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PLAN PURPOSE

This plan will explore the current conditions of Highland Park, review best practices in community revitalization and make recommendations to 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC for the use of the site at 3014 Meadowbridge Road in the Highland Park Neighborhood. By understanding the factors that lead to disinvestment, as well as the impacts to the community, recommendations will be identified based on opportunity-based research conducted within the community. The primary goals of this plan are to: 1. Connect the building owned by 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church to Education, Health and Housing needs in the community. 2. Foster and create relationships with 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church to other community assets already existing in the neighborhood. While this is an opportunity-based plan due to the ownership of the building, it will be conducted as a community-based plan.

CLIENT DESCRIPTION

The 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church has been an integral part of the Richmond community since they open in 1909. From its early beginnings, the church was very active in providing services to the community. They began providing food to the community through free soup and sandwich programs, as well as hot meals on holidays. Warm clothing being offered during the cold, winter months, programs to help with alcohol or narcotics were hosted there by Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous. The church has also helped by creating tutoring programs in the fellowship hall to assist children with schoolwork. These programs have allowed the church to embrace a mission-based orientation and have created very strong connections within the community. With these connections in mind, the church has created the 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC. This entity is a vital component of the 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church. The formation of the CDC was to continue to provide quality care and services to the community without the potential constraints associated with being a place of worship. This CDC is committed to the education and empowerment of its residents and wants to retain the current resident population. In order to provide the best recommendations, the focus will be
on utilizing the connections the church has in and to the community, the utilization of the physical space at 3014 Meadowbridge Rd and the clients desire to improve educational, worship, and community development concerns in the Highland Park neighborhood.

BACKGROUND

History

Established in the 1890s through an annexation decree, the Highland Park neighborhood became one of Richmond, Virginia’s original streetcar suburbs. Figure 1 shows the suburb in relation to the city of Richmond. The neighborhood was comprised of several historic districts north of downtown Richmond, Virginia that include East Highland Park, North Highland Park (Highland Park Plaza), and South Highland Park (Chestnut Hill/Plateau). Containing six neighborhoods: North Highland Park, Green park, Highland Terrace, Providence Park, Highland park Southern Tip, and Magnolia Industrial Center, this area was an opportunity for growth.

![Figure 1. Highland Park location within City of Richmond Boundaries](Source: Google Maps)
Figure 2. Displays the relationship of the different neighborhoods in proximity to the site, marked with a purple triangle. As with most growth, once the homeowners were settled, businesses followed. Different types of businesses, from grocers to restaurants, and entertainment outlets like movie theaters were introduced into the community fabric and began booming. During this period of growth, there were many laws that prevented African Americans from moving into the neighborhood. This type of restriction was not just happening in Richmond, but across the nation. There were also shifts and advancements in technology that caused personal vehicles to flourish, as well as changes to public transportation.

The area declined after World War II, when the integration of public schools, the introduction of public housing, and other economic factors encouraged wealthy and middle-class residents to depart for newer neighborhoods in the city’s West End (also known as White Flight). The empty homes were then rented by immigrants and African Americans who migrated into the area. After “White Flight”, Segregation practices, like Red Lining and Jim Crow ended, this neighborhood was one of the first
places affluent African Americans moved to. Part of the relocation to this neighborhood was due to its proximity to Jackson Ward, or “The Black Wall Street”.

Existing conditions

Figure 3. shows the Target Study area and the location of the building at 3014 Meadowbridge Rd, in the red rectangle. This building is currently zoned UB-PE8 with a building square footage of 32,381, and a finished living area of 14470. This building is located in and Enterprise zone: III and it has a Master Plan Future Land Use designation of: CM-NB. This once thriving neighborhood has a few different indicators of disinvestment. The need to understand the effects of disinvestment on residents and businesses is vital in order to provide more equitable and inclusive communities. To center my focus and research, I will home in on the central themes of:

- The historic conditions, policies and practices that make communities more susceptible to disinvestment.
- The way investment/disinvestment patterns are affected today as a result of these conditions.
- The ways that disinvestment impacts communities.
Through these lenses, it is the goal to provide a plan recommendation that will allow the best community engagement in order to retain current residents, build upon the assets in the community to increase the human capital in the area and utilize the building location to create a continuous, community-based atmosphere that address community needs.

The difficulty in accomplishing this goal is compounded by the fact that this site is in a neighborhood that has suffered from historical disinvestment and is viewed by many residents, to be in the early stages of gentrification. Figure 4 shows some of examples of improvements to the Highland Park neighborhood. The top two picture show the before and after view of a 1.2-million-dollar revitalization of infrastructure and transit in the form of a roundabout in 2016. The bottom two pictures show the before and after of refurbishing of the 11.4-million-dollar redevelopment of Highland Park High School in Highland Park Senior Living Apartments in 2015. As property values continue to shift, rental affordability will be the next factor to make an appearance, unless steps are taken to prevent the disinvestment of this historic area.

Figure 4. Highland Park Six Point improvements. *Clockwise from Top: Top right; Previous Six Points intersection, Top left; Current Six Points intersection, Bottom left; Previous Highland Park High School, Bottom right; Current Highland Park Senior Living Housing.*

Source: Left: RVAHub, Right: Richmond Times Dispatch
Figure 5. displays the location of the three census tracts that make up the Target Study Area. The three census tracts are: 108, 109, and 110. The blue triangle represents the building location and the red circle is the .5-mile radius from the site that creates our Target Study Area. The initial indicator that pointed to disinvestment in this neighborhood was the disparity in the new resident population within this Target Study Area. With more than 220,000 people, Richmond is a thriving community, having increased its population slightly less than ten percent since 2010. This area has been representing 9,420, or approximately 4% Richmond residents. Of the 9420 residents, many of them are African American, in fact 86% of them.1

Below, Table 1 shows the growth of the City of Richmond’s population from 2010 to 2017. From 2010 to 2017 the City of Richmond has grown approximately

1 U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates
9.5% in population. Although the Target Study Area has represented around 4% of the population in both years, the Target Study Area has actually declined by 0.34%. This indicated that while new residents were moving to the Richmond area as a whole, many of them are not moving into this area. It also indicates that residents living in this neighborhood are also migrating as well. In America, racial diversity has much more often come to white neighborhoods. Between 1980 and 2000, more than 98 percent of census tracts that grew more diverse did so in that way, as Hispanic, Asian-American and African American families settled in neighborhoods that were once predominantly white.

But since 2000, according to an analysis of demographic and housing data, the arrival of white residents is now changing nonwhite communities in cities of all sizes, affecting about one in six predominantly African American census tracts. The pattern, though still modest in scope, is playing out with remarkable consistency across the country — in ways that jolt the mortgage market, the architecture, the value of land itself.\(^2\) Out of the 66 census tracts in the City of Richmond, these census tracts have lost over 1/3

of their population. This can affect new development in the area, improvements to infrastructure and even the health and education of the residents.

A second indicator of disinvestment is the racial disparity in the Target Study Area. In Table 2, the City of Richmond has been broken down into majority demographics for the years 2000, 2010 and 2017. The City of Richmond has a majority demographic of African American residents, followed by Caucasian and in 2000 and 2010. African Americans are 54% of the population while the next major majority, Caucasian, is 44%. In 2017, there was a 6% drop in the African American population and a slight increase in the Caucasian population by 1%. Even with this adjustment to the overall city landscape, the table shows that the racial breakdown of the Target Study Area has not changed much at all.

Table 3 shows that during this same timeframe this Target Study Area has not only increased its African American population but has also significantly increased its Caucasian demographic. This trend may also connect to the trend of increasing property values in the area due to recent infrastructure improvements. A third indicator and one of the largest impediments for the Target Study Area is income instability. Income instability is defined as repeated changes in income that are unpredictable or unintentional and that do not lead to improved economic circumstances. Part of this issue is due to the lack of available jobs within the area, the other part is the cost to live in the area.

---

Table 4 shows a comparison of the Median Income in 2017 for The United States, the State of Virginia, the City of Richmond and the Target Study Area. This allows a comparison to evaluate the Target Study Area against the National average. This data indicates that the Target Study Area has many residents bringing in 27% less income than the rest of the city. Residents with income stability have impacts they suffer from aside from limited funds or access. They must choose how to utilize or spend their resources wisely. Oftentimes having to make sacrifices to maintain a daily sense of “routine”. This can affect the ability to save, move, obtain childcare, medical services and also creates other obstacles to building equity.

Figure 6 shows the diversity growth in the City of Richmond and each of its neighborhoods based on data from the Census for the years 2000-2017. Neighborhoods where the Caucasian population grew are represented in orange, neighborhoods where the Non-Caucasian population grew are in blue and areas that have not changed diversity in are in white. This figure shows us that most of the Caucasian diversity is occurring near the city center. While the Non-Caucasian diversity is occurring in the suburbs. In the suburbs, a far different set of

| Source: Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community 5-Year Estimates |
| Figure 6. Neighborhood Diversity growth in Richmond, Virginia between 2000 and 2017 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Median Income Comparison 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL AVERAGE 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income (dollars)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Census Bureau, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data
processes is driving the demographic change, as middle-class minority families seek more space or better schools, as immigrant communities take root, or as families are increasingly priced out of the city. To focus on the Target Study Area in order to obtain a better idea of what this means for the area, we turn to Table 4.

Table 5 shows us that each census tract in the Target Study Area has not only become more racially diverse, the new residents are on average making $10-$20K more than the current residents. Another alarming trend to be identified is how many of the loans offered in this Target Study Area were to Caucasian buyers. Across the nation, public housing projects were demolished for mixed-income housing, cities reinvested in neglected downtowns, and innovative infield and brownfield projects were created to meet additional housing needs.

The run-up in home prices in the early 2000’s also left middle-class households searching for affordable housing. By then, many working-class white neighborhoods in good locations had already gentrified. Predominantly African American and Hispanic neighborhoods were what remained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Caucasian population in 2010</th>
<th>Loans to Caucasian Buyers</th>
<th>Mean Income</th>
<th>Mean Income +/- between All Households and Caucasian Buyers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Households in 2012:</td>
<td>All homeowners in 2012:</td>
<td>Caucasian buyers, 2012-2017:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>$42K</td>
<td>$45K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>$39K</td>
<td>$52K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$43K</td>
<td>$51K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Target Study Area Diversity growth in Richmond, Virginia between 2000 and 2017**

Sources: Census Bureau, Home Mortgage Disclosure Act data

---


To further support this claim of income instability, Table 6 shows a Below Poverty Level Comparison for the City of Richmond and the Target Study Area for 2010 & 2017. This table shows how the level of income has changed within the area compared to the city as a whole. The Poverty guidelines for 2020 include: For families/households with more than 8 persons, add $4,480 for each additional person. For families/households with more than 8 persons, add $5,600 for each additional person. For families/households with more than 8 persons, add $5,150 for each additional person.\(^6\) There are two slightly different versions of the federal poverty measure: poverty thresholds and poverty guidelines. The poverty thresholds are the original version of the federal poverty measure. They are updated each year by the Census Bureau. The thresholds are used mainly for statistical purposes — for instance, preparing estimates of the number of Americans in poverty each year. The poverty guidelines are the other version of the federal poverty measure. They are issued each year in the Federal Register by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The poverty guidelines are sometimes loosely referred to as the “federal poverty level”.\(^7\) By comparing the percentage of the City or Richmond that is living under the Poverty Line and the Target Study Area, it will be possible to identify other trends or impacts for residents.

By viewing Table 6, it is easy to recognize that the Poverty Level for all people has remained approximately the same overall for the City of Richmond. The most drastic portion of this data is the dramatic 10% increase to the population living below the Poverty Line in Census Tract 110. Much of this increase can be explained by the decrease in income level within this Tract. The other section showing an increase is in Census Tract 108. Like Census Tract 110, we can use the dramatic change in income level data to explain this almost 50% increase in Poverty Level. Separate from the percentage living below the Poverty Line and Income Level, but also a major factor in income, is the unemployment rate. The unemployment rate is the percentage of unemployed workers in the total labor force.

---


Table 7 contains the Unemployment Rate percentages for the United States, State of Virginia, the City of Richmond, the individual tracts within the Target Study Area and the combined Census Tracts in the Target Study Area for 2010 and 2017. In 2010 each Tract within the Target Study Area are all significantly more than the National average, in most cases twice the percentage. Each of them is also twice the State percentage as well. Combined, this Target Study Area made up more than 15% of Richmond’s combined Unemployment Rate. While the National and State percentages have remained approximately the same in 2017, the percentage shifts within the census tracts are dramatic. With the Unemployment Rate sharply decreasing by 14.10% in Census Tract 109 and almost reducing by 50% in Census Tract 108, the narrative appears that things are getting better.

While this is true to a degree, this combination of financial setbacks and roadblocks have hindered this community for a long time. These hindrances have also segued into other aspects of the resident’s lives. With the aforementioned financial difficulties, it is difficult to establish income stability. Aside from financial repercussions, this inability to generate income stability can also affect the ability to participate in the legislative process that impacts your neighborhood. Financial constraints also play a major part in where you or your family live, go to school, shop or attend church. Each of these things could allow a person to elevate their status and increase their socioeconomic abilities. Overall, 61 percent of high-poverty tracts (with poverty rates above 20 percent) and 55 percent of majority-minority neighborhoods experienced declines in job proximity between 2000 and 2012. A growing number of these tracts are in
suburbs, where nearby jobs for the residents of these neighborhoods dropped at a much faster pace than for the typical suburban resident (17 and 16 percent, respectively, versus 7 percent).\(^8\)

Another indicator of disinvestment in this neighborhood is the limited educational offerings. Table 8 shows the current education institutions within Census Tracts: 108,109 and 110. Overby Sheppard Elementary school and Barack Obama High Schools are nearby, but there are no schools within the Target Study Area. There have been recent interventions that have created afterschool and educational programs in the Six Points Innovation Center, the neighborhood for teenage residents.

Tables 9 displays the educational attainment for 2010 and 2017 in the City of Richmond. While there has been a slight decline in high school graduation citywide, there has been an influx in attaining a bachelor’s degree or higher. When compared to the Target Study Area in Tables 13 and 14, there is a very marked difference in the levels of attainment. While there is a very large portion of residents that attain a high school diploma within the Target Study Area, the percentage of residents who pursue their education further is less than 20%.

Employment and education are the two basic ways a person can improve their situation. This lack of jobs and educational opportunities available within proximity to this neighborhood and other low-income resident’s influence housing options that are not always affordable or stable. Housing stability is another indicator of disinvestment. This Target Study Area is also suffering from fluctuating property values. Table 10 shows the City of Richmond’s median property values from 2010 and 2017. Once again, this data is displayed by Census Tract as a method of comparison. Instead of combining the tracts, which may provide a false narrative, they are displayed separately to showcase the drastic changes in this community. This table shows that through the time period examined, the property values across the City of Richmond remained very similar. Within the Target Study Area, there has been a dramatic decrease in the median property values.

Table 9. Educational Attainment Comparison - City of Richmond vs Target Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Richmond</th>
<th>Target Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Attainment</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree of higher</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining population</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community 5-Year Estimates Decennial Census

Table 10. Median Property Values Comparison - City of Richmond vs Target Study area Census Tracts 2010 & 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Richmond</th>
<th>Census Tract 108</th>
<th>Census Tract 109</th>
<th>Census Tract 110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Property Values</strong></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>201,800</td>
<td>105,600</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$209,200</td>
<td>$90,400</td>
<td>$122,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+/- (%)</td>
<td>+3.7</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community 5-Year Estimates Decennial Census
This fluctuation in property values for the combined Target Study Area did not represent the full picture of how these increases make it easy for a long-time resident to become burdened by higher taxes, but the same amount of pay. Increased property values also cause other economic factors, like rising rents which may contribute to displaced residents. Lowered property values also create problems for residents as well. Lower property values encourage investors and developers to buy homes, rehabilitate them and resell them for higher prices. This often causes property values to rise and also removes the original residents from the community.

Eviction also plays a large role in housing insecurity. According to Eviction Lab, Virginia’s eviction rate is twice the national average. The problem is even worse in the City of Richmond. According to the Princeton Eviction Lab, among large U.S. cities in 2016, Richmond had the 2nd highest eviction rate in the country at 11.44%. This is three to four times the national average and has remained steady over the past 16 years. A total of 30.9% of all Richmond renters receive a notice of eviction in any given year. Virginia Supreme Court and sheriff department data reveal, 56 Richmond families were evicted from their homes every week in 2017; in certain neighborhoods the number of evictions was twice as high. This study also found that within the Target Study Area, at the block group level, eviction is a major concern.

Below, Table 1 shows the Eviction rates for each Census Tract in 2020. The impacts of eviction are often a ripple effect. Those ripples not only affect the entire family, but the community as well. Not only is this family displaced, it creates added financial burden on them by having to find accommodations and resources to salvage what they can before eviction day. Sometimes work is

---

missed, causing less money to be coming in at this critical time. The likelihood of being laid off is 15% higher for workers who have experienced an eviction.¹²

Children are affected by possibly losing time from school and that can affect them in the long term. A recent study by RVA Eviction Lab at Virginia Commonwealth University found that the schools in areas with the highest eviction rates had the highest rates of chronic absenteeism, and the Richmond elementary school located in the area with the lowest eviction rate had one of the lowest rates of absenteeism. The low eviction/low absenteeism elementary school is fully accredited; the highest eviction/absenteeism elementary school is not accredited at all.¹³

The loss to the community is two-fold. There is the loss of resident, who brought assets and revenue to the community and the loss of the community ties that resident had. There is also the loss of income the landlord received on that property. “Evictions are expensive for landlords, because by the time they get to housing court, they’ve usually gone without rent for at least a month. If the tenant is evicted, it can take several months before landlords find and screen a new tenant.” – Tracey Benton, President of the


Table 11. Eviction estimates within the Target Study Area 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>108</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eviction Rate</strong></td>
<td>19.61%</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
<td>23.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evictions</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupancy /Vacancy rates and Tenure are also good indicators of a disinvested community. Occupancy/Vacancy is counting the buildings in a neighborhood or area and tabulating the total number of vacant and occupied units. Vacant lots can be a visible indicator of future displacement; they are effectively the placeholders for future development. Table 12 Shows that there has been an occupancy shift in the City of Richmond from 2010 and 2017. In 2010 the Occupancy rate for the city of Richmond was 86% while in 2017 it was 89%. With a little more than 2400 new units in 2017, the Vacancy rate for the Target Study Area was more than 28% of the Total housing units. With the City of Richmond at 14.2% it shows an alarming trend. In 2017, the Total Study

Area, overall, had approximately 8.5% more Housing units than in 2010, but 6% less Occupied units. It also shows that the number of Vacant units had increased by 84%.

Tenure shows the number of homes that are being rented versus owned. Table 13 shows the Tenure for the Target Study Area for 2010 and 2017. When reviewing this data, it shows that the number of Owner-occupied dwellings has increased by 7 residents (.5%), while the number of renters to migrate to the area has grown by more than 200. (12%). With minorities being excluded from homeownership in the past, this trend helps to identify that homeownership for the current residents is still a very large problem. This also points to another concern, which is that new units being built are for new owners, not for the current residents or their income bracket.

When examining the struggle low-income individuals have, it is apparent that many of these issues are connected and troublesome enough on their own, without the added impact of disinvestment. Another indicator of a disinvested neighborhood is the individual and community reliance on federal and state aid. Table 14 shows the comparison of current total
households in the City of Richmond and the Target Study Area who received SNAP for the Target Study Area in 2017, while Table 15 shows the comparison of total households who received Disability in the City of Richmond and the Target Study Area in 2017. Being able to determine the number of residents who receive this benefit can allow me to see trends in this neighborhood and find other precedent interventions from similar neighborhoods.

When analyzing this data, it became very evident that this is a serious indicator of disinvestment. In 2017, the City of Richmond overall had approximately 16% of its residents receiving SNAP, while the census tracts in the Target Study Area were showing averages of 20%. The City of Richmond also had approximately 50% of its residents receiving Disability and the census tracts within the Target Study Area were showing averages of 34%. This data is very helpful in identifying the types of services the resident population may want or need in the community. With having to qualify for SNAP, it shows there is a large, verifiable, concentration of low-income residents within this Target Study Area.

One last indicator of a disinvested neighborhood that is often used is Crime. This analysis is based on a high-level view. The reason for this is that the City of Richmond Crime data is provided on a Civic Association, Council District, Neighborhood, Police Precinct, Police Sector, and Dispatch Zone level. With the other levels of data being at a Census Tract level, there is no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14. SNAP Comparison 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF RICHMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSUS TRACT 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSUS TRACT 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSUS TRACT 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community 5-Year Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15. Disability Comparison 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF RICHMOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSUS TRACT 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSUS TRACT 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENSUS TRACT 108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 American Community 5-Year Estimates
correlating data. The current data set was obtained at the Neighborhood level and only included the crimes of: Homicide, Sex Offense, Robbery, Assault, Burglary, Vice (Prostitution), Theft, and Vehicle Theft. When calculated from 01/01/2010 to 12/31/2017, Table 16 shows this as an aggregate compared against the City of Richmond. Considering these crimes, the Target Study area was responsible for 4% or less of all the Total compared crime in Richmond.

The data indicates that while crime may be a factor to consider, it is not a dominant factor within this Target Study Area. In researching recommendations, they will be general safety measures to ensure residents are safe and “feel” safe as well. To obtain the most detailed data, any reevaluation of current data and collection of future data sets will be conducted on a Census Block Group Level.

In summary, this area has shown many different indicators of disinvestment. These indicators will influence the methods used to communicate and execute this plan. The history of this neighborhood is important. It is imperative not only to preserve that history, but to also curate it into a living narrative. A compositional shift in the urbanizing population, not a surge in population growth in urban neighborhoods, has driven recent neighborhood change.16 With many more educated people in Richmond, trends indicate a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/ Type of Crime</th>
<th>HOMICIDE</th>
<th>SEX OFFENSE</th>
<th>ROBBERY</th>
<th>ASSAULT</th>
<th>BURGLARY</th>
<th>VICE</th>
<th>THEFT</th>
<th>VEHICLE THEFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Study Area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>4777</td>
<td>36059</td>
<td>13661</td>
<td>17004</td>
<td>48737</td>
<td>7730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

reversal of “White Flight” that is displacing residents. Considering that, this neighborhood has all the earmarks of a disinvested neighborhood and is a candidate poised for the possibility of future gentrification.

Research background

This plan identified four specific themes and will investigate them in more detail further. The first theme identified is the social and cultural effects disinvestment and gentrification has on the health of the residents. The second theme identified is the social and cultural effects disinvestment and gentrification has on housing for residents. The third theme is the social and cultural effects of disinvestment and gentrification on education. The last theme will research different effects of disinvestment and gentrification on community development. The main hope of resolution is to be able to identify Engagement and Empowerment strategies that are conducive for execution within the Highland Park neighborhood. It is the plan’s intent to utilize findings in the pieces below to establish, clarify and hopefully resolve and answer the research question. While it is important to gather data on low-income communities, communities of color and other marginalized communities, pertinent data will be reviewed from all around the world.

Literature Review

Some scholars have identified several categories of community-based projects. They are community as setting, community as target, community as agent, and community as resource. This plan will utilize the community as a resource strategy. Community as a resource means that every person, building, and organization are all considered resources. The execution is connecting these resources to each other for a singular vision to improve a community priority. This model is being utilized because of the widely

endorsed belief that a high degree of community ownership and participation is essential for sustained success. Some successful programs that have utilized this model have included the National Healthy Start program, the “healthy cities” initiatives and the federal Center for Substance Abuse Prevention Community Partnership program.\textsuperscript{19} Without residents taking an interest in their community, these types of programs wouldn’t work. Things like drugs, crime could escalate, and the overall sense of community would fade. Community as a resource-based frameworks and activities that are used by community leadership and support organizations to facilitate the process of community empowerment and engagement help improve collaborative partnerships for community health, education and housing development.\textsuperscript{20}

Disinvestment leading to Gentrification

Often many combined indicators of disinvestment can lead to gentrification. The impacts of gentrification can be viewed as a debatable topic, within the context of under invested neighborhoods. Some argue that gentrification is good because it increases the economic value of a neighborhood, improves the economy, decreases crime in an area, and increases property values and taxes.\textsuperscript{21} While the homeowners, tenants and middle-class individuals enjoy the fresh new city, there are other individuals from the community who face negative effects due to gentrification. Some of these effects are displacement, loss of community/culture and shifts in socioeconomic dynamics.


There will be some renters that no longer are capable of paying the rent and will be displaced. In terms of education, low income families are displaced and that means changing the school the child goes to. With the increase of middle and upper class individuals in a gentrified neighborhood, these families tend to be more involved in the education of their children, and match that with more demands on the local school system. Some authors define gentrification as private sector-initiated residential and commercial investment in urban neighborhoods accompanied by inflows of households with higher socioeconomic status than the neighborhood’s initial residents. Aside from the physical displacement, many resident also suffer from a cultural displacement. The shifts in the long-term populations of the once disinvested and structurally segregated neighborhoods have resulted in significant collective displacement of low-income, largely African American renting communities. Residents aren’t just losing a home, often they must cut ties with friends, businesses, and traditions that they hold dear to them. Often, these ties are hard to replace or re-create. The ability to control public spaces, housing or governance in a community – a signature of gentrification – can change the way that communities are experienced and understood – which ultimately translates into individual and institutional level investment in the neighborhood.

---

Impact of Disinvestment on Housing Instability

Disinvestment can also lead to gentrification because when reinvestment occurs, it forces out low-income residents due to the increased cost of rents and higher cost of goods which can lead to involuntary population migration and displacement.\textsuperscript{26} Often, this changes the culture of the community, can cause resentment from the previous residents and it creates a space that excludes low-income individuals and/or people of color. This theme indicates that gentrification is usually defined or based on two distinct tenants. Economic gentrification and Cultural gentrification. Economic gentrification is defined by a “rent-gap”, which describes the value of (devalued) inner city land and its potential value (if regenerated).\textsuperscript{27} Economic gentrification offers a counter point to this argument that gentrification leads to displacement. It offers a “back-to-the-city “movement vibe, indicating that these communities are being reclaimed by middle class people who are tired of commuting, tired of their low-density suburbs and seek an alternative to their growing social concerns and problems (traffic emissions, city transit etc.)\textsuperscript{28} One scholar would even suggest that this middle-class population are just opportunists, a homogenous and undifferentiated mass.\textsuperscript{29} A mass of bodies seeking cheap shelter and close amenities.

This type of gentrification is also paired with another type of gentrification known as “Studentification. This group, also known as “apprentice gentrifiers” are attracted to contemporary inner cities and city centers in proximity to universities, cultural facilities and concentrations of other students.\textsuperscript{30} Change in residential neighborhoods is inevitable whether a neighborhood gentrifies or not. The


problem is not that it is happening, it is how it is occurring. Forcing a sizable portion of community members to move is harmful both to them and to those who remain.\textsuperscript{31} By having been able to identify multiple effects to housing based on gentrification, it is not hard to see how community members would have other areas of their lives affected by housing instability in their changing neighborhoods. When residents remain in the gentrified area, they feel a sense of loss regarding the space. Aside from the neighborhood, they lose neighbors, familiar routines and emotional security.\textsuperscript{32} The anxiety, stress and depression that is felt is not healthy. These long-term effects of displacement have been documented and are a necessary factor to consider.

Impact of Disinvestment on Education

The effects of disinvestment on education seem to be a benefit to a portion of the community (that remain) and a detriment to others (that leave). The benefit is that when families with higher incomes move in, the area receives more taxes that can go to the school for resources. This is another benefit because it helps add an integration of different social and economic classes for the school in that community. The detriment to this situation is this can only happen if these new higher income families decide to enroll their child in their neighborhood school.\textsuperscript{33} Some families moving into gentrifying neighborhoods want to improve the educational opportunities for their kids. Some also go as far as pushing for a charter school in the area or even enhancing the public school.\textsuperscript{34} This push also creates problems. When the middle- and upper-class parents send their kids to charter or private schools then public schools begin to lose students from that socioeconomic background and that causes a large segment of low-income students in the


\textsuperscript{34} Hankins, K. B. (2007). The Final Frontier: Charter Schools as New Community Institutions of Gentrification. \textit{Urban Geography}, 28(2), 113–128. DOI: 10.2747/0272-3638.28.2.113
public schools to become marginalized.\footnote{Pineda, M. (n.d.). The Effects of Gentrification: Inhabitants, Education, and Displacement. Retrieved September 23, 2019, from https://scholarworks.umb.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1027&context=honors_theses.} Those who have studied this problem and written about have noted that nonwhite, low-income families do not have the same opportunity to be able to exercise their school-choice options like the white upper-income parents do.\footnote{Gallagher, M., & Reed Jordan. (2017, February 2). Does School Choice Affect Gentrification? Retrieved October 23, 2019, from https://www.urban.org/research/publication/does-school-choice-affect-gentrification.}

How to implement Community Development in Disinvested areas

Asset-based community development (ABCD), or asset-based community-driven development as it is sometimes called, is a bottom-up way of working with communities that focuses on community strengths and assets rather than on deficits and problems. This approach has recognized that communities are flawed and that by focusing on the “haves” instead of the “have nots”, there is a better opportunity to connect with individuals within the community. ABCD is built on four foundations: First, it focuses on community assets and strengths rather than problems and needs. Second, it identifies and mobilizes individual and community assets, skills and passions. Third, it is community driven – “building communities from the inside out”. Finally, it is relationship driven.

The main theme within ABCD is to be inclusive. Everyone in the community is an asset and has something to offer. The main assets are usually broken down in categories. Categories include individuals, associations, institutions, physical assets, and connections. These categories are used to map or identify the assets in a given community. ABCD also stresses the importance of social capital as a cornerstone of sustainable community engagement. While this approach has had many planners and community members praising it, there are those who suggest that this is not a solution for long-term problems. Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD) was originally conceived as an approach to support community development in deprived inner-city populations
in the United States in the early 1990’s. The last part of ABCD is Asset Mapping. Asset mapping is also intended to encourage engagement and promote cooperative relationships within communities which is also a key outcome associated with ABCD. ABCD may well present a problem in that it explicitly favors interpretation through the value frameworks brought into being through its process by which the participants, local communities, and actors understand outcomes. The last issue with ABCD is that when programs or policies are introduced, outside organizations are in the administration seat instead of the community members. Asset Based Community Development will prove to be a challenge should there is not enough community support.

The role of Disinvestment on Equitable development

To identify themes in equitable development, Equitable development had to first be defined. Equitable development is an approach for meeting the needs of underserved communities through policies and programs that reduce disparities while fostering places that are healthy and vibrant. It is increasingly considered an effective placed-based action for creating strong and livable communities. Equitable development is driven by priorities, values, and clear expectations that the outcomes from development need to be responsive to underserved populations and vulnerable groups. Because their unique narrative often excluded or missing from planning, design other place-based discussion, Lower-income citizens and people of color must be included to help successfully guide the changes that occur within their communities rather than reacting to them. This is to be achieved through the foundational elements in equitable development: Strong communities and people, and Great places with equitable access. The themes identified were affordable housing, quality education, transportation and good paying jobs. A second theme found was this approach is most

---

37 Lewin, L. (1947). Group Decision and Social Change. Readings in social psychology, 3(1), 197-211
often used in low-income communities. This will be a benefit due to ease of approach and its use in other interventions. The challenge faced will be to introduce assets to other assets, establishing a strong connection between the assets and connect them with long-term solutions that they can administer themselves.

Disinvestment is a hot-button topic and is creating an opportunity to open the doors of communication between residents and the planners in their community. Using these data sources, it has determined that many cities and regions plan for diversity and inclusion without participation from the community. By identifying better ways to connect and engage with the community, it is believed that planning can become more effective and inclusive. By focusing the research through an Asset Based lens, it will be possible to research and utilize the best methods of Community engagement.

This process will unfold in five phases.

- First phase: Identify the high-level narrative.
- Second phase: Present the high-level narrative.
- Third phase: Obtain Community narrative.
- Fourth phase: Analyze and Compare the two narratives.
- Fifth phase: Present community narrative and recommendations based off of narratives.
The Highland Park neighborhood is prime example of Rational Planning. Through institutional policies created by government officials, like Segregation and Jim Crow laws, this community has had limited involvement in the development of the neighborhood. With a history of being excluded in the decision-making process through Rational Planning, this plan will focus on the Communicative Planning method of community involvement to engage the community and use Radical Planning theory to make recommendations.

To identify which type of citizen participation must be utilized, reference was made to Arnstein’s Ladder of Citizen Participation, shown in Figure 7. Where Rational Planning relied heavily on quantitative data and not on community input, Communicative Planning relies heavily on community input as well as data. This allowed the community being affected to have a voice, influence and control within their community. They received a seat at the “power” table and power over what happened around them. Even if they cannot stop the action, their voices are considered essential. This is a very important theory for marginalized and disinvested communities, mostly because their narrative is often unheard. Radical planning provides a critique of capitalism, its perpetuation of poverty, and its deleterious effects on many local neighborhoods.\(^\text{40}\)

---

Interventions in this community need to have community involvement from the ground up.

When using comparing these theories on Arnstein’s Ladder of Citizen Participation, we find Rational Planning to be on the low end of community participation and Radical Planning on the high end. The basic goal of this project is first, to bring the community into the conversation. Many decisions have been taken in the Highland Park neighborhood without resident input. With that being the case, this intervention must be taken upon their behalf and it is imperative that I receive their feedback. In the Abram’s piece, Criteria for Urban Renewal, he suggested that: Any project, public or private, or publicly assisted, must leave room for the occupants to leave something of their own. This plan will utilize this method to help make this space a place the residents feel is their own.

To better align the question with the desired information requested, the clarifying research questions are:

- How can 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC be part of equitable development in the Highland Park neighborhood?
- What could 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC do to improve their connection to other community assets?
- In what ways can 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC utilize the building located at 3014 Meadowbridge Rd to become a better asset to the community and meet their needs?

METHODOLGY

In order to answer, “How can 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church be part of equitable development in the Highland Park neighborhood?”, a determination of the resident's definition of equitable must be obtained to better identify what types of services they desire/need in the community. This data would be obtained through on-line and in person surveys and focus groups. To answer, “In what ways can 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC utilize the building located at 3014 Meadowbridge Rd to become a better asset to the community and meet their needs?"

asset to the community? “, online and in person surveys are being tabulated to highlight top recommended uses. These uses will be d presented in a Community Forum using the Asset Based Mapping. Residents will select listed uses or write in alternatives. To answer, “What could 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC do to improve their connection to other community assets?”, in person interviews with community programs, leaders and organizations. This is to identify community partnerships, programs and other collaborative means to engage the community. The interviews will be prompted based on the clarifying research questions.

Some of the interviewees would include: one (1) Government agencies, four (4) Community organizations, two (2) Citywide non-profits, and 1 (one) Community development organizations. The number of interviewees at each station may change. It is expected that by speaking with these various groups, the feedback will help identify not only the things that the residents find important, but also areas they find are lacking. This would include different services based on need, or services specific to them and their families. There will be two different surveys, one for residents and one for business owners. The reason for a different survey, is to make certain questions focused on the resident so that the responses help make where they live better, and also to obtain the perception from people who do business in the neighborhood, whether they live there or not. The idea is that residents and business owners may incorporate the same space, but also have different needs or expectations in a neighborhood. The survey was released online and available from 01/01/2020 – 02/8/2020 through AllCount. In person surveys and focus groups were presented to residents and business owners on three occasions at 1-hour increments. On 02/8/2020, the online survey is to be removed, and the responses will be tabulated. These highest number of responses will be used to create the Asset Map that community members will use to identify best possible uses of the space, or programs to be implemented.

At a community Forum, an Asset Map will be presented based off of the qualitative data and quantitative data. This Asset Map will have points in red marking high-Level narrative, and points in blue symbolizing the Community narrative. Using this map, will help to identify how close or different the high-level and community narratives are to each other. At this forum, community members will select the items they feel are most important and to identify any community assets that they are aware of that applies to that item.
Asset mapping is both a methodology intended to locate assets and also a technique in the Asset Based Community Development process. It is designed toward creating a collective sense of “empowerment” and producing meaningful outcomes for a community. Aside from the concern about the long-term effects, another point of concern is the process of asset mapping. Due to this process requiring engagement, the execution is often difficult. Attempting to engage multiple residents at once and to understand the motivations behind a roomful of people as opposed to a small handful is difficult. This will result in the presentation of recommendations based on the community narrative and Asset Mapping exercise. Recommendations will be based on current zoning, viable uses and services identified by residents.

The benefit of using multiple methods is being able to get a larger amount of dataset and obtaining more specific data. Each method is a means of citizen participation and allows for Asset Based Community Development. Table 17 demonstrates how each of the research questions will be answered using the various method. The online survey allows a convenient way to reach residents at many different times of day, even those who aren’t physically in the area. It also allows anonymity, so respondents can speak more freely. The in-person surveys, interviews and focus groups conducted in the neighborhood allow the residents without a computer or cell phone to participate. This is a benefit because it will allow respondents to reach the survey location due to proximity and allows the opportunity to have face to face interaction and provide clarification to respondents regarding questions. The face to face interaction helps make it more personal and encourages participation. The Asset Mapping exercise allows ideas to be challenged and helps residents put ideas into perspective. It can also generate group thought and alternative ideas. Each of these methods combined help portray the community as a whole and in parts. Not only do each provide their own data, but the data can be used to identify larger issues, or concerns that have gone unnoticed. With each level, the level of scrutiny gets larger and larger.
Table 17. Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Asset mapping</th>
<th>Community Forum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC be part of equitable development in the Highland Park neighborhood?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC do to improve their connection to other community assets?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways can 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC utilize the building located at 3014 Meadowbridge Rd to become a better asset to the community and meet their needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH FINDINGS

The basis of this research was to obtain community feedback regarding needs and wants in order to apply them to my recommendation for the building owned by the client. The data obtained was then classified into three categories: connectivity to services, resident interaction in the community and elevation of the neighborhood and its residents. This research found:

1. Residents feel disconnected from critical retail and city services.
2. Vacant buildings create additional barriers to neighborhood stability.
3. There are few opportunities to engage in the future planning and decision-making in the neighborhood.

These findings will be explored in detail in this section. The section will end with a focus on community asset, including institutions, structures and spaces.

Residents feel disconnected from necessary services and retail

In the interviews and focus groups conducted, many residents reported feeling of disconnected from the rest of the city. This disconnection was particularly pronounced for food access, banking and other retail. They reported that the lack of services like a grocery store, bank, or pharmacy has left them with very few options. Considered a food desert by the Food Policy Task Force for the City of Richmond, Virginia\textsuperscript{42}, there is currently no grocery store in the Highland Park community. Currently, residents trying to find a full-sized grocery store must go to Food Lion, which is 5-6 minutes away by car and 27 minutes by public transportation. Those

\textsuperscript{42} http://www.richmondgov.com/ProjectFoodPolicyTaskForce/documents/FPTF_ReportJuly2013.pdf, pg.23
without access or time typically shop at Six Points Express Mart, Simpson’s Market or rely on food programs. However, while there are food programs in the neighborhood such as Highland Park Food Pantry, most residents feel reluctant to participate due to the social stigma attached and the donations being different preference food choices. This concern was echoed by residents and local organizations, regardless of age or length of time in the neighborhood. Not only do residents feel that a grocery store would help them access healthy and affordable food in the neighborhood, but they also see it as a way to address employment and policing concerns because it would increase the foot traffic in the neighborhood. During the community forum, some young people in attendance mentioned the limited food options and when asked about the future of Highland Park, replied that they have feeling of despair due to surroundings.

These feelings are buoyed by the Bank of America closing the Highland Park location in 2017, as well as the exit of the S&K Supermarket across the street the same year. This loss of revenue for this neighborhood also translated into a loss of jobs. The idea that new jobs and businesses need to be brought into the neighborhood had been repeated throughout every survey and in every interview conducted. At the focus group, one resident mentioned that she” did not believe that there were not enough low- to moderate-skilled jobs to employ the abundance of people with a low- to moderate- education.” The impact of the disconnection is clear. Lack of food access has impacts on health and educational outcomes, and the lack of banking means that low- and moderate-income households have limited access to credit and checking accounts that can help them maintain long term economic stability.
Vacancy creates barriers to neighborhood stability

The loss of existing retail has created a two-fold problem. The first is: Lack of safe public spaces present barriers to engagement among residents. When asking about the interaction within this area, most residents felt there is very limited participation due to the perception of safety and crime, residents (especially older residents) not feeling included or supported in past decision making and the lack of a community space. At the focus group held at Highland Park Senior Living Apartments, many of those present felt that they have no control in the neighborhood. They reported not feeling protected by police and not being taken seriously when they voice a concern. There was also an overwhelming agreement among that focus group that “everyone” knows the problem, but no one is addressing it. “Everyone” referring to the police officers on duty, police officials, the councilperson and Mayor of Richmond. One respondent, a Highland park resident since 1984, went as far as to say, “We see them when they come here to take pictures with us. We tell them what is going on and they say they will fix it…. but they don’t.” This resident was speaking to an instance where they advised the police lieutenant and Mayor of safety concerns in the neighborhood surrounding a corner store that has given the residents much grief. “The prostitutes working out there in front of the store, bring their [clients] in here, the police know, the people that run this place know, we even told the Mayor, and nothing happened.” When speaking to residents on the street, they also reported criminal activity occurring within the store and in front of the store, many going as far as to say, “the owners allow it.”

At the community forum it was revealed the many residents felt that the police are unresponsive. This was also voiced during the focus groups. Residents report that when calls are made to police, the police take a very long time to respond, if the come at all.
Residents see vacancy as a factor that made safety more challenging. Many respondents feel that there are too many empty buildings in the neighborhood, one resident suggested, “the city should incentivize people to open businesses and provide jobs in them.” The group also suggested that the vacant buildings could also be used to provide apartment housing. They expressed the idea that added housing could help increase revenue in the area and with coordinated transportation to large scale companies, would encourage more people to stay in the neighborhood.

Another theme that also appeared in each focus group and the community forum was that there was no “community” space. Some argued that a public space that could be utilized without police interference would possibly allow the crowd in front of the corner store to migrate there. This migration would help create a sense of safety for those who frequent the corner store. Lastly, there was also a general apathetic attitude towards the church building itself, and 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church. Of all interviewees, survey respondents and attendees at the community forum, only one was familiar with the church. When it was mentioned that the intent of this research was to eventually supply recommendations for the location, the reply was often, “It’s about time.”

There are few opportunities to engage in the future planning and decision-making in the neighborhood

Many of the residents interviewed, who participated in the focus groups and forum mentioned that they felt that they had no “real” power in determining what took place in their neighborhood. From criminal activity to infrastructure development, they advised...
that there are no avenues for them to have their concerns heard, recognized and addressed. They also advise that to survive in this neighborhood, a “make-do “attitude is adopted. The residents in the senior living facility state how they had no choice where to move, they were relocated to Highland Park without any input on their behalf. Other residents mention how the traffic roundabout that was put in as a community safety measure, the residents would have preferred a traffic light because the intersection is still very unsafe. While there were other actions mentioned, these two examples were repeatedly brought up as ways the citizens feel they have been removed from public meetings and forums. They want services and amenities, like the grocery store and bank, to return to the neighborhood but have no one to advocate on their behalf.

Assets: Elevation of the neighborhood and its residents

Three trends that kept coming up were: the lack of jobs in the area, the lack of new businesses in the area and the number of empty buildings in the neighborhood, including the building at 3014 Meadowbridge Rd. The idea that new jobs and businesses need to be brought into the neighborhood had been repeated throughout every survey and in every interview conducted. At the focus group, one resident mentioned that she “did not believe that there were not enough low to moderate level jobs to employ the abundance of people with a low to moderate level education. Many residents feel that there are too many empty buildings in the neighborhood, one resident suggested,” the city should incentivize people to open businesses and provide jobs in them.” The group also suggested that the vacant buildings could also be used to provide apartment housing. They expressed the idea that added housing could help increase revenue in the area and with coordinated transportation to large scale companies, would encourage more people to stay in the neighborhood.

This area has been shaped by policies and legislation. To connect and create assets in the community, there has to be a focus or center for them to engage. The main elements that have been identified as areas for focus within the research are: Services – having business like banks, grocery stores and others that generate revenue, Support- provide jobs and allow interaction and
participation within the community. Safety - all residents feeling safe in the neighborhood: being taken seriously by police, more “positive” interactions.

Aside from the vast resource of people, this neighborhood also has many valuable assets in the institutions that have integrated themselves into the neighborhood. Entities like 6PIC, Storefront for Community Design and Boaz and Ruth have helped to energize this neighborhood by working to improve the look and feel of the physical space and improve the live of the residents. These institutions have created various programs and alliances that can be utilized to assist the 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC and Highland Park residents with addressing their neighborhood concerns. This neighborhood also has assets in the many structures in and around the neighborhood. The many vacant buildings that exist can be used for housing and new businesses that help supply jobs and help increase the tax base for this area. There is also a good amount of space that can and should be utilized as an asset by the residents for relaxation, and as a space to promote community harmony.

Being able to connect an existing assets/s to this building location to better assist the residents is the initial goal, while also hoping to initiate other connections with other assets that may be useful to residents. The recommendation that will be presented will attempt to remedy or find solutions that will be beneficial to the community and the residents and utilize assets that already exist in the community. The main ways that have been identified as ways 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC can assist the Highland Park neighborhood is by assisting with improving food access options for residents, improving community relations with law enforcement, elevating neighborhood students educational advancement and contributing to an overall increased atmosphere of community engagement.
## Community Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Provide Labor force</td>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job training</td>
<td>Boaz and Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers for afterschool program</td>
<td>Six points Innovation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer for Food access</td>
<td>Grown to Go Community Mobile Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community policing</td>
<td>Richmond police department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Richmond Redevelopment And Housing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New business</td>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food access location</td>
<td>Grown to Go Community Mobile Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food access</td>
<td>J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td>Virginia Supportive Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Community clean-up</td>
<td>Storefront for Community design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food delivery</td>
<td>Northside Outreach Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEST PRACTICES

**Improving food access options for residents**

With 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC not having the ability to utilize this building location to open a full size grocery store to address residents’ concerns, there are many other ways that they can still assist in improving food access options for the residents in Highland Park. Concepts like an open community kitchen, food bank and food delivery programs and partnerships with farmers markets are currently in use to help feed the low-income residents in a community, provide healthy food options and also can help residents receive skills necessary to obtain jobs or open new businesses. There are food access programs that operate in Highland Park and these assets, along with others that can be created, should be identified as potential development concepts to improve the Highland Park neighborhood. Additional assets include partnerships that collect or distribute food to Highland Park residents currently. These concepts can utilize people as assets and also be useful in employing residents or drawing from a volunteer network pool of retirees, people with disabilities, school groups, church groups, people doing community service (court-ordered or school-required) and employees from local businesses or corporations. A combination of federal, state, and private funding can turn each of these ideas into a great example of successful public-private partnerships. Some examples of these concepts that have been successful are discussed below.
## Open Community Kitchen

### Stockton Community Kitchen - Stockton, California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose/Mission:</th>
<th>The Stockton Community Kitchen provides free instruction, mentorship and business expertise to help talented, under-resourced culinary entrepreneurs become successful in the food industry. Committed participants who desire business ownership are supported from initial concept to product launch. The Stockton Community Kitchen works exclusively with low-income entrepreneurs as determined by Housing and Urban Development guidelines for San Joaquin County and strives to provide services to those facing the highest barriers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides:</td>
<td>Job training and entrepreneurial training skills, a fully staffed commercial kitchen facility, classroom space, and offers hands-on experiences necessary to operate a food business—including ServSafe certification. Commercial space for use by residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process:</td>
<td>Those who are accepted attend an orientation meeting, then go through a four-month pre-incubation program that concentrates on business basics, such as product development, marketing, business finance and managing business operations. The next step, the incubator phase, involves more technical instruction and access to affordable commercial facilities at BellaVista to support their sales. Those who have successfully attained the benchmarks of the program become graduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by:</td>
<td>Rima Barkett, Anthony Barkett, Stockton Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, City of Stockton, donations and grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created because of an idea by</td>
<td>Mayor Michael Tubbs &amp; Councilman Jesus Andrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website:</td>
<td><a href="https://stocktoncommunitykitchen.org/">https://stocktoncommunitykitchen.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food Delivery programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visiting Nurse Association’s Meals on Wheels – Dallas County, Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose/Mission:</strong> Help Dallas County residents who cannot prove for themselves due to illness, advanced age or disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides:</strong> Freshly prepared hot meals to Dallas County residents who cannot prove for themselves due to illness, advanced age or disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Every weekday (including Thanksgiving and Christmas), VNA prepares fresh, hot meals in a state-of-the-art kitchen. 300 daily volunteers to deliver meals to clients’ homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded by:</strong> VNA receives approximately 40% of its funding from federal and state sources and the rest from private donations. Most of the funds are through the Older Americans Act, administered by the US Department of Health and Human Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Created by:</strong> The Meals on Wheels Program in Dallas was organized in 1957 as a pilot project by the Women’s Council of Dallas County. It was one of the first Meals on Wheels programs in the United States. In 1973, VNA agreed to assume responsibility for the service, viewing the Meals on Wheels program as a logical extension of home health care and as an advancement of the agency’s mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website:</strong> <a href="http://www.vnatexas.org">www.vnatexas.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partner with Farmers/Mobile Markets that accept SNAP

**Virginia Fresh Match - Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program:</th>
<th>Virginia Fresh Match is a statewide program that consists of a network of farmers/mobile markets and food stores across Virginia that offer double the value of federal nutrition benefits like SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, food stamps) spent at participating farmers markets and food stores.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local Providers | **Grown to Go Community Mobile Market** 1010 W Laburnum Ave. Richmond VA 23227  
**OnTheSquare VA Farmers Market** 1314 East Grace Street Richmond VA 23219  
**Birdhouse Farmers Market** 1507 Grayland Avenue Richmond VA 23220  
**The Carytown Farmers Market** 3201 Maplewood Avenue Richmond VA 23221 |
| Funding | LEAP and Virginia Community Food Connections partnered under VFM and received a USDA FINI (Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive) grant to provide SNAP incentive funding through 2021. This funding is also designed to expand the network to new markets and retail grocery stores. |
| Website | [https://vafma.org/programs/virginia-fresh-match/](https://vafma.org/programs/virginia-fresh-match/) |
Improving community relations with law enforcement

Church organizations, CDC’s and other community-based organizations have many ties to the community and a connection to a large pool of volunteers. They play an important connecting role between the community and city authorities like mayors, councilmembers and police. They are and can be very influential in promoting change and progress within communities. Community policing programs, including assigning Neighborhood Police Officers to designated areas, help with developing relationships with their citizens, by becoming familiar faces and fostering a friendly police presence. This type of partnership is crucial because it creates a positive interaction with residents. These types of interaction and relationships help to end campaigns like “Stop Snitchin’” and promote a healthier and safer community. “Stop Snitchin’” is a call/slogan from criminals to residents and informants not to cooperate with law enforcement. By 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC having control of the building, they can coordinate community meetings in this space and invite many different participants. These participants can range from police officers, council members and even advocates with special interest. With community policing programs and residents working together, they can create a safer community for everyone. Whether it is a focus on improving safety, crime reduction, or community involvement, this connective role is vital in repairing a long history of mistrust between police and low-income communities. Successful implementation of these types of programs hinge on the ability of the partnership to be built from the ground up. These programs must focus on the unique professional skills and assets available in the community, knowledge of the community, training on officer-resident intersection, and parallel missions. The most successful and effective partnerships explain the role of each partner, provide a clear expectation of what each one is expected to bring to the table, and an understanding of the challenges they face.
**Explore and create Community Policing partnerships with Law Enforcement**

**Safety programs**

**Neighborhood Policing – New York City, New York**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose/Mission:</th>
<th>To provide a comprehensive crime-fighting strategy built on improved communication and collaboration between local police officers and community residents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process:</td>
<td>The process begins by assigning the same officers (NCOs) work in the same neighborhoods on the same shifts. This repeated interaction increases their familiarity with local residents and local problems. Two officers designated as the neighborhood coordination officers (NCOs). The NCOs serve as liaisons between the police and the community, but also as key crime-fighters and problem-solvers in the sector. The officers, radio dispatchers, supervisors then work together to maintain &quot;sector integrity&quot;. Sector integrity means that the sector officers and sector cars do not leave the boundaries of their assigned sectors, except in precinct-wide emergencies. This mean that officers are the face of the department in the community and residents have a contact for their concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded/Created by:</td>
<td>New York City Police Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website:</td>
<td><a href="https://www1.nyc.gov/site/nypd/bureaus/patrol/neighborhood-coordination-officers.page">https://www1.nyc.gov/site/nypd/bureaus/patrol/neighborhood-coordination-officers.page</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Richmond Police Athletic League – Richmond, Virginia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Purpose/Mission:</strong></th>
<th>To promote healthy habits, provide tools for long-term success, and bridge the gap between police officers and the community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides:</strong></td>
<td>Multiple outreach programs ranging from introductory clinics, competitive sports teams, immersive summer and spring camps, mentorship opportunities, and creative arts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships:</strong></td>
<td>Richmond Police Department, Virginia Union University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Create Community Watch group

**National Neighborhood Watch – National**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose:</th>
<th>National Neighborhood Watch began in 1972 to unite law enforcement agencies, private organizations, and individual citizens in a nation-wide effort to reduce crime and improve local communities by drawing upon the compassion of average citizens, asking them to lend their neighbors a hand.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides:</td>
<td>The National Neighborhood Watch Program is the portal for training to assist law enforcement agencies and their communities, technical assistance, resource documents, watch stories, networking, and assistance to the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process:</td>
<td>Register through the website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by:</td>
<td>Funded in part by the National Sheriffs' Association, through a grant from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created by:</td>
<td>A grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nnw.org/">https://www.nnw.org/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elevating neighborhood student’s educational advancement
Create State of the art classrooms

**The Falls Church Education Foundation – Falls Church, Virginia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose/Mission:</th>
<th>The mission of the Falls Church Education Foundation is to ensure our students are prepared to effectively meet the challenges of the 21st century by providing them equity of access, staff readiness and preparing students to function in the 21st century</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides:</td>
<td>Support to Super Grants, Teacher Grants and Equity of Access. FCEF also invests and stewards 22 scholarships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships:</td>
<td>Various partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded by:</td>
<td>FCEF raises funds through an annual Gala, Run for the Schools and Academic Boosters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created by:</td>
<td>The Falls Church Education Foundation was established in 2004 as a vehicle through which the community could donate to Falls Church City Public Schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fcedf.org/mission.html">http://www.fcedf.org/mission.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Create After School program for elementary aged children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>First United Methodist Church After School Program – Salisbury, North Carolina</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose/Mission:</strong> The After-School Child Care Program was established in 1990 to provide quality care for students in Kindergarten through Fifth Grade and is governed by the First United Methodist Church After School Board. Children receive a healthy snack, time for staff assistance with homework, devotions and engaging developmental activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provides:</strong> After school programs are important to communities who rely on after school programs to supervise children in the afternoons and early evenings. They also provide spiritual, emotional, physical, intellectual and creative development with a service to others component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funded/Created by:</strong> First United Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website:</strong> <a href="http://www.fumcsalisbury.org/after-school-child-care.html">http://www.fumcsalisbury.org/after-school-child-care.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contributing to an overall increased atmosphere of community engagement

**Community engagement**

**Adopt-A-Block – Baltimore, Maryland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Effectively meet the spiritual, emotional, mental, and physical needs of individuals, families, and communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides</td>
<td>Adopt-A-Block is a recurring event that is put together by Adopt-A-Block, Inc. This group is a non-profit coalition made up of organizations, partnerships with local churches, the city government, the police department, community associations, local businesses, service and health agencies as well as residents. The goal is to restore Baltimore City through block parties, one block at a time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="https://adoptablockinc.com/">https://adoptablockinc.com/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Create temporary/transitional housing

**The Friendship House Transitional Housing Program - Wilmington, Delaware**

| Mission: | Many recently released prisoners, veterans, homeless people and at-risk youth can benefit from the use of temporary/transitional housing. Other people in need of short-term housing as they get their lives back on track include families, victims of domestic violence, and people new to the area. |
| Provides: | This program helps residents find and maintain employment, learn how to maintain a budget and manage finances, receive credit counseling and work to eliminate outstanding debt, improve relationship-building and decision-making skills, receiving parenting training and, when possible, reunite with their children and address any issues threatening their long-term strategic recovery. To qualify for services, all participants must have a positive recommendation from a residential recovery program and involvement in a daily program, either employment based, or education based. |
| Funding: | Fundraising, donations and partnerships |
| Website: | [https://www.friendshiphousetohome.org/delaware-homeless/our-programs/transitional-housing/](https://www.friendshiphousetohome.org/delaware-homeless/our-programs/transitional-housing/) |
RECOMMENDATIONS

Vision: The 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church CDC builds on the existing resources in the Highland Park neighborhood to address community needs including the spiritual, emotional, mental and physical empowerment of all Highland Park residents in their everyday lives; a commitment to perpetual educational opportunities, offering programs and advancement for all residents of Highland Park; a commitment to improving the community engagement initiatives, programs and offerings originated by the founding members and working to improve and increase law enforcement engagement within the community.

Goal 1 Improve the overall Food Access options in the Highland Park Neighborhood through a multi-faceted approach

   Objective 1.1 Develop an Open Community Kitchen that can be a centerpiece for congregational meals, job training, business incubation, and a homeless feeding center/homeless feeding preparation center.

   Action 1.1.1 Create a new non-profit organization for the open kitchen

   Action 1.1.2 Create partnerships within community for use of space during off hours/downtime.

       - Partnerships could include: J. Sargent Reynolds, restaurant training programs, school functions, workshops and private events.

   Action 1.1.3 Create partnerships with local food banks, health agencies store owners and growers for distribution and nutritional education programs i.e., Feed More, Northside Outreach Center, and Shalom Farms – Northside Site

   Action 1.1.4 Recruit volunteers
Objective 1.2 Create a food delivery program for Senior residents

Action 1.2.1 Create partnerships for donated food from local grocery stores, local food banks, health agencies and growers
Action 1.2.2 Obtain list of senior residents in need
Action 1.2.3 Recruit volunteers to collect, package and deliver food

Objective 1.3: Partner with a Farmer’s/Mobile Market that is a member of Virginia Fresh Match.

Action 1.3.1 Coordinate and provide rides for residents to participating Farmer’s Markets or grocery stores.
Action 1.3.2 Assist Farmers market with delivery and take-out for residents.
Action 1.3.3 Coordinate the use of the building parking lot for a mobile market, like Grown to Go: Your Community Mobile Market
Action 1.3.4 Obtain list of residents in need
Action 1.3.5 Recruit volunteers

Goal 2 Promote positive community relations with law enforcement by coordinating action to improve the perception of Safety in the neighborhood

Objective 2.1: Explore and create Community Policing partnership with Richmond police

Action 2.1.1 Explore partnership with various police programs
Action 2.1.2 Have monthly meetings at church with a police representative present
Action 2.1.3 Explore resources and space for Community Safety officer (NCO)
Objective 2.2: Create Community Watch and register with national program

Action 2.2.1 Elect patrol board and positions: president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, etc.

Action 2.2.2 Recruit volunteers

Action 2.2.3 Register group for membership in National Neighborhood Watch program

Goal 3: Provide and improve academic support to students currently enrolled in area schools

Objective 3.1: Create State of the art classrooms/tutoring program for students to receive educational assistance

Action 3.1.1 Partner with local schools for equipment use/lease/buy program

Action 3.1.2 Funding options
  o State Farm Good Neighbor Citizen Grants
    ▪ One facet of the Good Neighbor Citizen Grants is Education Excellence. Tutoring programs can apply for this grant online. Funding amounts vary each year.
  o Dollar General Literacy Foundation Summer Reading Grants
    ▪ After school programs need support during the summer months when many programs are open for extended hours. Grants can assist with programs for Pre-K through 12th grade student programs. The Dollar General program focuses on literacy including new readers, struggling readers, and students with learning disabilities.
  o Learn and Serve
    ▪ The Learn and Serve America Summer of Service Grant is another option. It is for programs that serve middle school students. There is $1 million in funding available to be split between 5-7 grants. Students in the programs must do a minimum of 100 community service hours.
American Honda Foundation Grants

- This grant funds programs in many areas including technology, science, math, literacy and engineering. Schools can apply online with specific plans for what they would do with the $20,000-$60,000 which is awarded annually

**Objective 3.2:** Create After School program for elementary - middle school aged children

**Action 3.2.1** Partnership with 6PIC for a transitional program (from middle school to high school)

**Action 3.2.2** Partner with area schools to gather interest and to recruit volunteers

**Action 3.2.3** Elect board to run program

**Goal 4:** To solidify community connections with those who are still currently living in the Highland Park by re-introducing 7th Street Memorial Baptist Church into the community

**Objective 4.1:** Create engagement through community engagement programs

**Action 4.1.1** Block party designed to celebrate the neighborhood.

- Free event for the residents, but charge vendors to participate.
- Establish location (Empty lot besides senior living as a base of operation)
- Provide food (Barbecue, candy apples, etc.)
- Provide games (Simon Says, cornhole etc.)
- Provide entertainment (face painting, bounce house, demonstrations, etc.)
- Provide music (live performances, karaoke, etc.)
- Dancing (Electric Slide, the Macarena or line dancing)
- Local fire department may also participate in the party, bringing out trucks that they display for show.
o Local fire department may also participate in the party, bringing out trucks or cars, that they display for show.
o Have local service vendors and providers make an appearance to establish a base and culture of inclusivity in the community
o Coordinate with the City of Richmond neighbors for permits, participation and sound ordinances.

Action 4.1.2

- ORDAIN Program (Our Residents: Displaced and In Need)
  o Clean up known vagrancy lots and locations
  o Initiating the relocation of homeless residents to other housing opportunities by coordinating with HomeAgain.

Objective 4.2: Create Temporary/Transitional housing

Action 4.2.1 In the UB Urban Business District, no building or structure shall exceed 28 feet in height

- This creates a challenge to a third-floor housing concept. Possible solutions would be to request a variance for the height. A variance may also be submitted to include a smaller housing unit.
  o *Dwelling units contained within the same building as other permitted principal uses, provided that such dwelling units shall be located above the ground floor of the building or to the rear of other permitted principal uses so as not to interrupt commercial frontage in the district, and provided further that the ground floor area*
devoted to other permitted principal uses shall be a minimum of one-third or 1,000 square feet, whichever is greater, of the floor area of the ground floor of the building and shall be not less than 20 feet in depth along the entire length of a principal street frontage, except for ingress and egress (see Section 30-800.1 for provisions for nonconforming dwelling uses)

- Housing is allowed, but due to configuration of the space, it may be limited.
  - Housing/ rental laws
    - Should space be created, all rental space would fall under the normal Virginia Residential Landlord and Tenant Act?
  - A transitional housing partnership can be initiated with Boaz and Ruth for residents returning from prison.
  - A transitional housing partnership can be initiated with HOMEAGAIN Richmond for homeless residents

- Possible 500 square foot floorplan to the right.

**Action 4.2.2 Community-Centered Governance**

- Create a new nonprofit for the management and administration of new community programs. This decision-making board would be elected and serve set terms. It would be responsibly for obtaining funding for all new programs and well as their execution. This group would also organize community meeting with different topics and invite guest speakers.
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