created unsure conditions so that "people are not interested in spending as much on rehabilitation as in the past" as a further factor which was hindering rehabilitation efforts. 201 However, he also credited the economy for making low-interest loans more appealing, predicted that the full $500,000 local loan fund would be loaned out by the end of the year, and noted that PRHA had 39 loan requests totalling $697,000 in four neighborhood projects. 202

In Park View, the first street paving in forty years and the opening of a playground at Anne and Holladay Streets were signs of progress in implementing the conservation project. 203 Further progress was seen as the long-delayed park's football-baseball field opened and the Mayor presented the Park View PAC with a schedule of dates for the maintenance building, lighting, basketball and tennis courts, and fences—all set to begin before
the end of the year. The deadlines were not kept, however, and three months later, the City Manager stated that "the city staff has failed to deliver what was promised, and I cannot shun responsibility for that." In response to the continued deterioration of certain areas of the neighborhood, the Park View Conservation Project had again faced amendment in the fall of 1974 to allow demolition of dilapidated properties by recategorizing selected areas of the neighborhood from conservation to redevelopment. To finance the clearance called for in this second amendment to the Park View project, the PRHA Chairman urged Community Development funds be used to finance the clearance required in Park View so that land assembled through the clearance of deteriorated structures in these areas will be combined with several small parcels now in the Southside Project and utilized for new housing construction. The City Manager stated that "the best description of the Park View project I've heard yet is that it has run out of gas," and added that "well, this is the gas to keep it going," referring to the injection of almost $1.1 million in Community Development funds for use in Park View.

An innovative element of the March, 1974 Community Development application was the provision in March, 1974 of a $200,000 low-interest rehabilitation fund which required the PRHA, city, and HUD to approve an amended agreement because, as PRHA Executive Director Frye explained, "the authority in carrying out this rehabilitation program must be a party to the grant agreement for the 1975
Community Development action year." In fact, closer relationships were forced upon PRHA and the city because the new Community Development approach which insured that "in the future, the housing authority will have to come to the city government for most of their funds instead of applying directly to the federal government."  

During this period, two major administrative changes occurred. First, amendments for the Commission of Architectural Review were made to correct "certain loopholes and inconsistencies in the ordinance" in January and in May.  

Second, in April of 1975 the city council quickly appointed Robert T. Williams as City Manager to replace outgoing Phil Horton. (Horton replaced the long-serving Aubrey P. Johnson, Jr., after his retirement a little over a year before.)

**Olde Towne Conservation Efforts, 1975-1976**

As the U.S. Bicentennial approached, Olde Towne was marked by dissent over loan availability, conflict over project coordination or design, and progress in both private development and capital improvements. Both the increasing awareness of the historic area as 1976 approached and the need to complete the capital improvements by the originally anticipated 1977 completion date may have spurred these efforts.

Dissent over loan availability surfaced as a "Letter to the Editor" complaining that loans had been unavailable and that rehabilitation costs had been far greater than estimated loans.
prompted the Mayor of Portsmouth to respond that PRHA officials had given notification of the indefinite federal funding availability, that interim funding by local banking institutions had been depleted, and that:

During the sixty-three (63) month period that conservation has been in effect, federally assisted money was available for only twenty-four (24) months. For eight (8) of those twenty-four months, federally assisted funds were available only to persons of low income. Of the remaining thirty-nine months, through the assistance of local participating financial institutions, the Authority made funds available during sixteen (16) months. Thus, the Authority has been obligated to operate at the whim of federal procedures and the exigencies of the highest market rate in the history of this country. One hundred twenty-nine (129) units nevertheless, have been rehabilitated.217

He closed by noting that the cost-plus nature of the rehabilitation contracts in a period of unparalleled inflation was a contributing factor to the family's difficulties.218 In 1975, PRHA reported that approximately $1,000,000 in loans had been made by PRHA in Olde Towne, that 127 rehabilitation jobs (58% of the houses) were underway or completed in the neighborhood.219

Conflict emerged as the city efforts to rebrick the sidewalks clashed with VEPCO's efforts to install distinctive light poles and run new utility lines to them, and conflict flared as the city, PRHA, and the PAC dealt with the construction of a Bicentennial Arch. A different type of conflict arose over the construction of a brick wall in the "Demonstration Block."

VEPCO and the city found themselves in conflict because VEPCO needed to dig up streets and sidewalks at the very time that the
city was rebrick the sidewalks. Lamps that were originally ordered for Olde Towne had arrived in the summer of 1969, but there had been some problems over breakage and the lamps had been stored in a vacant PRHA-owned building. Later, British gas lamps subsequently were obtained from London, England, and suffered damage before being placed in storage. "Due to the present natural gas shortage," the advice to PRHA was to convert the lamps to electric use, and plans were made to alter 73 lamps for use with "four 35-watt incandescent bulbs controlled by an electric photo cell." PAC and PRHA in 1974 had approved City plans for "street lights in Olde Towne area...of Colonial design approximately 10-14' in height," but the installation of these lamps by VEPCO interfered with city efforts to lay 25,754 square yards of new brick sidewalks. The Director of Public Works contacted VEPCO to solve the problems caused as "our sidewalk project has now moved into sections of Olde Towne where conflict with the installation of underground electric service for subject lights has occurred." A boost for the sidewalk rebrick was received in June when PRHA and the City worked together to obtain a $200,000 grant from the Department of Commerce under the Economic Development Act to hire CETA workers under city supervision to do much of the remaining work.

Conflict between several organizations occurred after the Olde Towne PAC angrily discovered construction underway on Bicentennial Arch that had not been presented to the group for approval. The City Manager wrote to PRHA that this "points out a weakness in
the existing communications between the City, the PACs, and the PRHA" and "in an attempt to improve this situation, I am requiring that City staff be present at all future PAC meetings on a regular basis in order to keep the PAC as up to date and current as possible on the status of City public improvements within the project areas." A newspaper report later that month implied that PRHA blamed city staff for the situation, and two PRHA staff members wrote to the mayor explaining:

No such criticism was intended nor verbalized. In fact, this has never been the case, even in the past when circumstances may have warranted it. This policy of four-years' standing has been made under explicit instructions from the Executive Director.

They suggested that the problem had been due to a "breakdown in communications".

Another brick project occasioned a different conflict between constituencies in Olde Towne. This turmoil was created by public notice published in April that the City Council was considering an appropriation of $9,000 for the parking lot in the "Demonstration Block" (the 500 block of North Street), and a resident of the 200 block of Washington Street protested that "many residents of Olde Town [sic] feel that the tremendous resources poured into that block as compared to that expended on other blocks is not only unfair but highly discriminatory." The Mayor responded that he felt morally obligated to carry this out since "shortly after being elected mayor in 1974, I determined, after much research, that these concerned citizens had been promised that a brick wall, the only improvement which they felt
even remotely resembled the plans they originally approved, would be built as a screening treatment...."\textsuperscript{233}

Progress in private development was seen in 1975 when an investor bought the former Elks Club (329 North Street) from PRHA and began spending over $200,000 to convert the 1892 structure into 10 apartments.\textsuperscript{234} A year later, the former Harbor Court Hotel site in the 300 block of Court Street was sold by PRHA to an investor who planned to build two apartment buildings.\textsuperscript{235}

Progress in public improvements for a three-year period was scheduled.\textsuperscript{236} The Director of Public Works noted that "although the proposed pedestrian malls are not scheduled until 1977, a final determination which should be made on the feasibility of this undertaking in 1976 to coincide with the present state of the overall plan for Olde Towne,"\textsuperscript{237} and he pressed for a decision on the malls.\textsuperscript{238} After a city official subsequently "brought up the appropriateness of the proposed malls on Middle and Dinwiddie Streets" to the PAC in November of 1976,\textsuperscript{239} the PRHA Development Director warned of legal complications since land had been acquired to complete the original plan:

Any related adjustment to the plan, if needed, should be handled very carefully because the Authority and the City may be placed in a very untenable position because of not following through on planned public improvements when the threat of condemnation for this purpose was utilized to acquire a number of jib properties in the assembling of this land.\textsuperscript{240}
Further Changes in the Park View Project, 1976-1977

In January of 1976, PRHA Director of Development Forehand noted that changes were to be made yet again to the Park View plan and that "the PAC's initial proposal was modified by the Authority in consideration of structural survey data. These changes were supported by the neighborhood [PAG] at their January 15, 1976 meeting." The February hearings on the Community Development Funds revealed that the additional changes further reduced the conservation area:

Amendment Number 3 to the Park View Conservation and Redevelopment Project provides for the redesignation of a section of Park View which was previously slated for conservation, to acquisition and redevelopment. This action, which complements similar activities undertaken in both the conventionally funded Park View Project and the 1975 Community Development Program, was recommended by the Park View Project Area Committee in the earlier public form that was held by the Citizens Advisory Committee prior to the formulation of the 1976 C.D. Program. The expansion of these development activities in Park View was included in the CAC's community development proposal to the City Council.

After reiterating views that he had been expressed in the 1974 CD hearing, Mr. Horace Johnson of the Park View PAC noted that the influx of people in 1965-1970 had destroyed the concept of family living that this neighborhood had enjoyed for so many years. It also destroyed the prospect of rehabbing the area. By 1972 everyone concerned was aware that voluntary rehab would not work in Park View.

Citizens submitted a plan that would allow for a clearance of blighted areas, to make way for new constructed family-type housing. It was also hoped that this would stop further blight. This plan was adopted after being slightly changed in 1973. During 1973 and 1974, a three-block area was cleared and the original Federal grant for this project was depleted.

For 1975 you provided approximately one million dollars from community funds to continue planning, acquisition and clearance of spot blighted areas....
In planning for 1976...the Park View Area Committee had unanimously agreed to ask the City to provide funds from Community Development to acquire and clear the major portions of areas....[which we] believe....are the most blighted and those needing more immediate attention.... estimated to cost one point three million dollars.243

Amendment Number Three to the Park View Conservation Project was passed by the PRHA Board of Commissioners on February 17, 1976, and it was endorsed by the city later that day.244

Following the January 1976 request by Mr. Omar Hoelzel to the Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Development goals for the including the core area of Park View in the VA-R-48 project prompted a response from PRHA that "we are supportive of the inclusion of this section...into the Park View Project, considering the homogeneous nature of these two areas,"245 but there were concerns over limited funds for existing projects in a time of decreased Community Development Program funding.246 PRHA suggested a comprehensive analysis of the area and of the impact that including the core area in the project would have.247

At the November 18, 1976, PAC meeting, "a very comprehensive and timely plan to prevent the core area of Park View from going the way of the redevelopment area of Park View"248 was presented, and "the members of the PAC, especially those from the core area were very pleased to learn the city has finally realized that it is time to take steps to prevent the area from decaying."249 On December 7th, the Parkview Core Area - Status Report was sent to PRHA with a letter of transmittal that sparked controversy because it mentioned the need for increased staffing for codes enforcement and explored an historic district for the area.250 The "comment
regarding 'staff requirements' for this program is a concern because it portends a subsequent city request for CD funds for this purpose...."

The Historic District was opposed because:

we feel that this particular step should be taken in the Core Area only after considerable study and selectivity to insure that the designation of individual properties would not create future obstacles and other definite actions required to improve and protect the overall community. We do not feel that any building in the area should be specifically designated for the historic preservation unless it is conclusively shown that the architecture of the particular structure is unique or unless the building is historically significant. It is also our feeling that even if these conditions are prevalent, the overall feasibility of rehabilitation should also be considered prerequisite to determining whether a building should be designated. In this regard, the ownership of the property, the physical feasibility and cost of improvements, and the condition of the surrounding structures are important considerations."

Further Changes in the Olde Towne Project, 1977-1978

Following a door-to-door survey of Olde Towne residents who lived in areas where malls had been planned, the PAC endorsed the Middle Street Mall but requested the Dinwiddie Street Mall be eliminated and Glasgow Street mall be eliminated because of the inability to acquire the Monumental Methodist Church former cemetery lot for parking. Work on the mall was again delayed, however, "considering the serious problem encountered in acquiring the needed property for the parking lots" which had to be constructed before malls could be built. The delay in PRHA obtaining the land meant that city construction of the lots could
not begin until Fall of 1977 and "we could not expect to complete the lots until the following summer."256

In the spring of 1977, the Olde Towne PAC unanimously recommended to the City that it request the American Institute of Architect's Regional Urban Design Assistance Team (R/UDAT) to visit Portsmouth "for the purpose of studying the downtown area, and making suggestions and recommendations with regards to solutions of problems in the city's urban area."257 Following that team's suggestions, it was "felt that an extension of the Olde Towne Historic District south to Queen Street (from London Boulevard) from Court Street to the rear lot line of properties fronting on Green Street" would be advisable.258 At the November 1, 1977 Planning Commission meeting, this extension was made in addition to an enlargement of the Historic Residential district north to include "the Hampton Place area."259

While plans to expand the Historic District were being made, plans to increase compliance in the project area were underway. That November, the Assistant City Manager contacted the Director of Public Health about making inspections in Olde Towne because of "several complaints about numerous dwellings within the conservation district which are in violation of the Minimum Code and are likewise not taking advantage of any of the low interest loan programs offered to the district owners,"260 asked for a "windshield inspection" of dwellings, and noted that a discussion of the problem by City, PRHA, and PAC leadership had resulted in "our collective opinion that the PAC should be given the first
opportunity to deal with those property owners who have not yet taken effective action." PAC Chair Doris Leitner was sent a list of houses needed to be brought into compliance as well as a list of houses needing underground wiring, and she was informed that the City Traffic Engineer, Mr. R. D. McDaniel, had just been authorized to "begin working on a restricted parking plan for Olde Towne...." Expansion of the Olde Towne Historic District was enacted by City Council on January 10, 1978. PRHA immediately informed at least one city agency to "please note that this action does not extend the boundaries of the Olde Towne Conservation Project...Therefore, no low-interest Federal rehabilitation loan will be available." Increased codes enforcement was authorized by the City in mid-1978. Following a June 7, 1978 meeting with C. H. McGinnis of the City Manager's office, Hugh Forehand of PRHA and Ed Hayden of the City Health Department, authorization was given to proceed with initial inspections and a suggestion was made to the Health Department to appear before the Olde Towne PAC to explain "the process and requirements." In late 1978, some of the reasoning for not being more rigorous in enforcing codes was given by the Assistant City Manager:

Codes enforcement is the last phase of any such [redevelopment and conservation] public effort. It is scheduled last in order to insure that private property owners are given every opportunity to upgrade their property to legally required standards and to participate in the many advantageous
financing plans offered through the Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority. Lastly, it is an appropriate final effort in order to safeguard the millions of dollars of public and private investments which have been made on the basis that a particular area will be totally improved.

Codes enforcement in Olde Towne had been discussed by the City, the Authority and the Olde Towne PAC for at least a year prior to its initiation. The City even made an attempt to see that properties were improved without official intervention....

Concentrated codes enforcement has been an on/again off/again proposition here in Portsmouth for sometime [sic]. The present City administration regards proper codes enforcement as a must if many neighborhoods are to be protected from serious blight. It is our intention to resurrect this vital component of our housing program and to use it wisely in the public interest.266

While the city was promoting a broader Historic District and tougher code enforcement, it was took two steps to increase the quality of life in Olde Towne. First, the City Council approved a parking district which allowed long-term on-street parking for Olde Towne residents and guests only.267 Second, work on the park at Middle and Glasgow streets was begun.268 While these steps took place in Olde Towne, there were increased efforts in Park View.

Renewed Efforts in Park View, 1977-1978

In January of 1977, PRHA received a grant of $10 million--"more than 20% of the $50 million made available by Congress for the entire nation for the current fiscal year."269 The $1.8 million designated for Park View, according to PRHA Assistant Executive Director Hugh Forehand, would be used for fifty homes, of which 20 were already scheduled for demolition.270
After spending nearly $3 million in federal aid, a newspaper writer observed in February of 1977, "it appears that the tide may be turning" on Park View as both residents and city officials reported a slowed level of flight of middle-class white families from the area, a lower level of influx of absentee landlords, higher morale among residents, and signs of renewal in the building of about a dozen new homes by private contractors. PRHA official Hugh Forehand noted that making the area a conservation area in 1968 had allowed residents to apply for low-interest [Section 312] loans but no money was provided:

And when someone did ask for a loan they often were not available, says Forehand. The federal government kept cutting the program.

We worked on one person for 9 months to convince him to take a loan. When he finally agreed, the government turned the money spigot off. He got disgusted and told us to jump in the lake, Forehand recalls.

As a newspaper article reported, Park View looked like a textbook study in urban decay:

In the early '60s, nearly all the houses were owner occupied. By 1976, 70% were rental. In 10 years, the area changed from nearly all white to 65% black.

In the 2 year period ending in 1975, Park View lost 22% of its upper-income residents. By last year, 30% of its residents lived below the federal poverty level and 35% were on welfare or social security.

The price of housing plummeted. The average sales price last year was $17,000 for a substantial home.

This dire situation had prompted the emergency funding which was now lifting spirits, but one of the terms of the federal grant was that it was to be the last such one Park View could receive.
and HUD's Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development noted that cities such as Portsmouth received generous grants because they received little money between 1967 and 1972. Mayor Richard J. Davis noted that tough times lay ahead because Portsmouth had received $4.5 million a year since 1975 in Community Development funds but that amount would be reduced to $3.8 million for the next budget year and would be reduced to $2.3 million by 1980, hampering the attempt to use CD funds for slum clearance at a time when "for the first time, [Portsmouth is] achieving a pace which is beginning to exceed that of unending blight."  

As the effort in the conservation area of the Park View neighborhood seemed to be having success, the area which had been excluded from the project was increasingly noticed. In May of 1977, there were "several questions raised relating to participation in the PAC planning process by residents of the so-called core area." An update on Park View was given in September of 1978 on the "southeastern portion of Park View Renewal and Conservation Project and [the] adjoining so-called Park View Non-assisted core area" where "growth of medical facilities as an essential core city component has exceeded all expectations (Naval Hospital, Portsmouth General Hospital, the Psychiatric Center, the Manning Home, the City of Portsmouth Health Center, and numerous medical offices, etc.)." Shortly thereafter, PRHA indicated that it was studying the matter. Two months later, PRHA "concluded that a traditional conservation program with large scale lending and
supporting administrative costs would not be advisable at this time because of the "competing conservation priorities within the city, the availability of loan funds (Section 312, local rehabilitation loans and elderloans) and the locality's decreasing Community Development entitlement." PRHA's suggestion of an alternative treatment was for the city was "implementation of a flexible code enforcement program in this neighborhood."

The city agreed with this assessment of the lack of funding but disputed the alternative suggestion barely a week later. Concern that cracking down on enforcement without providing relatively cheap loans to promote compliance would be detrimental was a factor prompting the Assistant City Manager to write that:

> Only a major change in funding levels of our existing programs or a new program such as the Chicago bond concept would help us in areas such as the Core. However, I must admit that I am even less enthusiastic about a codes enforcement program in the Core now because of the recent and projected increases in interest rates. Perhaps though, as you have suggested, VHDA winterization loans interwoven with other improvements will assist in keeping the overall rate below market [interest rates].

> I will further review the "flexible codes enforcement" concept, but as I have indicated on previous occasions, I have reservations concerning the legality and political wisdom of employing it."

Near the end of 1978, PRHA announced that "we've had a decided interest in people from outside the city moving into Park View." The occasion for speaking was the sale of one of the eight homes which PRHA had rehabilitated and sold in Park View recently.
Administrative Changes, 1977-1979

Between 1977 and 1979, there was an "end" to the Olde Towne conservation project as "Urban Renewal" projects, HUD funding and PRHA leadership changed, and the CAR came under fire. None of these changes was accompanied by conflict or policy shifts.

In late 1977, Portsmouth signed official "close out" agreements on the Olde Towne, Northside, Mount Hermon, Effingham and Crawford Urban Renewal projects as part of a deal made with HUD in January so that the $10,044,061 special "urgent needs" grant could be obtained.286 City Manager Robert T. Williams explained that this was primarily a bookkeeping matter:

"There's no lessening...no slacking in our commitment," Williams said. "This is a financial closeout as far as HUD's concerned. "So everything comes under one set of rules?"

asked Councilman E. Saunders Early, Jr.
"That’s right," Williams said.287

To carry out its federally funded activities, Portsmouth was allotted $3.803 million, a drop as expected from the $4.5 million which the city had been receiving since the Community Development Act had been passed in 1974.288 To carry out its redevelopment and housing activities, the city had new leadership as PRHA Executive Director Frye resigned289 and was replaced by his former assistant, Michael A. Kay, in August of 1978.290 In 1979, a court case ruled that the Committee of Architectural Review could not delegate authority to an administrator to issue "certificates of appropriateness," and sections of the City Code had to be amended.291 The changes prompted this observation:
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This is both timely and of more importance as exterior appearance takes on new meaning in our more sophisticated approach to land use control through zoning. Moreover, we are talking about preservation as a basis for conservation program[s] of the future where our community development program is headed.292

The Committee of Architectural Review drew extended attention in July of 1979, as City Attorney Gordon Tayloe:

"noted that perhaps of all municipal activities this is most restrictive of personal property rights...and cited examples of disputes over house paint color, front yard fences and whether a stuccoed house could be covered with aluminum siding."293

Discussion followed and "Mr. Moore added that this program of historic preservation lies at the base of our future urban conservation efforts in the so-called "blue-belt band of neighborhoods" from Cradock to Truxton to Port Norfolk and must be dealt with in an appropriate manner."294

Olde Towne Changes, 1979-1980

During these two years, compliance was emphasized in the project area, the borders of the Historic District were defended and extended, and PRHA refined its final plans for the project area. PRHA Executive Director Kay noted that "we have seen in excess of four million dollars invested in private funds in the rehabilitation of the Old[e] Towne community."295

A proposal to allow Historic Limited Office zoning in the 300 and 400 blocks of London Boulevard296 was opposed successfully by Olde Towne residents.297 Later that month, a proposal was reviewed to extend the Historic District to include the 300 block of Washington Street as well as the 600 block of North Street
(between Washington and Green Streets), including Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church, and it passed.

During 1980, two major changes were made to the Olde Towne area. In July of 1980, PRHA formally acknowledged that it had determined not to acquire the land owned by Monumental United Methodist Church on Glasgow Street, effectively leading to cancellation of plans for off-street parking and hence to the planned malls. In September, the city transferred property owned at Crawford Parkway and Washington Street to PRHA so that it could be sold to private developers. Although there would be a few minor actions later, this was the last major PRHA action taken in Olde Towne during the study period.

Park View Changes, 1979-1980

In the spring of 1979, the PAC was concerned that "the expansion of medical related facilities in or adjacent to the Park View community has created serious parking problems, and further, numerous structures have been demolished to create surface parking." The request for a copy of a parking study said to be underway was followed by a suggestion that the area "would benefit from a parking arrangement similar to that imposed on the Olde Towne area" which was refused because "only one street qualifies under the existing restrictive parking ordinance."

In July of 1979, the PAC turned to more substantial and continuing concerns when a lengthy list of properties "needing some
type of attention" was forwarded to PRHA. The same concerns over enforcement without an accompanying loan program again appeared as they had in 1978 when PRHA responded in late August:

Although we agree that the structures listed in your letter require corrective action, it is felt that it would be more appropriate to postpone a decision on the disposition of these properties at the present time due to unknowns associated with the Neighborhood Strategy Area (NSA) program. As you are aware, other than code enforcement and/or encouragement of property owners to fix up their properties by the PAC, there is little that can be accomplished without financial resources. In this connection, a plan cannot be developed until the feasibility including cost of the NSA program is determined. This information should be available in the near future at which time rescheduling of the remaining community development funds in Park View can begin. In the interim, we will be reviewing the list you have provided from a proposed treatment and annotated cost standpoint.  

The Park View PAC "wanted inspectors to get in early so they went right in after completing Olde Towne," said Assistant City Manager Chet Meginnis when he reported that housing inspectors had found violations in 183 of the 538 properties in the project area as of late 1979. Despite having about 1 in 3 properties with violations and having some properties with a few violations, none of the violations were major and the number of violations were spread 50-50 among resident owned and absentee owned properties. These statistics and the encouraging fact that no violations were found in any of the new housing were factors that "prompted city officials to conclude they are starting to turn the corner in Park View."  

A threat to the continued progress loomed ahead, however, when federal officials in March of 1980 said "the government is not
making idle threats when it warns cities like Portsmouth that it will cut funds if they don’t spread subsidized housing into affluent neighborhoods."³¹⁰ Although HUD Secretary Moon Landrieu said his policy was somewhat flexible, he stated that "ultimately he will use his power to deny federal funds to cities that do not put subsidized housing in middle and upper income areas."³¹¹ The evolving dispute is described in the next chapter of this study.


In Table VI-1 (on the next page), the implementation experience is assessed by an analysis of each factor. Of the fifteen implementation factors, two had no influence on implementation. One (Initial Allocation of Financial Resources) was not applicable because the initial stage of implementation had passed, and another (Support from Sovereigns) was not relevant because there were no interventions in the implementation process by representatives of the executive, congressional, or judicial branches of government.

Eight factors facilitated implementation during the decade. The minimal technical difficulties and the low diversity of behaviors regulated were unchanged factors which had positive effects on implementation. Although the population of Olde Towne increased while that of Park View diminished as clearance of dilapidated properties increased in the latter project, implementation was facilitated in both projects because neither area ever constituted a large percentage of the city’s population.³¹²
**TABLE VI-1**

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS
FOR THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW
CONSERVATION PROJECTS, 1970-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLDE TOWNE</th>
<th>PARK VIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical Difficulties</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Range of Behaviors Regulated</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Target Group as a Percentage of the Population</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of Behavioral Change Required</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jurisdiction over Causal Linkages</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Initial Allocation of Financial Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Integration Within and Among Implementing Institutions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clarity of Decision Rules of Implementing Agencies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recruitment of Implementing Officials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Formal Access by Outsiders</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public Support</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Attitudes and Resources of Constituents' Groups</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support from Sovereigns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Innovation of Implementors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Favorable effects on implementation are shown with a plus sign ("+") , negative effects with a minus sign("-"), and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero ("0"). For further details on evaluating changes, see Figure II-1.
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There was jurisdiction over causal linkages as PRHA contracted with the Virginia Health Department for Environmental Specialists to conduct inspections and as PRHA began a Local Rehabilitation Loan Program in 1973 which allowed local control. Although the erratic funding of Section 312 loans and the growing awareness of the limited legal standing of federal conservation standards diminished the degree of control, the implementing agencies still exercised jurisdiction through these federal mechanisms and through the city's CAR in Olde Towne.

The integration within and among implementing institutions was improved. Although the formal hierarchical integration among implementing agencies was reduced by eliminating PRHA inspectors and assigning their duties to Virginia State Health Department Environmental Specialists (Figure VI-1 on the next page), cooperative relationships emerged and there is no record of conflict emerging from this relationship. Moreover, the creation of positions for PRHA Project Coordinators to coordinate the city and federal efforts, the beginning of monthly meetings between city and PRHA administrators, and the closer working relationships forced by the shift of federal funding from urban renewal funds given directly to PRHA to Community Development dollars given through the city helped foster more integration among the implementing agencies. As the implementing units became more familiar with one another and with the regulations which they jointly administered, routinization began to set in at this stage.
FIGURE VI-1
ORGANIZATIONAL CHART OF IMPLEMENTING INSTITUTIONS
FOR THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW
NEIGHBORHOOD CONSERVATION PROJECTS, c. 1978
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There was clarity of decision rules during the period. Familiarity with the Section 312 program; design of the local LRLP program with locally written and administered rules; and understanding of the way that the conservation standards, the zoning standards, and the Historic District standards complemented one another were changes which increased clarity.

Formal access by outsiders was provided by the Olde Towne and Park View Project Area Committees, and this assisted implementation. A further facilitating factor was the innovative leadership of implementing officials in developing the Local Rehabilitation Loan Program program utilizing tax-free bonds and in cooperating to utilize Community Development funds as a loan-funding device.

Two factors impeded implementation during the 1970s. First, the inability to recruit implementing officials specifically for the conservation projects also continued to be a factor which hindered implementation. Second, the pattern of socioeconomic change showed a decline in both Olde Towne and Park View.313

Three implementation factors differed between the two conservation projects, and all three show better implementation in Olde Towne (Table VI-2 on the next page). This supports the observations of administrators and residents during the period that the Olde Towne Project was more successfully implemented than the Park View project.
First, there was a greater extent of behavioral change required in Park View because of the large number of absentee property owners. Statements by PRHA and PAC representatives indicate that the homeowners cooperated while the large number of non-resident investors did not participate in the program, and a high degree of change would have been required for them to have complied. Although owner-occupancy declined in Olde Towne while it increased in Park View, the problem was primarily among the large number of absentee landlords in Park View.

Second, public support for the federal conservation effort was stronger in Olde Towne than in Park View. Park View residents were often vocal critics of PRHA efforts, much to the consternation of HUD and PRHA officials. The Park View PAC and the Park View Improvement League backed the 1971 attempt to repeal the conservation project and helped reduce the area marked for conservation by initiating and supporting three amendments which
decreased that area in 1973, 1974, and 1976. Although these steps were taken to promote neighborhood revitalization, they were nonetheless complicating factors which impeded implementation in Park View while public support in Olde Towne facilitated it.

Third, the attitudes and resources of constituents' groups promoted implementation in the Olde Towne project while hindering it in Park View. The Portsmouth Historical Association continued to use its expertise and resources to promote an expanded Olde Towne Historic District. By contrast, the Park View Improvement League became dormant. Neither PAC had extensive resources, but support was usually evident in Olde Towne while confrontational in Park View during the decade.

The experience in the two study areas suggests three additional implementation factors. First, the erratic funding suggests that continued funding of financial resources may influence implementation. The call for a congressional investigation in 1971 and the turmoil caused by the unpredictable funding suggests that this was an influence on implementation.

Second, perceived consistency of policies emerges as an influential factor during this period of the study. The apparent reversal on the issue of PRHA taking property after the required year-and-a-day waiting period was cited in three PRHA documents (Appendices F, G, and H) as having damaged morale, created conflict, and weakened faith in the conservation effort.

Third, marketing and promotion again emerged as a differential factor in implementation. The presentation of Olde Towne as a
unique neighborhood with brick sidewalks and antique lamps may have created perceptions which affected implementation success, especially during the period of heightened historical awareness engendered by the United States bicentennial. By contrast, no similar effort to enhance the unique character of Park View or to promote the neighborhood was undertaken during the decade.

During the decade, the implementors were partially successful in providing outputs (Appendices F, G, and H). Both the federal rehabilitation loan program and the federal housing inspection program failed as originally envisioned, but local alternative programs succeeded in providing both loans and inspections.

Although precise figures are not available, numerous observations by PAC and PRHA representatives during the period clearly indicate that Section 312 funding was available only erratically and that relatively few such loans were made. Despite the failure of the original loan mechanism, however, alternative sources of funding were developed by implementing units to sell interest-free bonds and to use Community Development funds to create a local funding mechanism that did succeed in making funds available for rehabilitation loans.

The federal inspection program failed because PRHA was unable to maintain inspectors to carry out the required inspections. By entering into a contract with the Virginia Department of Health, however, Environmental Specialists were hired to conduct inspections to carry out limited inspections during most of the
1970s and to conduct project-wide inspections at the end of the decade.

The impact of the conservation projects shows differing patterns in the two study areas (Table VI-1 on the page after next). Although Olde Towne does not show positive neighborhood change in as many factors as does Park View (as indicated by the number of plus signs), it does show greater percentages of positive change in the factors that do show beneficial movement.

In the 1970s, Olde Towne’s changing conditions improved in five of the eight indicators. In addition to over a two hundred percent increase in median housing value and a continued rise in new construction, beneficial changes were shown by the vacancy rate, overcrowding, and housing lacking plumbing. However, three other descriptors indicated deteriorating conditions (owner occupancy, long-term residency, and multi-family units).

Improvement in Park View is indicated by positive signs for seven of the eight indicators for which data is available. Increases in median housing value of about 169% and in owner occupancy by 20% suggest that some of the problems reported earlier in the decade had begun to be resolved by the time of the census. With the exception of an increase in overcrowding, all of the descriptors show Park View improving during the 1970s.

Both neighborhoods show improvement in more descriptors of neighborhood condition than they did in the previous decade. Since both neighborhoods showed increasing percentages of minorities during this period, the improvements in neighborhood conditions
during this decade call into question some of the literature of neighborhood change which suggests that such increases result in deteriorating conditions. Improved neighborhood condition in both areas (Table VI-3) is associated with more successful implementation in the two neighborhood conservation projects (Table VI-1) during the 1970s.
### TABLE VI-3

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS, 1970-1980**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>OLDE TOWNE</th>
<th>PARK VIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>EVALUATION*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing Built Within the Past Ten Years</td>
<td>+ 28.5%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Median Housing Value</td>
<td>+ 253.1%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multi-family Units</td>
<td>+ 4.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing Lacking Some or All Plumbing Facilities</td>
<td>- 15.8%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overcrowding</td>
<td>- 17.6%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Owner Occupancy</td>
<td>- 17.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Residency At the Same Address for Five Years Or More</td>
<td>- 4.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>- 60.1%</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: The percentages of change are derived from the U.S. Census of Population and Housing for 1970 and 1980. Improvement in neighborhood condition is shown with a plus sign ("+"), deterioration with a minus sign ("-"), and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero ("0"). For further details on evaluating neighborhood changes, see Figure II-2.*
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5.Ibid.


7.Frances K. Worrell, Report on Conservation Projects (Portsmouth VA: PRHA, 1971), 9. See Appendix H for further details. These inspections were for compliance for the city's minimum housing code rather than for compliance with the higher conservation standards. The problems with getting inspections and inspectors to enforce the conservation standards are dealt with throughout the remainder of this chapter.

8.Ibid.


10.Ibid. In July, 51 parcels had been acquired, another parcel's price had been agreed upon, 7 other parcels were under negotiation, and none of these actions had required PRHA to take property by condemnation proceedings.

11.Ibid. Mr. Winters noted that two or three loan contracts had been signed already and that several homes had been inspected and were having specifications drawn up to bring them into compliance with project standards. The loans were Section 312 loans.

12."Conservation Progress Satisfactory But Slow," Virginian-Pilot, October 3, 1970, sec. B, 2. She reported that the number of properties inspected had grown to 66 and the number acquired to 57.

13.Francis K. Worrell, Report on Conservation Projects in Portsmouth, (Portsmouth VA: PRHA, October 1970), 5. See Appendix H. The "Demonstration Block" was the Bain-Pritchard house at 525 North Street (located in the Demonstration Block). The
Demonstration Block was bounded on the north by North Street, on the south by Glasgow Street, on the east by Dinwiddie Street and on the west by Washington Street.


15."Conservation Progress Satisfactory But Slow," Virginian-Pilot, October 3, 1970, sec. B, 2. She reported that of 263 structures standing in Olde Towne, 42 were to be acquired by PRHA. Of 205 residences to be rehabilitated, 50 had already been inspected, 6 had been restored with PRHA assistance, and restoration of 4 others was in progress.


19."New PRHA Acting Director to Begin Duties Around Jan. 1," Ledger-Star, November 4, 1970, sec. A, 3. The announcement of HUD funding was made by PRHA Chairman Shocklin at the same time that he announced the appointment of the Acting Director.


21.See the contract between the city and VEPCO dated this day.

22.Letter from Arthur C. Meginley, Jr., Acting Executive Director to Mr. Douglas E. Chaffin, Jr., Acting Assistant Regional Director for Renewal [HUD], June 17, 1971, 1.

23.Letter from B. S. Trant, Director of Building Inspections to Mr. Carrol Mason, Executive Director, PRHA, April 6, 1970, 1.

24."Park View Residents Air Concerns in Renewal Pace," Ledger-Star, January 8, 1971, sec. B, 1. Mr. Siff was appearing as at the PAC meeting as a representative of Harland Bartholomew and Associates, the consulting firm which had designed the Park View project.

25.Ibid. Others complained that they were hesitant to improve their houses unless they knew what would happen to nearby substandard housing, and Rudd L. Jenson charged that PRHA did not get new property owners to rehabilitate dwellings before renting
them. Billy Goree indicated that PRHA did not assist homeowners, and he cited his own experience with having his house inspected the previous May, approving improvements in July, and still not having PRHA’s specifications for changes received yet.

26. Ibid.

27. Letter from A. P. Johnson, Jr. [City Manager] to Mr. Arthur D. Meginley Jr., Acting Executive Director [PRHA], January 13, 1971, 1. The City Council meeting had been held on January 12th.


29. Ibid., 2.


31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.


34. Ibid.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid. See Appendices F, G, and H for further discussion of the impact of this apparent reversal of policy.


41. "Council to hear Park View Report," Ledger-Star, March 9, 1971, sec. B, 141. He reported that PRHA had inspected 110 structures, completed 25 write-ups of work to be done, made 3 low-cost Section 312 loans, had 1 more approved, submitted 4 more loan applications for approval in Park View.
42. Donald Moore, "Congressional Scrutiny eyed for Park View Blight," Ledger-Star, March 11, 1971, sec. B, 1. The motion was moved by Dr. James Holly and seconded by R. Irvine Smith. The original inquiry of January 12, 1971 had emphasized the lack of Section 312 funding and resulted in the City Manager’s being asked if there were any ways to speed up the loan process, so it is likely that the inquiries were meant to focus on increasing financial aid rather than on management of the projects.


47. Ibid.


51. Ibid. The house was at 250 Armstrong Street.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid.


55. "Executive Director Sought by PRHA," Virginian-Pilot, September 17, 1971, sec. C, 4. Meginley had been Acting Executive Director for eight-and-a-half months.

56. "PRHA Elects Wimbrough," Virginian-Pilot, September 15, 1971, sec. B, 3. The official date of his letter of resignation was later (September 28th), but his resignation was not formally accepted until January of 1972. (See "Action on Shocklin Resignation Set," Virginian-Pilot, January 21, 1972.)


66. Ibid., 3.

67. Ibid., 4.

68. Ibid., 4.

69. Ibid., 5.

70. Ibid., 5.

71. Ibid., 6.

72. Ibid.

73. Ibid., 9.

74. Ibid.

75. Ibid., 10.

76. Ibid., 7.

77. Ibid., 10.
Demolition was scheduled beginning in January 1971 (along Armstrong St. from Blair to Southern limit, along Blair from Owens St. to Elm Ave., on Holladay from Armstrong to Elm), in July 1972 (from Armstrong St. between Leckie and Spratley), May 1973 (along Howell Street from Elm Avenue to Webster), June 1973 (along Butts St, Lane and Williams Street) and September 1973 (Primrose Street). Capital projects were scheduled to begin in January 1972 (storm drains and sanitary sewers), July 1972 (water and gas line installation), July and August 1972 (street construction and new sidewalks--a two year project) and July 1972 (parking lots), and the Recreation Department was prepared to begin development of the six-acre playground and the Blair Street playlot.

Interview with former City Manager Aubrey P. Johnson, Jr., December 8, 1992.


Letter from W. C. Johnson, Rehabilitation Loan and Grant Branch for Acting Assistant Regional Administrator for Renewal Assistance, HUD to Mrs. Frances K. Worrell, Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority, July 9, 1971, 1. Meanwhile, grant applications could be processed if they were not to be considered in conjunction with loans.

Letter from W. Kevin Boland, Program Manager, HUD to D. B. Frye, Jr., [Executive Director, PRHA], February 25, 1972. The authorization for allowing local approval was cited as RHM 7375.1, Supplement, dated July 9, 1970.

Report of Telephone Call from William Rudko, Rehabilitation Officer to Jerry Wilson, HUD Area Loan and Grant Officer, April 19, 1972, 1.

Ibid.


91. Ibid.


96. Ibid.

97. Ibid.

98. Interview with Gordon E. Wheatley, Director of Operations for Development, December 18, 1992. The inspectors underwent a six-month training program to become familiar with the building code and building materials, but they soon used their knowledge to gain new jobs which paid more than the relatively low wages which they received for working in the conservation projects.


102. Letter from E. V. Peele, Jr., Rehabilitation and Conservation Program Director, Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority, June 16, 1971, 1.
103. Letter from John A. LaVey, Director of Operations, Region III, Department of Housing and Urban Development to Mr. Aubrey Johnson, City Manager, January 31, 1972, 1. The contract originally had been submitted on November 5, 1971.

104. Letter from H. L. Forehand, Assistant Director of Development to Mr. D. B. Frye, Executive Director, December 29, 1971, 1. PRHA requested raising the funding to $40,000 ($25,000 for Olde Towne inspections and $15,000 for inspections in Park View) and asked HUD to approve $420,000 in rehabilitation loan funds (assuming 40 loans at approximately $11,000 each).

105. Inter-Office Communication, William Rudko to Code Specialist and Project Coordinators, December 27, 1971, 1. Code Specialists were to "coordinate the inspection of at least 84 dwellings per year by city inspection personnel in conjunction with the activities of the Rehabilitation Specialist" in addition to personally performing all inspections requested by residents in the conservation areas. The goal for Financial Advisors was "to prepare and have approved 17 312 loans and/or grants per year" as required by the plans that Rehabilitation Specialists initiated. As for the Rehabilitation Specialists, their "minimal acceptable levels and the measuring stick for...work performance" were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Olde Towne</th>
<th>Park View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures completed per year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work write-ups and inspections</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bids [that] must be put out and accepted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


107. Letter from Satyendra Singh Huja, Deputy Director [of Planning] and Chief Planner, Portsmouth Planning Department to Miss Sue Whitley, PRHA, January 10, 1972, 1.


109. Commission of Architectural Review, Minutes, January 25, 1972, 2. The four buildings were considered to be historically important by the CAR, and there was concern lest PRHA act without consulting the CAR about carrying out the ordinance which treated boarded up buildings as abandoned structures.

110. Letter from H. M. Myer, Jr., Assistant City Manager to D. B. Fry, Jr., Executive Director, PRHA, February 11, 1972, 1. Of course, the reason for not being informed of inspections was that inspections had not begun due to the problems of getting the appropriate contracts and authorization to hire inspectors.
111. Letter from D. B. Frye, Executive Director, PRHA to Aubrey Johnson, City Manager, February 10, 1972, 1. The letter went on to state that "an analyses of the anticipated workload indicates that approximately 320 man hours per month or approximately 2 man years annually will be required to maintain our inspection schedule and to expedite the conservation program in these neighborhoods."

112. Interview with Aubrey P. Johnson, Jr., December 8, 1992. Because of fiscal constraints, the city had worked out an agreement with the state so that the Health Department’s Environmental Inspectors were paid by the state.

113. PRHA Board of Commissioners, "Resolution 15," February 8, 1972. The earlier PRHA request for $40,000 in funding was apparently not received favorably by HUD, for on February 8, 1972, PRHA passed Resolution 15 authorizing payment for inspection services not to exceed $25,000.

114. D. B. Frye, Executive Director, PRHA to Aubrey Johnson, City Manager, February 29, 1972, 1. Since inspections are "regular city functions and are normally available upon request," he argued that the city should not charge PRHA for the service.

115. Letter from William Rudko, Rehabilitation Officer, PRHA to Dr. C. M. G. Buttry, Department of Public Health, March 13, 1972, 1.

116. Donald Moore, "Better Coordination of PRHA, City Sought," Ledger-Star, June 20, 1972, sec. B, 1. The speaker was Assistant City Manager H. M. Myers.

117. Bill Trask, "New Rules Forcing Code Work To Halt," Virginian-Pilot, June 27, 1972, sec. B, 3. The area in Park View was to be the "core" section which had been excluded from the conservation project. The new requirement was that the beginning and ending of F.A.C.E. programs had to take place within a year, and the extent of the proposed program required a longer time.

118. Letter from D. B. Frye, Jr., Executive Director, to Mr. John Amos, Area Counsel, HUD, July 13, 1972, 1-2. Mr. Amos responded that this response was satisfactory and the matter was closed. (Letter from John A. Amos, Area Counsel, HUD to D. B. Frye, Jr., August 4, 1972, 1).

119. Memorandum from HGJ to Mr. D. B. Frye, Jr., Executive Director and Glenn James, Rehabilitation Officer, April 24, 1973, 2.

120. "Housing Authority Criticized for Delays," Ledger-Star, January 14, 1972, sec. A, 3. The four houses were in the 1200 and 1300 block of Leckie Street.
121.Ibid.
122.Ibid.

124.Donald Moore, "Letters Aid Blight Attack," Ledger-Star, January 19, 1972, sec. B, 1. The new code was based on the Southern Standard Housing Code and required dwellings to be recertified by the city before being reoccupied. City inspectors would not, however, be inspecting homes in Olde Towne and Park View for compliance with the projects’ Conservation Standards.


131.Ibid.


135.Ibid.


for new sidewalks, curbs, and gutters.

138. Letter from H. M. Myers, Jr., Assistant City Manager to Mr. D. B. Frye, Executive Director, PRHA, April 27, 1972. 1. The changes had been unanimously approved at the PAC meeting on April 13, 1972.


142. Ibid.

143. "Council Asked to Back Shift in Park View," Virginian-Pilot, April 25, 1972, sec. B, 5. Vice Mayor Johnson reported rental units then constituted 60 to 65% of the property in Park View.

144. "Park View Project Changes Endorsed by City Council," Ledger-Star, September 15, 1972, sec. A, 2. The lone dissenting vote was cast by Councilman Dr. James Holley who opposed the motion because he felt changing the project would slow it down.


147. Ibid.

148. Ibid., 2.

149. Owen Easley, "Fund Cuts Upset Two Neighborhoods," Ledger-Star, May 11, 1973, sec. B, 1. She also indicated that the regional office was attempting to get the amendment approved before a fund cutoff expected to take effect on June 30.

150. Letter from C. A. Butler, Chairman, Park View Citizens Committee to Miss Eleanor Woolard, PRHA, August 15, 1973, 1.


152. Planning Commission Minutes, October 2, 1973, 6. The changes were described succinctly in this way: a three-block area generally located to the east of Scott’s Creek has been
redesignated for acquisition and residential development. Two of these blocks, which were previously scheduled for conservation, have been designated for redevelopment (to be acquired for private residential use). The land use in the third block, the majority of which has been acquired by the Authority, has been revised to allow for residential development. A large parcel of land in the northwest corner of the project, which is now scheduled for acquisition in the Park View Conservation Plan, has been designated as a redevelopment area in order to facilitate its acquisition for private residential use. A number of other adjustments to the plan, including the reduction in the area of the Harrell Street Playlot, the elimination of the proposed Scott's Creek Park, and the redesignation of several small parcels from acquisition to conservation, are also proposed...."


154. Ibid., 5-7. George Minor pointed out that the program including eliminating the Scotts' Creek Park, reducing the proposed Harrell Street playlot at the foot of Elm Avenue, adjusting the northeastern boundary of the project, and changing a three-block area (bounded on the east by Elm Avenue, on the west by Armstrong and Owen Streets, on the south by Leckie Street, and on the north by Spratley Street) to private residential use.

155. Ibid., 9. Mr. Walker then resided at 1749 Spratley Street.

156. Ibid., 17. Mr. Smith, a resident of 200 Elm Avenue, used the opportunity to chide the city council members about "the lack of enforcement...of trash and garbage ordinances" (Ibid., 17-18) and to charge that: "Weeds are allowed to grow between the curbs and gutters. Debris is allowed to be piled on the streets and stay for weeks." (Ibid.)

157. Ibid., 20-21. Mr. Johnson then resided at 152 Owens Street.


159. Ibid.


161. Interdepartmental Correspondence from J. C. Mobly, City Engineer, to Aubrey P. Johnson, Jr., City Manager, April 4, 1973, 1.
162. Ibid.

163. Letter from Satyendra Singh Huja, Secretary, Commission of Architectural Review to Mrs. Frances Worrell, PRHA, October 27, 1971, 1.

164. Letter from John Paul C. Hanbury to Arthur Meginley, PRHA, November 18, 1971, 1.

165. See Deed Book 626, page 561. The property was conveyed from Ruth C. Bryant to Quinton A. Roesser on August 2, 1973.

166. An amendment to Section 3-19 was passed by City Council on October 24, 1972.

167. Letter from Donald C. Kilgore [PRHA Attorney] to Hugh Forehand, December 1, 1972, 1. The lot is shown as Parcel 3, Block 4 on the PRHA site map.


169. Letter from H. Thomas Fennell, Jr. [PRHA Attorney] to Mrs. Susan Whitley, PRHA, September 8, 1973, 1. The provision in question is Paragraph C(2)(a) on page five of the Olde Towne Conservation Plan: "No land or building shall be used for hotels, motels, rooming houses or other housing of transient use." If the home was a non-conforming use, it could not receive an anticipated grant or undertake major repairs.


171. "Flynn Home Upgrading Conforms to Land Use; Gets OK," Ledger-Star, September 19, 1973, sec. A, 2. Since there are only five PRHA commissioners, this abstaining by two is significant.

172. "Flynn Home Zoning Questioned," Virginian-Pilot, September 29, 1973, sec. B, 3. The Assistant City Attorney indicated that HR zoning designated provided only for single-family residences, duplexes, and multiple-family residences, and he stated his opinion that the zoning ordinance thus allowed the continuation of non-conforming uses but not their enlargement.

173. Ibid.


175. Ibid. The matter had come to public attention by announcement of the grant for repair and enlargement of the Flynn Home earlier that year.
176. Ibid. Dissension within Olde Towne was seen as a petition signed by over 200 people was presented to the commissioners in favor of the Flynn expansion in opposition to the original one signed by 96 people (ten of whom now indicated that they wished to change their position).


178. Letter from J. Richard Gill, President, Olde Towne PAC to Mr. D. B. Frye, Executive Director, PRHA, July 20, 1973, 1. The reason cited was that the traffic bottleneck that would be created as the six-lane London Boulevard entered the two-lane section of London between Green Street and Court Street only to widen to four lanes before having to feed into Crawford Street.


181. Ibid.

182. Grading of the small park on the corner of London Boulevard and Washington Street began in the spring of 1974, (Letter from Eleanor Woolard, Project Coordinator to Mrs. Frank C. Tonkin [Virginia Federation of Garden Clubs], March 5, 1974, 1) and the Virginia Federation of Garden Clubs, Tidewater District donated several "Battery Park" style benches for placement in Olde Towne. (Letter from Mrs. Eleanor Woolard, Project Coordinator to Mrs. Frank C. Tonkin, March 5, 1974, 1.) The name of the benches comes from the distinctive Charleston, S.C. style.

183. Itemized Improvement Schedule for Olde Towne Conservation Project VA R-49 (Portsmouth VA: City of Portsmouth, April 10, 1974. Public Improvements of $423,097 were scheduled for 1975, while $525,922 for 1976 and $356,737 for 1977 were committed.

184. Letter from R. D. Hester, Assistant City Engineer to Eleanor Woolard, PRHA, March 1, 1974, 1. Parking lot specifications were drawn for those in the 300 block of Court Street as originally envisioned, but those for the 500 Block of Hampton Place (where a narrow alley prevented through traffic and narrowness prevented angular parking) and the 400 block of Court Street (where there was insufficient lot dimension adjacent to court street) had to be redrawn.

185. Letter from H. E. Forehand, Director of Development to Mr. H. Thomas Fennell, Attorney, September 25, 1974, 1.
186. Olde Towne Project Area Committee Minutes, May 9, 1974, 1.

187. Ibid.

188. Letter from John A. LaVay, Jr., Director of Operations, HUD Region III to D. B Frye Jr., Executive Director PRHA, September 17, 1973, 1. The property was cited as Block 14, Parcel 32. Although it had been for sale at only $8,160 and seven individuals had investigated buying the 6,780 foot parcel, the structural dilapidation, inadequate parking, and costs of meeting modern fire code regulations were great obstacles. (Letter from H. E. Forehand, Director of Development [PRHA] to Mr. Joseph Aversano, Urban Renewal Department, Richmond Area Office [HUD], June 18, 1974, 1)

189. Letter from Eleanor J. Woolard, Project Coordinator to Clinton Butler, [Park View PAC Chairman], February 20, 1974, 1.

190. Letter from C. A. Butler, Jr., to Mr. H. M. Myers, Jr., City Manager, March 8, 1974. City Engineer Mobly had written to the Park View PAC to ask for assistance and to threaten a cessation of activities unless the incidents ceased, and Mr. Butler had responded that the PAC was a volunteer organization without any police powers.

191. Letter from Eleanor J. Woolard, Project Coordinator to Mr. Clinton Butler, Chairman, Park View Concerned Citizens, March 15, 1974. As evidence of progress, she stated that only $394,690 of the $1,018,770 approved for real estate purchases still remained; $567,864 of the $682,818 approved for relocation remained; and $21,768 of the $56,800 approved for site clearance (demolition) remained.

192. Ibid. As for rehabilitation, she noted that $119,802 had been provided for either the Section 312 loans or the Section 115 grant programs but that "of the $250,000 which has been loaned in all conservation projects through the Authority’s local loan program, Park View residents have only borrowed $1,272.00."


195. Ibid.
Mr. Forehand reported that "43 have been rehabilitated through the program or through private means, and 20 of that were financed with federal funds." Moreover, he said that 64 buildings were being rehabilitated privately at that time (i.e., April of 1974), 18 were in some state of the rehabilitation process, and 4 structures were processed for PRHA assistance since January 1, 1973.
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The completion of the maintenance-concession building was overdue because of vandalism (implying it would be finished soon), and beginning of the lighting was set for December 1st, for the fencing within the next thirty days, and for the basketball and tennis courts within the next two weeks.

The City Manager was Phin Horton. The other community targeted for CD assistance was Southside, which was budgeted for about $2.8 million.

Later, Mayor Richard Davis explained that the $4.5 million to be received in 1975 was exactly the same amount which had been received in the previous fiscal year under previous programs, and
the CD funds for specialized projects did not represent extra funding. (Donna Weatherly, "New Development Monies Not A Windfall: Mayor," Virginian-Pilot, November 2, 1974, sec. B, 3.)

210."Rehabilitation Loan Fund Okayed, Virginian-Pilot, March 12, 1975.


213.Ibid., 3-4. Section 40-98 was amended to require the obtaining of a "certificate of appropriateness" from the CAR Secretary for external changes to structures, and Section 40-111 was altered to specify the method of appealing decisions on this certificate.

214.Planning Commission Minutes, May 6, 1975, 11. Additional changes were made to Section 40-93 and Section 40-102 specifying the sections where the restrictive zoning applied.


216.Ibid.


218.Ibid.


220.Memorandum from Mr. S. C. Stewart, Assistant to the Executive Director [PRHA] to Mr. H. E. Forehand, Deputy Executive Director [PRHA], August 25, 1978, 1.

221.Ibid.

222.Letter from Mr. Dick Garle, Boston Redevelopment and Housing Authority to D. B. Frye, Executive Director, PRHA, November 19, 1975, 1.

224. Interdepartmental Correspondence from R. D. McDaniel, City Traffic Engineer to R. T. Williams, Assistant City Manager for Finance, July 23, 1974, 1.

225. Estimates by R. K. Weeks, Engineers in March of 1967 showed square yardage as follows: Malls, parking areas and alleys (8,005 s.y.), Crawford Parkway (1,640 s.y.), London Street (5,564 s.y.), North Street (3,385 s.y.), Glasgow Street (375 s.y.), Hampton Place (507 s.y.), Waverly Boulevard (350 s.y.), Washington Street (3,410 s.y.), Dinwiddie Street (793 s.y.), Court Street (1,545 s.y.), and Middle Street (180 s.y.).


227. "Grant to Meet Costs of Olde Towne Sidewalks," Virginian-Pilot, June 17, 1975, sec. B, 3. The grant was to hire 43 workers (32 of them unskilled people who would learn the skill of bricklaying) to lay 13,000 square yards of brick. Not all of the costs were met by the grant since the city was still expected to spend $50,000 of its own money and to provide an additional $50,000 in auxiliary services.

228. Interview with Harry C. Nash, Jr., December 19, 1992. The brick arch still stands in the park on the southeast corner of Crawford and Glasgow Streets.

229. Letter from City Manager Robert T. Williams, City Manager to Mr. D. B. Frye, Jr., Executive Director, PRHA, February 23, 1976, 1.

230. Letter from Susan C. Stewart, Assistant to the Executive Director and Pat W. Collins, Special Programs Assistant to the Honorable Richard J. Davis, Mayor, February 25, 1976, 1.

231. Ibid.

232. Letter from Richard R. Early to Honorable Richard J. Davis, Mayor, April 30, 1976, 1. The letter noted that the Demonstration Block parking lot would receive a brick wall as a border while one across the street would just get a shrub border, and it mentioned a "letter writing campaign to our congressman and HUD to point out this discrimination on a project using federal funds."


236. Enclosure in letter from Ellis B. Hilton, Jr., Director of Public Works to Mr. Richard Heimbach, PRHA, March 2, 1976. He reported that "Street improvements to Dinwiddie, Court, Waverly, Hampton, and North Streets along with six off-street parking sites and the Ornamental and Demonstration Parks which make up the Phase I 1975 public improvement activities in Olde Towne are virtually complete. This work, which includes storm drainage, sanitary sewers, water distribution lines, traffic signalization and street lighting, brings the total cost of public improvements for the 1975 F.Y. to $423,097.

"The 1976 improvements, which are estimated to cost $426,000, include similar work along Washington and North Streets and London Boulevard, three off-street parking sites, two parks including sit-out and pedestrian plaza facilities. During the next 12 months, priority should be placed on the acquisition of all jib parcels needed for public parking and park areas in Olde Towne. The City has indicated that it will advertise for the construction of all of these facilities providing the Authority can purchase the required land. The Authority expects to obtain title to cemetery property owned by the Monumental Methodist Church....
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237. Ibid.

238. Letter from Ellis B. Hilton, Jr., Director of Public Works to Mr. Richard Heimbach, PRHA, March 2, 1976, 1. The malls were to be on Glasgow Street between Washington Street and Crawford Street; Dinwiddie Street between North Street and London Boulevard; and Middle Street between North Street and London Boulevard.

239. Letter from C. H. McGinnis, Assistant City Manager to Mr. Hugh E. Forehand, Director of Development, PRHA, November 15, 1976, 1.
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Olde Towne Restrictive Parking District, (Portsmouth VA: City of Portsmouth, July 1979), 1. The ordinance to allow restrictive parking districts was (#1978-22) was passed on June 26, 1978, and the Olde Towne Restrictive Parking District became effective September 5, 1978. Authority for creating the district was based on the city's right to regulate the environment as defined by the 1976 Supreme Court decision (#76-1418) in County Board of
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270. Ibid.
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CHAPTER VII
IMPLEMENTING THE CONSERVATION PROJECTS, 1980-1990

Olde Towne Changes, 1980-1981

In the spring of 1980, Glenn James of PRHA reported that property in Olde Towne was appreciating at rates of "12 to 18 percent a year, higher than the 7 to 12 percent for the rest of Portsmouth," and that it was nearly complete from PRHA's viewpoint because "it has reached a level where just the economics will maintain it for the foreseeable future."¹ Not only were the apartments able to command rents high enough to induce landlords to make improvements but:

Today, there aren't enough houses and apartments in Olde Towne to meet the demand from people who want to live there, James said. We get an average of two calls a day from people who want to buy homes in Olde Towne. That works out at 500 a year and there are only 230 houses in the neighborhood. Only 125 of them are single-family houses, which is what most people want, he said.²

Citing examples such as a home on Court Street which was bought for $35,100 in 1975 and sold for $92,000 earlier in the year, Glenn concluded that as the first conservation project in the state "mistakes were inevitable" and made these comments:

Housing authority officials began with a hard-sell approach, telling property owners to bring their housing up to modern building codes or face court suit and fines.
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Some prominent citizens walked out of meetings, vowing not to cooperate. But the housing authority "did a total change of philosophy," James said. "We turned to a soft-sell approach.... The amount of money the federal government supplied wasn't enough to meet the Olde Towne demand. "We were out of money more often than we had money. We usually had enough to last five months of any year, James said.

The investment has yielded high sale prices and values for Olde Towne property.\(^3\)

Construction of 33 new townhouses with selling prices of $70,000 to $90,000 was announced for Olde Towne in 1980.\(^4\) As the Worthington Square condominiums were being completed in April of 1982, a 30-unit townhouse development just outside the project area was approved.\(^5\)

Although a dispute between HUD and the city would delay receipt of funds "for the completion of" the Olde Towne conservation project, there was little impact of this dispute on implementation in the project. After 1981, there was little left to be done in the Olde Towne conservation project.\(^7\)

A New Approach in Park View, 1980-1983

Although the decade began with a familiar battle over code enforcement, it was marked by some encouraging signs of change. In addition, PRHA initiated a new approach to conserving properties.

As 1980 drew to a close, the Park View PAC "armed with color slides of alleged violations, brought their complaints to City Council"\(^8\) concerning lack of code enforcement in the neighborhood. City Manager Robert T. Williams "promised answers to the PAC."\(^9\)
As a controversy over subsidized housing mounted during 1981 in Portsmouth, PAC Chair Jay Casper noted that Park View never had subsidized housing but that it had "experienced its ten years' deterioration because of the actions of block-busting real estate profiteers who preyed on the fears of homeowners...." He stated that the flight of homeowners had been reversed and noted that new single-family construction was among the $2.8 million of private investment which had been generated.

Two major changes in the Park View project occurred in 1982. First, the proposed waterfront park was eliminated because "there are clearly not enough funds available to complete said projects as originally conceived." Discussion of that change of plans prompted a City Council member Morton Whitlow to press the City Manager for more details on "an updated plan of attack." The result of several month's discussions was that PRHA began "to implement the acquisition and rehabilitation alternative" This meant:

the Authority currently owns nine structures within the project for which we will immediately seek qualified persons who wish to purchase and rehabilitate these buildings. In concert with this marketing effort, the Authority will also begin acquiring by negotiation those structures previously recommended by the Park View Project Area Committee which have been reviewed by our staff and determined to be blighting influences on the community....Should the owner of the subject property be determined not to have the capacity or desire to complete the required improvements, the structure will be acquired and marketed for sale and rehabilitation. Based upon the response of the private sector, this approach will be continued; however, if appropriate marketing efforts produce no positive response, the Authority will proceed to market the property for new compatible development.
Evidence that PRHA was pursuing a new course of action was seen in the fall of 1982 as eight Park View residences attracted 53 offers for renovation. As PRHA officer Gordon Wheatly explained, "Initially, [PRHA]...acquired the...buildings for demolition. Instead, it decided to see if private enterprise could provide the reasons for the extensive work needed to put the buildings back in use and back on the tax roles." Later, Robert Andrews, one of the partners who bought the eight units, spoke of selling a home on Armstrong Street for $20,000 more than its $25,000 purchase price after making repairs and stated "I don’t think they’ll tear down any more of these houses."

**Legal Actions and Administrative Change, 1980-1982**

Following stiff opposition to subsidized housing, the city proposed an alternate plan and Portsmouth’s Congressional representatives lobbied for more flexibility but HUD held firm on its interpretation of Community Development Block Grant requirements. Park View PAC Chairman Jay Casper wrote to Congressman Daniel:

> Because of the opposition from residents of the Hodges Manor community in the City of Portsmouth to the construction of 100 federally subsidized dwelling units in the community, the Department of Housing and Urban Development responded with a threat to cut off all Community Development Funds to the entire City of Portsmouth unless a satisfactory alternative was submitted.

Our immediate concern is the completion of redevelopment activities in the community of Park View, Va. R-48; particularly the remaining $1.2 million which was to be allocated to us for Community Development Year 1980. The road of progress in Park View has been a long
one since 1968—most of the progress becoming visible in the past two years. Due to the recent success of our program in Park View, we feel that it is unjust to jeopardize the allocation of funds to communities such as ours because of the Hodges Manor issue.24

Nonetheless, HUD "froze" nearly $4.5 million in Community Development funds in July of 198025 and advertised on its own to find a builder for 100 units of subsidized housing in Portsmouth.26 The city sued HUD.27

PRHA had filed its own suit against HUD in the fall of 1982 protesting a new HUD requirement on subsidized housing28 and that matter dragged on in the courts.29 By the end of 1982, however, HUD ceased its earlier demands30 and released $6 million in Community Development funds in 1982--but it continued to hold $2.6 million pending resolution of the matter.31

In the city, two major administrative changes took place. First, City Planning Director J. Brewer Moore had been relieved of duties by City Manager Williams over a policy dispute in 1981.32 With the removal of the person who had devised the federally-funded conservation projects within a GNRP proposal in 1960, originated a CAR-supervised Historic District within the Colonel Crawford Commons Plan for Olde Towne in 1962, and advocated centralized city direction of redevelopment efforts, the remainder of the decade was marked by fewer new city initiatives in the study areas and by fewer conflicts between the city and PRHA.

Second, City Manager Robert T. Williams and four other city officials were killed in the spring of 1982 when their plane crashed while en route to Alexandria, Virginia to view the style of
waterfront development there.\textsuperscript{33} While City Attorney Steve Lieberman served as Acting City Manager for the next six weeks, the city found a replacement in George Hanbury, the former city manager of nearby Virginia Beach, Virginia.\textsuperscript{34} Just a year later, the new City Manager seemed to adopt the ideas which Williams had been pursuing as he unveiled a $1.85 million plan in order, as a newspaper reporter stated, "to spread the quaint landscaped look of Olde Towne along central streets and the seawall"\textsuperscript{35} so that Portsmouth would become to Norfolk what Alexandria was to Washington, D.C.\textsuperscript{36}

At PRHA, there was a major change during this period as the inspections program was greatly simplified. The previous method of having inspectors fill out multiple-page reports on work to be done was replaced at the start of the decade by a single-page, simplified form which allowed inspectors to work more efficiently and to accomplish their tasks more inexpensively.\textsuperscript{37} Thus, the smaller staff required by budget cuts was able to accomplish the same level of inspections that had been previously conducted by a larger number of workers.\textsuperscript{38}

During this period, there was also a change in the conservation neighborhoods as civic leagues emerged. In Olde Towne, the need to respond to increasing numbers of proposals for the City Council to change zoning in the area resulted in the citizens forming a civic league in 1980.\textsuperscript{39} Although there were few PRHA actions in the area during the period, Olde Towne residents increasingly looked to this organization rather than to the PAC as
the civic league became more active and addressed a broader range of issues. In Park View, a civic league also began to function in addition to the PAC as a representative of neighborhood interests.

**Park View Resurgence, 1983-1984**

By August of 1983, the new Park View Preservation League was seeking historic district designation for an eighteen-block area near the Naval Hospital grounds. After state officials had toured the area and stated that it was probably eligible for historic district status, the League called upon PRHA to stop its plans to develop nearby vacant land with housing it said would be incompatible with the surrounding architecture.

This highlights a dilemma for the implementers. The residents wanted development to match the two-story turn-of-the-century ambience of the conservation area and found the PRHA-approved single-story brick houses to be both inappropriate and to be obstacles to preserving the neighborhood. PRHA had originally sought developers of two-story dwellings but found that financial institutions would not fund them because their marketing studies did not detect demand for them. The smaller homes sold well, and PRHA continued to approve this type of construction.

Commenting on the role of PRHA in Park View’s neighborhood preservation efforts, a writer summarized resident’s views:

In the early 1970s, it administered a federal low interest loan program designed to stimulate improvements to homes. Residents charged the program was so slow and cumbersome that it did little to encourage them,
however, to stay and little to encourage landlords to invest in and maintain their properties. The program died when its funding was chopped from the federal budget.

The authority cleared some land outside the core area. Along Elm Avenue it replaced slums there with single-story suburban style houses. Despite the conservation, residents said demolition of cheap housing in urban renewal projects around the city encouraged breakup of Park View homes into poorly maintained rental units.\textsuperscript{47}

The Planning Department subsequently approved the proposal endorsed the proposal for a 20-block area,\textsuperscript{48} and after a request from City Manager Hanbury PRHA "accepted requests from local officials and area residents who feared that new housing on the site of Spratley and Elm streets would detract from the 1900s-era homes to be protected by the district."\textsuperscript{49} However, PRHA Executive Director Michael Kay used the occasion to complain to the city manager about inappropriate remarks made by a city official because, "according to Kay, the staffer said the city researcher had researched whether it could block sale of the land by the authority but there was nothing the city could do."\textsuperscript{50} Despite protests that the comments had been misunderstood, the uneasy relations between the city and PRHA had once again arisen.

One former resident of the area was prompted to bemoan the city's decision fourteen years ago "to demolish many beautiful old homes in the name of progress and redevelopment,"\textsuperscript{51} but PRHA had already continued its emphasis on rehabilitation by advertising ten additional residences for public purchase\textsuperscript{52} rather than for demolition.
To further the rehabilitation efforts in Portsmouth, City Manager Hanbury in the fall of 1983 raised the idea of creating a purely local loan fund which would utilize Community Development funds to reduce lender costs to those rehabilitating homes in Port Norfolk, Park View, West Park View (i.e., the area west of the existing conservation project) and in other neighborhoods.53 This would make a better use of the shrinking federal Community Development funding (now less than $3 million per year),54 and extend the operation of a community rehabilitation fund which had been operating in Cradock since 1978 and in Truxton since 1981.55

In January of 1984, the chairman of the community league formed in West Park View, John Winters, stated that in the spring he was formally going to propose covering that area west of the conservation project with a similar program because "I see West Park View as the next facet of conservation in Portsmouth."56 City Manager Hanbury responded that he "hopes to see an expanded conservation program developed."57

In February, the city council approved the Park View Historic District,58 and heard residents suggest a new vision for the Park View neighborhood. Richard Branch, President of the Park View Civic League, suggested that the city should "get the junk out of the creek" as a step toward "a blossoming of waterfront development."59 Jay Casper, Park View Preservation League president, expanded on that view and "council members appeared to agree with Casper that creation of the district and a new focus on Scotts
Creek could bring major investment into an area that has been struggling to emerge from years of decline."60

Although Park View had received only $2.937 million of Community Development funds in 1982 for "maintenance and marketing of residential property assembled" and no funds in 1983, CD funds were now proposed for completion of "urban renewal activities including acquisition, relocation, site clearance, and public improvements."61 $115,000 of Urgent Needs Funds were allocated to be used in addition to the $50,000 in entitlement funds to help renovate the project area. In early spring, another eight abandoned Park View properties were put up for sale by PRHA for the public to rehabilitate rather than to demolish.62

PRHA, 1984-1985

Despite the continuation of rehabilitation efforts in Park View, PRHA had been demolishing dwellings in the Olde Towne South area and the director of the city department of engineering and inspections took the unprecedented step of blocking further demolition by refusing to issue the required permits in April of 1984.63 By July, Executive Director Michael Kay and Deputy Director Hugh Forehand had resigned amid reports that the Board of Commissioners were unsatisfied with their performance.64

In January of 1985, PRHA won its suit against HUD and HUD agreed to release the funds it had withheld.65 PRHA had not only become "the only housing authority out of 1,500 in the nation to successfully fight HUD's demand" but HUD also agreed not to require
PRHA to reimburse HUD for most of the legal fees—although it continued to press for payment of $25,000. Also in that month, Danny E. Cruce, who had been serving as Acting Executive Director, became the Executive Director of PRHA.66

Despite a cut in the 1985 funding for PRHA from the Community Development program by nearly $900,000 from the 1984 amount, PRHA proposed using $350,000 in CD funds to expand the current Truxton and Cradock low-cost rehabilitation loan fund operations to Park View, West Park View, and other areas in 1985.67 PRHA planned to use $350,000 to establish the fund out of the $1.8 million available to PRHA from the city's 1985 CD allocation of $2.7 million.68

Although the spring had seen the announcement that about $500,000 in application and administration charges which PRHA had charged to issue revenue bonds was being made available to fund special projects including low-cost loans to fund facade improvements in the downtown area,69 the fall was marked by the announcement that problems over administrative fees had led to another rift between HUD, the city, and PRHA. The city had been advised that HUD's annual review found PRHA was in violation of rules and regulations concerning administrative costs,70 and the city had cut off money to PRHA for administration earlier in January.71 Although Executive Director Cruce indicated that a consultant had been hired to develop a satisfactory plan,72 HUD officer John A. LaVey, Jr., indicated that dissatisfaction extended to other areas. Among other items, "LeVey said for nine months PRHA had failed to carry out a major housing rehab initiative..."
ordered by the City Council last year by using CD funds to reduce interest rates in older neighborhoods such as Park View.

By October, a satisfactory plan to account for administrative costs had been worked out to HUD's satisfaction, but concern over administrative costs as a percentage of program costs continued to be troublesome to HUD despite the PRHA Executive Director's finding that this was only 25% of program costs when loans were considered which were being processed at the time of the earlier computation. In November, HUD became satisfied with the handling of CD funds but expressed concern over PRHA's having received $280,000 in Community Development funds that year for a low-cost loan program but had not yet made any loans. By late November, PRHA had taken an important step to funding the program by approving the sale of $1.5 million in tax-free bonds to raise money for the local share of the program which would provide 10-year loans of about $15,000 each at 7% interest.

It was not until late February of 1986, however, that new conservation districts were first created in the city "as a technical prerequisite to offering the loans." The new conservation districts in the neighborhoods of West Park View, Brighton, Port Norfolk, Prentis Park, Ebony Heights, and Twin Pines joined those of Cradock, Mount Hermon, Effingham, Truxton, and Park View. After years of discussion about extending the Park View Conservation Project to include the "core" area of Park View, that area was finally created as a separate conservation project called East Park View at the same time.
The spread of the conservation approach and the provision of new funds did not mean a panacea, however. In March of 1986, the Chairman of the Park View Civic League’s Housing Enforcement Committee, the Reverend Mr. James A. Hundley, appeared before city council to seek help in his seven-month quest to get the city to enforce the code on a site in the neighborhood, to argue that the city code needed to be changed in order "to put some teeth in the law" to avoid the loopholes which he was informed were the cause of the delay, and to state "we're mad as heck, and we're not going to take it anymore."\(^8^2\)

In a different, more optimistic moment in May, the Reverend Mr. Hundley noted that "a lot of people are renovating today, especially in the last five years."\(^8^3\) Real estate data from Metro MLS Inc. listings seemed to show improvement because the average Park View home in 1986 took 81 days to sell (as opposed to 91 days in 1985) and ranged from $32,542 to $58,900 (as opposed to $19,000 to $54,000 in the previous year). "Having seen the success enjoyed by Olde Towne development,"\(^8^4\) entrepreneur Bill Sprott renovated one house and built six condominiums which were to sell for $60,000 or rent for about $450 per month.

By November of 1966, all but $240,000 of the $1.7 million local rehabilitation loan program (LRLP) had been lent to 103 homes in conservation projects, and a plea was made for residents to borrow before the loan fund ended on December 31st.\(^8^5\) Among the loans were 12 for $188,756 in Park View and 7 for $111,705 in West Park View.\(^8^6\) Despite the news that the 1987 Community Development
funding was to be decreased by 18%, the local fund had been successful enough that the LRLP program was again proposed for refunding with $225,000 of CD funds accompanied by another $1.5 million raised by PRHA tax-free bond sales.87

There would be no major controversies throughout the next year, however, as the plans awaited development of the Scotts Creek proposals until early 1988. The familiar issue of neighborhood residents seeking code enforcement reappeared but this time it did so in the context of a cooperative approach involving the civic leagues of Park View, West Park View, and Shea Terrace—a grouping now referred to as "the Northside neighborhoods."88 As West Park View Community League President Richard B. Crawford asserted that "the city is not focusing on the chronic sites" and called for more aggressive enforcement, Merilee Hawkins, the city's Director of Housing Services and Community Relations, noted a ten-fold increase in citations for violations of the housing code from 1985 through 1987, but city attorney Stuart E. Katz responded that taking a property owner to court was only the last resort because he would "rather have somebody spend $50 to paint their house than pay a fine."89

Community Development funds for 1988 were committed to the Park View project, but the sum of $141,300 for "continuation of property management and marketing" was shared among Effingham, Mount Hermon, Northside, Twin Pines, and Park View.90 An interview with Donald Porter, who had grown up in Park View and was now president of the Center of Music stores, indicated an upbeat sense
of expectation as he noted that he had sold his Olde Towne home in order to move to Park View and observed that "eventually it will be like Olde Towne...but there are no deals left in Olde Towne."\textsuperscript{91}

The Scotts Creek Project Progresses, 1985-1987

In February of 1985, the city and PRHA began working together to determine how much vacant land was available for the development of Scotts Creek.\textsuperscript{92} West Park View resident Bartley F. Tuthill pointed out that the proposed dredging would be similar to that done along Rudee Inlet and the Lynnhaven River to spur development in nearby Virginia Beach,\textsuperscript{93} and City Manager Hanbury predicted that potential development could exceed $100 million.\textsuperscript{94} By August, there was discussion of making the five block area at the west end of Bay Street into a special urban renewal district under PRHA so that the land around Scotts Creek could be acquired by it.\textsuperscript{95} To keep the area available for condominium and other development, the city council deferred proposals in October for a marina on Scotts Creek, and City Planner Ernest Freeman reiterated a hope that the different parcels of land in the area could be consolidated for development.\textsuperscript{96}

Near the end of 1985, a newspaper writer noted that development in Park View had been at a standstill since the previous summer while the planning department studied the four-block area around Scotts Creek and the Army Corp of Engineers studied whether to dredge the creek to a depth of 20 feet as the city suggested.\textsuperscript{97} In April, the Army Corps of Engineers began the
first phase of its two-part study, and Robert H. Bartel, Project Manager for the Norfolk District Office, reported that federal funds were no longer being provided to carry out dredging projects for recreational boats.98

In May of 1986, the city council formally approved applying for federal funds to dredge Scotts Creek and asked the affected civic leagues (Park View, West Park View, and Shea Terrace) for their ideas for developing the area around the creek. City Economic Development Director Gerald Burgess reported that "The city is concentrating on code enforcement there, but is waiting on the community to come up with some redevelopment ideas."99

In June, the civic leagues presented their plan for a marine-oriented commercial park but Shea Terrace President Arden Pfeiffer reported that the city was "still not grasping the idea."100 After presenting the idea to the Portsmouth Ports and Industrial Authority, however, that group appointed a two-person subcommittee to serve as liaison to the group.101 After reports that the Army Corps of Engineers would finance only $2 million at most of the $3.2 million expected cost of dredging, Mr. Pfeiffer suggested assessing a special fee on area residents to raise the funds.102

Olde Towne Changes, 1986-1990

As part of a joint effort by the City Council, the City Planning Commission, and PRHA to revise the Comprehensive Plan for Portsmouth, hearings were held in 1986 throughout the city.103 Residents of Olde Towne expressed concerns over specific irritants
such as the noise and congestion coming from the nearby waterfront entertainment center just northeast of the neighborhood, but there was an overall concern for what Civic League President David Leonard characterized as a "need to preserve the architectural integrity and quality of life in this historic community."

In the fall of 1986, city council changed Section 40 of the City Code to regulate the conversion of residences in the Olde Towne and Park View Historic Districts to multiple-unit dwellings. Housing activity in and around Olde Towne by late 1986 had caused one writer to observe that the construction of a new $2 million condominium development just outside Olde Towne "and more than a half-dozen similar projects with nearly 400 dwellings" in the area were evidence of the market demand.

A dispute arose when PRHA sold property in 1990 at 700 North Street to a group of investors for a motel without advertising its availability to the general public (thus preventing an adjacent motel from bidding on it) at a price which was reported to be half of the $700,000 assessed value. However, Executive Director Cruce responded that PRHA felt the proposal was "in the highest and best interest of the city," and the dispute never grew.

Focus on Scotts Creek, 1988-1990

At the start of 1988, City Council approved a proposal by private developers to build a 162-slip marina on Scotts Creek and to dredge a 570-feet long by 620-feet wide approach to the berthings. In June of that year, a 35-page report by the
consulting firm of Hunter Interests, Inc., of Annapolis, Maryland, supported the idea that Scotts Creek could produce $71.7 million of development by providing a mix of pleasure boat support and services and a marine industrial park. Assistant City Manager Patric J. Cofield indicated that the report had been withheld until a review of the report could be made by city officials and that development in the range of $40 to $50 million was a more realistic figure. In response to Industrial Development Authority Chairman Benjamin J. Levy’s characterization of the plan to change Scott’s Creek from heavy industrial zoning as "ludicrous," Economic Development Director Burgess responded that the consulting firm’s plan was grandiose but that a scaled-down approach would produce "financial return about what would be expected for heavy industry." That response seems to have caused Mr. Levy to change his position, for in September of 1988 he argued that the city should abandon the quest for Army Corps of Engineer financing of the dredging and act quickly:

"If you’re going to spend eighteen months negotiating for $175,000 the corps would put into dredging, it’s not worth it," Levy said. "It’s obvious a large number of properties would have their value increased by the dredging and that could have more than offset the cost to the city."

However, in November of 1988, City Manager Hanbury stated that the amount sought from the Army Corps of Engineers was about $551,000 and that the chances of starting before 1991 were "remote." The Capital Improvement Budget showed dredging scheduled for the 1991-1993 period, with most of the dredging occurring in 1993, although Mayor Gloria Webb suggested that the
IDA Chairman Levy and Economic Director Burgess argued that the expenditure in dredging would require an investment of $2.26 million currently in order to reap $8.23 million over the next twelve years—a net gain of $5.97 million by the year 2000. The City Editor of the newspaper endorsed the proposal as a way to capitalize on Portsmouth’s “prime location on the intercoastal waterway” and bring new shoppers to the nearby downtown business district.

Community Development funds continued to be made available in the following years. Shea Terrace had been added as a conservation district in 1988, and in 1989 the local rehabilitation loan fund continued to draw on CD funds for the conservation projects (Park View, East Park View, West Park View, Olde Towne, Shea Terrace, etc.) for $200,000 in 1988 and additional support was available from the Virginia Housing Authority Rental Rehabilitation Program, which provided 3% loans in Park View and other selected areas. For 1990, that additional support continued to join Community Development funds, which now utilized $213,000 for the conservation projects’ rehabilitation fund.

In March of 1990, city Assistant Director of Economic Development Muriel Zober met with over 100 Park View and Olde Towne residents to ask for patience as the city undertook a national search for developers for the Scotts Creek project and awaited the Army Corps of Engineers to grant a permit for the dredging operation before the $1,275,000 project proposed in the 1990-1991 capital improvements budget could begin. She also announced
that a second consulting company had been retained by the city to develop plans for the 27-acre site and to do the paperwork for the dredging and other permits required to undertake the project.\textsuperscript{123}

At the same meeting, Assistant City Manager Pat Cofield indicated that citizens concerned about violations of the building code should "call every day if you need to....Don't expect the city to do it."\textsuperscript{124} PRHA Executive Director Cruce announced that the Authority would continue "removing blighted property," that it had made $600,000 in below-market loans since 1987, and that their neighborhoods were important because they were "the survival of downtown."\textsuperscript{125}

**Administrative Changes, 1985-1990**

During the second half of the decade, five major administrative changes were made. First, the inspection program was eliminated. As the conservation plans were amended to extend them for an additional period of time, inspection of all dwellings in the project areas to assure compliance with the federal standards was eliminated.\textsuperscript{126} The federal standards continued to be applicable to residents of the conservation areas who took advantage of the low-cost loan program, however.\textsuperscript{127}

Second, PACs were replaced by Civic Leagues as the representative neighborhood groups with which PRHA worked. Rather than having to create PACs, new federal laws allowed urban renewal agencies to deal with existing neighborhood organizations, and the
civic leagues which had emerged in the 1980s in both neighborhoods gradually replaced the Project Area Committees.\textsuperscript{128}

Third, PRHA and the city began executing annual contractual agreements which specified duties between the two entities in undertaking activities financed by Community Development funds. A more cooperative attitude emerged which was marked by frequent communication between PRHA and city officials and which replaced the high-conflict relationship which often had existed previously.\textsuperscript{129}

Fourth, the entire city of Portsmouth was declared a conservation project. Although the idea of establishing the entire city as a conservation area had been explored several years earlier,\textsuperscript{130} it was not until March of 1990 that a proposal was developed that "would create a new conservation district which would encompass all of the remaining property which is not currently either a redevelopment or conservation area."\textsuperscript{131} Conservation loans could then "be made available to eligible applicants with incomes below 80\% of the area median,"\textsuperscript{132} and Community Development funds could be utilized in the areas.\textsuperscript{133}

Fifth, planning for a new way of providing conservation funding was begun in order to provide low-cost loans for the entire city. A grant application was being prepared to the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development for funds to be used in "buying down" the interest rate on home improvement loans made by a participating private institution\textsuperscript{134} which was to be chosen by selecting the best proposal from local financial firms.\textsuperscript{135}
As the study period concluded, the implementation of the conservation projects required less complicated interventions. PRHA administered the loan programs in the two study neighborhoods and maintained properties which it acquired in Park View while awaiting final disposition of the Scotts Creek proposal. With no new major initiatives planned for Olde Towne and with Park View being maintained, the two conservation projects ended the decade with low-cost rehabilitation loans as the primary treatment to promote the aims of neighborhood conservation.

**Implementation Summary, 1980-1990**

During the 1980s, implementation became more successful as the projects eliminated a program that was difficult to administer (inspections), re-funded the LRLP program, and reduced the level of activities in the two study areas. The majority of factors facilitated implementation in each of the conservation projects (Table VII-1 on the next page). Moreover, the implementation experiences were essentially the same during the 1980s (as indicated by the exact matching of plus, minus, and zero signs).

One factor is not applicable (Initial Allocation of Financial Resources). Another factor (Target Group as a Percentage of the Population) cannot be evaluated because no 1990 census tract information is available with which to evaluate the shifts in the percentage of the populations of Olde Towne and Park View. A third factor (support of sovereigns) receives a neutral "zero" rating because there were no interventions into the implementation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLDE TOWNE</th>
<th>PARK VIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical Difficulties</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Range of Behaviors Regulated</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Target Group as a Percentage of the Population</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of Behavioral Change Required</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jurisdiction over Causal Linkages</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Initial Allocation of Financial Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Integration Within and Among Implementing Institutions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clarity of Decision Rules of Implementing Agencies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recruitment of Implementing Officials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Formal Access by Outsiders</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public Support</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Attitudes and Resources of Constituents' Groups</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support from Sovereigns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Innovation by Implementors</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Socioeconomic Conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Favorable effects on implementation are shown with a plus sign ("+") , negative effects with a minus sign ("-"), and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero ("0"). For further details, see Figure II-1.
process by powerful administrative, judicial, or legislative figures during the 1980s.

Nine of the fourteen factors facilitated implementation. Eliminating the federal inspections program in the project areas during the 1980s made implementation easier. Lowered technical difficulties, diminished diversity of behaviors to be regulated, and reduced required behavioral change were three factors which facilitated the implementation process. With simpler and more locally directed tasks to be undertaken by the implementation units, implementation was facilitated by the clarity of decision rules.

Without the Environmental Inspectors to conduct inspections, the formal arrangements between implementors was eased (Figure VII-1 on the next page). In addition to the vertical integration, there was increased horizontal integration as routinization set in and as coordination was increased by annual contracts between the city and PRHA on the spending of Community Development funds and the administration of programs.

Formal access by outsiders was assured by the continuing PRHA relations with Project Area Committees and civic leagues during the period. Support was high among the public and among the constituents' groups. The new Olde Towne and Park View civic leagues emerged to represent citizens of the two areas, and both were supportive of conservation efforts. Resources of expertise and organization were shown as the Park View Preservation League successfully promoted the establishment of the Park View Historic
District and the Park View Civic League worked closely with other organizations to develop and promote a vision for Scotts Creek development. These changes facilitated the implementation process during the 1980s.

In addition, innovative leadership by implementing officials helped to promote successful implementation in three ways. First, a program of "acquisition and rehabilitation" involved PRHA with buying dilapidated property and reselling it to private developers with the requirement that property be improved to conservation standards. Second, Community Development funds were utilized to bring new life to the Local Rehabilitation Loan Program. Third, a method of working with a private lending institution was being devised at the end of the decade which allowed PRHA to use grant funds to "buy down" the interest rates on rehabilitation loans.

While the above nine factors facilitated implementation, three factors impeded implementation. First, the elimination of the federally supervised inspection program to enforce compliance with project area standards reduced the jurisdiction over causal elements. Whatever the motivation for the change (unworkability of the program, cost of inspections in a time of limited resources, etc.), the elimination of a way to deal with one of the causes of urban housing deterioration reduced PRHA control over the causes of the problem.

Second, the lack of implementors specifically recruited to administer the projects continued to impede implementation. Considering the last factor, however, raises questions about its
significance. Whether hiring administrators specifically to run intra-city projects is feasible or is likely to lead to better results seems to be a question that should be examined by more extensive research.

Third, the socioeconomic conditions in both neighborhoods showed a decline.\textsuperscript{137} Since the census data which measures this factor is based on sample data only, this finding must be tentative until the final census report is released.

One of the more striking findings to be found by examining the implementation factors is how similar they are for each of the two projects during the 1980s as routinization sets in. Even allowing for some lack of sensitivity in measuring the factors, the identity of fourteen factors strongly suggests that the implementation experience becomes less diverse as the number of activities to be administered is reduced (elimination of the inspection program, reduced acquisitions, etc.) and the method of carrying out programs is simplified (establishment of a local rehabilitation loan program, emphasis on using financial resources to buy and then sell to private rehabilitators rather than undertaking the task by PRHA).

The federal elements of the programs failed to deliver the outputs which had been originally envisioned. Although complete information is not available on loans during this period,\textsuperscript{138} the available data (Table VII-2 on the next page) and interview information\textsuperscript{139} indicate that extremely few Section 312 loans have
### TABLE VII-2

**LOANS MADE IN THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW CONSERVATION PROJECTS, 1984-1990.**

#### I. PARK VIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Section 312 No.</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
<th>LRLP No.</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
<th>RRP No.</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$57,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$76,653</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,232</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,974</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. OLDE TOWNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Section 312 No.</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
<th>LRLP No.</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
<th>RRP No.</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$83,215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$95,641</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Section 312 provides low-cost long-term loans under provisions of the Housing Act of 1964. Local Rehabilitation Loan Program (LRLP) funds are provided through PRHA by using funding from the Community Development program and from tax-free bond sales. While both of these programs are meant primarily for homeowners, the Virginia Rental Rehabilitation Program provides low-cost loans for the restoration of rental properties.

**SOURCE:** Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority.
been made in the 1980s. By adaptation, however, the implementing units have found alternative resources for rehabilitation loans.

The other federal element also failed. During the decade, the federal inspection program was eliminated and the conservation projects were left without one early PRHA administrator called the backbone of such efforts (Appendix H).

The impact of the conservation projects during the 1980s cannot be evaluated because only sample data from the 1990 census has been released. That data (Table VII-3 on the next page) is too incomplete for conclusions to be drawn concerning neighborhood changes during the decade. Further lessons to be learned from the overall implementation experience in the two study areas, however, are explored in the next chapter.
### TABLE VII-3

**COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS, 1980-1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>OLDE TOWNE</th>
<th>PARK VIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Housing Built Within the Past Ten Years | N/A | 0
| 2. Median Housing Value | + 100.1% | + 131.6% |
| 3. Multi-family Units | N/A | 0
| 4. Housing Lacking Some or All Plumbing Facilities | N/A | 0
| 5. Overcrowding | + 7.1% | + 11.8% |
| 6. Owner Occupancy | N/A | 0
| 7. Residency At the Same Address for Five Years Or More | N/A | 0
| 8. Vacancy Rate | + 76.1% | + 99.1% |

**NOTE:** Percentages of change are derived from the U.S. Census of Population and Housing for 1980 and from sample data published in Summary Tape File section STF1A and checked against updates through STF3A.

*NOTE:* Favorable effects on implementation are shown with a plus sign ("+"), negative effects with a minus sign ("-"), and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero ("0"). For further details on evaluating changes, see Figure II-2.
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CHAPTER VIII
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Findings
Assessments of implementation for each decade have been presented at the end of each of the three preceding chapters, and in general the findings support the literature on the implementation process. Just as Pressman and Wildavsky observed, the Portsmouth experience demonstrated the difficulty of achieving joint action among fairly autonomous governmental entities which had different perspectives and priorities. Furthermore, apparently simple programs face lengthy delays in getting implemented and unexpected decisions emerge to complicate implementation. This study also found that governmental projects can adapt and survive beyond expectations.

Just as the "top-down" theorists have argued, the study found that simpler means of accomplishing objectives seem to result in more successful implementation. Just as the "bottom up" theorists have suggested, the study also found that freedom to innovate and to adapt to local circumstances enhances the implementation process. While the study thus supports the general findings of others concerning the complexity of implementation, it provides
specific insights into the implementation process by drawing conclusions to each of the research questions.

**Conclusions**

Implementation of neighborhood conservation projects varies widely at the beginning of the projects but becomes more similar as the projects continue (Table VIII-1 on the next page). This finding supports the literature which suggests that implementation varies according to differing neighborhood contexts in an intra-urban environment, but it adds new insight by showing that the differences are greatest in the initial stages of implementation and are eliminated as work becomes more routinized and tasks are simplified.

The implementation process was consistently facilitated by the low level of technical difficulties and the low range of behaviors regulated. One factor (lack of recruitment of implementing officials) consistently impeded implementation. As the conservation projects continued to operate, most factors for which data were available show changes which were more favorable for successful implementation, and this indicates that government learns from its experiences.

In Portsmouth, implementation was facilitated by learning to shift from an approach where government did almost everything to an approach in which government facilitated the process in several ways. First, rather than awaiting federal funding for the full amount of rehabilitation loans, local sources of funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Technical Difficulties</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Range of Behaviors Regulated</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Target Group as a Percentage of the Population</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extent of Behavioral Change Required</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jurisdiction over Causal Linkages</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Initial Allocation of Financial Resources</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Integration Within and Among Implementing Institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Clarity of Decision Rules of Implementing Agencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recruitment of Implementing Officials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td>OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Formal Access</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Outsiders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Public Support</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Attitudes and</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources of Constituents' Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Support from</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Innovation by</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Socioeconomic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: OT = Olde Towne
PV = Park View

NOTES: Findings for 1980-1990 are based on Summary Tape File data for 1990. Because the information is based on sampling data rather than on the final census report for 1990 (which was unavailable as of the time this study was being completed), findings for this period are tentative and must be considered with caution. Favorable effects on implementation are shown with a plus sign ("+") , negative effects with a minus sign ("-") , and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero ("0"). For further details on how these evaluations were derived, see Figure II-1.

SOURCE: This table summarizes findings from Tables V-1, VI-1, and VII-1. For a further discussion, see the "Implementation Summary" sections of Chapters V, VI, and VII.
were developed to replace or supplement federal funds. Second, rather than raising all of the funds for rehabilitation loans and administering the lending process, plans were laid in 1990 to work with an existing lender to have a greater impact by using funds to "buy down" interest rates for rehabilitation and to have fewer administrative problems by allowing the lending institution to qualify the loan applicants and service the accounts. Third, rather than buying properties and spending the additional funds to rehabilitate the structures before offering them to private buyers, a new approach involved buying dilapidated properties and selling them to the public at attractive prices with the promise of inexpensive loans and the requirement that the properties be brought up to conservation standards. Fourth, the range of activities was simplified by eliminating the awkward and legally questionable federal inspection program. By simplifying operations and using its limited resources to supplement private resources, the implementation process was made more successful.

Two factors (Technical Difficulties and Range of Behaviors Regulated) consistently facilitated implementation, while one factor (Recruitment of Implementing Officials) consistently impeded implementation. Six factors varied between the two conservation projects and therefore may be imputed as the factors which helped account for implementation differences (Table VIII-2 on the next page). These factors were: Extent of Behavioral Change Required, Jurisdiction over Causal Linkages, Initial Allocation of Financial
**TABLE VIII-2**

IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS WHICH DIFFERED
FOR THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW
CONSERVATION PROJECTS, 1960-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td>OT</td>
<td>PV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Extent of Behavioral Change Required
*Initial Allocation of Financial Resources
*Public Support
*Attitudes and Resources of Constituents’ Groups
*Innovation by Implementors
*Socioeconomic Conditions

KEY: OT = Olde Towne
PV = Park View

NOTES: "Blank" spaces indicate that factors did not differ in those years. There were no differences in the 1980s. Favorable effects on implementation are shown with a plus sign ("+"), negative effects with a minus sign ("-"), and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero ("0"). For further details, see Figure II-1.

SOURCE: This table summarizes Tables V-2 and VI-2. See the text of the "Implementation Summary" sections of Chapters V and VI for additional discussion.
Resources, Public Support, Attitudes and Resources of Constituents’ Groups, Innovation by Implementors and Socioeconomic Conditions.

Although the conservation projects were originally based on a loan program (which was distributive, i.e. gave the benefits of the last decade suggests that as governments simplify their conservation projects, undertake fewer activities, and routinize operations, there are fewer differences in implementing such projects within the same city. low-cost interest rates to induce housing rehabilitation) and an inspection program (which was protective regulatory because it protected the public by regulating housing quality through the enforcement of higher standards in the conservation project areas), the inspection program operated erratically in the 1970s and was abandoned in the 1980s. Therefore, the neighborhood conservation projects were primarily distributive programs at the local level as implemented by PRHA and by the city.

At the higher administrative level, the programs were entirely distributive. HUD never showed an interest in taking part in the inspection program, but it did maintain an active role in the Section 312 loan program.

Since the literature suggests that a distributive program should be marked by a low level of conflict, the presence of so much conflict during the study period is surprising until it is realized that the level of conflict varied according to how the loan program was funded. During the period of heaviest reliance on Section 312 funding (1968-1973), there was often heavy conflict.
As locally directed loan programs became more prominent (1973-1990), there was less conflict.

This can be explained by the on-again, off-gain nature of Section 312 funding for the low-cost loan program resulted in anger by the public which had relied upon the availability of the loans and in turmoil for PRHA administrators who were caught between the HUD directives to continue soliciting loan applications and the calls from residents seeking loan funding. The erratic nature of the funding exacerbated tensions between PRHA and the city, resulting in the city council calling for a Congressional investigation in 1971. Even when funding was available, the "strings" which accompanied federal funding increased friction between PRHA and HUD. As local direction brought greater PRHA control and faster approval of loan applications, tension between implementing units as well as between the public and the governmental units diminished considerably, and relations became marked by low conflict.

Thus, the expected relationship was not fully supported because the program often was not truly "distributive," that is, it met the definition of that program type as given by Ripley and Franklin but it did not actually distribute benefits in some periods. The experience in implementing the Olde Towne and Park View Conservation Projects suggests that the implementation of a distributive program is marked by low conflict when there is a dependable supply of benefits to be distributed with little "red
tape" but that the erratic provision of benefits and complex administrative procedures results in a high degree of conflict.

According to the literature, a high level of conflict should have accompanied the inspection program but this did not occur. When inspections were first discussed (1970), there was apprehension and opposition in Olde Towne but by the time that an area-wide inspection program began (1978) there was no opposition in Olde Towne or Park View. The reason for this situation may be that the inspection program lacked legal standing to compel compliance by property owners and PRHA lacked the financial means and the desire to exercise its powers to obtain and rehabilitate non-complying property. Those who did not wish to comply were able to decline having inspections conducted on their property, thus evading the program rather than opposing it.

Conducting the inspection and loan programs within an intergovernmental context created cumbersome relationships among the governmental units. Some working arrangements were specified by contractual agreements (the Cooperative Agreement between PRHA and the city which specifies that PRHA was to administer the conservation projects, the Loan and Grant agreement between HUD and the city which specified exactly what in-kind services the city would provide in order to meet the requirement that it pay one-third of the cost of the projects, etc.) but there was often a lack of cooperation due to the semi-autonomous nature of most of the implementing units and the lack of a central authority to resolve conflicts.
Because the implementation of the two conservation projects was marked by fragmentation of authority among several administering organizations which functioned without direction from a central authority, the findings support the literature. For example, the original conservation plans were developed by PRHA consultants without coordination with or input by the City Council, the city Planning Commission or the residents. In addition, inspections were carried out by state employees (Virginia Health Department Environmental Specialists) who nominally reported to the City Manager in order to enforce federal conservation standards for PRHA, which may have had to have coordinated with some other city body (such as the Committee of Architectural Review) in determining the area or houses to be inspected. Although the fragmentation was worse during the 1960s and 1970s than in the 1980s, the fragmented nature of implementation within an intergovernmental context was characteristic of the experience with the two conservation projects.

The implementation process was marked by conflict, bargaining, and flux in the early years of the implementation process. The findings of this study show that the fragmentation of authority sometimes resulted in heavy conflict despite efforts to decrease disputed by innovations such as holding joint meetings and creating Project Coordinators to facilitate joint PRHA and city actions in their respective project areas. As operations became more routinized, conflict was reduced. Similarly, as funding for the conservation projects began flowing to PRHA through the city
under the Community Development program rather than through direct federal urban renewal programs, more cooperation was fostered. Thus, national shifts in federal programs helped create a change in the nature of local implementation.

Bargaining rather than line-and-staff relationships were characteristic of the way that implementing units attempted to affect behavior. Flux in the personnel who ran the projects, in the Executive Directors and Chairs of PRHA, in the city officials and City Council members, in PAC representatives and in the federal support for the projects was a further characteristic of implementation during the study period. The literature is strongly supported by these findings.

To determine the extent to which implementation of the two conservation projects was successful, implementation success has been measured in two areas: (1) providing program outputs for the inspection and loan programs, and (2) fostering positive changes in neighborhood conditions.

The federal inspections program failed. Federal conservation standards were drafted clearly, but efforts to provide inspectors turned out to be awkward at best and no legal enforcement powers actually existed. Although area-wide inspections were finally carried out in 1978 and 1979 (ten years after the projects were created), the one-shot nature of the inspections and the lack of enabling legislation result in a lack of success for this program. The program was eliminated in the 1980s.
The federal loan program also failed. Although the Section 312 element of the loan program failed because funding was often nonexistent as national priorities shifted amid the lessened faith in government action and the reduced commitment of national resources which Chapter IV of this study has reviewed, the subsequent Local Rehabilitation Loan Program as financed in differing ways during the 1970s and 1980s was successful insofar as it provided money for rehabilitation loans in the two project areas. Both the lack of actions protesting lack of funds for such loans and the subsequent expansion of the program to the entire city suggest that the program was successful, but this can only be a tentative conclusion considering the lack of more complete data.

The conservation projects were successful in promoting improvements in neighborhood conditions (Table VIII-3 below) to the extent that they were implemented successfully. When the implementation was better in Olde Towne than in Park View during the 1960s (as indicated by the greater number of plus signs in the first column of Table VIII-1 above), neighborhood changes showed that Olde Towne improved (as indicated by the greater number of plus signs than minus signs in the "OT" column for that decade in Table VIII-3) while Park View declined in that decade (as indicated by the relatively larger number of minus signs in the "PV" column of Table VIII-3). During the 1970s, both neighborhoods showed more successful implementation (as shown by greater numbers of plus signs in their respective columns of Table VIII-1) and more improvements in neighborhood conditions (as shown by increases in
plus signs for each neighborhood in Table VIII-3). Although there is insufficient data with which to assess the experience in the 1980s, the record of the previous two decades shows that the projects were successful as measured by the improvement in neighborhood conditions which followed more successful implementation of the neighborhood conservation projects.

Thus, implementation was clearly successful in Olde Towne insofar as it was associated with positive neighborhood changes there in the 1960s and 1970s. In Park View, it was not successful in the 1960s but it did succeed in the 1970s as measured by the improvements in the estimators of neighborhood condition during that decade when implementation was also improved. Although a lack of 1990 census data inhibits drawing final conclusions about this measure of success, the study shows that improved neighborhood conditions are clearly associated with better implementation. As implementation success increased, neighborhood conditions improved in the study neighborhoods during the two decades for which conclusions can be drawn.

From this examination of implementation, a number of implications for practice are suggested. They are particularly relevant when considered within the context of national policy.

One of the findings of the study is that changes in national priorities influence the implementation of local neighborhood conservation projects. That influence can be detrimental as when diminished funding for federal urban programs that first created disappointment in the Section 312 loan program impeded
TABLE VIII-3

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CHANGES
IN NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS, 1960-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Housing Built Within the Past Ten Years</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Median Housing Value</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multi-family Units</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing Lacking Some or All Plumbing Facilities</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overcrowding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Owner Occupancy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Residency At the Same Address for Five Years Or More</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Favorable neighborhood change is shown with a plus sign (+), negative change with a minus sign (-), and either neutral effects or lack of data by a zero (0). The lack of 1990 census tract data at the time this study was being completed prevents reaching a conclusion on neighborhood change during the 1980s.

SOURCE: Data on percentage changes in each factor from Tables V-3, VI-3, and VII-3 has been evaluated according to the guidelines in Figure II-2. For further discussion of each decade's results, see the "Implementation Summary" sections of chapters V, VI, and VII.

289
implementation when it fostered great conflict among different governmental units and between PRHA and the public. On the other hand, it can be beneficial as when the change to Community Development funding for urban renewal projects helped promote greater horizontal integration between PRHA and the city. What is certain is that implementation of public policies must be conducted within the national context, and in the foreseeable future that means that it is unlikely that large scale, heavily funded programs will be developed in many areas. Some of the lessons learned from this study neighborhood conservation projects may have wider application, although they are of particular use to those who seek to implement similar programs.

First, implementors must be innovative to succeed. The continued reduction in the scope and size of government programs which has been described in Chapter IV means that new ways of working with the private sector must be developed.

For example, PRHA formerly bought, rehabilitated, and then sold housing which was in need of rehabilitation. In the early 1980s, a new "acquisition and rehabilitation" alternative was devised by which the agency acquired dilapidated properties but sold them to private investors at attractive prices with the proviso that they had to be brought up to higher standards within six months of purchase. With the new approach, the government does not interfere with the real estate market by becoming a developer but facilitates free market operations. Besides preventing the
Authority from having to tie up large sums of money for perhaps long periods of time in rehabilitated housing with uncertain futures, the new approach promotes more rehabilitation by allowing a smaller amount of money to be involved in promoting the renovation of a relatively larger number of dwellings.

As another example, the evolution of the low-cost loan program shows increased experimentation in Portsmouth. Past adaptations included finding new sources of funding (selling tax-free bonds, utilizing Community Development funds) to carry out the rehabilitation loan program in much the same way it was originally conceived. The approach being developed at the end of the study period, however, would allow government to use its limited funds to "buy down" interest rates on loans made through a private financial institution. Not only does this method free the implementing agency from competing with free market operations by becoming a lender as it formerly did, but it promises to promote efficiency by allowing the private institution to handle the tasks which it is specialized to do (qualify loan applicants, service the loan, etc.). Perhaps most importantly it may allow limited funds to have greater impact because a smaller amount of money can be used to leverage more rehabilitation loans than could be afforded if government sought to finance the entire loan amount.

Both of these examples hold the promise that government can adapt its operations to accomplish more with fewer resources if it looks for new ways of doing things. The lesson is not that others should adopt either of these programs but that new ways of using
limited funds must be developed if governmental agencies are to implement their programs in times of tight fiscal constraints.

Second, implementors should be willing to work with and learn from those for whom they are ostensibly carrying out public programs. When the Park View conservation plan was developed without consulting the residents, an intervention was designed which created conflict because of the lack of consultation and which required several amendments because it was developed to meet rigid HUD guidelines which did not necessarily fulfill the local needs. By contrast, the development of the Scotts Creek proposal in that neighborhood was initiated and led by residents who have developed it and lobbied for its adoption by city officials. Since the study has shown that public support as well as the attitudes and resources of constituent's groups facilitate implementation, government administrators who learn better ways of working with their public may also garner ideas, support, and resources which could be crucial to implementation success.

Third, simplification is necessary for better implementation. For example, interviews with administrators who had been involved with the implementation process indicated that the early procedure involved lengthy forms but that simpler forms developed around 1980 had allowed the same workload to be carried by a smaller staff that could spend more time inspecting rather than filling out paperwork. Moreover, the study found that implementation was consistently improved when there were simple means (low level of technical difficulties) and an uncomplicated scope of operation (low range of
behaviors to regulate). Twenty years after Pressman and Wildavsky's study discovered the virtues of simplicity, this study reaffirms their observation that simpler methods promote better implementation.

Questions for Future Research

This study has provided an intensive case study of the experience with a single type of governmental program within a single city in Virginia. Although it has answered some important research questions, it also raises a number of other questions:

1. Are the factors found to be determinants of implementation success by this study characteristic of implementation of other neighborhood conservation projects?

2. Which of the factors identified as influencing implementation success are consistently powerful? Can the number of factors be reduced and placed in a simplified model which allows implementation success to be predicted?

3. To what extent does historic district status significantly enhance the prospects of revitalization for neighborhoods? Is this influence independent of or enhanced by the presence of higher standards for external appearance and/or a special regulatory commission to help interpret and enforce these standards.

4. Does the evolution of a unified theme for a central business district with one or more of its nearby neighborhoods increase the revitalization of the "downtown" area?

Each of these questions for future research is examined below.
1. Are the factors found to be determinants of implementation success by this study characteristic of implementation of other neighborhood conservation projects? Because the current study focuses on only one city's experience during a limited period of time, replication of its findings in the implementation experiences of other cities attempting urban neighborhood conservation projects would substantiate or challenge its findings. Whatever the conclusions of additional studies using the same methodology employed in this study, the additional knowledge discovered would be valuable for governments which seek to conserve their older urban neighborhoods.

2. Which of the factors identified as influencing implementation success are consistently powerful? Can the number of factors be reduced and placed in a simplified model which allows implementation success to be predicted? Although this study reached conclusions about nine of the fifteen implementation factors (two which consistently facilitated it, one which consistently impeded it, and six which accounted for differences in certain periods), it did not establish which factors were more powerful. Further research under more controlled conditions that would allow greater discrimination about the relative power of the the implementation factors is needed so that a comprehensive, simplified model can be developed.
3. To what extent does historic district status significantly enhance the prospects of revitalization for neighborhoods? Is this factor independent of or enhanced by the presence of higher standards for external appearance and/or a special regulatory commission to help interpret and enforce these standards. In this study, a difference in treatments of the two study neighborhoods was the establishment in Olde Towne of an Historic District, the amendment of the city code to provide for regulation for exterior appearance, and the creation of a Commission of Architectural Review to interpret the code by reviewing applications for exterior changes ranging from types of windows to colors of paint. Residents of Park View thought that this was an approach that was important as indicated by their successful effort to bring the same treatment to their neighborhood in the 1980s, and the City of Portsmouth has endorsed the approach by utilizing it in other neighborhoods (Cradock, Truxton, and Port Norfolk).

4. Does the evolution of a unified theme for a central business district with one or more of its nearby neighborhoods increase the revitalization of the "downtown" area? Part of the reason for adopting a neighborhood conservation strategy in the two study neighborhoods was the perception that it would enhance the viability of its downtown commercial area, and subsequently the city embraced the American Institute of Architect's Rural/Urban Design Team's 1977 suggestion to tie the CBD to its nearby Olde Towne neighborhood both visually and economically. Extension of
Historic District zoning, amendment of the city code to create a special "D-1H" area with controls on exterior appearance, a D-1 Committee to function much as the CAR does, to adopt a Facade Improvement Program, and to intentionally bring elements of Olde Towne's distinctive style (brick sidewalks, etc.) were attempts to help revitalize the CBD. A study focusing on the resulting impact of these efforts on CBD revitalization would be an important addition to the literature.

In conclusion, cities can no longer expect to solve their problems by annexing affluent suburbs or by receiving massive infusions of federal funding for urban renewal projects. Since massive clearance projects for urban renewal have been more expensive and more controversial than neighborhood conservation projects, this alternative strategy has been gaining increased international popularity by public administrators who must deal with the problems of revitalizing dilapidated urban neighborhoods.

This study has examined the implementation of the first two conservation projects in Virginia. Lessons learned from the successes and mistakes of this experience should promote a better understanding of the implementation process and assist those who seek to more effectively implement neighborhood conservation projects in their older urban neighborhoods.
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APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY OF GOVERNMENT TERMS

Community Renewal Program -- This involves study and preparation of a program for the entire city. Among other facts this will identify the area suitable for redevelopment and will assign priorities for such redevelopment. It would be financed one-third by the city and two-thirds by the Urban Renewal Administration.

The Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority would apply to the URA for survey and planning funds with which to develop the definitive plans for the project assigned top priority under the Community Renewal Programs. Survey and planning funds advanced by the URA for a specific project are absorbed by the project.

General Neighborhood Renewal Plan -- This plan, now being contemplated for Park View and downtown north of High Street, would embrace two or more projects.

The "neighborhood" under such a plan can be quite large and need not be restricted to what is looked upon locally as a neighborhood. The authority applies for advance funds to prepare this plan and these funds are charged to the first project undertaken, which must not be less than 10 per cent of the total area studied.

Work must have been started on all projects in the area within 10 years of the inception of the plan.

Feasibility Study -- This is similar to the GNRP. The authority requests an advance of funds from the Urban Renewal Administration to prepare this survey. The survey or study is limited to an area where there are special problems for the purpose of delineating one or more projects within the area.

The authority requests an advance of funds from the Urban Renewal Administration to prepare this survey. When projects have been delineated, the authority applies for survey and planning funds for a specific project.

There is no advance of city money and all funds expended are charged to the project.

NOTE: In late 1961, PRHA prepared a booklet explaining technical terms being used in the discussion of a proposed Parkview [sic] General Neighborhood Renewal Plan (GNRP) under Urban Renewal Administration (URA) guidelines. These terms were thought especially noteworthy by the local newspaper.]
Survey and Planning Study -- The City Council, the Planning Commission and the authority agree on the need and general boundaries for a project. The authority applies to the URA for an advance of funds for the purpose of developing a specific project as was done in the case of Lincolnsville.

The cost of the survey and planning is absorbed in the total cost of the project so developed.

Non-Assisted Project -- As distinguished from a Title I project assisted by federal loans and grants, the principal form of federal help for a non-assisted project is FHA special mortgage insurance.

This project, essentially a "conservation" program is contemplated for the "core" not the entire) area in Park View north of Ann Street.
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APPENDIX B

MAPS OF THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW NEIGHBORHOODS BY 1960 CENSUS TRACTS

KEY: PARK VIEW = TRACT #107
      OLDE TOWNE = TRACT #109

APPENDIX C

MAPS OF THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW NEIGHBORHOODS BY 1970 CENSUS TRACTS

KEY: PARK VIEW = TRACT #107
OLDE TOWNE = TRACT #109

APPENDIX D

MAPS OF THE OLDE TOWNE AND PARK VIEW
NEIGHBORHOODS BY 1980 CENSUS TRACTS

KEY: PARK VIEW = TRACT #107
     OLDE TOWNE = TRACT #109

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 United States Census of
         Population and Housing (Washington DC: U.S. Printing
         Office, 1982.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
APPENDIX E
1970 PRHA ANNUAL REPORT

PARKVIEW CONSERVATION PROJECT, VA R-48

With a staff of five the Park View Office was set up in February of 1970. Up to that point progress was limited to a few scattered inspections and planning. The first step was a survey of Holladay Street from an environmental and structural standpoint.

From March, 1970 to January 13, 1971, our records have produced the following progress in Park View.

145 Inspection notices mailed which covered 177 structures
   86 Responses received
   59 No response
   10 Houses noted for sale to which inspection notices were mailed
      6 Responded
      4 No response
   1 Condemned by the City Building Inspector

90 Structures have been inspected covering 175 dwelling units
15 Structures have been completely costed; these buildings contained 34 dwelling units
   7 applications submitted for 312 loans
   3 Approved (work complete representing 5 D/U)
   4 Awaiting HUD Action
   1 Structure rehabilitated with private funds
   7 Awaiting owners final action
9 Structures are in the costing process at present (some have been revised as many as 6 times at the owners request.)
8 Structures representing 17 dwelling units being costed are in various stages of completion and are being held in abeyance for various reasons (lack of money, owners action, etc.)
32 Structures noted under private rehabilitation
16 Dwelling structures have been condemned by the City Health Department as a result of inspections requested by our code specialist.
   9 Have been corrected to meet Health Department requirements
   8 Dwelling structures have been condemned by the City Building Inspector as a result of inspections requested by our code specialist.
   3 Assesory[sic] buildings have been condemned and demolished
8 Dwelling structures were demolished by owners
(unscheduled by PRHA)
30 Abandoned automobiles were tagged and removed from the
Project area
54 Parcels acquired for Public Reuse at a cost of $412,050.00.
This represents 22% of the total acreage slated for
acquisition, including land for both public and private
redevelopment.
46 Structures demolished.
51 Families relocated into standard housing
6 Individuals relocated into standard housing
Family moving expenses paid this year $6,199.00
Individual moving expenses paid this year $476.00
19 Replacement Housing payments paid this year $72,100.00
1 Additional Relocation Payment Paid this year $408.00
During periods in which work was not pressing in Park View
the staff personnel assisted the Olde Towne staff by
inspecting and costing 9 structures in that project.

In addition to the above, it became apparent that it would be
necessary to establish a good working relationship with various
city agencies if we were to make progress in certain areas. This
was done and complete cooperation has been give to this office by
Mr. Davis, Public Works Department, Mr. Eaton, Parks Department,
Mr. Campbell, Recreation Department, Mr. Trant, Mr. Trogdon and Mr.
Jones, Building Officials Office, Mr. Pendelton, Mr. Morrison and
Mr. Hayden, Department of Public Health.

As a result of their cooperation we have been able to secure
better garbage and trash collection-cleaner streets-condemnation of
structures that are health and safety hazards. A block of
Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority property in VA R-39
was cleared and playground and swings and other equipment provided
for the children of Park View. This took seven weeks. Most of
the time required was contributed after working hours by members of
the Park View staff. It could not have happened without the help
of Mr. Campbell and members of his staff.

A clean-up campaign was started in March and 20 truck loads of
trash and debris were hauled away from Holladay Street. Much
effort and energy has been expended to revitalize the Park View PAC
Committee with gratifying results. A Garden Club has been
organized by our Community Organizer and grass has been planted in
many of the yards on Holladay Street.

In late November it was decided our inspection forms,
procedures, terminology, etc. needed to be reviewed and revised.
When this process is completed, the final result will be an
operations manual, which can be used in all four conservation
projects. It will take approximately two months to complete this
job.
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Community Organizer Activities

1 - Nine regular PAC meetings held (3 regular monthly meeting canceled during PAC reorganization.)

2 - PAC reorganizational survey conducted by phone and in person. The reorganization of Parkview PAC has resulted in a more active, effective citizen group which is representative of the area racially, geographically and economically.

3 - Temporary playground opened on vacant land in R-39 with the cooperation of PAC

4 - Spring clean-up campaign held on Holladay Street in April sponsored by PAC. Residents provided 24 truckloads of junk for PRHA maintenance trucks to haul away.

5 - Garden Club formed September 1970. Twenty-five black women have several beautification projects underway and would like to combine eventually with the white Garden Club. Sergeant Don Brown of the Police Community Relations Department, has helped this club in two projects.

6 - Christmas party held for approximately 350 children. Toys and refreshments provided by donations.

7 - C. O. accompanied Code Specialist on inspection of houses to explain the conservation program and locate families with social problems which may need referral services.

8 - Referral follow-up work done by the Park View Community Organizer to date includes: [A list of referrals to Social Service organizations follows.]

During 1972 it is expected that the following will be accomplished in this project:

- 25 Dwelling units rehabilitated
- 60 Dwelling units costed and the work write-up completed
- 225 Dwelling units inspected
- 20 Structures demolished thereby reaching the 70% point of total demolition for Public reuse
- 100% of the area for the Park View School and playground conveyed to the City.
- 15 P.A.C. meeting held with emphasis on educating the Community regarding the Project program
- Community Organizer will continue working with the established Garden Club Committee.
- Site improvements commenced
- Study and effort will be directed to selecting acquisition for failure to comply.
During the year of 1970 the following was accomplished:

60 - Inspection letters mailed to property owners
48 - Replies received from property owners
43 - structures inspected containing 102 dwelling units
33 - work write-ups including costing completed covering
119 dwelling units
7 - Structures rehabilitated containing 15 dwelling units.
2 - Structures under rehabilitation at the end of the year
containing 6 dwelling units.
20 - Work write-up awaiting action.
15 - Loan and/or Grant applications completed
15 - applications submitted to HUD
  9 Approved
  3 Disapproved
  1 Canceled by Owner
  2 Pending approval by HUD
2 - Grant applications approved locally
24 - Parcels were acquired at a cost of $210,900.00.
  Acquisition is now 58% complete.
  Demolition is 65% complete.
  Construction on this project’s part of the flood
  protection structure 90% complete.

The project area committee under the guidance of our Community
Organization staff member accomplished the following:

12 - Regular meetings
2 - Neighborhood-wide meetings held to educate and enlighten
the residents on rehabilitation procedures.
1 - Special meeting with the residents who live in the
vicinity of the demonstration block to explain the
manner in which this block will be treated.

Various City Officials have attended the regular meeting during the
year at the invitation of P.A.C. whereby a better understanding was
reached regarding mutual problems.

In an effort to promote a harmonious relationship between residents
of the are and the Authority, a program was inaugurated in October
whereby the Community Organizer accompanies the Code Specialist on
inspections to present the program on an individual basis.

During 1972 we expect to accomplish the following:

90 - Structures inspected
60 - Work Write-ups and costing accomplished
30 - Applications submitted to HUD
22 - Structure[s] rehabilitated
   14 - Using 312 loans
     8 - Using private financing
  1 - New residential structure completed
20 - Parcels acquired
  1 - Demonstration House rehabilitated
  1 - Park area complete (Block 8)
  1 - Off street parking area complete (Block 8)

  Street improvements on Washington Street commenced.
10 - Structures demolished
12 - Regular P.A.C. meetings
  3 - Special P.A.C. meetings
  1 - Parcel sold for private redevelopment

  Flood control structure completed

Study and effort directed toward enforcing compliance with the Property Rehabilitation Standards.

APPENDIX F

PARK VIEW CONSERVATION PROJECT REPORT, 1971

The Park View Conservation Plan which was approved by Resolution of the Commissioners of the Authority on June 25, 1968, and by Resolution of the City Council on June 26, 1968 establishes certain objectives...

Through the distribution of printed material, public meetings, personal contact between staff personnel and the public visits to the Site Office, in PAC and Community League Meetings, the objectives and methods of obtaining those objectives of the Conservation Plan were discussed in general and specifically with individual property owners and residents being told what could be expected to happen by the execution of the Plan.

Gradually the residents and property owners in Park View were coming to a more realistic understanding of what the Park View Conservation Plan could do toward overcoming the blight which had begun to move rapidly through the neighborhood. As evidence of this acceptance, the PAC began in January of 1971 to press for faster inspections which would make it possible to move quickly against those property owners who refused to bring their property up to Property Rehabilitation Standards. Soon after this through the news media, in a letter, and at a Mass Meeting, the public was told that instead of moving to acquire property when the owner refused to bring it up to Property Rehabilitation Standards the Authority might elect to have the City enforce local codes. The public could not understand how one property owner may be required to meet the standards of the Conservation Plan within the one year and thirty-day time limit established, while the property owner who refused to comply and waited out the time limit could be expected to meet the lower standards of the City codes. This seemed a repudiation of policy made and repeatedly expressed during the eighteen months previous.

Please furnish the Conservation Offices with new guidelines for use in executing Projects VA R-48 and VA R-49, especially with reference to the following matters:

a. Acquisition policy - Will RP-1 be used as the basis for future acquisition within the limitations of the budget, especially when property is to be acquired, cleared and disposed of for private development?

b. Inspections - Are we to use City Inspectors or hire replacement for vacancy which exists?

c. Staffing - Can we fill existing vacancies or will there be new organization schedule?
d. Consideration of Agreement to permit local approval of [Section] 312 loans.

e. Can we make offer for 1024 Blair Street - LPA Rehabilitation

f. Execution of Architect's contract contingent upon decision on "e" above.

g. Selection of new site office - dependent upon size of staff in "e" above.

h. Final inspections have been accomplished and recommendations made for subsequent action. Dependent upon policy decision on referring to City for enforcement of City Codes.

REPORT on PARK VIEW CONSERVATION PROJECT

May 1968 Plan approved by Council and Authority

December 7, 1968 Site Office on North Street, information and phone calls (F. Ornoff)

June 1969 Loan and Grant Contract signed, delayed for Workable Program recertification (six month delay for Park View at onset)

August 1969 Code Specialist at site office, served Olde Towne as well

November 1969 Clerk Typist hired and training begun

December 1969 New Department Head, Frances K. Worrell replaced David Crandall, PAC re-organized

January 1970 Cost Estimator and Financial Advisor hired and training begun, site office, 1217 Ann Street, Heating plant replaced, staff worked from Olde Towne office

February 1970 Permanently moved to 1217 Ann Street

February & March 1970 Environmental survey, Holladay Street. This used as the basis for concentrated inspection and clean-up

July 1970 Playground opened, Garden Club
PARK VIEW CONSERVATION PROJECT, Va R-48

The Parkview Conservation Project, as well as being Virginia’s second approved conservation project is similar to the Olde Towne Conservation Project with the exception that it is an area of sound homes, but its architecture and styles are of a later and different period.

This 100 acre project will also enable the property owners to secure low interest rate loans and Federal grants in order to bring their property up to certain standards. The project improvements in this area will also be of a great magnitude and will provide the area residents with many amenities that can be found in no other section of the City. There will be areas available through project improvements for beach and boat facilities; a large recreational area; small tot lots; and will make sites available which will lend themselves for multi-family type reuse. Parkview, it is hoped, will again become an area of proud homeowners.

Number of Families Relocated 0
Number of Families to be Relocated 65
Number of Individuals to be Relocated 20 (est.)
Acquisition Parcels 122 (complete)
Disposal Parcels
  36 Residential
  13 Public
  7 Right-of-way eligible for dedication
Street Improvements 0
Park Facilities 0
Boat Ramps 0
Playground 0
Recreation 0

APPENDIX G

REPORT ON OLDE TOWNE CONSERVATION PROJECT

VA R-49

It should be noted that not one of the original staff remains in the Olde Towne office. Each has been trained on the job, since December of 1969. The training of a Cost Estimator requires at least six months. The inspector resigned as of April, 1971, and has not been replaced.

The systems, record-keeping, filing, reporting and every step in the rehabilitation process has been reviewed and analyzed by the legal advisors and administrative staffs of P. R. H. A. and HUD. Many changes have been made and others are contemplated.

The procedure to be followed when an owner fails to comply, or refuses entry, is an important policy decision which must be established firmly and tested before this project can be pursued to orderly completion. The plan states positively:

"If at the end of this one year period plus an additional 30 days appropriate action has not been taken to bring the property into compliance, proceedings for condemnation shall be initiated."

Every public statement on the subject prior to January 1971 has followed that premise. Since doubt has been cast on the legality of the process, the program has faltered. At a time when the momentum of both projects had begun to increase and the staff in each office looked forward to greatly accelerated activity during the good weather in the summer of 1971, the Authority weakened its position by stating in a public meeting and for publication that property would not be acquired for failure to comply. From the time this statement was made a lack of confidence in the program has made it difficult to obtain cooperation from the public.

Much of the year of 1970 was spent in public dialogue between the property owner and the LPA staff resulting in greatly improved understanding and support for the program. A firm and immediate policy statement with determined pursuit of the policy will reinforce the progress made and serve as impetus for future results.

The following items await decision which cannot be made at staff levels:
1. Issuance of Certificates of Compliance to 13 owners awaits approval and printing of forms.
2. Demonstration Block awaits award of contract by City.
3. Demonstration House awaits decision on whether to re-bid or attempt to sell to developer to rehabilitate.
4. Inspections are being performed by Project Director, but the use of his time for this purpose is a waste and awaits a decision on whether inspections will be performed under contract by City.
5. If this project is to be completed in scheduled time, additional staff must be hired and trained at once.

May 1968  
Plan approved by Council and Authority

October 1968  
Site office opened at 435 Court Street

December 1968  
Loan and Grant contract signed

During 1969  
Staff was hired and trained

TOTAL BUILDINGS 205

INSPECTIONS:
1969: 28 Buildings
1970: 45 Buildings
1971: 30 Buildings
Total: 103 Buildings

WORK WRITE-UPS:
1969: 10 Buildings
1970: 31 Buildings
1971: 13 Buildings
Total: 54 Buildings

NOTE: These figures do not include duplicates; some of these have been done as many as eight times.

REHABILITATION COMPLETED:
1969: 1 Mullen
1970: 8 Jacobsen, Meeder, Blumberg, Adams, Robins, Armistead-Morrison, O'Connor, Oglesby
1971: 2 Robertson, Johnson

REHABILITATION IN PROGRESS: 1971: 2 Wallace, Keil

LOANS PENDING: 1971: 2 Schwalenberg, May

SOURCE: Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority (Portsmouth VA: PRHA, undated). [The report was evidently compiled very late in 1971 or early in 1972.]
APPENDIX H

REPORT ON CONSERVATION PROJECTS IN PORTSMOUTH*

I. OBJECTIVES

This report will present an objective review of the conservation program in Portsmouth in sufficient detail to provide a basis for analysis of methods, procedures, techniques and policies which may also be used as a guideline in formulating changes and strengthening existing procedures. It will deal with general problems which are rooted in differences in the basic approach to conservation rather than details of administering the [Section] 312/115 loan and grant aspects of the program.

The material and statements contained herein are documented in the files and records of the individual site offices, in the central office and in the minutes of the three Project Area Committees. More detailed study of some of these records, and discussion with key personnel may prove advantageous in making final decisions on some of the questions posed herein.

Recommendations contained in Section V are included as a suggestion that these problems do have workable solutions and are intended as guides only. {2}

II. THE HOUSING AUTHORITY, THE CITY AND THE CITIZEN

The first two conservation projects in Portsmouth (Olde Towne and Park View) were actually on the drawing boards before the state law would permit their implementation. For that reason perhaps all of the differences between clearance and conservation were not fully foreseen or understood by the three groups that would eventually be involved in their execution. For example, the new function of the Housing Authority as it related to the "inspection" process was more far-reaching than most of the participants in the programs had imagined. This function, which is the backbone of the conservation procedure poses several questions which have not been resolved to the satisfaction of the three groups mentions. Some of those questions are:

NOTE: This appendix contains the complete text of the PRHA internal assessment of implementation progress. Editorial clarification is contained in footnotes or in regular brackets, "[ ]." The original document lacked page numbers, but the page sequence is indicated by assigning page numbers in curved brackets, "{ }," for ease of reference to the document when referred to in this study. Although the text has been edited for spelling and format, no other changes have been made.
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A. What effects will the more stringent Property Rehabilitation Standards have on the City’s enforcement of the Minimum Housing Code in Conservation Project Areas?

B. When serious conditions needing immediate correction are discovered by the Housing Authority personnel what action will be taken?

C. If any referral action is taken, will it weaken the legal position of the Housing Authority later when enforcing the one year and thirty day compliance notice?

D. How can the average resident or property owner be assisted in understanding and complying with the two standards?

E. How should the Authority deal with the problem of wholesale property abandonment, or a calculated failure to comply in an effort to have the Housing Authority acquire the property?

These and many other problems were not anticipated. Certainly communication and cooperation between City Departments, Housing Authority personnel, residents and property owners are an absolute must, and should begin during the planning process and continue {3} until the project is completed. A legal opinion as to the role of each entity, fully understood and accepted by the three groups should be the basis for an honest and direct approach to the conservation of any area. It became apparent early in the program that some Housing Authority employees and most City personnel had no idea of the impact these programs would have on them in the performance of their jobs.

The nature of the program made it impossible to set out in the plan the specific properties which would be acquired; since the law permitted the imposition of the eminent domain statute in conservation areas only after the lapse of one year and thirty days without compliance; or to clear title. This has created some confusion for the property owner in Park View.

Answers to these questions must be provided and understood by all three groups before the programs can achieve full effectiveness. {4}

III. CONSERVATION PLAN

The Conservation Plans for Olde Towne and Park View for the most part are adequate and provide the necessary guidelines to execution of the projects. The plans, together with additional data and information include in the Part I submittals have been accurate in the procedural methods outlined. Details have been refined, but no basic changes have been necessary as far as the
inspection, work-writeup, cost estimating process is concerned. However, it appears that the impact of the [Section] 115/312 loan and grant process on the overall program has been over-emphasized. There are two primary reasons for this: i.e. lengthy processing and nit-picking of individual applications at the Federal level; and the unavailability of funds for 312 loans. These two facts have discouraged the property owner from using the 312 loan. In future projects, and in reviewing the two existing projects additional financial tools must be developed to help the owner pay for the rehabilitation of his property. No more than twenty percent of any rehab workload can be expected to utilize the 312/115 loan and grant.

The acquisition of property for private reuse in a Conservation Project has presented some difficulty in the two projects now in execution. Solution to this problem should be sought before filing Major Amendatory Applications [to change the plans for the Conservation Projects] or another Part I Application [for additional survey and planning funds]. {5}

IV. REVIEW OF PROGRESS

A. OLDE TOWNE

The Loan and Grant Contract for the Olde Towne Conservation Project was signed in December 1968. A Coordinator of Conservation and Clerk Typist who served both projects during the planning stage formed the nucleus for the future staffs in both offices. The position of Coordinator has been vacated and filled twice since that time. Two cost estimators were hired and trained, a process requiring at least six months. One resigned after one year; the other after one and [a] half years; both left because of low salary. One Financial Advisor left after approximately six months and an Inspector after nearly a year because of salary. Files have been set up, procedures established; staff training is a continuous effort. Overcoming a lack of understanding for and fear of the program by the public has required much time. Two mass meetings were held early in 970; the Coordinator attends all Project Area Committee meetings. Commission of Architectural Review meetings and other meetings as necessary to help keep other groups informed of the Program. The Project Director attends PAC meetings, as does the Community Organizer. The acquisition of property and demolition of buildings in Olde Towne has proceeded on schedule. Beginning in January 1970 several steps were taken to accelerate the program and provide the impetus needed to encourage property owners to rehabilitate their property:

1. Block 8 was designated a "Demonstration Block" and efforts were coordinated to acquire, demolish and prepare for sale to the City the public use property in that area.
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2. Preliminary sketches and design drawings were prepared for development of the Demonstration Block and were shown to civic leaders, city officials, PAC and other community groups.

3. The Bain-Pritchard house at 525 North Street was purchased and plans drawn for the Authority to rehabilitate it as a guide and incentive to the program. This building is located in the Demonstration Block. {6}

4. A block by block inspection schedule was established and implemented.

5. The underground placement of utilities was pursued with City, Authority and VEPCO representatives participating.

6. Two properties were acquired and boarded up to hold for future rehab and sale by the Authority, or for sale and rehab by a private owner.

7. The Harbor Court (a non-conforming use) was acquired.

8. The Elks Club (another non-conforming use) was acquired.

9. Three parcels on Crawford Parkway were acquired and two buildings demolished.

10. Through cooperation with the City Building Inspector and the Commission of Architectural Review a structure at 322 London Street was demolished by the owner after condemnation by the City.

11. The owner of the "Pass House" on the corner of London St. and Crawford Parkway was assisted in applying for a 312 commercial rehabilitation loan. The loan was approved in June of 1971.

12. A review of rehabilitation procedures by HUD was conducted and used as the basis for an in-depth study of rehab procedures. After this study some changes were made and all local practices were formalized in staff meetings and by memorandum.

13. As a result of this review the Authority received the documents necessary to apply for authorization to approve 312 loans locally. The Attorney has been requested to review the papers.

14. A filing, record-keeping and reporting procedure has been developed which provides prompt and accurate status reports.
Since March of 1971, as a result of the following events progress in Olde Towne has slowed to a serious degree:

1. Bids on the Demonstration Block came in high and the City is re-designing in an effort to reduce the cost. {7}

2. Bids on 525 North Street (Demonstration House) came in high. Architect recommended changes and re-bidding. Advertising was stopped on the recommendation that the property be sold [to] a private developer for private rehabilitation. No further action has been taken.

3. It was proposed that the Housing Authority contract with the City for inspection services. The contract was drawn and disapproved by HUD.

4. Staff salaries have been frozen (pending results of the Management Survey). Hiring has also been suspended: The staff is as follows:
   1 - Project Director - Cost Estimator - Inspector
   1 - Cost Estimator
   1 - Clerk-Typist
   1/2 - Financial Advisor (Serves Park View)
   1/2 - Clerk-Typist
   1 - Community Organizer

5. The Coordinator of Conservation and the Olde Towne Project Director began preparation of a procedural manual for guidance and training of employees in all phases of the conservation process. This work was suspended when about 85% complete awaiting completing and implementation of the Management Survey. The Survey recommended a different inspection procedure from the method now in use or the use of city inspectors. The Management Survey recommends that the Cost Estimator handle one case from initial inspection through final inspection.

6. Newspaper articles concerning Park View reported that the Housing Authority would not in most cases acquire property in the Conservation Projects at the end of the year and thirty day period for failure to comply with the Property Rehabilitation Standards. This evoked strong public reaction both in Olde Towne and Park View. Both PAC groups interpreted that as a reversal of past statements of policy. Much public discontent has developed. Those property owners who have spent money fixing up properties feel that they have been misled. {8}

7. An Amendment to the Plan has been prepared to eliminate a portion of the alley between Court and Dinwiddie Streets. This came as a direct result of meetings with PAC leaders and in response to their request. {9}
B. PARK VIEW

The Park View Conservation Project has changed character completely since the Plan was developed. When the project was planned it was composed of predominately white, middle-income, single family, sixty percent owner-occupant with a high percentage of elderly. There has been a rapid transition to black, tenant, multi-family, low and moderate income. Many of the elderly and a hard core of middle-aged couples with deep roots in the community have remained and are resisting the transition of the neighborhood. I believe that many of these will stay if the neighborhood can be stabilized.

The Park View Site Office opened at 1217 Anne Street in March of 1970. Staff was trained in Olde Towne and transferred to Park View. The block-by-block inspection started at the southern boundary of the project, which was the area first affected by the transition mentioned above. It became quickly evident that any effort at compliance would be limited to homeowners. Most of these wanted to rehabilitate but because of low equity and high rehab costs could not qualify for a 312 loan large enough to complete the job.

The inspection process gave an early indication of the problems involved, which were discussed with the Executive Director and the Assistant Director of Redevelopment. An environmental survey of the first twelve blocks of the Project were conducted by the Inspector and, based on the results of this survey, a referral system was worked out which permitted the Inspector (Code Specialist) accompanied by the Community Organizer to request assistance from any city department to help correct problems discovered in the course of regular inspection. It served as a means to assess and administer to much more than housing needs. The community understood and cooperated with the effort and a great deal was accomplished both of an environmental and social nature. All city departments cooperated: Police, Fire, Welfare, Building Inspector, Sanitation, Recreation and Health. A Garden Club was organized with the help of the Community Organizer. A clean-up campaign received the (10) enthusiastic support of the community. A temporary playground was opened with parent supervision. Fifty abandoned automobiles were removed.

At the same time that this activity was concentrated in the southern part of the project inspections were proceeding in other areas. All vacant houses were noted and scheduled for inspection. Several residents scattered throughout the projects requested inspection and several elderly widows applied for grants. PAC began to apply pressure for action against absentee owners.

* NOTE: The document is not included in this appendix because a copy of the circular has not survived. They were told that no action could be taken, except in cases of an emergency nature, until the one year and thirty days had elapsed.
Flyers written by staff and reviewed by legal and administrative department heads were distributed which explained the procedure. A copy of one such circular is attached.* By early 1971 it became evident that acquisition of property for failure to comply could become quite costly. Then at a mass meeting in late March or early April the public was informed that the Authority would not condemn property for failure to comply in most cases but would request the city to enforce the Minimum Housing and Building codes. Prior to this meeting all staff members were instructed to make no further referrals to city departments for any reason until after expiration of the one year and thirty day period. At this time twenty-five final inspections have been completed. Recommendations for final action will be forwarded to the Executive Director.

The PAC has sponsored a petition requesting the City Council to stop the project and re-plan it in order that the Community may take part in the planning process. A report is being prepared for the City Manager to assist them in their response to the petition. Property acquisition has stopped. The budget is adequate to cover all scheduled acquisition (which contained some for failure to comply). Since April this project has had little activity. Inspection and work write-ups have continued at the level permitted by the small staff, but a lack of public confidence is reflected in the failure of the public to apply for loans or grants. {11}

Resigning staff members have not been replace and the staff now stands at:

1 - Cost Estimator - Project Director
1 - Code Specialist (Inspector)
1 - Clerk Typist
1/2 - Financial Advisor
1/2 - Clerk-Typist
1 - Community Organizer

[V. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. General suggestions for all projects are as follows:

1. There is serious need for central file control responsibility, maintenance of incoming mail log, and a library to provide ready access to available data on HUD programs, legislation, printed reports from other Authorities, S & P Applications, Part I and Part II Applications and Amendments.

2. Also needed is [a] Department to compile and distribute status reports on all phases of Urban Renewal activities.
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Department Heads should be furnished with regular financial and status reports which could be taken directly from information which is forwarded from Site Offices to Central Files.

3. A definite assignment of secretarial assistance to the Department Heads in Centra Office. The responsible secretary should be on the same phone with the Department Head she is assisting, especially in cases where the Department Head is out of the office frequently. She should accept and handle phone calls when possible.

4. Dissemination of policy statements, public relations releases, news information for public and general staff guidance should be centralized at one point and coordinated.

B. Recommendations - Olde Towne

1. Prepare for disposition to City of Block 8 to encourage prompt development as planned non-cash contribution.

2. Advertise for bids on Bain-Pritchard House for LPA Rehab, in accordance with "as if" appraisal and approval of HUD.

3. Employ an Inspector, train with help of City’s Inspection Department and establish and maintain final inspection schedule and pursue the original first inspection schedule.

4. Assemble three other properties in 400 block of London Street, offer as a package for private rehabilitation. If no public interest, proceed with LPA rehab.

5. When contract for underground placement is received from City, check for non-cash credit. Requires legal opinion. The City is paying VEPCo [sic] $45,500 per year for five years.

6. Hire architectural consultant for advice on reuse of Harbor Court Hotel.

7. Work with Project Area Committee to obtain Historic Preservation funds for Elks Club.

8. Hold disposition of property on Crawford Parkway until final action on Bunn property is evident. The rehabilitation of 200 London Street may increase the value of the Bunn property (land) to interest a developer in the purchase of both parcels.

10. Establish policy that will permit the completion of the procedural manual for its use in training new personnel.

C. Recommendations - Park View

1. Set meeting of top level City and Authority personnel to define and clarify the roles of all participants. When this policy has been established have a meeting of all city and Authority personnel who will be charged with carrying out the policy to explain the procedures. Then begin a public information program to assure that the citizens understand their role.

2. Hire an Environmentalist who will be responsible for working with other city employees and agencies to provide an umbrella approach to the Park View problems.

3. Take immediate action on all final inspections. Prepare for acquisition of at least one property for failure to comply. Preferably involving an absentee landlord who does not want sell. Arrange to obtain necessary legal admittance to inspect where requests have been ignored.

4. Acquire for LPA rehabilitation several properties. Prepare for resale under 235 with interest subsidy; check on buy-back agreement now permitted to HUD to see if this can be done in this state.

5. Prepare for Major Amendatory by investigating possibility of acquiring Beazley Center, then replan the use of that land along with the recreation area in the present plan. The possibility of including a Neighborhood Facility which {14} can serve to unify the community and also provide housing for many of the city services which are needed by the neighborhood; i.e., day care center, adult education, welfare meeting space, etc.

6. Proceed with acquisition as scheduled.

APPENDIX I

INSPECTION PROCEDURE FOR CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Inspections are handled in the following manner:

* The owner is sent a letter requesting permission to survey property.

* If no reply is received in 30 days, a second request is sent.

* If there is still no reply a third notice is sent by certified mail citing the Property Rehabilitation Standards, which read: "PV-1103 where entry by inspectors is refused—penalties—where the proper local authority or his agent is refused entry or access is otherwise impeded or prevented by the owner or occupant from conducting an inspection of the premises, such person shall be considered in violation of these standards and subject to the penalties as provided by law."

* When permission is granted to inspect a property, the representative of the Authority and the community organizer (female) makes an appointment. While the code specialist conducts the survey of the property, the community organizer discusses the program with the resident explaining the assistance available and answering questions.

* If the owner requests it, he is then given a detailed work writeup which, when approved by him, serves as the specifications for bidding.

* Bids are requested from the entire list of qualified contractors.

* After owner approval, this forms the basis for making application for loan and/or grant.

* After loan and/or grant approval, work commences and is inspected by the staff.

APPENDIX J

PRHA Executive Director’s Analysis, 1974

The Portsmouth Redevelopment and Housing Authority was criticized in the recent City Council campaign for dragging its feet with Park View renewal—a project that dates back to 1968.

To get the Authority’s viewpoint on the status of things in Park View, the Ledger-Star asked D. Bart Frye, executive director of the PRHA, to respond to a series of questions.

Q. What is the Park View Conservation Project?
A. In the mid-1960s, the Park View neighborhood, which consists largely of homes constructed around World War I, showed evidence of structural deterioration. It was recognized that without some type of concentrated effort to reverse this trend, Park View would become a slum.

Conservation as an Urban Renewal Program, was that time, a new concept. Its major focus was to provide the tools for physically upgrading an inner city area through the renovation of existing structures and the improvement of public facilities.

In 1968, the City of Portsmouth and the federal government approved a conservation program for the Park View area.

The plan for the 90-acre project is two-fold.
1) The Authority provides extensive technical, architectural, and financial assistance to property owners on an individual basis to enable them to renovate their homes to a long term sound condition. The Authority also acquires certain designated properties, demolishes them, and dedicates the land to the city for public use.

2) The city constructs parks and playgrounds on the land provided by the Authority. At the same time, streets, sidewalks, curbs and landscaping are then up-graded as part of the city’s share of the conservation effort.

Q. How does it differ from urban renewal projects?
A. Conservation is an urban renewal program. It differs from the better known types of urban renewal programs, such as redevelopment, in that emphasis is placed on the improvement of existing homes rather than clearing structures to make land available for the development of new residences. The rehabilitation of existing structures requires the individual participation of each property owner in the conservation area.

Specific activities include a survey of each property in the area by the Authority to determine its structural condition. An in-depth study is then made, at the owner’s request, delineating what improvements need to be made, types of construction materials to be used and the cost of such improvements to the home-owner.

The owner then has the option to rehabilitate his home privately or to apply for financial counseling and assistance.
Technical advice on home improvement is available to every property owner at no cost.

One of the most significant benefits of the program is the availability to the property owners of below market rate interest rate loans up to $17,500 per dwelling unit, payable over a 15-to-25 year period. Interest rates on these loans range from 3 to 5 1/2 per cent as opposed to the going market rate of 11 to 16 per cent over a 5-to-7 year period.

In addition, owner occupants who qualify may receive up to $3,500 in a non-repayable rehabilitation grant. The underlying theory of conservation is that the excellent benefits provided should serve as a strong impetus for individuals to renovate their property, a process which is for the most part, voluntary.

Q. What can the Authority do to speed up clearance and/or rehabilitation?

A. As cited above, the rehabilitation process is primarily a voluntary undertaking. To stimulate rehabilitation in the absence of adequate private initiative, the Authority can renovate homes to be used for demonstration purposes, such as the Site Office at 243 Armstrong St.; the rehabilitation staff can be increased; rehabilitation procedures can be refined to better serve the needs of Park View; a constant flow of below-market interest loans and quick loan processing can be achieved; some structurally substandard dwellings can be acquired for clearance or rehabilitation by the Authority.

These things the Authority has now accomplished. At the same time, innovative ideas for encouraging individual rehabilitation of homes are being studied. Conservation is still a young program, and at this point in Park View, experience has dictated that the initial federal concept of conservation, which was totally dependent on private imitative, is not adequate. **

If the Authority had sufficient funds to purchase a large number of substandard properties and rehabilitate them, then the impetus for property owners to renovate their homes would be strengthened.

The present budget does not provide these funds. However, the Authority is researching the possibilities of securing additional funds.

Physical evidence that the city is investing in Park View by providing public improvements can greatly stimulate rehabilitation. To date, one play lot has been constructed, and curb and sidewalk improvements have begun. The Authority is working closely with the city to insure the initiation of public improvements long planned for Park View.

Finally, the rehabilitation effort could be "speeded up" by a genuine bolstering of morale within the neighborhood. The somewhat fatalistic attitude toward Park View's future which as been voiced publicly by various persons has had a definite effect on the residents' willingness to rehabilitate their homes.
Right or wrong the fact that negative attitudes about Park View have prevailed publicly since 1969 cannot help but have taken its toll on the neighborhood, affecting Park View's future which so dependent on the faith in and support of the program for [and] from the all property owners.

Clearance can be expedited by working through the judicial process to hasten litigation in cases where the acquisition price is contested.

The number of independent appraisers working in the area can be increased.

The number of attorneys performing title searches can be increased.

Private real estate agencies can be involved in negotiation with property owners regarding the amount offered to the owner for his property to reduce the time involved in the acquisition process.

The Project Area Committee can be requested to assist the Authority to assist the Authority in clarifying acquisition and relocation procedures to the residents.

The relocation effort can be phased with acquisition to assure the availability of land for new construction at the earliest possible time.

A concerted effort can be made to attract developers while the property is being acquired, so that construction can begin shortly after demolition is complete.

All of the above have been done by the Authority. Acquiring properties and relocating residents are still time-consuming processes, highly dependent upon the resources and capacities of the private sector over which the program has no control.

Q. How important is citizen participation in this sort of project?

A. Citizen participation is essential simply because conservation's success relies greatly on voluntary individual rehabilitation efforts. Also, an informed citizenry which is publicly supportive of the project is the most effective means of stimulating voluntary rehabilitation.

Q. How much has been accomplished in Park View?

A. The real measure of accomplishment in the conservation area is the degree to which the trend toward structural blight has been curtailed and, ultimately, reversed. The domino theory of blight spread has historically been difficult to turn around.

A conservation program was undertaken in Park View because of the rapid spread of blight in the area in the mid-1960s. The pendulum continued to swing in that direction in the very early '70s. However, signs now indicate that physical and racial stability are beginning to become a reality. The spread of blight appears to be receding.

Actual physical achievement in the area include the clearance of over 6 acres of land by the Authority which as been dedicated to the city. The city has constructed one play lot on part of this
land, and has recently awarded contracts for development of another large recreation area on the remainder.

A contract has been executed for curb and sidewalk improvements throughout the project area, and that work is in progress.

A contract for extensive street resurfacing and construction of turn-arounds at dead ends was recently awarded, with that work scheduled to commence this summer. The city has also completed removal of those streets, curbs, sidewalks and underground utilities in the contemplated park areas.

Between 1965 and 1972 the city contributed $219,500 toward its one-third share of the project. Its remaining share is being contributed in in-kind project improvements previously described.

An estimated $300,000 in private funds have been invested in the rehabilitation of 43 structures. Of these funds, $158,902 has been provided through the conservation program in below market interest loans and non-repayable grants.

Two hundred eighty-two of the 357 structures designated for rehabilitation at the present time have been inspected by the Authority. Owners of all uninspected properties have been contacted by the Authority requesting that they permit inspection. Legal action is the only recourse in cases where inspections are flatly refused.

A major achievement having a direct bearing on Park View was the institution of the Local Rehabilitation Loan Program (LRLP) in mid-1973. The Authority, with the aid of six publicly-minded local banks, created the LRLP, which provides below-market interest rate loans to property owners.

A frequent citizen complaint prior to the LRLP was that the conservation effort was slow due to the sporadic availability of federal below-market interest rate loans. Lengthy loan approval periods frustrated many applicants.

Now, loan processing which formerly took 6 months to a year, takes a maximum of 60 days, and a constant flow of these funds is assured.

Federal and local approval for an amendment to the original for Park View was received during the past year. This amendment provides for the clearance of over 6 acres of land for new residential construction. The Authority is seeking out potential developers through the media, and the Project Area Committee is actively participating in this effort.

The Authority is undertaking the acquisition of some substandard houses designated for conservation, within the confines of the limited funds available for this purpose. These units will be rehabilitated by the Authority and then sold on the private market. On such rehabilitation is presently under way at 260 Webster Ave.

The time-consuming groundwork laid by the Authority and the city which results in visible physical achievements in the area is seldom realized or understood by the layman. However, this groundwork is coming to fruition in Park View, and observable physical improvements are more evident now than at any time in the project’s history.
Q. Olde Towne and Park View are both conservation projects. Why does there seem to be much more being accomplished in Olde Towne?

A. Olde Towne has received much publicity as a result of its designation as an Historic District. Rehabilitation has succeeded in Olde Towne because residents (old and new) were and are anxious to restore the houses in the area, many of which are historically and/or architecturally significant.

The Portsmouth Historical Association and the Commission of Architectural Review, which is a body appointed by City Council to oversee exterior physical changes to buildings in Olde Towne, have contributed to the constant public support of the project. The technical and financial assistance offered by the Authority have been eagerly utilized.

Before the Olde Towne Project was initiated some private rehabilitation had been completed, but generally the physical condition of the structures was somewhat higher than those in the Park View Area.

The relatively high income range of Olde Towne residents versus the more moderate income range of the majority of Park View residents has also been a significant factor in the degree of rehabilitation success in each of these projects.

Q. What is the role of the Project Area Committee (PAC) in such a program as that embraced by Park View?

A. Project Area Committees were organized by the Authority to involve the residents of conservation and redevelopment areas in the planning and execution of the projects. A Project Area Committee is formed to represent the project areas geographically, racially, age wise, etc., and the PAC serves as a liaison between the citizens and the Authority.

PAC members are kept informed on a continuing basis of all project activities and are responsible for disseminating that information to their neighbors.

At the same time, the PAC serves an important function by providing input to the Authority regarding citizen wishes and desires for their community.

An example of the close productive interaction of the PAC, the Authority and the city is the plan change of 1973 which provided for clearance and redevelopment in Park View, among other things.

Q. There are a lot of unoccupied houses in Park View. What will become of them?

A. Houses remain vacant because, as tenants move out, the Department of Public Health must inspect the property to certify that the dwelling unit meets the city's Minimum Housing Code. Those structures which are below code cannot be re-rented.

The landlords who own these substandard dwellings often are unwilling to effect the necessary repairs. Thus, the buildings remain vacant to be boarded up (for which the owner pays a fee to the city) or demolished by the city when the property is deemed to be structurally unsound (demolition costs are charged to the owner.)
Q. What can be done about the "Absentee landlord problem?"

A. Absentee-owned, substandard properties create Park View's most severe problem. Tenant occupied dilapidated housing is also handled through the Department of Public Health's code enforcement program.

If the properties are condemned by the Health Department, the Authority aids in relocating tenants and the properties remain vacant until they are repaired or demolished.

In the case of vacant or tenant occupied absentee owned houses, the Authority can take the landlord to court and purchase the property to demolish or rehabilitate it, if rehabilitation is feasible.

However, the funds for such purchases are severely limited, and the present budget for Park View does not provide for the extensive acquisition required to expeditiously eliminate this problem.

In addition, purchasing slum properties by the Authority, particularly vacant ones, in a sense rewards the slum landlord. In such instances, the landlord is paid for a property which he has "milked" for profit and has no intention of rehabilitation.

Therefore, through acquisition, he is freed from the threat of court action and fines from the city and does not have to bear the expense of eventual demolition.

In the absence of adequate funds to acquire these properties, the neighborhood must rely on the enforcement of the city's Minimum Housing Code. Also, the Authority is meeting with absentee landlords in an effort to demonstrate that through the rehabilitation of their properties with available below-market interest rate loans, they will realize a higher financial return while reversing the dilapidation in an area which was primarily caused by them.

Q. Are there any plans for reuse of the numerous vacant lots where substandard buildings have been razed?

A. Some of these lots which are large enough to be developed, have been designated for acquisition by the Authority to be sold for new residential construction. The private market has also made contributions to development of vacant areas in the project.

Two new homes have been built, and the Authority has reviewed plans for construction of apartment buildings on two other privately owned vacant sites. The number of inquiries as to the availability of vacant land has increased during recent months.

This should give rise to some optimism since new construction by the private sector is a strong indicator that Park View's inherent potential is being recognized.

Q. About a year there was talk of development of townhouses and single family structures in the three-block area of Park View under an amendment to the Park View plan. Whatever happened to this?

A. The previously mentioned change in the Park View Plan permitted the designation of this three-block area for clearance
and residential redevelopment. Acquisition of the properties began after the plan change was approved in late 1973. While the acquisition, relocation, and clearance efforts are under way, the Authority is advertising through the media for interested developers and is seeking builders willing and able to construct homes in the area which will meet the citizens' expectations and, at the same time, will be economically feasible.

Q. How much federal grant money has been received for Park View and how has it been spent?
A. The Federal Capital Grant for Park View is $2,973,099, of which $1,609,679 remains. The funds which have been expended for legal costs, project planning, acquisition expenses, demolition of acquired property, rehabilitation (not including loans), real estate purchases, relocation payments, rehabilitation grants and administrative services.

Q. What will happen to the program if there is disinterest or antagonism on the part of Park View residents?
A. Disinterest and antagonism have existed in the past to the detriment of the program. Strong citizen support is a most important factor in reversing blight.

In the past, owner occupants have been hesitant to remain in the area and improve their homes. This was attributable to the physical deterioration of the area, as well as social and racial problems.

To a great extent, the success of a conservation effort is directly proportional to citizen participation and support of the program.

Defeatism and low morale, which have been perpetrated in Park View, have caused many homeowners to leave the area, making the neighborhood ripe for slum landlords to purchase properties with no intention of rehabilitating them.

The Authority and the PA are now working together to change Park View’s image for the better. Hopefully, a much needed sense of community pride will be generated through the conservation of existing homes, the development of new homes, the improvement of sidewalks, streets, curbs and construction of parks and playgrounds.

Q. What is the outlook for the future of Park View?
A. Park View, at the very least, represents a significant challenge at this time. The Authority does not agree with those who hasten to say that the area is past the point of feasible rehabilitation.

With the investment of six major banks in making long term below-market interest loan funds available in the neighborhood, at a time when the trend is gravitating rapidly toward "in city living" (fuel crisis, wasted commuting hours, etc.) as opposed to moving to the suburbs, with the commencement of extensive public improvements by the city; with the approval of a plan change to allow for new residential construction to better serve the needs of
the community; and with serious need for housing in this city, at a time when soaring interest rates have made the purchase of new homes or home improvement loans out of the financial reach of many citizens, the Authority feels that the outlook for Park View is considerably better than it has been in the past 24 to 36 months.

Park View's excellent location with regard to medical facilities, employment opportunities and shopping areas, particularly in light of the ongoing fuel shortage, should be a very positive factor in assuring the stability of the neighborhood.

The outlook for Park View can best be judged by those who objectively evaluate these facts, and disregarding past rumors and frustrations, look forward to the successful renewal of what can be an appealing inner city residential area.
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