

## Introduction

Before we become immersed in MH and ES, it is important to consider what we mean by revitalization, what we are working to accomplish through a revitalization plan and reflect on what can be learned from the range of revitalization strategies that have been tried over the past three decades.

We can apply several vantage points to considering these questions:

1. Their meaning for the broad causes and consequences of neighborhood decline in US cities.
2. How they relate to the two commercial districts we are working in
3. How wins and losses under different revitalization approaches and what that implies for class and racial justice?

It is also helpful to think critically about our enterprise and how this critical perspective frame what we do or relates it to other community development goals. So I want to leave some time to discuss limitations and criticisms of commercial revitalization and Main Street programs as a community/urban development agenda.

## Discussion Questions

What is revitalization? What outcomes are associated with revitalization?

To what extent are these people-based or place-based? Are their class and race implications of these views?

What were the major strategies and approaches to revitalization discussed in the readings? How do they differ? Do they differ in their notions of revitalization? Do certain strategies seem more effective or more likely to overcome the root causes of declines? Do any seem better suited to the issues faced in Mission Hill or Egleston Square?

How can people and place-based approaches be integrated?

How central is housing development/improvement in revitalization strategies? Does commercial revitalization follow housing reinvestment or lead it?

What role does design play in achieving revitalization goals?

What role does economic development play? Who do they inter-relate?

What are some of the limitations or criticisms of the commercial district revitalization as a revitalization or community development focus?