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Executive Summary

The purpose of this project is to determine the impact of a redevelopment master plan on the existing population surrounding the project area. In the Spring of 2014, the City of Hartford, Connecticut and Utile prepared a redevelopment Master Plan for a portion of their downtown titled “Downtown North / Downtown West: A Plan for the City of Hartford.” The Downtown North (DoNo) section of the plan area consists of vacant lots, parking lots, and underutilized properties, many city-owned, which appear prime for redevelopment. My research questions and analysis focus on the housing portion of this Master Plan in the DoNo neighborhood, and examine the social justice impacts of the potential redevelopment.

Abutting this area is the wealthy and more expensive Downtown and in contrast with the low-income, minority, and marginalized neighborhoods of Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill. My main research questions are as follows. Will the Master Plan provide enough housing to meet the future needs of market rate and affordable housing in the project area? Will the potential influx of new residents spill over into the adjacent Clay Arsenal, Asylum Hill, and Upper Albany neighborhoods and cause the displacement of residents?

Throughout the year long process of conducting this research project, the City contracted the New Britain Rock Cats to move to the DoNo and agreed to construct a $56 million minor league baseball stadium for them. A developer submitted a proposal in response to the City’s Request for Proposals (RFP) for the stadium and included a $350 million mixed-use neighborhood development around the stadium. The evolution of this project has given me the opportunity to also compare the developer’s proposal, which is in the final negotiations with the City Council, to the original redevelopment Master Plan.

The DoNo redevelopment Master Plan and subsequent proposal struggle to balance needed economic development to the neighborhood, the City, and existing residents. This critical piece (DoNo) of the City has formed a gap between Downtown and the surrounding North End neighborhoods. The City is at an exciting time in its history with the opportunity to heal the scars of the early generations of urban renewal.
that left much of DoNo vacant and underutilized, and shifted resources and amenities away from the North End and into Downtown.

The DoNo Master Plan aimed to bring in approximately 800 residential units into DoNo, for young professionals and empty nesters. Much of the plan intends to bring in amenities that would also benefit these groups, although the improvements in streetscaping, transportation, and connections to several parks would benefit the surrounding neighborhoods. A grocery store that would also serve North End neighborhoods, as well as Downtown, would be a great benefit.

The redevelopment proposal for the minor league baseball stadium and mixed-use neighborhood drew criticism despite its best efforts to produce a viable plan for this forgotten part of Hartford. The original proposal included no affordable housing units, which targeted units for wealthier young professionals. The proposal substantially undercut the number of housing units initially; however, the City pushed back and now will see over 900 units. If the City Council succeeds in their efforts in the developer's agreement, 20% of the units will have low and moderate-income affordability restrictions. No preference requirements have been set yet for the neighborhood. Moderate-income affordable units may be most successful as they would slowly transition income mixing.

Analysis of this project has developed recommendations for the City of Hartford to assist them in planning for the benefit of the existing low-income residents. This project, at the very least, proves that the field of planning matters. We may never know if the Master Plan process was the impetus for this redevelopment; however, it has acted as a guiding document none-the-less. The City has been able to utilize the Master Plan to push the developers to follow the type of development they are interested in for their community.
Introduction

As a culminating experience for my Master’s of Regional Planning degree at the University of Massachusetts, I selected to complete a Master’s Project. This six credit course required me to work independently on a project to explore various aspects of regional planning. This self-designed research project was developed with the assistance of my advisor, Professor Darrel Ramsey-Musolf, my Committee Member, Professor Wayne Feiden, and my Research Issues Professor Ethan Carr.

This Masters Project analyzes the potential impacts of Hartford’s Downtown North / Downtown West Master Plan (December 2013) on the surrounding neighborhoods. The area that is the focus of this Masters Project is the Downtown North neighborhood. This neighborhood has been coined “DoNo” (pounced Dough-No), playing off of Hartford’s south-of-downtown “SoDo” neighborhood. DoNo is bound by Interstate 84 to the south, the Connecticut River to the east, railroad tracks and the North Meadows neighborhood to the north, railroad tracks and the Clay Arsenal neighborhood to the west.

The DoNo area is located north of Interstate 84, which separated this neighborhood from downtown in the late 1960’s. This formerly diverse neighborhood has been plagued with poverty, lack of resources, and large amounts of vacant parcels. This area contains prime developable real estate in Hartford. Hartford is the 8th smallest capital city in the United States by land area.

Hartford has been a low or no growth city within a low or no growth state for almost half a century. After urban renewal and race riots demolished many structures in the DoNo area in the 1960’s, Hartford’s population drastically declined with “white flight” to the suburbs. Historically, there has been little reason to attract people to move back to Hartford, until now. There is a trend in many cities across the country of young professionals and people without children to move back to urban centers, especially in up and coming and inexpensive areas. The city, the University of Connecticut, the University of St. Joseph’s, and Trinity College have all expressed interest in revitalizing the greater downtown area of Hartford and this Master Plan as it stands represents a
vision for this area. As a small capital city, any vacant or underutilized land such as the Downtown North area has potential for infill development.

The redevelopment plan focuses on the area surrounding the junction of I-84 and I-91 located just north of Downtown Hartford. Much of this land is vacant land, parking lots, or underdeveloped. The project’s vision statement seeks: “To harness the full potential of Downtown North and Downtown West by creating a seamless environment.” With the Connecticut River to the east and Downtown to the south, this predominantly African American, West Indian, Latino, and low-income neighborhood located to the northwest (Upper Albany and Clay Arsenal neighborhoods) is a vulnerable part of the city in relation to the proposed development due to its lack of resources, political power, and inexpensive housing stock.

Since the beginning of this Master’s Project, the Master Plan was completed, released to the public, and the City called for Requests for Proposals (RFPs). A proposal was submitted, plans were submitted to the City and were approved by the City Council, and the groundbreaking for a minor league baseball stadium has been celebrated.

Figure 1 Downtown North and Downtown West aerial photograph. DoNo is bound to the north by North Meadows, to the northwest by Clay Arsenal with Upper Albany beyond, to the west and southwest by Asylum Hill, to the south by Downtown West and Downtown, and to the east by the Connecticut River. Source: Utile, 2013, p. 12.
If the DoNo Master Plan does not adequately involve the northwest adjacent Upper Albany community members in the planning process, then the Downtown North area may only attract middle and upper-income individuals coming from outside the city. The Upper Albany neighborhood is largely African American and West Indian, and has a high concentration of low-income residents. This community has been devastated by “White flight” after race riots in the 1960’s and urban renewal that demolished much of this area. It is important to note that the Clay Arsenal and Upper Albany neighborhood formerly connected and included portions of the Downtown North area.

Specifically, if the plan fails to provide enough housing units and a variety of housing types that are attractive for these newcomers, then the residents of the adjacent Clay Arsenal and Upper Albany neighborhood may be susceptible to displacement due to its inexpensive and diverse housing that may be renovated for higher profits. The Capital Region Development Authority (CRDA) currently has granted $60 million dollars specifically for housing development in downtown Hartford. The projects seek to create mixed income housing (80% market rate and 20% affordable units) while providing small mixed use areas as well.

Additional negative effects of gentrification may also include difficulties with mixing cultures; newcomers versus existing residents, mixed-income housing, and different retail and housing preferences and needs. Longtime residents, regardless of income level may be accustomed to certain ways of life, types of housing, types of retail, and architectural styles. Low-income residents may only have access to certain kinds of retail and other resources that may be displaced with the retail demands of new middle and upper-income residents. In mixed-income housing complexes or neighborhoods, amenities may be only allotted for the residents paying market rate prices and housing association fees, creating a divide amongst residents (Johnson, 2008, p. 599-600.)

It should be noted that there are positive effects of gentrification. These can include an increase in shops, restaurants, and entertainment, which can lead to more vibrancy in an area. The increase in business can increase the tax base for the city. Often times better amenities and infrastructure such as park benches, trash service, sidewalks, street lighting, signage, street plantings, crosswalks etc. are brought in and are maintained better. Many of these positive effects of gentrification do impact people
across all demographics. Many of these services and amenities require significant funding and the increase in economic development that spurs gentrification has the ability to pay for them.
Existing Conditions

The DoNo project area is located within the northern portion of the “Downtown” census tract 5021 and southern portion of the “North Meadows” neighborhood (5007). The nearby neighborhoods are Clay Arsenal to the northwest (5009, 5017, 5018), Upper Albany beyond Clay Arsenal to the west (5014, 5035, 5037), Asylum Hill to the southwest (5031, 5032, 5033, 5034), and Downtown to the south (5021). The Connecticut River abuts the area to the east. Figure 2 below identifies the neighborhoods of Hartford and their census tracts. The approximate DoNo boundary is outlined in blue. For the purposes of conducting the existing conditions, the Downtown statistics have not been broken down as the DoNo portion of this census tract contains no residential units.

The existing conditions are described into the following themes: population, median age, race and ethnicity, income and poverty, housing, educational attainment, and zoning. The immediately adjacent neighborhoods are compared with the City of Hartford as a whole and the State of Connecticut. Although the North Meadows has a small reported population, the majority of the existing conditions were not reported for this neighborhood and are not listed on the graphs. The data was collected from the United States Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates.
from 2009 to 2013 by census tract, with the exception of in Asylum Hill due to census tracts 5032 and 5034 latest data being from the 2005 to 2009 five-year estimates.

**Population**

It is important to analyze population to see where the people are located in relation to the redevelopment, who will be most affected, and the scale of the neighborhood. The total population of Hartford, the Capital of Connecticut, is 125,130 persons, making it the fourth largest city in the State. The total population of the State of Connecticut is 3,583,561. The five neighborhoods that encompass and surround DoNo consists of a total of 27,456 persons, with the majority of persons living in Asylum Hill, as depicted in Figure 3. Downtown and North Meadows have the smallest populations with less than 2,000 each. The population for Hartford and Connecticut are not included in the graph. Due to their large size, their populations would have skewed the interpretation of the graph.

![Figure 3 Population of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts](image-url)
Median Age

Analyzing the median age is important to determine what potential types of services and amenities an area requires and may benefit the residents. Figure 4 shows the median age of Hartford is 30.1 years old, 10 years younger than the State’s median age of 40.2 years old. Each neighborhood more closely resembles the City ranging from 27.1 to 31.8.

Figure 4 Median Age of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut
Race and Ethnicity

The racial makeup of the State and City are remarkably different. Figure 5 indicates State is predominately White alone/non-Hispanic (70.5%), whereas the City is much more diverse with a large Black and Latino population. Once again, each neighborhood is more similar to the City than the State, with the exception of Downtown, which more closely resembles the State. The contrasts between the racial composition of Downtown and the remaining adjacent neighborhoods is shocking and represents a history of racial segregation in the City. According to Tateosian and Cohen’s research, these neighborhoods formerly had higher concentrations of Whites until race riots after Martin Luther King Jr.’s assassination and urban renewal led to “White flight” (1998, 2008).

Figure 5 Race and Ethnicity of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut
Median Household Income

Median household income is the amount of income for households, not necessarily families, where half of households make more and half make less than the median. Median household income is generally used as the best indicator for a community’s wealth due to the fact that it is not dramatically affected by high or low outliers like a mean would. Figure 6 shows the median household income for the State is quite high at $69,461, which is higher than its neighbor to the north Massachusetts ($64,496) and the United States ($54,425) as a whole. However, the City’s is less than that at $29,430. The Downtown neighborhood’s median household income of over $74,837 is almost four times higher than the surrounding neighborhoods that range from $18,675 to $26,423.

![Median Household Income by Census Tract](image)

*Figure 6 Median Household Income of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut*
Poverty Rate

Even if a community’s medium household income is relatively high, there may still be a substantial portion of the population below the poverty rate. The poverty rate follows the income trends in these neighborhoods with rates between 35.5% and 53.1%, as seen in Figure 7. These rates are three to five times that of the State poverty rate of 10.2% and Downtown at 14%. The City’s poverty rate is also over three times that of the State at 33.6%.

![Poverty Rate by Neighborhood](image)

*Figure 7 Poverty Rate of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut*
**Unemployment Rate**

The unemployment rate illustrates the amount of the population that is able and willing to work but cannot find jobs. This leaves out the number of discouraged workers, who are typically higher in low-income areas. Unemployment is important because it measures unproductive human resources in the economy. The more people out of work, the fewer people capable of consuming goods and services in the local economy. Despite a relatively low State unemployment rate of 6.6%, the unemployment rate in these neighborhoods ranges from 18.2% to 20.4%, while Downtown has a very low unemployment rate of only 2.9%, as depicted in Figure 8. The real unemployment figure, taking into consideration the number of discouraged workers, may be significantly higher than the reported numbers.

![Figure 8 Unemployment Rate of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut](image-url)
Food Stamps

The food stamp program, which is now titled Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), assists low-income individuals and families purchase necessary groceries. This indicator shows the amount of the population who struggle to meet their basic needs. The percent of households receiving food stamps continues to show the disparity in wealth in this area, as depicted in Figure 9. Only 9.4% of Downtown households received SNAP benefits, up from 3.9% from the 2005 to 2009 five-year estimates. Between 45% and 73% of households in the adjacent neighborhoods received SNAP benefits.

![Households Receiving Food Stamps by Neighborhood](image)

Figure 9 Household Receiving Food Stamps of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut

Another indicator of poverty is the number of students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch. These figures are determined for school districts and not by census tract or neighborhood. Approximately 35% of Connecticut students were eligible while the vast majority (91%) of Hartford students were eligible for free or reduced price lunch in the 2010 to 2011 school year. Many of these students attend schools in the Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill neighborhoods.

![Students Eligible For Free- Or Reduced-Price School Lunch (2010-11)](image)

Figure 10 Students Eligible For Free- Or Reduced-Price School Lunch (2010-11) for the Hartford School District and Connecticut as a whole.
Housing

Housing is the basis of this project. The redevelopment project will likely include housing and will impact the housing of the surrounding neighborhoods. Therefore, it is important to understand the existing housing stock. The five neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo comprise a total of 13,845 housing units. The majority of the units are in Asylum Hill with the remaining neighborhoods having about half the number of units.

![Total Housing Units by Neighborhood](Figure 11 Housing Units of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts)
Examining the vacancy rate is important because it paints a picture of the real estate conditions of the neighborhoods, as seen in Figure 12. The vacancy rate for the State is 8.8%, nearly half of the City. The vacancy rate for these neighborhood rates are even higher, ranging between 20% and 21.9%. North Meadows only has 11 units, which are reportedly 100% vacant. This information shows the effects of the long term population loss of the north end of Hartford.

Figure 12 Vacant Housing Units of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut
Another important indicator to be conscious of is the percent of renters who pay more than 30% of their income on rent, illustrated in Figure 13. This figure is important because 30% has been identified by the federal government as the point at which one becomes housing burdened. As depicted in the graph below, over half of the State of Connecticut’s residents spend more than 30% of their income on their rent. Hartford as a whole, as well as Asylum Hill and Upper Albany are closer to 60% with Downtown (42.7%) and Clay Arsenal (49.9%) lower than the State average. Clearly, the neighborhoods to the northwest and west of DoNo are much more housing burdened than the Downtown to the south. This may be due to low-incomes rather than high rents.

![Rent Greater Than 30% of Income by Neighborhood](image)

*Figure 13 Rent Greater Than 30% of Income of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut*
Additionally, we see that median rents for Downtown are approximately $500 higher than the State, while the surrounding neighborhoods are approximately half the rent of Downtown (Figure 14). Even though rents in the surrounding neighborhoods are quite low, averaging $692 to $850 per month, residents here may be housing burdened due to low incomes.

Figure 14 Median rent of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut
Commute times also vary amongst the neighborhoods (Figure 15). Downtown commute times are significantly less (4 to 8 less minutes) than the surrounding neighborhoods, the City, and the State, possibly indicating many Downtown residents work Downtown.

![Commute Times by Neighborhood](image)

*Figure 15 Commute times of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut*
According to the Connecticut Department of Housing, Hartford had a total of 51,822 housing units in the 2010 Census, of which a total of 19,588 or 37.80% were affordable. These affordable units were split between governmentally assisted units (9,540 units, 18.41%), tenant rental assistance (8,525 units, 16.45%), and CHFA/USDA mortgages (1,523 units, 2.94%). Figure 16 below shows a map of the Housing Authority of the City of Hartford’s (HACH’s) public or subsidized “affordable” housing locations. This figure does not include portable vouchers (Section 8) that renters take with them to rent market rate units or low cost market housing that is affordable even absent any subsidies. This preliminary assessment reveals that none of these units are located in the Downtown or North Meadows neighborhoods. Thirteen of these developments are located in Upper Albany, 28 are located in Clay Arsenal, and only two developments in Asylum Hill.

Figure 16 Housing Authority of the City of Hartford Affordable Housing Locations
Educational Attainment

Educational attainment shows the percentage of the community that have high school diplomas or higher and a bachelor’s degree or higher (Figure 17). These percentages are important to identify the human assets or needs in the community. This data looks at the area’s population that is older than 25 years of age with a high school degrees or higher and a Bachelor’s degree or higher. The State of Connecticut high school diploma rate is 89.2%, with 36.5% with a Bachelor’s degree or higher. This is much higher than the City which has only 69.5% high school diploma rate and 15.2% with a Bachelor’s degree or higher. The Downtown neighborhood has an impressive educational attainment level of over 73% of its residents having a Bachelor’s degree or higher. Clay Arsenal and Upper Albany have very low levels of higher educated residents with only 6.6% and 4.0%, respectively and just over 60% of its residents with high school degrees.

![Educational Attainment by Census Tract](image)

*Figure 17* Educational Attainment of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo by census tracts, Hartford, and the State of Connecticut.
Zoning

The DoNo area is primarily zoned B-1 Downtown Development District and B-2 Downtown Perimeter District just north of I-84. DoNo also has areas zoned C-1 Commercial District, I-1 Industrial District, and P Public Property and Cemetery District. The surrounding neighborhoods zoning is detailed in the Table 1 below. Residential potential is high within each of these areas. It should be noted that single and two-family dwellings are permitted by right in RO-1, Ro-2, and R-1 through R-7. Three family dwellings are permitted by special permit in RO-1, Ro-2, and R-1 through R-4. Four or more family dwellings are permitted by special permit in RO-1, Ro-2, R-1 through R-4, I-1, I-2, C-1, B-1, and B-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>DoNo</th>
<th>Clay Arsenal</th>
<th>Upper Albany</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Asylum Hill</th>
<th>North Meadows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1 Downtown Development District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2 Downtown Perimeter District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-3 Business District (general-linear business)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-4 Business District (neighborhood business)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1 Commercial District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1 Industrial District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2 Industrial District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Public Property &amp; Cemetery District</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1 Residence District (high density, 150 PPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2 Residence District (high density, 100 PPA)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3 Residence District (medium density, 75 PPA)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4 Residence District (three-family)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5 Residence District (one &amp; two-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7 Residence District (single-family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro-1 Residence-Office District (300 PPA)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ro-2 Residence-Office District (225 PPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PPA=Persons Per Acre

*Table 1 Zoning in and around DoNo*
The City is currently undertaking a “Zone Hartford” project to update and revise their zoning regulations from 2005. The City is contemplating changing to form based regulations. The goals as stated by the City Planning Department website (http://zonehartford.com/) are to:

- **Simplify the regulations** - making them more user friendly, using clearer language, charts, and diagrams to better explain processes and requirements
- **Support walkable development** - by adjusting current zoning districts, and creating new districts where necessary, the City can promote pedestrian-oriented, mixed-use development in proximity to transit and where people live
- **Protect neighborhood character** – new regulations and the addition of design guidelines will help guide and improve the quality of Hartford’s built environment
- **Spur economic development** - new regulations and changes to the current processes will make it easier for businesses and developers to open and develop with less red tape, saving everyone time and money
Figure 18 Zoning Map of the neighborhoods containing and surrounding DoNo.
**Summary**

By analyzing the existing conditions of the DoNo area, we see that the Asylum Hill neighborhood to the west/southwest of DoNo has the highest population with much fewer people residing in Downtown. The median age of people Downtown is significantly higher than the other neighborhoods. Downtown is also significantly Whiter than the other neighborhoods and the City of Hartford as a whole, which are more diverse with a large Black and Latino population. Additionally, Downtown is much more educated than these neighborhoods with a higher percentage of their residents having Bachelor’s degrees or higher than the percentage of surrounding neighborhoods residents with a high school diploma or higher.

Income and poverty was analyzed with several indicators. The results revealed downtown is considerably wealthier, has less unemployment, less poverty, and less people on food stamps than the surrounding neighborhoods. The residents of these neighborhoods are also much more likely to be housing burdened due to low incomes despite high amounts of vacant housing units. Downtown and DoNo reportedly do not have any subsidized or public “affordable” housing units. Asylum Hill, where the majority of housing units are, only has two affordable housing developments, while Upper Albany contains 13 and Clay Arsenal has 28 subsidized “affordable” housing developments.

The area around DoNo has a plethora of different zoning designation. These neighborhoods have a total of 16 different zoning districts ranging from industrial to various commercial and business districts to single and multi-family residential. These districts are in general, clear and understandable and relate well with each other. There are nine different residential zones to ensure proper densities.

Most of the neighborhoods to the northwest and west are zoned for medium to higher density residential with strips or pockets of commercial uses. The North Meadows neighborhood to the north is mostly industrial with the Downtown to the south zoned Downtown Development. The City of Hartford’s Planning Department is currently conducting a rezoning of the City and therefore, these zones may be different in the near future.
It is clear to see that there is an extreme dichotomy between the Downtown and the adjacent neighborhoods to the west and north. The Downtown is far more affluent, better educated, less diverse, and slightly older than its neighbors. DoNo is located at the intersection of these neighborhoods and represents a bridge that has been a scar that divided the Downtown from the north end neighborhoods since the 1960’s when urban renewal demolished most of the DoNo area and I-84 cut off the north end from Downtown.
Site Visits and Photographs

On June 24, 2014, July 23, 2014, and October 11, 2014, I conducted site visits on foot and by motor vehicle. I ran and drove around DoNo and the surrounding neighborhoods extensively on June 24th. The July 23rd tour was at Riverside Park on the east side of DoNo. Photographs from October 11th were taken from the Radisson Hotel, located at 50 Morgan Street, which is immediately adjacent to I-84 with Downtown to the south and the proposed DoNo redevelopment immediately to the west and northwest.

Photograph 1 View of a parking lot at the intersection of Main Street and Trumbull Street at the heart of the DoNo redevelopment area.
Photograph 2 View of a parking lot and vacant lot at the intersection of Main Street and Trumbull Street at the heart of the DoNo redevelopment area.

Photograph 3 View of Downtown Hartford beyond a parking lot and vacant lot at the intersection of Main Street and Trumbull Street at the heart of the DoNo redevelopment area.
Photograph 4 View of a Downton Hartford beyond a parking lot at the intersection of Main Street and Trumbull Street at the heart of the DoNo redevelopment area.

Photograph 5 View of a vacant lot at the intersection of Main Street and Trumbull Street at the heart of the DoNo redevelopment area.
Photograph 6 View of a parking lot at the intersection of Main Street and Trumbull Street at the heart of the DoNo redevelopment area. Main Street is very wide, which makes crossing on foot difficult and creates a feeling unsafe pedestrian conditions.

Photograph 7 View of a parking lot at 1214 Main Street between Pleasant Street and Trumbull Street. This is the location of the proposed minor league baseball stadium.
Photograph 8 View of the intersection of Chapel Street and Market Street beneath I-84 highway. The vacant lots to the north are located within the DoNo redevelopment area.

Photograph 9 View of a vacant lot on the east side of Market Street in the eastern portion of the DoNo redevelopment area.
Photograph 10 View of the pedestrian bridge over the I-91 highway to Riverside Park in the eastern portion of the DoNo area.

Photograph 11 View of barbeque picnic areas along the Connecticut River in Riverside Park.
Photograph 12 View of the Downtown Hartford from Windsor Street, which is to the north of the DoNo redevelopment area. The North Meadows neighborhood is to the left and Clay Arsenal is to the right. This area contains a wide rail yard that runs north-south and has few residences.

Photograph 13 View of typical multi-family residences with first floor retail spaces on the western side of the DoNo redevelopment area (1355 Main Street). These buildings are also characteristic of the surrounding neighborhoods.
Photograph 14 View of the North End Gateway Apartments (1450 Main Street) to the northwest of DoNo. These affordable housing apartments are located within the Clay Arsenal neighborhood and were constructed in 2008 using the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program.

Photograph 15 View west along Albany Avenue at the junction of the Clay Arsenal & Upper Albany neighborhoods.
This photo tour was conducted to gain on the ground experience of DoNo and the surrounding neighborhoods. The photographs illustrate the dichotomy between the neighborhoods to the north and northwest of DoNo and Downtown, and how DoNo acts as a physical gap separating the neighborhoods from a pedestrian point of view. The surrounding area consists of a beautiful Riverside Park, an industrial strip, partially or fully vacant mixed-use buildings with good bones, a plethora of low-rise housing, and Downtown office buildings. In many areas, connections are difficult on foot, and even by automobile. After conducting the site visits, it became clear that the vacant parking lots within DoNo were ripe for redevelopment and, with improved connections and amenities, the surrounding neighborhoods could foster gentrification.
Research Questions and Methods

Research Approach

My first step in beginning of this project has been to identify the City of Hartford as my location. The City of Hartford is at a pivotal moment leading up to a large scale redevelopment effort in its North End. The area was subject to a Master Plan titled “Downtown North / Downtown West: A Plan for the City of Hartford.” Although the report is dated December 2013, it was not made public until April 2014. “This project area bears both the traces of its historical origins and the scars of urban renewal and suburban flight…existing challenges can become assets and help create opportunity for change” (City of Hartford Planning Department Website, 2014.) I analyzed the housing aspects of the redevelopment plan to determine if the proposal will meet the housing needs or if it strains the adjacent low-income minority neighborhood. Additionally, since this redevelopment has actually begun, I compared the Master Plan with the final proposal and most up to date plans.

In order to contextualize the projected results of Hartford’s Master Plan, I identified two similar cities that have undergone redevelopment in the past 15 years. By analyzing cities that have completed similar plans within the past 15 years, I been able to evaluate any results from those plans, gaps between goals and results, and any changes throughout the process. This Project concludes with recommendations to the City of Hartford in implementing their plan.
Research Questions

The focus of this proposal and the overarching question is: How will the Master Plan impact the adjacent neighborhood in terms of housing, mixed-income neighbors, and gentrification? The following questions break this focus down into smaller components.

1. Will the Master Plan provide enough housing to meet the future needs of market rate and affordable housing in this area? Will the potential influx of new residents spill over into the adjacent Clay Arsenal, Asylum Hill, and Upper Albany neighborhoods and cause displacement? More specifically:
   - How many units are planned?
   - What kind of units are they?
   - Where are they located within the project area?
   - What proportion of housing will be affordable compared to market rate?
   - Is the housing going to be constructed all at once or phased?
   - What are the existing conditions of the adjacent neighborhood?
   - What does the plan propose exactly?
   - How does the plan work with the City's Planning Department, the State redevelopment agency, and Capital Region Development Authority?
   - What is the target audience?
   - Who is likely to move into this area once/if it is redeveloped?
   - Will there be auxiliary benefits with increased retail and commercial businesses? Will the incoming businesses be too expensive for the current residents?
   - How are the housing projects going to be funded?
   - What are the planning strategies, tools and techniques planners can use to successfully integrate a variety of income levels in this portion of the City.
2. What are the factors in creating a successful mixed-income, diverse neighborhood? It is necessary to understand these factors that enhance social fabric to influence the planning process of mixed-income communities.

- How do planners provide both high end, expensive retail for the middle and upper class residents, as well as affordable retail and food options for the existing lower income residents?
- Are the mixed-income residential units in the same building or different buildings?
- Will amenities be shared equally across income levels?
- Is authentic integration possible with new-coming middle and upper class residents and existing low-income residents?

3. What are the tools and techniques planners can use to keep existing residents in their homes during the process of gentrification?

- Is Hartford’s historical lack of growth going to continue despite the revitalization leading to the elimination of possible displacement?
- Is there already a surplus of housing that will accommodate newcomers?
- If local residents are displaced, where will they likely go? Will their lives be impacted negatively by the displacement: longer commute, more expensive housing, lack of community etc., or just different?

In summary, what are the details of the redevelopment that will impact the existing underserved residents? DoNo is located at the junction of contrasting neighborhood: the affluent Downtown and the low-income Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill. The Master Plan attempts to balance of economic development and social justice. This Masters Project aims to analyze what that proper balance is and what planners can do to meet it.
Understanding Gentrification

Origins and Definitions

The phenomenon of gentrification has a deep and complicated history. Gentrification as a unified field of study began when the British sociologist Glass coined the term “gentrification” in 1964. Citing from Smith, Essoka of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency writes that Glass “recognized certain rehabilitation patterns where working-class London residences and multiple-family dwellings were converted to expensive residences once leases expired” (Essoka 2010, p. 303). However, the process of gentrification occurred long before the coining of the term. The “Haussmannization of Paris” demolished the low-income residential areas and replacing them with tree-lined boulevards, monuments, and new buildings with strict building guidelines (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 5). Additionally, parts of New York, New Orleans, Charleston, and Washington, D.C. began gentrifying in the late 1930’s (p.5).

The definition of gentrification has been fought over and transformed for half a century now. Early definitions of gentrification began along the lines of Glass’s by Neil Smith, a Scottish geographer and anthropologist. By gentrification I mean the process by which working class residential neighborhoods are rehabilitated by middle class homebuyers, landlords and professional developers. I make the theoretical distinction between gentrification and redevelopment. Redevelopment involves not rehabilitation of old structures but the construction of new buildings on previously developed land (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 9).

Most definitions complimented Smith and Glass’s throughout the 1970’s and early 1980’s. Dictionaries went back and forth defining gentrification as the ‘movement of middle class families into urban areas causing property values to increase and having the secondary effect of driving out poorer families,’ 1980 Oxford American Dictionary, to the ‘restoration of deteriorated urban property especially in working-class neighborhoods by the middle and upper classes’, 1982 American Heritage Dictionary (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 9). While some adhere with these definitions, Smith altered his definition in 2000 due to the evolution of the field to the ‘reinvestment of CAPITAL at the urban centre, which is designed to produce space for a more affluent
class of people than currently occupies that space’ (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 9, all capitals in the original).

Clearly, there are many facets to the process of gentrification and a strict definition only limits our understanding of the full process. One early box put on gentrification occurred only in urban areas and only to low-income neighborhoods. The original and mainstream “classical gentrification” stems from Glass’s ideas of disinvestment of neighborhoods that are then revitalized by “pioneer gentrifiers” and leading to the inevitable displacement of the indigenous residents (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 10). This definition delves only into the residential rehabilitation facet of gentrification. Early models “developed in the 1970’s and 1980’s to both explain the process and predict the future course of gentrification mirrored Glass’s definition of classical gentrification” (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 30). Early studies by Clay in the late 1970’s laid out gentrification from stage 1 (pioneer gentrification) to stage 4 (maturing gentrification) (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 30).

With many definitions and explanations of different processes, it is difficult to pin down a complete definition without removing an important component. However, Davidson and Lees proposed a flexible definition relating to the following contexts: “(1) reinvestment of capital; (2) social upgrading of locale by incoming high-income groups; (3) landscape change; and (4) direct or indirect displacement of low-income groups” (Davidson and Lees 2005, p.1170). This definition sets out criteria that allows researchers to identify the different processes at play.

Production vs. Consumption

The early theoretical debates about gentrification revolved around finding the causal factors of gentrification. Smith posed a production-side or supply-side arguments based on economics, while Ley suggests that changing societal consumption demands is the main factor in gentrification (Mathema 2013, p. 1-2). A key feud between the two dealt with the quantification issues with Smith’s “rent gap” thesis. This states that “gentrification occurs when there is a mismatch or a “rent gap” between potential economic returns from a centrally located building and the actual economic gains from
its current use. This comes in the form of underutilized, decayed buildings in central areas. The investment in rehabilitation, reconstruction, or new construction takes place only when it is profitable, or in other words, if the gains that the structure can generate from its future use is more than the cost of investing in it (Mathema 2013, p. 1-2).

Smith’s ideas stemmed from Glass’s identification of the cyclical nature of gentrification. Middle or higher income neighborhoods become disinvested in and begin to decay with lower income populations filling the housing. Many properties are left abandoned or in need of repair, opening the door for the upswing of rehabilitation and the possibility for higher rents and home values.

The ‘see-saw’ process of investment and disinvestment highlights uneven geographical development that was the focus of much of Smith’s work (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 50-51). The key to this theory is that capitalism drives these changes. Landowners and developers are constantly looking to maximize their profits. Revitalizing properties in places where real estate is low in price offers an avenue to desired higher profits. This brings up the issue of measuring the potential “ground rent” or highest and best economic use of a property. Though we can measure current housing prices, there are other components that affect the potential ground rent of a property. Very little work has been done empirically in this area and is the main cause for debate (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 61-62).

After Glass’s coining of the term gentrification, it was Smith’s rent gap theory that brought above the next wave of ideas of the causes of gentrification. A divergence from the rent gap theory came in 1986 with Hamnett and Randolph’s “value gap” explaining the pressure to convert rental housing to owner-occupancy (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 69). The value gap refers to the difference between the stream of rental income versus the sale value for owner-occupation of a particular property.

The greatest debate with the production-side argument is the consumption-side theory. Consumption-side theories “explain gentrification as a consequence of changes in the industrial and occupational structure of advanced capitalist cities. This is the loss of manufacturing employment and an increase in service employment” (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 90). This change in employment opportunities created a larger middle-class of “yuppies” who desired to live in central urban areas. Early on, the
debates of the consumption-side focused on who the gentrifiers were and why they were returning to the city. The revanchist, anti-suburbanization ideals of these possible gentrifiers is the main factor, though their reasons and make up are quite diverse and complicated. The key player on the consumption-side, Ley, began his “humanistic geography” work in 1972 in Canada, where he continues to work (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 91-92).

Ley argued that postindustrial society and altered the rationale behind the allocation of land use in the urban contexts in Canada, as new middle-class professionals (i.e. ‘cultural new class’) were an expanding cohort with ‘a vocation to enhance the quality of life in pursuits that are not simply economistic’ (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 92). Ley argued that gentrification represented a new phase in urban development where consumption factors, taste, and a particular aesthetic outlook towards the city from an expanding middle class saw an ‘imagineering of an alternative urbanism to suburbanization’ which could not be captured by explanations of the process that privileged structural forces of production and housing market dynamics (p. 92).

Instead of looking at the economics that produce gentrification, Ley, along with Hamnett (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 90) focused on the production of potential gentrifiers. These are the middle class people returning to the city for a variety of reasons. Changing types of employment, political and social movements, as well as education have fed the production of gentrifiers. Gentrifiers are not simply middle or upper class households looking for a good deal in an urban area. They are yuppies, artists, hipsters, members of the Lesbian Bisexual Gay Queer and Transgender (LBGQT) community and others minorities looking for a home in a diverse neighborhood away from the rigid nuclear family suburbs. The focus on who the gentrifiers are, however, distracts attention away from the injustices at play. People empathize with the fact that the neighborhoods are getting more desirable and, over the long term, safer, rather not the indigenous low-income residents.

Here lies the main debates and avenues of discussion in the gentrification arena in its first few decades. These discuss what has been deemed the first and second waves of gentrification where sporadic gentrification occurred in the 1960’s and 1970’s and the
anchoring of gentrification in the 1980’s (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p 174-177). Other offshoots or mutations have sprung up with the third wave of gentrification in the ever globalization of the world (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 178). Rural-gentrification, new-build gentrification, super-gentrification, and tourism gentrification are examples of these mutations (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 129-159).

The newest avenue in gentrification research lies within a “geography of gentrification.” With contemporary gentrification’s changes during neo-liberalism and globalization, the geographical location of gentrification has been a major focus of new research (Lees, Slater, and Wyly 2008, p. 187-189). The geography of the gentrification process allows for comparisons across nations and cities. Gentrification is not always a homogenous process but one impacted by the actors and economics of different locations. Each actor has a different identity, which impacts where they may gentrify, why they gentrify, and how they gentrify.

Non-Displacement Studies

Despite a half century of gentrification research conducted on the displacement of indigenous residents is a key result of gentrification, many recent studies expel this assumption. Displacement is not easy to measure so these surprising results have sparked skepticism amongst many community activists and researchers. This was the key motivation for Freeman’s book *There Goes the ‘Hood* (Freeman 2006, p. 4-5).

The wave of non-displacement gentrification theories has led to the makeover of gentrification as a positive redevelopment strategy. Often titled ‘urban renaissance’ or ‘social mixing,’ these strategies are amongst the third wave of state led gentrification (Lees 2008, p. 2646). These euphemistic terms are used in place of the heavy and negative gentrification term to push revitalization. The reality is that social mixing policies often create more social segregation by forcing the privileged middle class into areas dominated by indigenous low-income residents.

Social mixing is heavily influenced by the types of gentrifiers or middle class new residents who are the key to having social mixing work, if possible at all. These incoming households may disrupt the indigenous communities’ way of life, while also bringing
access to resources and amenities. Progressive political consciousness and respectfulness to others is another key to the functionality of social mixing. “The new urbanist approach of intermixing a variety of building types and levels of affordability... becomes the template for infill development... it can provide a framework for a city that offers a higher quality of life to residents and visitors (Lees 2008, p. 2646).

Young’s ideas in 1990 accepted the domination of specific neighborhoods by single groups, as long as the boundaries remained blurred. “In her ideal of city life, there is group differentiation and the interfusion of these groups occurs through social space. It is an openness to unassimilated otherness. She highlights the need to provide spaces (not neighborhoods) that offer opportunities for social interaction amongst people from different social backgrounds” (Lees 2008, p. 2646). Many social mixing or anti-discrimination policies propose to not only boost home ownership opportunities and affordable housing, but also to create economic opportunities with increasing job training and promoting small (local and minority) businesses (Glanville 2013, p. 13). Essoka lays out the necessities for social mixing:

No line should exist where revitalization begets gentrification. Instead, revitalization in debilitated areas should stress upgrading local resources (people and infrastructure) to produce more viable and attractive neighborhoods. Equitable development strategies can create more integrated communities—a preferred alternative to class-stratified neighborhoods. Integrated communities tend to be economically diverse, have varied housing choices, attractive physical characteristics, and strong community-based organizations and social institutions committed to maintaining diversity (Essoka 2010, p. 311).

Conclusions

There are gaps and conflicts in the research of gentrification. At this point, there is no consensus of the displacing effects of indigenous residents. The geography of gentrification tells that every place is different and making sweeping conclusions across all geographies is limited. Regardless of the actualization of displacement, it is known
that the benefits of gentrification don’t always ‘trickle down’ to the low-income indigenous populations and lead to social segregation. As Orfield discusses below, true, authentic, and just housing policies must be sought out to bring an end to segregation in this country. Orfield states:

Advocates need to pursue other remedies to further an integrated society. This involves using the federal FHA and state statutes and constitutions, together with a coherent multi-front legislative strategy. This strategy must involve long-term metropolitan integration, principles of opportunity-based housing, and the stabilization of integrated and gentrifying neighborhoods. Housing must be viewed as a clear path toward racial and economic opportunity that holds a real hope for revitalizing cities and older suburbs (Orfield 2005, p. 1804).

The positive effects of gentrification can include an increase in shops, restaurants, and entertainment, which can lead to more vibrancy in an area. The increase in business can increase the tax base for the city. Often times better amenities and infrastructure such as park benches, trash service, sidewalks, street lighting, signage, street plantings, crosswalks etc. are brought in and are maintained better. Many of these positive effects of gentrification do impact people across all demographics. Many of these services and amenities require significant funding and the increase in economic development that spurs gentrification has the ability to pay for them.

Housing assistance and rent stabilization can be used in gentrifying neighborhoods to increase the indigenous or ‘in-place’ resident’s resiliency to the increasing cost of living (Pearsall 2013, p. 2307). A multi-pronged approach to authentic social integration is the holistic approach that attacks the economic and housing disparities issues of gentrification. This Master’s Project seeks to identify specific tools and techniques that planners in urban areas can use to combat the negative effects of gentrification.
Understanding Housing

Introduction

Affordable housing has a long and complex history in the United States. The term elicits a variety of good and bad feelings, ideas, and tensions. Affordable housing is not one simple program, but is comprised of several different forms. Several of the programs include Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) or Section 8, Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), Hope VI, and public or subsidized housing. Each of these programs have different focuses, successes, and challenges, as well as varying histories, time periods, and impacts.

Housing is an essential human need that is often times taken for granted. However, the private market often times does not meet the needs of all residents. This gap affects many low-income, and even middle-income households in the United States. These households struggle to find safe housing they can afford in locations that provide quality opportunities and amenities. Since the private market fails to meet this demand, the federal government has policies and programs to address the issue of affordable housing.

This literature review explores the various affordable housing programs and connects them to the City of Hartford’s Downtown North (DoNo) redevelopment project. The review is centered on the following question: What are the housing policies and best practices that can be implemented in the DoNo area to prevent spillover into the adjacent neighborhoods, causing displacement of the existing low-income residents? The research is grounded in Schwartz’s pivotal book Housing Policy in the United States (2010) and explores current literature on affordable housing. By understanding the history and context of affordable housing in the United States, this review frames the situation in Hartford and sets out to assist the City in planning for the future.

Following this brief introduction, the next section explores the history and various aspects of federal housing policy. The second section discusses LIHTC and identifies pros and cons of such developments. The third section focuses on how various programs address or don’t address, promote or work against deconcentrating poverty. The fourth section analyzes the effects of programs and policies in regards to
discrimination. At the end of each section, the major take away points are provided as recommendations for the City of Hartford.

**Federal Housing Policy**

This section reviews four articles that discuss the history of United States federal housing policy and what it means for cities today. First von Hoffman’s “The End of the Dream: The Political Struggle of America’s Public Housers” is examined as it describes the history of public housing from its early days in the United States (2005). Landis and McClure’s article “Rethinking federal housing policy” evaluates the major goals of federal housing policy (2010). Tiebout’s “A pure theory of local expenditures” teaches us that people vote with their feet (1956). Lastly, Basolo’s “The impacts of intercity competition and intergovernmental factors on local affordable housing expenditures” lays out the difficulties municipalities have regarding funding and providing services to its residents (1999).

Von Hoffman discusses how public housing has transformed from its beginnings in the early 20th century to today (2005). In the early 20th century, the public housers early European experiments (decentralized with limited-dividend cooperatives) were municipality driven and included non-profits and cooperatives. Their original plan was to have a varied and flexible housing program for the majority of American households run by the states, municipalities, and private non-commercial housing developers. This plan was never fully imagined due to the Great Depression and other political circumstances that led to rigid and complex, top-down federal programs. Despite the housers strength and network, their message did not resonate with the middle class to implement a grassroots campaign to push their houser ideals, therefore, the housers employed a smoke-and-mirrors strategy of anti-slum arguments to win supporters. The result was a focus on the very poor and slum clearance, rather than the middle class housing satisfaction.

The European experiments are quite fascinating. These socialist ideals of equality for all, and giving government a hand in creating that equality, is generally not a widely excepted idea in the United States. Individualism and capitalism are too strong to
consider these ideas, even if they were quite impressive. Public Housing policy has put the very poor in a position of having to take assistance from the government, with few options, while at the same time being looked down by from society. Releasing control of public housing to smaller, more localized agencies could provide better oversight and variety of housing as the top-down public housing had a stereotypical “look.” Providing affordable housing to not just the very poor but the lower middle and middle classes would provide a substantial benefit to the country and is almost impossible to imagine.

Landis and McClure identify the three main focuses of federal housing policy: increase home ownership, assist low-come households, and reduce discrimination (2010). Federal housing policy has succeeded in increasing home ownership; however, this push has led to the housing crisis and crash of 2008 and threatens low-income renters as it does not provide much support for them. Landis and McClure aimed to “examine the trends, summarize the research evaluating the performance of these programs, and suggest steps to make them more effective and connected to each other” (p. 319). Landis recommends “privatizing aspects of the secondary mortgage market and move to eliminate mortgage interest deductions and replace with ten year home ownership tax credit,” regionalize the voucher program or make it into an entitlement program that works through income tax system, and “sell public housing projects to nonprofit sponsors where appropriate, and eliminate some of the rigidities in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program” (p. 319).

These programs are not well coordinated and aimed towards helping higher income households that vote and contribute. There is little evidence that much will change in the near future. Landis and McClure recommended utilizing fewer and better coordinated programs, as well as using tax credits rather than tax deductions. Low-income subsidy programs should be reconfigured to make it easier for able-bodied individuals, who want to work, move to areas of higher opportunities. LIHTC has been successful; however, it is expensive and should promote mixed income developments better.

Tiebout furthers this idea of intercity competition with an analysis of tax rates and services (1956). His theory is that individuals move to municipalities that have the best goods and services with the lowest tax rates. This way individuals are getting the
most for their money. When roads fall to disrepair and school systems worsen, the wealthy leave because they have the financial option to find a better place to live. This means that municipalities limit affordable housing to decrease taxes and services.

Basolo’s research analyzes the influences and effects of intercity competition and intergovernmental factors on local affordable housing expenditures (1999). Due to the lack of regional agencies and regional planning, municipalities are forced to compete with each other for funding. This leads to inequality and hasty developments. The effect of competition on affordable housing is that municipalities are looking to increase their tax base in order to be able to provide services and amenities. Affordable housing doesn’t produce high amounts of taxes so the attention given to affordable housing is much lower. “Intercity competition reduces the likelihood that cities will spend local dollars on housing programs. Intergovernmental factors, such as federal funding and state-mandated housing planning, on the other hand, positively influence cities to spend local funds on affordable housing programs” (p. 659).

Basolo’s research found that when intercity competition increases, cities are less likely to spend their local funds on affordable housing unless they are a municipality that already spends their local money on it. The influx of federal dollars only partially motivates municipalities to spend their own money, while state money does not have an impact. States do however have more influence with state-mandated housing planning and local set-aside requirements. Basolo’s research determined that most intergovernmental factors did not influence municipalities to begin funding housing programs but do have a positive influence on the amount of local-source dollars spent on affordable housing programs, in municipalities that already spend their local funds on these programs (p. 681).

Basolo’s findings indicate that cities have different commitments to affordable housing and therefore, spend various amounts of their own money on housing programs in competitive regions (ibid). Furthermore, state and federal policies do affect local expenditures on affordable housing (p. 682).

Federal Housing Policy Summary
In summary, federal housing policy impacts municipalities at the local level. According to the Connecticut Department of Housing (DOH), 37.80% of Hartford’s housing units are affordable (2010). Basolo’s research suggests Hartford is invested in affordable housing and federal and state housing policies and funding will continue to complement their efforts. However, Hartford may be looking to be more competitive with neighboring communities in terms of goods and services, as well as higher end/luxury housing and amenities. Tiebout would say this may impact their commitment to affordable housing. Landis and McClure would recommend Hartford to implement an inclusionary housing policy and to be cautious when utilizing LIHTC for affordable housing as often times it does not promote mixed income developments due to the larger profits to developers who construct only affordable units (Landis & McClure, 2010, p. 334).

Hartford, and specifically the DoNo area, still feel the scars of urban renewal and slum clearance. The DoNo redevelopment is in an area devastated by urban renewal and left as vacant or underutilized for decades. The City has the opportunity to patch the injuries of the past and should plan the redevelopment to combat the errors of their history. Urban renewal destroyed DoNo once before, Hartford should implement a housing policy that will not devastate or push out the adjacent residents who have lived cut off from downtown for decades due to urban renewal and I-84. Redevelopment of this area with mixed use and mixed income developments has the possibility to revitalize the community.

Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)

LIHTC is an affordable housing program that began in 1986 during the Reagan administration. LIHTC funds are allocated by the United States Treasury Department to states based on population size. Each developer has to apply to the state for tax credits to build affordable housing. Developers with higher scores based upon how well their projects meet the priorities and selection criteria set forth get more tax credits. LIHTC developments generally consist of lower-middle class and working class individuals and families.
This section focuses on three peer-reviewed articles on the LIHTC program. Deng’s two articles analyzing LIHTC: “The cost-effectiveness of the low-income housing tax credit relative to vouchers: Evidence from six metropolitan areas” (2005) and “Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Developments and Neighborhood Change: A Case Study of Miami-Dade County” (2011) focus on costs, as well as the community impacts of LIHTC. Melendez and Schwartz’s article “After year 15: Challenges to the preservation of housing financed with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits” (2008) discusses the major issues in maintaining LIHTC housing for the long term.

In 2005, Deng compared the cost of LIHTC development subsidies of new-construction with the alternative 20-year HCV voucher subsidies in six cities around the United States, three in hot markets: San Jose, Boston, and New York City and three in cold markets: Cleveland, Atlanta, and Miami (2005). Deng found that LIHTC is more expensive than vouchers. Local market conditions and program administration lead to regional variations in premiums. Vouchers were still cheaper in the three tight housing markets. Supply and demand in the low-income housing submarkets is what matters to housing policy makers as this impacts the cost-effectiveness of vouchers.

Payment standards used by state and local governments administering the voucher program also impact their cost-effectiveness. Additionally, higher quality standards for apartment units reduces the cost advantage for vouchers, although this means expanding neighborhood choices and improves access to employment and education. New York City and Boston add community revitalization and other objectives onto LIHTC, making the development invaluable to the local residents and communities, though it significantly increases the cost.

HCV vouchers and LIHTC compete ideologically and programmatically. As, discussed above, HCV vouchers are allocated to qualified low-income individuals who then have to search for apartments that are willing to adhere to inspections. LIHTC developments are constructed by developers who apply to the state for tax credits that are initially allocated by the United States Treasury Department. They work very differently and analyzing the costs of each program is helpful for municipalities to determine the best option. It is important to think about the aspects of LIHTC and
vouchers that can be controlled that increase the costs, such as adding community revitalization to LIHTC or having higher standards for vouchers.

In Deng’s second article, she uses a case study in Miami-Dade County to analyze the neighborhood change with LIHTC developments (2011). The study finds that over half of the LIHTC neighborhoods have experienced more positive changes than their control groups; however, the effects vary by neighborhood context. Black high-poverty neighborhoods receiving the LIHTC investment have experienced the most positive changes, while changes in middle-class neighborhoods have been the most negative. In the Black neighborhoods, LIHTC was located in redevelopment projects, so any money was seen as a positive step; however, in white neighborhoods it was not received as well and may have led to White flight and disinvestment.

Melendez and Schwartz’s article looks at the challenges associated with sustaining LIHTC developments for the long term (2008). LIHTC is currently the largest subsidy program for low-income housing. According to Schwartz and Melendez, the greatest risks to LIHTC are the expiration of income/rent restrictions and more strongly the need for capital improvements. Schwartz and Melendez’s research looks at the “likelihood that tax credit housing will convert to market-rate occupancy and the challenges confronting the long-term physical viability of the housing if it is to remain affordable” (p. 261).

LIHTC credits go to private owners but do not guarantee long-term low-income housing as the restrictions are only for 15 years, unless built after 1990, which have 30 years of required affordability in most circumstances. Most owners do not turn over to market rate but need assistance for maintenance and improvements. Even if these units continue to be affordable, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) stops monitoring these units after the initial restriction has expired. The article concludes that a relatively small amount of the affordable housing stock is likely to convert to market-rate (ibid).

Each state is essentially conducting their own experiment. Planners must balance the need for expanding and preserving affordable housing when subsidy dollars are scarce. A major issue is monitoring and enforcing long-term affordability requirements by state housing finance agencies after year 15. The federal government should reform the law to extend the restriction to 30 years. In addition, the IRS should
monitor the restrictions because each state’s housing finance agencies have uneven administrative enforcement capacity. It doesn’t appear as though convincing owners to keep the housing affordable is the major issue; however, in high growth markets or in times of rapid price increases, this may not be the case.

**LIHTC Summary**

In summary, LIHTC developments have many benefits but the City of Hartford should be cognizant of its drawbacks. LIHTC is very attractive to many developers and can lead to an increase in affordable housing. Despite its benefits, LIHTC is overall more costly than HCV vouchers and, as discussed later in this review, are not always located in the areas of higher opportunity. Hartford needs to decide whether adding higher quality standards for HCV or community revitalization programs in LIHTC are important enough to implement in these programs. Although creating a sufficient quantity of affordable housing units for the area is the main priority, the extra effort in developing the community are also essential to fight the cycle of poverty.

The neighborhoods in the vicinity of DoNo are majority Black and Latino. LIHTC in the DoNo area and surrounding areas may therefore lead to positive impacts for the adjacent neighborhoods. With the coming redevelopment of DoNo, LIHTC could aid the construction of affordable housing. Even though Hartford has been a no or slow-growth city for decades, DoNo has the possibility of turning things around and triggering a spur of growth. Since Hartford is giving the land to the developer for $1, far below market-rate, Hartford should consider extending the restrictions past 15 years to prevent the units from turning over to market rate and put a plan in place to monitor and enforce the affordability of the units. Additionally, Hartford should plan ways to assist owners in the areas with capital improvements, maintenance, and upgrades, which could require longer affordability restriction periods.

**Deconcentrating Poverty**

In this section, three articles review how housing policies and programs work with the deconcentration of poverty. The review begins with an analysis of McClure’s
Goetz breaks down the successes and failures of two poverty deconcentration programs in the Twin Cities region of Minnesota (2002). Lastly, DeFilippis and Wyly discuss the vouchers and LIHTC’s abilities to deconcentrate poverty in “Running to Stand Still: Through the Looking Glass with Federally Subsidized Housing in New York City” (2006).

According to McClure, housing vouchers supplied to households are not helping renters locate in low-poverty areas any more effectively than are current project-based subsidies (2008). It is McClure’s opinion that “planners seeking to make poverty deconcentration more effective [should] use housing placement counselors, administer programs at the metropolitan scale, lease and broker market-rate housing directly, promote mixed income LIHTC developments, practice inclusionary zoning, and monitor the impacts of these efforts” (p. 90). The LIHTC program may be providing greater low-poverty market penetration than the HCV program because the developer makes the location decision in the LIHTC program, while in the HCV program the household chooses the location. There are difficulties finding units, fear of discrimination, and loss of social fabric. Housing placement counselors are essential in the HCV program to help households that may not have access to internet, good credit, or references to find units and facilitate transition. Planners should make it easy for developers to place LIHTC and other affordable housing in the proper neighborhoods rather than vulnerable neighborhoods by zoning these areas to allow for multi-family developments.

Goetz’s research analyzed two poverty deconcentration programs: voluntary mobility programs and involuntary relocation of families through government action in the Twin Cities Region in response to the Hollman v. Cisneros case settled in 1995 that demolished 700 units (2002). These units were mandated to be replaced in a scattered fashion in non-concentrated parts of the metropolitan area (p. 108). The voluntary mobility program was similar to the “Moving to Opportunity” (MTO) program, which is a modified Section 8 voucher that must be used in low poverty areas (ibid). The greatest effects of these programs was seen in relieving issues of personal safety and neighborhood incivility (drug use, graffiti, drinking etc.). Neighborhood satisfaction was
highly variable and there were no employment effects of the moves that families made. Those who voluntarily moved saw happier neighborhood scenarios than those involuntarily relocated (p. 121).

Goetz hypothesizes that neighborhood conditions experienced by those who were relocated in Minneapolis were possibly not as bad as expected or in other cities. It is important for municipalities to not stereotype neighborhoods based on their low-income status as bad, decayed, or inhabitable. There is always social fabric and hidden assets that may not be seen from the outside. Furthermore, forcing people out of their homes generally does not make people happy or put them in better neighborhoods. Giving people options and the agency to make decisions leads to better neighborhood satisfaction.

DeFilippis’ focuses on vouchers (tenant-based) and the project-based Section 8 form of subsidized housing in New York City to determine if either program are locating in deconcentrated areas (2006). Project-based Section 8 units receive vouchers and stay with the private unit, not the tenant. Since the federal government has stopped constructing new public housing units and struggles to maintain the existing housing stock, project-based Section 8 programs seem to be doing well. However, landlords are leaving the program in gentrifying areas because they can get higher profits by converting units to market rate. The research found that vouchers do not promote deconcentrating poverty in New York City despite the common belief that vouchers allow poor households to move to neighborhoods with better opportunities and amenities.

The federal government has been paying project-based Section 8 landlords in New York City up to $3,000 per month to keep their units affordable (p. 24). By matching the market, the government is just reinforcing the market processes that have not been able to produce affordable housing. An alternate strategy is to move to an ownership system of preservation in which purchasers are tenant organizations or community based non-profits. DeFilippis believes the government should cease persuading landlords with extra funding to keep units affordable (ibid). If the market can’t keep units affordable, public housing should be built as a viable alternative to keep tenants in these areas of growth and opportunities.
DeFilippis suggests two approaches to combatting these issues. First, landlords should be required to give a longer notification period before termination of affordability and provide the “right of first refusal.” States should also require landlords to mitigate the costs of relocation for displaced tenants, which is the “stick” method. Lastly, the “carrot” approach would be tax incentives from the government.

Deconcentrating Poverty Summary

In summary, deconcentrating poverty with housing programs such as LIHTC and HCV vouchers has historically failed. HCV vouchers are not helping deconcentrating poverty despite the agency given to recipients to choose where they live. Voucher recipients may require a councilor to assist in finding the right place in neighborhoods with opportunities. LIHTC developments may have a greater ability to be placed in deconcentrated areas because of the developer’s options. Planners need to make it easy for developers to place LIHTC developments in deconcentrated areas with multi-family zoning and municipalities may have to offer additional incentives if the cost of land is too high in these areas to allow for a profitable development.

As stated previously, 37.80% of Hartford’s housing units are affordable (2010). From a preliminary analysis, the neighborhoods surrounding the DoNo area (north, northwest, and west) have substantial amounts of affordable housing that is likely to contain project-based Section 8, HCV vouchers, and public housing. With the coming DoNo redevelopment and influx of new residents, landlords may be interested in switching their units to market rate to increase their profits, which would begin to decrease the amount of available affordable housing. Hartford could work with landlords and incentivize keeping housing units affordable longer and provide longer notification before termination of affordability. The City of Hartford should persuade developers to construct LIHTC developments in low-poverty areas such as the DoNo area, as it is adjacent to and may be less expensive than the adjacent higher income Downtown. Additionally, since the City is in the process of revamping their zoning, they should make sure they have elements of inclusionary zoning.
Discrimination

This section discusses various aspects of federal housing policy and affordable housing programs that impact equality. As stated in the section above, Landis and McClure identified reducing discrimination as one of the three main focuses of federal housing policy (2010). This review begins with Woods’ “The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Redlining, and the National Proliferation of Racial Lending Discrimination, 1921-1950” and Pritchett’s “Which Urban Crisis?: Regionalism, Race, and Urban Policy, 1960-1974” to demonstrate the United States’ segregated history (2012 & 2008). Next, the review looks at Mhatre and Van Zandt’s research on the location of LIHTC developments in “Growing Pains: Perpetuating Inequality through the production of low-income housing in the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex (2009). Halasz analyzes fair housing standards and inequality in “Fair and affordable? Racial and ethnic segregation and inequality in New York City rental housing” (2011). The section concludes with Orfield’s article “Racial integration and community revitalization: Applying the fair housing act to the low income housing tax credit” (2005).

Woods reviewed materials from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB) and examined the detrimental consequences of the national adoption of the Home Owners’ Loan Corporation’s (HOLC’s) appraisal standards by national lending institutions (2012). HOLC’s definition of undesirable residents as racial or ethnic minorities, or low-income inhabitants was discriminatory, yet adopted and used throughout the country. These “scientific appraisal” standards systematically disadvantaged Black and low-income urban inhabitants and severely limited their ability to obtain mortgages (p. 1038). The process of “redlining” communities, discouraged by lending in Black neighborhoods, enforced segregation in much of the United States.

Wood’s research shows that “widespread disinvestment in urban neighborhoods, particularly those populated by African Americans, ultimately contributed to deplorable housing conditions experienced by that group in most American cities by the mid-twentieth century” (p. 1039). The HOLC assisted in nationalizing the practice of racial and socioeconomic lending bias that led to the segregation of the United States.
Although these practices have been illegal for decades, their effects are still shown today and people of color are still discriminated against in the real estate market by being shown less units and lower quality units.

Pritchett’s research looks at the debate in the United States in the 1960’s and 1970’s regarding the proper role of the federal government in addressing “urban problems” faced by older cities (2008). After struggles in the 1960’s by the federal government to solve these issues, President Nixon signed a bill in 1974 that provided funds to local governments for urban development (CDBG) (p. 282). This led to the end of regional and municipal planning cooperation and to competition between local governments. The results of the devolution of power back to local governments and the lack of strong federal support over the past several decades is that cities still struggle with uneven development and racial inequality without leadership from the federal government (p. 282).

Issues of “urban problems” became identified as issues of racial conflict in the 1960’s. Today, the stigma is still there. It is important to realize that this issues originated from the disinvestment of cities and governments in central cities and from “White flight.” The federal government has taken a back seat in addressing these issues; however, municipalities have the opportunity to take control using the federally funded CDBG resources. Local control can give municipalities the agency to make the changes they see as necessary to revitalize their inner cities.

Mhatre and Van Zandt examined LIHTC in the Dallas/Fort Worth area to test the theory that supply-side housing can facilitate redistribution of low-income residents, dispersing them throughout areas of better opportunity (2009). The author’s found that LIHTC units were increasing in non-central city counties of the region but not within the affluent suburbs. LIHTC units were being placed in less affluent peripheral areas to underwrite the production of small stocks of rental housing. Additionally, they were being located on the edge of these already peripheral municipalities.

The issue stems from the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUDs) use of Qualified Census Tracts (QCTs) to identify Difficult Development Areas (DDAs). These designations allow bonuses to be paid to developers who build affordable units in these areas that are defined by low incomes and high percentages of minorities.
QCTs are a strong predictor of the clustering of LIHTC developments. LIHTC should be amended to encourage the development of affordable units in unaffordable markets.

In disadvantaged neighborhoods, tax credit guidelines might limit the proportion of LIHTC units that are low-income to promote income mixing and deconcentration, whereas in affluent neighborhood developments should be required to include higher proportions of low-income units to promote economic integration. Zoning is likely concentrating multi-family in certain areas in the exurban/periphery areas. Planners have the ability and responsibility to make the changes necessary to encourage multi-family within these areas.

Halasz uses New York City as a case study to “examine the extent to which current affordable rental housing programs and policies violate fair housing standards and exacerbates socio-economic inequality” (2011, p. 267). Halasz’s research contributes three startling findings. Blacks and Latinos are still considerably segregated from Whites and Asians despite increasing neighborhood diversity in certain types of affordable housing (ibid). Contrary to popular opinion, wealth and social class do not determine the type of housing a family may occupy as much as race and ethnicity (ibid). Lastly, mixed income multi-family developments containing a variety of incomes, employment levels, and poverty were found to provide significant advantages over cluster developments such as public housing, which furthers racial, ethnic, and socio-economic inequality (ibid).

Halasz’s research reveals some unpleasant facts about segregation in the United States. Her research does provide hope in mixed income, multi-family developments. The planning implications are substantial. Planners can zone affluent areas for multi-family developments and use inclusionary zoning to require a certain percentage of the new units be affordable. These tools can begin to increase the mixing of incomes and possibly people of different races and ethnicities.

Orfield’s research analyzes the effects LIHTC has had on segregated and resegregating neighborhoods (2005). Orfield suggests HUD’s MTO and HOPE VI projects failed to bring economic opportunities to low-income households because they were located mainly in resegregating areas, despite being less poor than their original neighborhood. The Gautreaux program succeeded because the units were located
stable, more affluent, and more White areas with substantial opportunities (p. 153). Orfield warns though that race based planning (i.e. requiring units be located in majority White neighborhoods) is illegal. Planners can look at other characteristics to determine the health of a community such as school population, tax base, growth, jobs, and available land.

Orfield states that “based on law, regionalist policy, and empirical evidence, this article argues that the government should prioritize locating low-income housing in places with strong schools, economic opportunity, and plentiful local resources. It provides approaches for preserving affordable housing in rapidly gentrifying neighborhoods with segregated schools and maintaining or enhancing integration in communities that are unstably integrated” (p. 107). In terms of preventing gentrification or stabilizing gentrifying neighborhoods, shallow subsidies of up to half the cost of a new unit can be used to maintain existing housing to prevent resegregation. Subsidies should be concentrated in areas where opportunities exist to preserve units. Lastly, municipalities with weak market demand should avoid constructing new units where existing units are available, which may lead to abandonment with new construction.

**Discrimination Summary**

In summary, the private market, as well as housing policies at the local, state, and federal levels have historically discriminated against people of color and low-income households. Historically, discriminatory policies led to or enforced the segregation of the United States and placement of Black households in poor quality housing. Today, as Halasz found, socio-economic status does not determine the type of housing a family may occupy as much as race and ethnicity. This is disturbing for today’s society and housing policy must address these issues to combat housing discrimination in the United States.

Research shows that mixed income, multi-family developments can work well at providing opportunities for low-income households. It is important to note that while minorities have been discriminated against, mixed income does not necessarily mean
locating in wealthier White neighborhoods. Associating low-income to people of color reinforces the history of discrimination. Additionally, since LIHTC aims for lower middle class and working class households, LIHTC could be used to transition the low and very low-income housing with the middle and higher-income housing in Downtown and DoNo. Hartford should have a community revitalization plan addressing the possible gentrification of the DoNo area and surrounding neighborhoods. Efforts to stabilize the region prior to the redevelopment will go a long way in creating a long lasting mixed income and diverse community.

Conclusions

Affordable housing in the United States comes in many forms and benefits low-income households to varying degrees. The private market has been unable to supply housing that is affordable to all residents and at the same time providing access to opportunities, services, and amenities. This literature review examined various aspects of the evolution of federal housing policy and programs in an effort to paint a picture of the current situation for cities in the United States today. The review also identifies best practices and recommendations for the City of Hartford to implement with the coming redevelopment of its DoNo area.

In terms of federal housing policy, HCV vouchers, project-based Section 8, LIHTC, and public housing all play a role in providing affordable housing in municipalities. As previously stated, Hartford already has a significant amount of affordable housing. The questions though are: what is the quality of the housing and how long is the unit’s affordability restriction? HCV vouchers give recipient the agency to choose where they live, though Hartford should implement a program with housing placement councilors to ensure the successful placement of the recipients. Project-based Section 8 units may be most at risk with the DoNo redevelopment. Hartford can work with landlords to extend the restrictions before the market provides for higher profits in market rate. Programs and funding should be sought after to maintain the existing project-based Section 8, LIHTC, and public housing.
LIHTC can be a strong incentive for developers to include affordable housing; however, Hartford should make sure that the developments are mixed income and located in neighborhoods with opportunities and amenities. LIHTC should be used within the DoNo redevelopment to provide mixed income housing in this area. Hartford should require extending the restrictions past 15 years to prevent the units from turning over to market rate and put a plan in place to monitor and enforce the affordability of the units. Additionally, Hartford should plan ways to assist owners in the areas with capital improvements, maintenance, and upgrades.

Federal housing policy and housing programs have historically created discrimination, segregation, and concentrated poverty. HCV vouchers alone are not helping deconcentrating poverty without councilors or resources to assist households in finding the right place in neighborhoods with opportunities. LIHTC developments may have a greater ability to be placed in deconcentrated areas because the developer decides. The Hartford Planning Department should use multi-family zoning and other incentives to facilitate developers to place LIHTC developments in deconcentrated areas. The City of Hartford should persuade developers to construct LIHTC developments in low-poverty areas such as the DoNo area, as it is adjacent to and may be less expensive than the adjacent higher income Downtown.

The City is currently undertaking a “Zone Hartford” project to update and revise their zoning regulations from 2005. The City is contemplating changing to form-based regulations. Inclusionary zoning should also be included in the rezoning of the City. Much of the DoNo area and surrounding area is zoned for medium to high density multi-family residential.

This literature review concludes that mixed income, multi-family developments are essential at providing opportunities for low-income households. The Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill neighborhoods adjacent to DoNo are largely segregated and in need of investment and opportunities. LIHTC could be used to transition the low and very low-income housing with the middle and higher-income housing in Downtown and DoNo. HCV vouchers can give existing residents the opportunity to move to other areas of the City if they desire. Since the redevelopment is still in the initial planning
stages, Hartford should create a community revitalization plan addressing the housing needs and possible gentrification of the surrounding neighborhoods.
Summary of DoNo Master Plan

Utilizing funding from a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities Grant, the City of Hartford contracted Utile, Inc. in 2013 to prepare a Master Plan for Downtown North / Downtown West (DN/DW). Assisting Utile were Ningret Partners (economic design), Stoss Landscape Urbanism (landscape design), Nelson Nygaard Consulting Associates (transportation), and Fitzgerald & Halliday, Inc (community planning). The Master Plan’s states that it was finalized in December 2013; however, it was not made available to the public until late Spring 2014. The Master Plan’s project boundaries are delineated in Figure 1 below. Downtown North, now called DoNo, is located to the north of I-84, to the west of the Connecticut River, to the east of the Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill neighborhoods, and to the south of the North Meadows neighborhood and the XFINITY Theatre.

Vision

The Project Vision was “to harness the full potential of Downtown North and Downtown West by creating a seamless environment” (Utile, p. 5, 2013). Utile states that plan includes an existing conditions study, a market analysis, urban design
framework, recommendations and implementation plan, and design guidelines and zoning. The plan is divided into the following chapters: Previous Studies, Study Area Character, Transportation Network, Planning Strategy, Retail and Housing Analysis, Development Districts, Transportation Planning, Open Space Planning and Design, and Design Guidelines and Zoning. The recommendations and implementations plan are found within the Development Districts chapter. Below is a summary of the relevant sections referenced above, with the exception of Study Area Character, Planning Strategy, and Transportation Planning.

**Previous Studies**

Utile discusses several previous studies and reports that were conducted in these areas sponsored by the City of Hartford. The Downtown West Opportunities Plan in 2006 guided investment by identifying areas that are suited for redevelopment. A 2010 Downtown Circulation Study identified four projects concerned with converting one-way streets to two-way streets and redesigning intersections for improved traffic mobility at peak-periods. A Downtown North project from 2008, who’s purpose was to “remove obsolete and blighted buildings from a critical perimeter area of the Downtown, conduct site assemblage, and create a development opportunity for mixed-use development, rehabilitation of historic structures, and educational and commercial development that will strengthen the development patterns of the Project Area” and was the basis for this 2013 Master Plan (p. 10).

Also beginning in 2008 was a planning process to search for linkages between many of Hartford’s assets titled iQuilt. “Downtown Hartford's exciting urban design strategy for walkability and creative place making. It capitalizes on two of Hartford’s greatest strengths: its extraordinary concentration of arts, cultural, and landscape assets and it’s exceptionally compact downtown” (p.11). The plan focused on signage, wayfinding, and place making strategies for Downtown Hartford, A Greenwalk Master Plan was a core part of iQuilt (p. 11). These plans prepped Utile for the DN/DW Master Plan process and provided them with important background information.
Transportation Network

Utile identified the following issues regarding the roads in the project area:

- **Market Street:** Despite being only four lanes, the street feels expansive and underused.
- **Intersection at Main Street and Albany Avenue:** The intersection is intimidating to pedestrians and confusing to drivers.
- **Highway crossings:** Bridge crossings and highway underpasses should be improved to draw people comfortably from Downtown North to Downtown West.
- **Scale of streets:** As future development is built, the streets should be redesigned to Complete Streets standards (p. 16).

Utile identified four City-owned parcels located at Main Street, Trumbull Street, and Pleasant Street (totaling 8.3 acres) that are well suited for redevelopment. These parcels are currently underutilized as surface parking lots and vacant parcels. These parcels are currently a vacant void in between the downtown core and neighborhoods to the northwest. Hartford historians and planners label this area as a “scar” after it was clean scraped due to urban renewal in the 1970s. A large scale redevelopment is appropriate for this area, while an incremental redevelopment is more fitting for the Downtown West area due to its more built up nature.

In regards with transportation, the road network is currently disconnected for pedestrians and crossing the I-84 interstate is difficult and inadequate for pedestrians.
Additionally, Figure 20 above depicts active and inactive street edges in terms of restaurants, retail, hotels, and entertainment. The figure shows a large void of activity in the DoNo area with the exception of the northwest portion of Main Street before it turns into Albany Avenue.

**Retail Market Analysis**

Utile conducted a retail market analysis split between Downtown North and Downtown West because they serve very different demographics. The DoNo area was found to be able to provide needed goods and services for the surrounding population, including nearby residents, the 70,000 daytime office workers in Downtown, and visitors. Utile discusses the needs of the surrounding neighborhood in the following quote. “The residents north of the study area are currently underserved by retail and are required to drive to find basic retail services, such as groceries stores. It was determined that the Downtown North study area has a demand for 163,000 square feet (SF) of additional retail development. This development would produce $59 million in sales, and by 2017 it would generate up to $62 million in gross sales. The area could absorb up to 53,000 SF of restaurant space, a new 31,000 SF grocery store and additional retailers, such as departments stores, appliance stores and clothing stores.” (p. 44-45).

**Housing Analysis**

Due to the unpredictability of housing growth, Utile conducted a varied analysis of housing by looking at resident market research, demographic statistics, and precedent studies. Surveys and focus groups found that Downtown residents want more amenities and activities such as restaurants, entertainment, and shops. Respondents showed a demand for a mix of housing types such as townhouses or condos that opens to the street (61%), high-rise apartment or condos of 4-10 units (46%), lofts or untraditional (46%), and apartments or condo buildings (37%) (p. 46-47). Survey respondents stated that finding housing that is affordable in a walkable area is desired but not available in Downtown. Please note that the survey respondent’s demographics were not provided so the definition of what is “affordable” to the respondents is unclear.
It is presumed that this refers to mid-range rents for young professionals, not rents for low-income residents.

The analysis showed that housing growth Downtown is fueled by young professionals with annual salaries of approximately $60,882 as well as empty nesters (older adults whose children are no longer living with them). The analysis indicated that the average young professional’s budget for rent is approximately $750 and $1,000. The research showed that Downtown could support an additional 1,700 to 4,700 units of housing even considering the existing downtown units and the 1,100 units that are planned (p.47). Utile noted there are many factors that impact housing prices, such as fluctuation of the housing market, the volatility of local economies and change in consumer preference; however, there is strong evidence that there is a significant portion of the population in and moving to the greater Hartford area who would be interested in living in a vibrant urban area, such as Downtown Hartford (and potentially DoNo) if there were units in their price range.

Open Space

Utile’s plan suggests three options for connecting DoNo to the riverfront. The first option is to improve the current overpass, which is located in the northeastern portion of DoNo, by creating a landform on either side of I-91 to slope up to the top of
the newly redesigned overpass. Option 2 uses a switchback ramp design from the Market Street exit ramp on I-84 from the intersection of a rail cap and Market Street. The final option works off of an existing pedestrian access to the bridge and river using a suspended bridge.

The plan also proposes upgrading and designing Wexford Park (named “Heaven Park” by local skaters, bikers, and graffiti artists) to accommodate more uses. Currently, the park is blocked off with walls and is under disrepair. The current skate park, which opened in 2014 after the city invested $160,000 to upgrade it, is the main use and is important to the residents to the northwest. This skate park will be expanded and upgraded. The new “Town Green” would be for passive and recreational activities for all of Hartford’s residents (p. 102).

![Figure 22 Proposed redesign of Wexford Park into a Town Green. Source: Utile p. 103.](image)

**Design Guidelines and Zoning**

This chapter lays out development guidelines for any Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for development in the near future. These guidelines are measurable and will be incorporated into a city-wide form-based zoning code. The rezoning of the Downtown neighborhoods is ongoing and will prioritize these areas first. The primary goal of the rezoning is to “ensure that the building stock and related street network are consistent-enough in height, scale, and character that general form-based rules can be applied” (p. 108).
Priority Areas

Utile identified five priority areas for new development, two of which are in DoNo. These areas are identified as 1: Ann Uccello and 2: Main and Trumbull, which are in DoNo, 3: Main & Asylum, 4: Bushnell Park, and 5: Downtown West, which are located to the south of DoNo beyond I-84, and are depicted in Figure 23 below. Neighborhood scale development is appropriate in Ann Uccello, which is named after the former Mayor of Hartford from the 1960s.

A market analysis indicated there is a substantial demand for new retail and a 30,000 square foot grocery store in DoNo, which is the typical size of a larger “supermarket”. Utile indicates that the Main and Trumbull area “could form a new town center with retail anchors, residential development, and a proposed municipal office building” (p. 52).

Ann Uccello

The Ann Uccello future build out is depicted in Figure 4 below. This area contains several vacant lots, a new municipal complex, and the only strip of retail in DoNo. “Building upon the scale of the existing neighborhood, this plan proposes townhouses, corner retail, and Low-rise Mixed Use buildings (generally 4-5 stories) that are sensitive to the context of the area. Corner retail provides a social gathering space, while a courtyard behind the townhouses offer private outdoor space. Townhouses will have street facing front doors and vehicular access via a rear alley” (p. 54).
Main and Trumbull

The Main and Trumbull proposal is depicted in Figure 5 below. Despite the close proximity to the core of downtown, the DoNo area still feels a great distance due to the “no-man’s land” quality of the bridges over I-84, which have fallen into disrepair. Because of this fact, Utile proposes uses the Main and Trumbull area, which is municipally owned, as a node and gateway. The proposal indicates that a 10 story municipal building is planned for this area. “Other Mid-rise Mixed Use buildings anchoring that corner should be between 10-12 stories tall. As the development moves beyond that key node, the recommended building heights are between 4-5 stories for Low-rise Mixed Use buildings, which are primarily residential with some ground floor retail” (p. 60). A total of 681 residential units are proposed, as well as 250,000 square feet of commercial, 138,310 square feet of retail/active use, and 1,484 parking spaces.
Utile proposes a complete street revamp of Main and Trumbull. A road diet reducing the number of travel lanes is proposed for both streets. Crossing islands will reduce the curb-to-curb width for pedestrians attempting to cross the street. On-street parking and bike lanes, neither of which currently exist here, are proposed. Additionally, a five foot wide landscaped buffer will be implemented in between the bike lane and ten foot wide pedestrian zone.

![Figure 26 Reconfiguration of Main Street in DoNo. Source: Utile, p.64.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
<th>Critical?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential units</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial SF</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail or Active Uses SF</td>
<td>157,310</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 DoNo Master Plan proposed implementation table.*

In each of the summarization tables, the column labeled “Critical?” analyzing the importance of each item for DoNo. Critical elements for DoNo include residential, retail, and active uses. The housing element will strongly impact the development and
the surrounding neighborhoods, while retail and active uses will set the tone for the new neighborhood. Since Downtown and surrounding areas have a plethora of commercial office space, industrial properties, and parking, these elements may be less critical to the area.

Request for Proposals

On July 2nd, 2014, the City of Hartford posted a Request for Proposals (RFP) for “For Public Private Partnership of Completing Hartford’s Neighborhoods with Mixed-Use Development & Proposed Minor League Baseball Facility” at the DoNo site. The RFP responses were received by August 1, 2014. The main proposal, herein referred to as “the Proposal”, was created by DoNo Hartford, LLC, a collaboration between Centerplan Development Corporation and Leyland Alliance utilizing Priority Sites 1 and 2 (Ann Uccello and Main and Trumbull). The following section analyzes the Proposal and outlines the major differences from the proposal and the Master Plan.
DoNo Hartford, LLC Proposal

The DoNo Hartford LLC Proposal took many Hartford and Connecticut residences by surprise. Many had lost hope that anything would come of the blighted area. The Proposal is not for a single parcel but to create a full DoNo neighborhood. Below is the Proposal’s Concept Site Design, which includes a 6,000 square foot minor league baseball stadium with 3,000 additional suite, picnic, and standing seats, a little league field above three levels of parking, a 11,000 square foot brewpub with 35,000 square foot brewery, three additional parking garages, a large-scale grocery store, multi-family apartment buildings, offices, and mixed use buildings. The Concept Site Design also indicates that approximately twelve historic buildings along Main Street on the western portion of DoNo would be renovated and maintained as mixed use and multi-family buildings.

Interestingly, the possibility of the New Britain Rock Cats Double-A minor league baseball affiliate of the Colorado Rockies ending its 30 years with the City of New Britain and moving to Hartford was not discussed within the DoNo Master Plan. Reportedly, the Mayor of Hartford, Pedro Segarra and Hartford Director of Development Services, Thomas Deller, had been in private negotiations with the Rock Cats owner, Joshua Solomon, for 18 months prior to announcing in June, shortly after the completion of the DoNo Master Plan, that the Rock Cats signing a 25-year lease with the City of Hartford beginning in 2016. From my conversations with Junior Planner Caitlin Palmer, it appears as though these negotiations were completely private and the entire 2013 planning process for the DoNo Master Plan did not entertain this possibility.

During my June 2014 interviews with Ms. Palmer, who assisted on portions of the Downtown North / Downtown West Master Plan, stated that she didn’t believe there wasn’t an imminent potential for redevelopment in DoNo. Besides the City indicating it may start off the redevelopment with a municipal building in the DoNo area, she was unaware of any proposals or talks of potential developers for the mostly city-owned and underdeveloped site. From my research of newspapers, there appeared to be no talks of any development in this area.
Below is the Statement of Interest from DoNo Hartford LLC that was submitted to the City in August 2014.

[DoNo Hartford LLC] proposes to deliver a wide range of services in the creation of a dynamic, mixed-use neighborhood, including planning and design, construction management, financing strategies, commercial and residential leasing, and property management. The net result will create a neighborhood that will not only become an entertainment destination for hundreds of thousands of visitors annually, with a professional baseball team as its focal point, but will also link the North End of Hartford and Downtown within an environment that includes public space, apartments, offices, retail, restaurants, a grocery store, and a variety of potential destinations that will define itself as a holistic urban core that provides its residents with a real opportunity to live, work and play. This neighborhood, known as Downtown North, or DoNo, will energize an area that is presently dormant, and create a major new assembly venue for the region. (DoNo Hartford LLC, 2014, p. 6)
Proposal Description

The proposal separates DoNo into two development projects, Parcel A for the baseball stadium and Parcels B-G for a mixed-used development, which are depicted in Figure 27 above. All of these parcels are to be sold to DoNo Hartford LLC by the City for one dollar. The ballpark is situated on a parking lot and vacant lot bounded by Main Street, Trumbull Street, Pleasant Street, and Windsor Street. The Proposal eliminates this section of Windsor Street, allowing the ballpark to flow into a little league park overlooking the minor league stadium, a brewery with an outdoor beer garden, and 228 residential units, all located on parcel G. DoNo Hartford secured a contract to purchase this eastern parcel, currently developed with a vacant concrete block building. This new feature will create a new gateway to DoNo, connecting the triangle and Heaven Park (located above I-84) better for pedestrians.

DoNo Hartford LLC envisioned the City of Hartford moving its municipal office building to parcel F at the intersection of Trumbull, Main, and Morgan (an existing parking lot). This was proposed to be the anchor of the eastern side of DoNo and gateway to the park.

A block with parcels B, C, and D located in the southwestern portion of DoNo will be a residential block with a reconfigured Ann Uccello Street and parking garage. The existing buildings along Main Street and High Street will be restored and reused for
mixed use and residential purposes. The aim is to create a pedestrian friendly new neighborhood in across from the new public safety building on High Street. The parcels bounded by Chapel Street North, Main Street, Trumbull Street, and Ann Uccello Street will be a mixed use block E with a parking garage, and a 25,000 square foot (medium-large sized) urban grocery store. The first floor of the buildings will be retail shops along Main Street with four stories of residential above.

Regarding traffic, the proposal aims to improve pedestrian and transportation throughout DoNo. Currently, the area is heavily car centric with wide roads designed for faster driving and dangerous pedestrian atmosphere. The Proposal has three goals for roadway improvements. These include street re-alignment to accommodate the new stadium, street re-construction for traffic calming/place-making, and creating a functional/multi-modal transportation system (DoNo Hartford, LLC p. 14).

Regarding housing, the DoNo Hartford, LLC Proposal states that “the current downtown lifestyle proposition combines bland retail, old housing stock, and an office driven environment, making it a weak alternative to the incumbent outlying areas” (p. 17). The Proposal states that there is no real product in the middle to higher level rents, creating a “substantial latent demand in the $1,300 - $2,200 rent band” (p. 17). DoNo Hartford LLC sees the possibility of more mature households, renter by choice and empty nester renters, and student housing if the area can mature into a “fully-realized neighborhood that also has amenities and retail which properly caters to these multiple groups” (DoNo Hartford, LLC p. 17).

The Proposal included a market analysis prepared by RCLCO to supplement the Master Plan and 2013 Market Analysis of DoNo. The market analysis indicated that there is sufficient potential sources of demand for 750 to 800 total units making up 87% young professionals, 12% renters by choice, and 5% empty nesters (DoNo Hartford, LLC p. 19). Affordable housing and the needs of the low-income neighborhoods surrounding in DoNo are not discussed anywhere in the Proposal.

Although DoNo Hartford LLC discusses the need of including a centralized grocery store, they do not mention of the need due to the surrounding low-income food desert neighborhoods. Rather, they discuss the grocery store as necessary for the new young professionals. There is a concern that this could be a Whole Foods, which may be
too expensive for the existing residences. With the exception of stating that the new construction will preserve the historic fabric of the neighborhood, DoNo Hartford LLC appears to make no connection with the surrounding neighborhoods, except for wealthy Downtown. The developers state that “other smaller format, neighborhood-serving retail options such as a pharmacy or dry cleaner should be carefully vetted by how they fit within the wider ecosystem of a walkable residential community” (DoNo Hartford, LLC p. 18).

RCLCO lists daily serving retail, restaurants and nightlife, and public spaces are required for place making in DoNo. “These three uses are all critical in creating a place where residents can comfortably work, live, and play. Ultimately, the successful execution of this phase I plan will be determined by how well the target young professional’s core social and lifestyle needs are met. If this place making strategy is executed well, RCLCO believes there is a substantial amount of demand for the kind of integrated community that this site can offer” (DoNo Hartford, LLC p. 18). Other residential amenities recommended include a full-service gym, rooftop access to the residential buildings, Zipcar space, cappuccino/coffee bar, cardio bar classes, yoga studio, microbrewery, wave pool, bike storage, communal kitchen, dog park, drycleaner, community garden, and a workshop area.

RCLCO’s conclusion is that there is substantial potential in creating a revitalized neighborhoods for high income young professionals. Young professionals need to be targeted initially with later phases of the development catering to empty nesters and students.

Given the current dynamics between employment, the state of housing opportunities in outlying areas of Hartford, and the tremendous opportunity for place making around the ballpark, the necessary conditions are in place to redefine what it means to live downtown. There is currently no location in the region where young professionals can live in a walkable neighborhood with the critical mass of retail, restaurants, nightlife, and social activities that they truly prefer. Other markets have proven that a well-executed neighborhood providing these lifestyle amenities can be extremely successful in attracting and retaining young people. Hartford itself has proven that even in the absence of compelling lifestyle offerings, the downtown can still increasingly draw high income young professional residents. The subject site represents an opportunity to develop and deliver a mixed use neighborhood at the exact inflection point of downtown redevelopment. (DoNo Hartford LLC/RCLCO p. 20)
Table 3 represents the Proposal’s initial square footages and various uses for each of the parcels. A total of eleven buildings ranging from two to eight stories were proposed. A total of 673 residential units, a grocery store, retail space, two office-buildings, Hooker Brewery and Brew Pub, and five parking lots/garages were proposed. The number of residential units is significantly lower than the Master Plans. Not included in this table is the square footage of the baseball stadium, the center piece of the redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING #</th>
<th>FLOOR PLATE SF.</th>
<th>FLOORS</th>
<th>UNITS/SF.</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>RESI. SF</th>
<th>RETAIL SF.</th>
<th>OFFICE SF.</th>
<th>LIGHT INDUST. SF.</th>
<th>TOTAL BUILDING SF</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-1</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-2</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>109,200</td>
<td>25,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92,400</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-1</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-1</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-2</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-2</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>681,600</td>
<td>194,400</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Structure / Lot | Decks | SF/Deck | Spaces/Deck | Total Spaces | Total SF | Notes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52,400</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>53,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>47,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>53,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>31,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57,400</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>52,992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>530,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Detail of proposed uses with quantities within the Proposal. Source: DoNo Hartford, LLC p. 23.

Table 4 details the differences between the DoNo Master Plan’s implementation plan and DoNo Hartford, LLC’s Proposal.

**DoNo Implementation Table Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Difference (Proposal compared to Master Plan)</th>
<th>Proposal / Master Plan</th>
<th>Critical?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential units</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>-137</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial SF</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>-64,000</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Active Uses SF</td>
<td>157,310</td>
<td>326,400*</td>
<td>+169,090</td>
<td>207.5%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>+30,000</td>
<td>30,000%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>-253</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Comparison of the DoNo Master Plan’s implementation proposal with the DoNo Hartford, LLC’s proposal. Please note that the Proposal includes 220,000 square foot minor league baseball stadium as retail/active uses.
Therefore, the Proposal only includes 106,400 square feet of retail space, which is less than the Master Plan. Legend: Square Feet=SF

An analysis of the difference between the DoNo Master Plan’s implementation of residential, commercial, and parking with DoNo Hartford, LLC’s Proposal reveals that the Proposal does not meet the majority of the Master Plan’s numbers for DoNo as a whole. DoNo Hartford, LLC proposes slightly less residential units and parking spaces than the Master Plan. Hartford is not lacking parking; however, the lower amount of residential units is an issue. It should be noted that the Master Plan distinguishes between “commercial” and “retail or active uses” but does not define the two. DoNo Hartford, LLC indicates square footages for office, retail, residential, and light industrial.

I included office space as commercial and combined the retail figure with the proposed 220,000 square foot baseball stadium, which includes a 6,000 seat baseball stadium with 3,000 additional standing, picnic, and suite-style seats on Parcel A for retail or active uses. Please note the stadium building itself will only be approximately 90,000 square feet but the entire stadium with the field and standing room will be approximately 220,000 square feet. The light industrial use proposed by DoNo Hartford, LLC is a brewery for Hooker Brewing, which will also have a restaurant.

Planning and Zoning Commission Staff Report

On December 9, 2014, the City of Hartford Planning and Zoning Commission completed a staff report with recommendations regarding the DoNo Hartford, LLC proposal. Table 5 represents the changes made per the staff recommendations that increased the amount of housing over that of the Master Plan, while still providing retail and active uses, the two critical elements of the redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Proposal after Staff Report</th>
<th>Critical?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential units</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial SF</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Active Uses SF</td>
<td>157,310</td>
<td>326,400</td>
<td>407,955*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 DoNo implementation table comparison with updated numbers after the Planning and Zoning Commission’s staff report. Please note that the square footage for the commercial space and brewery may have been combined within the retail square footage within the staff report. *Additionally, the Proposal includes 220,000 square foot minor league baseball stadium as retail/active uses. The updated Proposal increased the retail space to 187,955 square feet.

Submitted Plans

On February 14, 2015, the City Council approved the proposed 25-year lease with a municipal authority formed to own and finance the baseball stadium. The plans were approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission with special permits and the ceremonial groundbreaking for the baseball stadium occurred on February 17, 2015. The City Council is still in negotiations over the final developer agreement with details regarding the mixed-use development portion of the project.

Since the Proposal was submitted, the City and DoNo Hartford, LLC have worked out some of the finer details for the DoNo redevelopment. A revised development plan
was created January 8, 2015 after BETA Group, Inc. prepared a Traffic Impact and Parking Study dated November 18, 2014. According to Ms. Palmer, the most up to date numbers approved by Hartford Planning and Zoning Commission were submitted to the Office of the State Traffic Administration (OSTA) in February 2015. Please note that the final plan for the redevelopment with the exception of the baseball stadium have not been finalized and made public. The plans for each of the parcels have been submitted by DoNo Hartford, LLC to the Hartford Development Services Division.

**DoNo Implementation Table Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Final Numbers Approved by Hartford Planning and Zoning Submitted to OSTA</th>
<th>Final Proposal/Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential units</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>116.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial SF</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Active Uses SF</td>
<td>157,310</td>
<td>196,400</td>
<td>349,178</td>
<td>222.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>43,000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>100.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 DoNo implementation table comparison with final numbers approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and submitted to OSTA. Please note that the Proposal includes 220,000 square foot minor league baseball stadium as retail/active uses. The final numbers include 129,178 square feet for retail. Note that 100% in the Final Numbers/Master Plan column on the far right would indicate an exact match between the Proposal and the Master Plan. Percentages higher than 100% indicate the Proposal offers a greater amount than the Master Plan allotted, while those lower than 100% indicate the Proposal offers a far fewer amount.

In terms of housing, the final Proposal appears to exceed the amount of units allotted by the Master Plan. The Proposal apportioned over 900 units for DoNo. This figure should assist in bringing street life to the neighborhood and aid in preventing spill over into the surrounding neighborhoods. The Proposal’s initial intention of undercutting the Master Plan to less than 700 units was unacceptable. The City is setting a good precedent to require more housing.

Another major change from the original Proposal to the final Proposal was the ratio of commercial to retail uses. Initially, the Proposal allocated a large area for a potential municipal office building. The City realized that this area does not need more office space but retail and active uses were most imperative. Coupled with the larger amount of housing proposed, the 129,178 square feet of retail, 43,000 square foot
brewery, and 220,000 square foot baseball stadium should create a vibrant neighborhood.

According to Ms. Palmer, the Planning and Zoning Commission did not require a percent of the housing be affordable as part of their special permit; however, the agreement with the city council, which hasn’t been finalized, may include 20% of the units be affordable housing. It is my opinion that the Planning and Zoning Commission should have required a percentage of affordable housing. Parcel E, confined by, Trumbull Street, Main Street, Pleasant Street, and Chapel Street in the southwestern portion of DoNo along I-84 will include a larger grocery store. Of note is the “historic” buildings along the western portion of Main Street and High Street, are no longer included in the project and will not be renovated by the developer. Additionally, the little league baseball field that was initially proposed on Parcel G to overlook the minor league stadium and inspire the youth of Hartford, is no longer included.

It appears as though the developer is removing some of the features designed to benefit the local residents. There seems to be no restriction on the type or price of grocery store or other retail tenants. The only aspect that appears to maintain some connection with the Hartford community are within the baseball stadium agreement with the City Council, which has yet to be finalized and provided publically. According to a Hartford Courant article “Hartford Releases Details of Downtown, Stadium Projects,” the city will be entitled to free use of the public areas of the ballpark for a minimum of five city sponsored events during baseball season and five additional events during the offseason (Carlesso, Jenna, and Goode Steven). The club will also be required to price tickets so that they are affordable to families, provide special programs for seniors and children, and hold an annual "Hartford" day. Additionally, local, woman and minority-owned businesses are to be given preference in contract work.

After all of the back and forth, the final proposal exceeded the Master Plans recommendation for residential units; however, the amount of affordable units is still up in the air due to the Master Plan not discussing this element. It is my opinion that if the Master Plan had identified affordable housing as a critical element for DoNo and recommended a certain percentage of units be affordable housing, the developer would have had better expectations and the City Council would have had firmer ground to
stand on to ask for affordable housing units. The removal of the office building appears warranted, while the increase in retail space and the baseball stadium should create a vibrant neighborhood. The grocery store should be a significant resource for the community; however, it is located in the south-central portion of DoNo and closer to Downtown than the underserved neighborhoods to the north and northwest. Overall, the final proposal exceeds the Master Plan. The developer’s agreement will tell how many community benefits may come from the redevelopment.
Rubric Analysis of Two Case Studies

As part of this research project, I searched for case studies within the State of Connecticut to help analyze the DoNo redevelopment and be able to extract some potential impacts of the project. Since the State of Connecticut does not maintain a list of redevelopment projects sponsored by municipalities, I contacted the planning departments of Connecticut’s ten largest municipalities to see if they had done such projects. Several cities along Long Island Sound in the southern portion of Connecticut were ruled out due to the economic spillover effect from New York City and from Yale University in New Haven. The two case studies I chose to analyze were in the cities of Meriden and Waterbury, Connecticut.

The Meriden redevelopment project has been in a longer planning phase than DoNo (since 2005), yet is coming to fruition in a similar time period. My analysis has focused on comparing Meriden’s guiding plan with the redevelopment proposals. I use Waterbury’s redevelopment to analyze the impacts of the project ten years after its completion.

I reviewed the redevelopment plans and any other relevant documents for each case study to understand what was originally proposed. To analyze the case studies, I conducted a site reconnaissance, interviewed municipal officials in connection with the prospective redevelopment projects, and compared demographic statistics from 2000 with 2013. From this information, I’ve made recommendations for DoNo based on the case studies.

Demographic Changes 2000-2013

To analyze the impacts of these redevelopment projects, I compared the demographic changes within each redevelopment area between 2000 and 2013. The redevelopment impacts were compared across population, age, race and ethnicity, educational attainment, employment and poverty, and housing to identify any changes that may have occurred as a result of the redevelopment projects.
Demographic statistics were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau 2000 decennial census and the 2008-2013 five-year estimates. Data for Meriden Center was collected for census tracts 1701 and 1702. Data for Waterbury’s Central Business District was collected for census tract 3501. The results are depicted in the tables and figures below. Please note that the results are for the census tracts listed above revolving around the redevelopment areas.

The below table shows that population has decreased in both redevelopment areas with a greater loss in Waterbury where the redevelopment has been completed for a decade. The median age also increased significantly in Waterbury. The only major race and ethnicity changes occurred in Meriden with few White alone residents and a higher concentration of Hispanic or Latino residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redevelopment Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Median Age</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</th>
<th>White Alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4,214</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,098</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-116</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-1,359</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Demographic changes in Meriden Center and Waterbury Central Business District from 2000 to 2013. Source U.S Census Bureau.

In terms of housing, both redevelopment areas increased the total number of housing units slightly; however, the overall vacant housing rate also increased to over 20%. Notably, the homeowner vacancy rate dropped to zero for Waterbury. Median rents for both redevelopment areas rose substantially with rents in Waterbury nearly doubling.
### Housing Changes 2000-2013 in the Case Study Redevelopment Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redevelopment Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Vacant Housing Rate</th>
<th>Homeowner Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Rental Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Median Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>$447.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>$745.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+164</td>
<td>+9.9%</td>
<td>+13.0%</td>
<td>+5.0%</td>
<td>+$297.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,731</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>$503.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+82</td>
<td>+12.0%</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>+8.8%</td>
<td>+$213.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Housing changes in Meriden Center and Waterbury Central Business District from 2000 to 2013. Source U.S Census Bureau.

In both areas, the percentage of residents 25 years of age and older with a high school degree or higher rose; however, their rates are significantly lower than those of the State. With Waterbury’s arts and education redevelopment project, the percentage of residents 25 years of age and older with a bachelor’s degree or higher rose to over 10%.

### Education Changes 2000-2013 in the Case Study Redevelopment Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redevelopment Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% High School Graduate or Higher</th>
<th>% Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meriden</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+11.5%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>+3.9%</td>
<td>+4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Education changes in Meriden Center and Waterbury Central Business District from 2000 to 2013. Source U.S Census Bureau.

The unemployment rates for both redevelopment areas increased to over 17%, over three times that of the State. The poverty rate increased to over 41% in Meriden but decreased to 26.3% in Waterbury. While the median household income rose several thousand dollars to nearly $21,000 in Meriden, Waterbury’s decreased to under $11,000.
The positive effects of the redevelopment project in Waterbury appear to be few and far between. Unemployment in the area surrounding the redevelopment area increased, while median household income. However, the percent of residents below poverty decreased substantially. Small gains were seen in educational attainment. The population has decreased and aged. Despite the lack of increased housing units, the vacancy rate and rents has increased.

It appears as though the Downtown of Waterbury was heavily impacted by the economic crisis beginning in 2008. Despite the efforts of the City and State to revitalize this area via the redevelopment project, few gains were seen by the residents living in this area. Some significant set backs were also seen in the decrease in median household income and increase in unemployment rate.

Although the redevelopment project has yet to be fully realized in Meriden, analyzing the changes in the past 15 years shows the direction Meriden is heading. The population in the vicinity of the redevelopment remained relatively stable with an increase of Hispanic or Latino residents of any race. Unemployment and the percent of residents below the poverty rate increased substantially despite the median household income rising over $2,200.
This area increased the number of housing units slightly while nearly doubling its vacancy rate. The median rent also rose nearly $300. Although the percent of high school graduates increased over 11%, the percent with bachelor’s degrees or higher decreased slightly. With the rise in vacancy rates and rents, this redevelopment project should be cautious in providing the appropriate housing for the existing residents.

**Waterbury, Connecticut**

Waterbury is the fifth largest city in Connecticut with 110,366 residents and is located approximately 30 minutes southwest of Hartford. Along with a rise and fall of manufacturing, the City of Waterbury has had a long history of redevelopment aimed at stabilizing employment and revitalizing the Downtown. Urban Renewal began in 1981, and was updated in 1987. Amendments 3 and 4 were conducted beginning in 2000. The City has conducted several amendments to the original Urban Renewal Plan of their downtown. In June 2000, the Waterbury Development Agency conducted the Third and Fourth Amendments of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Business District Renewal Project.

As part of my site reconnaissance, I interviewed Tom Gentile, Business Development Manager of the Waterbury Development Corporation. Mr. Gentile took me on a tour the redevelopment site and surrounding areas on March 3, 2015. Mr. Gentile provided information regarding the history of redevelopment in Waterbury.

The first Urban Renewal project in Waterbury began in 1981 and was funded by the U.S. Department Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to remove blighted structures from the Downtown. The 1987 Amendment focused on a larger area on the east side of Downtown, and did not bring in substantial reinvestment into the East Main Street section of Downtown, according to the Urban Renewal Plan for the Central Business District Renewal Project Amendment 4 report. The Palace Theater remained vacant with several other vacant properties. This area, along with the north side of East Main Street, were identified in a 1998 downtown revitalization planning process for redevelopment with cultural, entertainment, and education uses.
The current focus of this case study is the fourth amendment to the original Urban Renewal Plan that was implemented between 2000 and 2005. The 2000 project consisted of the redevelopment of Palace Theater, construction of one parking garage and renovation of a second garage, a new Arts Magnet Public School, and a University of Connecticut (UConn) campus.

Reportedly, Governor Tom Rowland backed the 2000 project and expanded it to include the larger education scope, beyond the original intention of just renovating the historic Palace Theater. According to Mr. Gentile, the project was entirely State funded with approximately $240 million of bonds. Similar to DoNo, the project was politically pushed. Initially, the idea was disliked by the public until the Governor backed the larger redevelopment project.

The Urban Renewal Plan did not provide as many detailed specifics regarding the redevelopment with the exception of the zoning and land use regulation changes for the area. The plan reads more as a general guide to the process. More detailed information regarding the redevelopment were acquired from Mr. Gentile. The larger project involved approximately 23 properties, some of which were acquired using eminent domain with several “blighted” buildings demolished. The residential and commercial tenants of several of the demolished structures were successfully relocated outside of the redevelopment area.

According to the Land Use Plan section of the Urban Renewal Plan, no ground floor residential area would be allowed in this area. The plan limited residential development to not more than 100 bedrooms per acre for the portion of one parcel (parcel 4) where apartments were permitted. No restrictions were designated for parcel 8, who’s zoning also allowed multi-family residential.
The aerial map on the left below (Figure 30) shows the Palace Theater to the east of Waterbury Green and Downtown. Much of the area to the north and east was underdeveloped with parking lots. The aerial map on the right below (Figure 31) shows the redeveloped area with the UConn campus to the north and Arts Magnet School to the east on the location of the demolished multi-family residential building and parking lot. The approximate redevelopment boundaries are outlined in red.
According to Mr. Gentile, the area didn’t see much private investment after the redevelopment. Few restaurants or shops appeared to come in despite the influx of students. The “Great Recession” and housing crisis beginning in 2008 certainly impacted the already struggling, former industrial city.

Several design elements appear to have hindered the street life in this redevelopment zone. The two parking garages are located in the rear of the project. One is directly behind the Palace Theater and the other is behind the UConn building. Street parking was also removed to enhance the pedestrian friendliness of the street. These elements allows people to drive in to the rear of the redevelopment site, park in the parking garages, walk through the garages into their respective buildings, and exit the same way, never interacting with the street.

The commuter centric result of the project and the lack of housing constructed deterred walkability and street life. As stated above, the plan specifically limited multi-family residential to a portion of two of the parcels and restricted the density to be no more than 100 bedrooms per acre for one of the parcels. According to Mr. Gentile, a 48 efficiency unit building was actually demolished on the eastern portion of the project to create room for the Arts Magnet School, relocating those tenants out of the area. No dormitories were constructed on the UConn campus and the school is geared to commuters living at home, outside of the downtown area. These factors have resulted in a lack of street life and therefore, lack of shops and restaurants.
By restricting housing in this area, the redevelopment focused on meeting the needs of commuters. The project relied too heavily on the hopes of private investment to bring in additional shops, restaurants, and housing. By leaving these elements out of the redevelopment, the project was only successful at bringing in stand-alone cultural, entertainment, and arts facilities without creating a neighborhood.

Meriden, Connecticut

Meriden is the tenth largest city in Connecticut with 59,653 residents and is located approximately 25 minutes south of Hartford. Meriden saw disinvestment in the 1960s like Hartford and Waterbury. Meriden is a federal entitlement community and a state-designated “distressed” municipality.

The redevelopment project involves the former Meriden Mall (later renamed HUB) site, a site consisting of 14 brownfields that is being redeveloped into a park and flood control area with approximately three acres for private development. The HUB site is part of the City’s transit oriented development (TOD) district. Within the TOD district there are several potential redevelopment sites, including the Mills Memorial Housing Complex, 116 Cook Ave/former Factory H, and the former Meriden Wallingford hospital site. This redevelopment is being done in as part of HUD’s new “Choice Neighborhoods” program, which “supports locally driven strategies to address struggling neighborhoods with distressed public or HUD-assisted housing through a comprehensive approach to neighborhood transformation” (HUD, 2015). The Choice
Neighborhood project is located on the east side of downtown on a large vacant lot/parking lot that is a brownfield site.

As seen in the photographs below, the site was historically a dense urban center with multi-story mixed use buildings covering the downtown lot. The area was demolished in the early 1960s by urban renewal, similar to DoNo, and the Meriden Mall was constructed with large amounts of surface parking. The Mall was later renamed the “HUB” and experienced difficulties staying economically viable in the 1980s and early 1990s. The property was prone to flooding and the building was abandoned for over a decade. The building was demolished in 2007.
The City has been trying to redevelop this large, downtown property in the heart of their downtown for over a decade. The commercial portion of the current downtown lies adjacent to the west beyond a railroad operated by Amtrak. Several proposals were suggested; however, major remediation of the contaminated brownfield site needed to be completed first. Much of this work was recently completed in 2014 utilizing U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Brownfields Assessment & Clean Up grant funding.

The HUB redevelopment project is part of a larger City Center Initiative to transform the downtown area. The guiding document for the redevelopment is the Meriden Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Master Plan dated April 2012 prepared by Parsons Brincherhoff. “The TOD Master Plan is intended to be a collaborative
community process that will include preliminary design concepts for the new Meriden Intermodal Center, a station-area market analysis, a strategy for building long-term public-private partnerships (tax incentives, subsidies, land assemblage), recommendations for improved traffic patterns and parking, and an exploration of the merits of various planning tools (zoning/regulations) and design guidelines (streetscapes/public realm/architecture) for defining the new identity of the City Center” (p. 4).

The Master Plan noted that the majority of Meriden is zoned for small lots; however, the HUB site and several other Downtown sites were identified as large parcels capable of being redeveloped due to their vacancy or underutilization. The Master Plan indicated the need for strategic infill development in the Downtown to fill in the gaps. The Master Plan specifically discusses mixed-use and mixed-income developments. Table 7 describes the Master Plans focus areas and recommendations for redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meriden Master Plan Implementation Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meriden Intermodal Center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colony Street (11 Crown Street)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUB Park</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meriden Housing Authority Site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East and West Main Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factory H Area (116 Cook Ave)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pratt Street “Gateway”</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Meriden Master Plan Implementation Table. Data collected from Parson Brinckerhoff report, 2012.
As in DoNo, the redevelopment is occurring in three sections. Three separate proposals from three different developers were selected in the Spring of 2015 for the three different areas of redevelopment. It should be noted that The Michaels Organization’s proposal was for all three areas; however, they were only chosen for their redevelopment proposal of the 11 Crown Street site. According to Ms. Juliet Burdelski, Director of the Meriden Department of Economic Development, developer agreements will be negotiated over the next six months while the final brownfields remediation is completed.

The larger HUB development project will daylight the underground Harbor Brook and create flood control infrastructure needed to eliminate flooding in and downstream of the central business area. Although several versions of the redevelopment have been proposed over the years, the City of Meriden’s Development & Enforcement Department website indicate Figure 38 is the Final Concept Plan. The plan consists of a city center park with transit oriented economic development with the upgraded high-speed Amtrak line running north-south (www.cityofmeriden.org).

Figure 37 Meriden HUB redevelopment final concept plan. Source: City of Meriden, Milone & MacBroom 2007.

Pennrose’s proposal for the HUB site includes a city park with a daylighted brook. Two principal buildings will be constructed along the roadside to help connect to
the street and will provide neighborhood retail with mixed-income housing. An amphitheater and pavilion cafe will also be included.

![Figure 38 HUB Conceptual Site Plan with ground floor plans of retail with mixed-income apartments above. Source: Pennrose, 2014, p. 17.](image1)

Pennrose’s proposal is for one building along State Street and two along Pratt Street. “The two principal proposed buildings are mixed-use and mixed-income, with affordable apartments mixed into the buildings in such a way as to be indistinguishable from the market rate units. All building materials and finishes will be of the highest quality and aesthetically compatible with the existing, historic context of downtown

![Figure 39 Graphic of proposed mixed use building on the HUB site. Source: Penrose, 2014, p. 16.](image2)
Meriden” (Pennrose, 2014, p.14). The third building will be a single story commercial structure that may double as a visitor’s center for the HUB park. The redevelopment is meant to serve as a bridge to the new train station and spill over development into Downtown.

The buildings will have 80 and 90 residential units, respectively, and ground floor retail with housing above. Penrose understood the need for density, affordable housing, and meeting the needs of the surrounding community. Penrose sought to create a mixed-income development targeting units at or below 80% of area medium income (AMI) that will still bring in ample rents; however, this may leave out the poorest of the poor in Meriden.

In order to maximize the density at 50 dwelling units per acre (du/acre) within the TOD the proposed developments must have 10% of the units reserved for residents at affordable income bands. The projects presented herein include both market rate scenarios and mixed income, with 20% of the units at or below 80% of area median income. For both financing feasibility reasons and in order to maximize density on these sites, the scenarios with 20% of the units limited to 80% of AMI, which still carry substantial rents, will likely be the preferred course of development. (p. 14)

The second redevelopment site is located at 11 Crown Street and consists of a 1.6 acre parcel overlooking the larger HUB site. The proposal calls for a five story podium apartment building overlooking the proposed HUB park with potential for ground floor retail or commercial and four smaller, three-story integral garage townhomes to taper down to the lower rise buildings on the southwest side of the neighborhood. A total of 81 mixed income units are proposed. “Michaels anticipates the use of Project Based Section 8, LIHTC (both 9% and 4% with tax exempt bonds), DOH funds, and private mortgage and equity financing. The first two phases will include 25% project based Section 8 units, 55% 9% LIHTC units, and 20% straight market rate units. The third and final phase is projected to be a tax exempt bond phase and include 50% tax credit units and 50% straight market rate units” (Michaels, 2014, p. 9). Landis and McClure have found that does not promote mixed income developments effectively due to the larger profits to developers who construct only affordable units (Landis & McClure, 2010, p. 334). However, since Michaels plans to use a mix of funding sources, their strategy may be more successful.
The final redevelopment proposal by Poko Partners was for the 116 Cook Avenue property located approximately ½ mile to the southwest of the main HUB redevelopment area. Poko proposes to redevelop the main former industrial building. The second phase of the redevelopment would consist of six smaller three and four-story residential buildings constructed around a central recreation area. “The proposed development will consist of 184 mixed-income units distributed throughout the seven buildings. Of the 184 total units, 145 will be market rate and 39 will be affordable to households earning up to 50% AMI. Meriden Mews will include 309 new parking spaces in three separate lots” (Poko, p. 4).
Table 8 details the differences between the Master Plan and the redevelopment proposals. The proposals allow for more mixed-income residential units and retail/commercial space than promoted in the Master Plan, while maintaining the need for a public park and intermodal transportation center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meriden Implementation Table Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUB Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony Street (11 Crown Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory H Area (116 Cook Ave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meriden Intermodal Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that the developers who submitted proposals for the three redevelopment projects within Meriden’s downtown were connected to the needs of the City and its current residents. Without denying the need for economic development and revitalization of the underdeveloped areas of its downtown, the developers were still able to meet the needs of the existing residents with affordable and mixed income units and neighborhood scale retail.

**Conclusions and Lessons Learned**

These two case studies provided unique insight into the world of redevelopment. Waterbury provided a case study of an area with a long history of large scale, State and Federally funded redeveloped. The latest of which began in 2000 and was fully complete in 2005, a full decade ago. This allowed me to analyze the results of the redevelopment and articulate lessons relevant to the DoNo redevelopment. Utilizing
Meriden as a case study showed a parallel redevelopment project, which gave me the opportunity to compare how Meriden’s guiding planning document worked in relation to the received development proposals.

The biggest lesson in Waterbury is that cultural, entertainment, and educational facilities do not always spur private investment, nor does it always spur displacement. The revitalization of the Palace Theater, UConn campus, and Arts Magnet School may be anchors in the neighborhood; however, these were designed for people outside of the surrounding area. This has led to people coming in for one purpose and returning immediately home. Waterbury, like DoNo, could have put out an RFP for mixed-use development to coincide within the redevelopment project.

The poor economy and continual decline of the inner city in Waterbury over the past decade, combined with the design flaws of the redevelopment, revitalization did not spur economic development in the area. Because of this, the surrounding neighborhood actually declined in terms of unemployment and poverty. Gentrification and spillover did not appear to occur as a result of this redevelopment. Due to the projects, some residences and local businesses were displaced anyway.

Meriden, like DoNo, has studied their target area many times in the last decade. Planning does not always immediately kick start development. The planning process may take many years in order to reach a consensus amongst municipal officials and the public. It also allows more time for research and data collection, which may later assist in attracting funding as in Meriden’s case. Because of their years of research into the target area, the City knows its issues well and have been able to collect grants and subsidies to assist in the redevelopment.

Since the Meriden redevelopment project is on a similar time frame as DoNo, comparing the redevelopment proposals with how well they match the Master Plan allowed me to make conclusions on how well DoNo was doing. It appeared as though the developers working in Meriden were much more attuned to the neighborhood needs, while also pursuing the economic development that DoNo seeks. Meriden; however, lacks the same wealthy and expensive Downtown that Hartford has so they had less pull to cater to the non-existent wealthy, young professional demographic in Meriden. Meriden was more successful at getting developers to do affordable housing because it’s
a Choice Neighborhood and had identified the need for affordable housing in previous studies and plans.
Summary & Analysis of DoNo Proposal/Master Plan

The DoNo Master Plan set the precedent for the DoNo Proposal; however, the proposal was centered on the construction of a minor league baseball stadium. While giving this redevelopment an anchor, this significantly changed the developer's perspective. While this area needs economic development, it also needs services and affordable housing for the existing underserved residents to the north and northwest of DoNo. Originally, the Proposal was shy of the Master Plan's recommendation for residential units; however, the City Council was able to increase that number to 116% of that of the Master Plan.

DoNo Implementation Table Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Master Plan</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Final Numbers Approved by Hartford Planning and Zoning Submitted to OSTA</th>
<th>Final Proposal/Master Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential units</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>116.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial SF</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>221,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Active Uses SF</td>
<td>157,310</td>
<td>196,400</td>
<td>349,178</td>
<td>222.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>43,000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>100.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 DoNo implementation table comparison with final numbers approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and submitted to OSTA. Please note that the Proposal includes 220,000 square foot minor league baseball stadium as retail/active uses. The final numbers include 129,178 square feet for retail. Note that 100% in the Final Numbers/Master Plan column on the far right would indicate an exact match between the Proposal and the Master Plan. Percentages higher than 100% indicate the Proposal offers a greater amount than the Master Plan allotted, while those lower than 100% indicate the Proposal offers a far fewer amount.

To analyze the Master Plan and final Proposal, I compared the recommendations to my original research questions. Will the Master Plan provide enough housing to meet the future needs of market rate and affordable housing in this area? Will the potential influx of new residents spill over into the adjacent Clay Arsenal, Asylum Hill, and Upper Albany neighborhoods and cause displacement? What are the factors in creating a successful mixed-income, diverse neighborhood? What are the tools and techniques planners can use to keep existing residents in their homes during the process of gentrification?
Utile’s Master Plan showed that housing growth Downtown is fueled by young professionals with annual salaries of approximately $60,882 as well as empty nesters (older adults whose children are no longer living with them). The analysis indicated that the average young professional’s budget for rent is approximately $750 and $1,000. The research showed that Downtown could support an additional 1,700 to 4,700 units of housing even considering the existing downtown units and the 1,100 units that are planned (Utile p.47). With this information, Utile proposed a total of 2,185 housing units within all five of the development districts. Of these units, 810 were designated for the two districts which are located in DoNo.

The latest numbers for the DoNo Hartford, LLC Proposal designated 941 units for the DoNo area. This area does not include the Downtown West area, which contained three additional development districts. The City appears to have pushed back on DoNo Hartford, LLC whose original Proposal included only 673 housing units. Although this number matches the Master Plan, it leaves a large gap in housing units for Downtown West, which has no current development plans. DoNo Hartford, LLC is not required to fully match the Master Plan; however, it is setting the precedent for development in Downtown Hartford. It may be in the City’s best interest to require development proposals to meet the standards set within its’ Master Plans. Without additional units planned throughout Downtown, there is a possibility of spillover of the targeted higher-income young professionals and empty nesters into the surrounding neighborhoods.

If this mixed-use development succeeds in attracting the large pool of young professionals and empty nesters Utile believes are interested and willing to move to a walkable urban environment in the Hartford area, there is a likely possibility of spillover to the adjacent neighborhoods. While each of the surrounding neighborhoods; Downtown, Asylum Hill, Clay Arsenal, and Upper Albany, all have high housing vacancy rates of 20 to 22%, low median rents in Asylum Hill, Clay Arsenal, and Upper Albany could attract young professionals to these neighborhoods.

Now, it may seem as though with vacancy rates double that of the state, these neighborhoods would simply slowly fill up and have room for any newcomers. In a perfect world this may be true but according to Andrew Helms research “gentrification seems to be undeterred by housing vacancy, particularly during the early stages when
renovators purchase and renovate abandoned buildings that are usually deteriorated but still structurally sound” (Helms, 2003, p. 485). Helms has several other findings that indicate the neighborhoods to the northwest and west of DoNo have the possibility of gentrifying:

By and large, the results confirm intuitive expectations and support anecdotal accounts about the determinants of renovation, particularly as it occurs in the context of gentrification. Older, low-density houses in older, moderate-density neighborhoods are most likely to be renovated. Accessibility to the [Central Business District] CBD matters: improvement is more likely in areas that are close to downtown and well-served by mass transit. Housing vacancy does not deter renovation, but nearby public housing projects do. Neighborhood amenities, including city parks and bodies of water (Lake Michigan in this case), encourage renovation activity (Helms, 496).

Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill are all located adjacent to a maximum of two miles from the CBD (Downtown), are older, moderate-density neighborhoods, and have a fair amount of parks. The DoNo redevelopment may also connect these neighborhoods to Riverside Park and the Connecticut River. These neighborhoods already contain the large Keney Park and Golf Course, Bellevue Square Park, Brackett Park & Parker Community Center, Heartbeat Park, Sigourney Square Park, and are close to Bushnell Park in Downtown.

Hartford’s public transportation is also increasing. There is an existing bus system connecting the surrounding neighborhood to Downtown, as well as a free “dash shuttle” circulating Downtown. The Amtrak train has recently been upgraded to “high-speed” connecting north and south, making it easier to get to cities such as New Haven and New York City. Hartford also has several large entertainment venues, and will have the new minor league baseball stadium in DoNo in Spring 2016.

According to the Metro Hartford Progress Points report developed by the Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, 82% of the 121,000 jobs in Hartford are filled by commuters from the surrounding region. The population of Hartford reportedly doubles during the daytime due to the influx of commuters. These statistics were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau, 2011. Many of these jobs are located in Downtown Hartford, especially those within the insurance and finance industries. Based on this information, coupled with the National trend of people moving back into
urban centers, there is a market for attracting professionals into the city for live, work, and play.

Comparing the final redevelopment Proposal, whose details are in the process of being finalized in a developer agreement with the City Council, with the Master Plan, we see a greater amount of housing, retail, and active uses with far less commercial development. The findings of this project indicate that this will assist in creating a vibrant and successful neighborhood with revitalization. The details regarding affordable housing and what types of future retail establishment are brought in will determine if the development will be beneficial to the existing low-income residents in the surrounding neighborhoods.

The project appears as though it’ll bring in some new people to the DoNo area; however, with Hartford being within a cold market and it being historically low-growth, it is unclear whether or not this redevelopment will create a large enough influx of new population that may cause spill over into the surrounding neighborhoods. That being said, the construction of over 900 housing units is at least a good start to supporting housing in this area and preventing displacement amongst the low-income residents of Clay Arsenal, Asylum Hill, and Upper Albany neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, little information is known regarding the developer’s agreement, as it has yet to be finalized for the mixed-use portion of the redevelopment. According to a Hartford Courant article “Hartford Releases Details of Downtown, Stadium Projects,” local, woman and minority-owned businesses are to be given preference in contract work for the baseball stadium. (Carlesso, Jenna, and Goode Steven). The City should use the developer’s agreement to get neighborhood services, job preferences, or training because it is selling the land below market rate. This is a critical planning tool that can be used to combat any negative impacts of gentrification.

Another planning technique the City could use is to sell a portion of the land to a non-profit to construct affordable housing using LIHTC, in order to more easily create a larger percentage of affordable housing units as it is more profitable for developers to construct all low-income units. This would create a balance of affordable housing constructed and operated by a non-profit and market rate units constructed by the stadium and mixed-use developer. This strategy may be more enticing for the mixed-
use developer as it would relieve them of the affordable housing requirements and need for a subsidy, while streamlining the affordable housing development under a non-profit developers who specializes in affordable housing.

The factors in creating a successful mixed-income, diverse neighborhood are different for every neighborhood. However, a key element is allowing access municipal amenities, such as parks and transit. Separating income levels by structure may not always lead to social and economic segregation if these amenities and opportunities are still accessible to all residents. Planners can use developer’s agreements as their tool to developing successful neighborhoods.
Recommendations

Essential to this project is the question “what is ‘Planning’?” The basis of this Master’s Project is to analyze the potential impacts of a critical piece of planning, a master plan. According to the American Planning Association, Planning works to improve the present and future community.

[Planning] is a dynamic profession that works to improve the welfare of people and their communities by creating more convenient, equitable, healthful, efficient, and attractive places for present and future generations...Good planning helps create communities that offer better choices for where and how people live. Planning helps communities to envision their future. It helps them find the right balance of new development and essential services, environmental protection, and innovative change (www.planning.org).

I began this project in the Spring of 2014 prior to the completion of the DoNo Master Plan or any proposals being submitted to the City for development. I had hope and excitement that this area was ripe for redevelopment. To my pleasant surprise, a major redevelopment of DoNo has unfolded right in front of me. While I am excited for the prospect of revitalization in and around DoNo, as a Planner, I seek to work to the benefit of the entire community.

Throughout my research of housing, gentrification, redevelopment, several case studies, and the details of this project, I have developed several recommendations for the City of Hartford to plan for all the current residents. DoNo’s location as the connecting piece between the contrasting Downtown and North End neighborhoods of Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill makes its’ redevelopment sensitive and political. The needs of the City and its economic development must be balanced with the needs of the existing underserved community.

Affordable Housing

- Hartford should require that 20% of the housing units constructed in DoNo are affordable with affordability restrictions of 80 or 99 years. DoNo Hartford LLC has stated that with the exception of the funding for the baseball stadium, the mixed use development was originally intended to be funded entirely by private financing. This
appears to be DoNo Hartford LLC’s reason for not originally including affordable housing.

- According to an article written by Kenneth Gosselin in the Hartford Courant on February 20, 2015, after they are seeking a $20 million subsidy from the Capital Region Development Authority (CRDA). “[The] city council pushed to have some rentals set aside for low and moderate income households. Those apartments carry lower rents. Centerplan and its partner, Leyland Alliance of New York, had intended not to seek public subsidies. However, including ‘affordable’ housing would create a gap between the cost to develop and the revenue that would be generated” (Gosselin, 2015).

- Additionally, the City should make a concerted effort to map the location of all types of affordable housing: Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher, Section 8 project-based housing, LIHTC developments, and public housing, that are located in the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. This information will arm the City with the knowledge of what units may be most susceptible to conversion to market-rate housing. The City could then work to enforce longer affordability restrictions at these locations. The City could provide resources to properties in need of maintenance or to the most vulnerable properties in terms of conversion and displacement.

Mixed-Income

- The DoNo redevelopment may be seen as something for middle and higher income residents with DoNo Hartford LLC stating that wealthier young professionals will be targeted and catered to at the start of this redevelopment. However, there are many efforts to make the development beneficial for the Hartford residents, especially in the surrounding neighborhoods. The need for a grocery store is high in these neighborhoods that have been classified as food deserts. The City should ensure that this grocery store is in the price range of those residents who need it now. Additionally, the grocery store is located in the south-central portion of DoNo and closer to Downtown than the underserved neighborhoods to the north and northwest. It would be more beneficial to the
residents of the food desert if it were located closer to them. It is understandable that not all of the retail and housing will be affordable to all the residents of Hartford; however, an effort should be made to include amenities for those of varying incomes and backgrounds.

- The City should use the developer’s agreement to get neighborhood services, job preferences, or training because it is selling the land below market rate.
- A technique the City could use is to sell a portion of the land to a non-profit to construct affordable housing using LIHTC, in order to more easily create a larger percentage of affordable housing units as it is more profitable for developers to construct all low-income units. This would create a balance of affordable housing constructed and operated by a non-profit and market rate units constructed by the stadium and mixed-use developer. This strategy may be more enticing for the mixed-use developer as it would relieve them of the affordable housing requirements and need for a subsidy, while streamlining the affordable housing development under a non-profit developers who specializes in affordable housing.

Master Plan

- Since DoNo Hartford, LLC is only focusing on DoNo and not Downtown West, the City of Hartford should push DoNo Hartford, LLC to match the Master Plan as best as possible to set a precedent for any potential Downtown West development. Additionally, the City should make a concerted effort to match the Master Plan’s additional housing units to meet the potential demand in the Downtown area. The creation of the attractive mixed-used neighborhood in Downtown will certainly bring in new residents to Hartford’s Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. Hartford must plan for the possibility of spill over into the surrounding neighborhoods of Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill.

Case Studies

- In terms of revitalization, Hartford should learn from Waterbury that bringing in cultural, entertainment, and educational facilities may not bring the economic development and private investment needed to create a vibrant and attractive
neighborhood for people to live in. Waterbury’s redevelopment brought in no housing, restaurants, or shops and was aimed for those who live outside of the greater Downtown area to drive in to use one facility and go home afterwards, eliminating much of the desired economic development and street life Waterbury desired.

- Attracting the minor league baseball stadium is a fantastic catalyst to the redevelopment of DoNo; however, if this is the only piece initially completed, DoNo will likely see the commuter-centric result of middle to high-income outsiders coming in for the sole purpose of going to the stadium and leaving immediately after without spending time in the surrounding areas around the stadium. This will leave DoNo in a similar state as it is today with the exception of a beautiful baseball stadium sitting amongst other vacant and underutilized parcels. The residential and retail mixed-use portion of the redevelopment will be the true anchor for the DoNo neighborhood.

- DoNo Hartford LLC and the City of Hartford could utilize resources and funding from various sources, which cities like Meriden and Waterbury took advantage of for their redevelopment. As in Meriden’s redevelopment, DoNo Hartford should work to make the affordable units blend in with the market rate units in a success mixed-income environmental. The structures should be compatible with the existing context of the surrounding neighborhoods, not just Downtown. This redevelopment should not just be an extension of the high-income and expensive Downtown, but should be beneficial to the Clay Arsenal, Upper Albany, and Asylum Hill neighborhoods as well.
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