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Part One: Introduction

Introduction

The Current Situation

Analyzing the complex patterns that influence society’s relationship to the built environment, many American cities exhibit an unhealthy discrepancy between community and the built environment (Kunstler, Long 19).

It is widely accepted that suburban sprawl is associated with isolated communities, sedentary lifestyles, and unsustainable consumption of materials and energy. “The state-of-the-art mega-suburbs of recent decades have produced horrendous levels of alienation, loneliness, anomie, anxiety, and depression, and we may well be better off without them (Kunstler, Long 19).” The authors of Suburban Nation regard suburban culture as dysfunctional saying, “we live today in cities and suburbs whose form and character we did not choose. They were imposed upon us, by federal policy, local zoning laws, and the demands of the automobile (Duany, xiii).”

Sprawl continues to erode the definition of community, as the public realm becomes a façade attempting to replicate authenticity. James Howard Kunstler describes the individual’s relationship to public realm in his book, The Geography of Nowhere. “It degrades the notion that the private individual has a responsibility to this public realm –
or, to put it another way, that the public realm is the physical manifestation of the common good (Kunstler, Geography, 27)."

If there is a correlation between the societal structure and the built environment; an assessment of the American public realm reveals that individuals today have largely shed this shared commitment to community in favor of individual pursuits in the private realm, regardless of its long-term impact on social and physical well-being; “biologists have suggested that this richness, the human desire to interact with the diverse world around them, is innate. Socially, biologically, and culturally, human beings are hardwired to seek out and connect with people not entirely like themselves (Affordable)."

**The Modern Sustainability Movement**

Kunstler recognizes this dichotomy as a clash between citizenship and consumerism. “Our technological building practices, even when mindful of ecological responsibility or claiming high artistic aspirations, still pursue a functionalist utopia in which all desires are fulfilled through material means, eliminating all irritants and always aiming at greater economy and comfort: maximum efficiency, economy, commodity, and entertainment value. Consumption and possession prevail as the bastard aims of desire (Kunstler, Long 5).” For Kunstler, the modern green movement focuses on material consumption as a cost-savings formula rather than a holistic, long-term strategy for sustainability.

A recent study by the Harvard University, Office for Sustainability and the University of Florida, Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation revealed the limitations of consumer-driven sustainability. “Homeowners in green communities reported more environmental knowledge and behaviors in just a few areas, but environmental scores were low overall and attitudes were no different than residents in the conventional
communities. The results suggest that new residents do not come equipped with the environmental knowledge, attitudes and behaviors to make green communities function as sustainable developments (Hostetler, 234).” If postindustrial, ecological sustainability focuses only on short-term profitability and remains detached from social responsibility, the trend will have a very limited impact on the root cause of today’s unsustainable consumption.

**Role of Designers**

To impact long-term sustainability, communities need a holistic reevaluation; and through this analysis, new opportunities will emerge for design-thinkers to promote and create alternative visions for society’s future. This offers an amazing opportunity for designers, but it is also an ethical decision, rooted in one’s personal and professional relationship to society. Is it my responsibility to react to society or to influence it?

In the recent past the designer’s role “transformed within the market economy into an image that serves marketing more than either architecture or society (Vidler, viii).” In his article, “Spectacle Architecture Before and After the Aftermath” Terry Smith references this shift as a professional acceptance of consumerism. “On the face of it, there would seem to be an obvious convergence between much of the most visible, and celebrated, architecture of the later twentieth century and the apparently most advanced social formations of that time, those devoted above all to the production of consumption, to culture as industry, to the generative force of the image-flow – ‘the society of spectacle (Smith, 3).”"

Anna Klingmann also notes the market shift towards ocularcentrism in her book, *Brandscapes*. “Since the emphasis on architecture as a means of increasing production efficiency declined, increasing pressure was placed on architecture to perform as a
marketable commodity; and as competition in the building industry accelerated due to improved methods of mass production, architecture became more and more reliant on the production of signs and images (Klingmann, 3)."

At the request of the general public, this trend also coincided with the modern architectural dismissal of important design relationships as the automobile placed increasing pressure on design agendas. Planners, traffic engineers, and policy makers also responded to the new automobile market, changing zoning codes that altered the progress of the American City (Frank, 153).

Whether a conscious decision or a reaction to the market, the design profession was largely stripped of its leadership, responsibility, and trust, leaving in its wake a redistribution of services to various agencies, most notably the developer (Miles, 5-7). But as quick as this change occurred, it appears that market trends and societal values are again shifting. "We are at a moment of change, moving from a time of interest in pure form to a time of interest in larger issues of architecture, social and environmental issues (Campbell, 13)."

Thus, the rigor posed by this thesis not only evolves from concern for ethics, but also a financial concern. For what future does the design profession hold if imagery is the primary output? If the design profession does not reassume public servanthood, what agencies will accept the responsibilities, and what agendas will they promote?

As part of the design community, it is our responsibility to advocate societal responsibility to the public realm. We recognize that today’s dominant building practices limit the ability of designers to influence a paradigm shift, but we believe designers can have a larger impact on the built environment through proactive design leadership.
Ultimately, we hypothesize that this model can influence societal behavior towards a holistic and sustainable model of living.

**Mission Statement:** Our partnership aims to reevaluate the role of the designer in facilitating community-oriented development.

**Goals:** Balancing theory and pragmatics, this thesis contains two main objectives for accomplishing the mission. It:

1. Identifies design principles and best practices of community-oriented development from a review of the existing body of literature, an analysis of precedent projects, and consultation with design leaders and community members.
2. Proposes the model of community-oriented development as a grassroots method for influencing fellowship towards a holistic and sustainable model of living, and applies the framework, characterized by a participatory design process, to a selected site in the city of Indianapolis.

**Significance:** The integration of these two models represents a symbiotic partnership underexplored by mainstream outlets. The significance of the thesis lies not in a particular design solution, but rather in the implications for urban development regarding the untapped opportunities for local community, city, and region to invest in social capital as a complementary means for urban revitalization. In this regard, it is hoped that this thesis will spark discussion about holistic reinvestment in the public realm. The level of desire for urban revitalization in Indianapolis warrants a demonstration of how an interdisciplinary collaboration among design leaders, developers, government, and
communities can physically manifest these social desires to promote the well being of the community.

On a community scale, the principles delineated in this study are intended to highlight the effectiveness of unifying community factions under a common vision for the purpose of shaping the immediate physical and social environment. The goal is to introduce the means to collectively shift the current paradigm from one of transience, consumption and displacement to one that cultivates community values, sense of place, economic vitality, and environmental health.

On a metropolitan scale, this thesis is intended to inform cities like Indianapolis of an alternative, comprehensive approach to urban development that inspires deliberate, sustainable growth. The information captures a “big picture” view of urban infrastructure and community development and endorses a weightier role for social capital in the design paradigm.

Finally, this thesis is intended to promote the effectiveness of design leadership in the facilitation of community formation. Capitalizing on the synergy generated by an interdisciplinary, collaborative approach, a participatory design process has the power to not only inspire people, but also serve people.

**Project Statement:** This thesis will tap into interdisciplinary collaboration to develop a pilot study testing the feasibility of a community-oriented development in urban Indianapolis. The thesis will result in the production of an original, neighborhood plan. The process will advance our understanding of how neighborhoods are formed, implemented and maintained. The thesis is not a universal utopia and will not strive to persuade everyone to join a community-oriented development; rather, the thesis aims to
raise awareness to alternative types of living in hope that visitors and users adapt concepts of community design to their own living situation, or in the very least, to alter consumer demands.

**Key Concepts:** The following concepts provide a general framework for the integration of theory and application into a viable design solution:

1. The thesis will explore ‘Architects as Developers,’ as a business model that challenges existing industry barriers by integrating design-thinking with pre-design services while simultaneously lowering the cost of quality. The entrepreneurial role also highlights the complexities of informed programming and project orchestration.

2. The thesis will provide an overview of intentional communities, a form of community-oriented development, as an organic method to holistic sustainability, and it will promote fellowship as a tool for empowering individuals and communities in local politics and decision making – key factors for influencing the public realm.

3. The thesis will utilize research, evidence-based design, and best practices in health, community, and sustainability to formulate informed design decisions in the development of a pilot, feasibility study.

4. The thesis will attempt to interweave the project with the broader community context with the ultimate aim of sparking a social renaissance in Indianapolis.

**Assumptions:** In order to manage the scope of the thesis, the following assumptions have been made:
1. Land use and zoning ordinances may require variances to accommodate design solutions presented in this study.

2. Funding partnerships and development phasing are speculative. It is assumed that they will be informed by communication with community leaders, informed by an RFP for a Broad Ripple parking garage, and informed by a review of relevant literature and focus groups on West Coast tour. As these models are often disjointed, we are providing the visionary framework for how these “could” work, not how they “will” work.

3. For the purposes of this study, we are proposing possible programmatic relationships, but the specifics of occupancy are speculative.

4. Land acquisition relating to the proposed site in Broad Ripple village would be possible given available property, RFP, conversations with community leaders, and a projected increase in property values as a result of development.

**Definition of Terms:** The following terms have been defined in order to clarify our intent and purpose:

*Communitarianism:* It may be best understood as a democratic collective. Communitarian paradigms state how a group of people “jointly construct their social lives through interactions with others and their rules for doing so (McGraw-Hill).” The individual, within a community, is considered to be the basic unit whose rights and responsibilities in society are balanced with that of the community. Amitai Etzioni, the sociologist credited with founding the communitarian movement in 1990, describes that communitarian values “[aim] to bolster the foundations of civil society -- including
families, schools and neighborhoods -- and foster a commitment to the welfare of the community (Milbank).

In his article, “Communitarianism and Emotivism,” Philip Bess outlines communitarianism as a philosophical social structure that balances individualism and collectivism, “a fundamental contention of the Aristotelian/communitarian viewpoint is that individual human well-being is impossible apart from the duties and privileges attendant to a variety of specific human practices, relationships, and roles. It is only in such roles within such relationships that, over the course of lifetime, individuals will discover (or fail to discover) the meaning of, and achieve (or fail to achieve), their well-being (Bess, 374).”

Community-Oriented Development: A community-centric model for the design and development of the built environment.

Built Environment: The part of the environment shaped and formed by humans, including buildings, roads, fixtures, parks, and all other improvements that form the physical character of a city.

Intentional Community: A community model of governance around a shared, common vision. “All intentional communities have idealism in common – each one was founded on a vision of living in a better way, usually in response to something perceived as lacking in the broader culture. Many communities aspire to provide a supportive environment for the development of members’ awareness, abilities, and spiritual growth. Most seek to create a life that will satisfy shared human cravings: security, family, relationship, fellowship, mutual cooperation, creativity and self-expression, as well as a sense of place, a sense of belonging (Kozeny, 12).” Intentional communities contain
many of the characteristics necessary for long-term, self sustaining, “communities in close association with one another can share ideas, resources, and mutual support, thereby benefiting from each other’s assets and experience (Kozeny, 17).” There are many types of intentional communities, including but not limited to cohousing, eco-villages, religious communities, and student co-ops.

**Participatory Process:** “A participatory process or approach seeks to engage all stakeholders in guiding and shaping their own development. This approach or process, over time, secures a lasting commitment and strong sense of ownership (DPRA).”
Part Two: Methodology

Methodology

The methodology can be broken down into two sections: theory and practice. The first section investigates the planning and organization that contributed to the theoretical framework supporting the study. The focus is less on the minutia of urban design theory (for which there are as many hypotheses for what defines a successful space as there are practitioners wishing to distinguish themselves from their peers) and more on how a democratic uprising of individuals supplies its own demand for a particular way of life. It tackles the conventional supply and demand models for urban development, identifies the gaps in community formation that traditional development models tend to overlook, and traces the success of projects that showcase the synergetic effect of designers and communities uniting to fill that need.

The second section distills theories on community, health, and sustainability in order to define the applicable principles and guidelines for a community-oriented development. While some of the parameters relate to issues beyond the scope of the project, they are still important to introduce in order to establish context for the strategies that drive the application of principle into practice.
Section One: Understanding the Supply and Demand of Community

A Literature Review of Community Design

Community Design Overview

Community-oriented design provides an overview of broad principles that can be applied to specific typologies. The authors of *The Architecture of Community* describe how this method can mend fragmented communities. The text provides a series of guidelines, modeled from precedents in the United States and Europe, for creating livable and sustainable towns; it contains a “collection of text and drawings that outline in an accessible way a general theory for the making of modern cities and villages (Krier, xxiii)."

These principles are evident in the New Urbanists Movement as well. The authors of *The New Urbanism: Towards an Architecture of Community* take a broad approach to restoring community and fostering sustainable environments. Using case studies and analyses, the authors highlight key issues such as urban infrastructure, affordable housing, crime prevention, health incentives, alternative forms of transportation, sustainability, and economic vitality (Katz).

In his book, *Community Design*, Arthur Mehrhoff regards community as a public policy agenda. He presents a case study on the Minnesota Design Team, a collection of architects, landscape architects, planners, economic practitioners, and community development practitioners, and he explores the team’s ability to implement a "holistic approach to understanding the systematic relationships between a place-based community and its larger social systems (Mehrhoff, 25)." He also asks community
designers to recognize the dynamic and fluid qualities of community, and calls on the design profession to represent communities in a rapidly changing society (Mehrhoff, 25). He claims this is important as communities currently have few representatives and community goals are easily circumvented by corporate agendas (Mehrhoff, 4). The authors of *Shaping Neighborhoods* argue that “local residents, business people and other users are the real owners of locality. They have a right to be involved in major decisions that affect their environment or livelihood (Barton 50).”

Finally, Mehrhoff provides a model for community design, including interviews with citizens, SWOT analysis, focus groups, and visual analysis, to assemble into a shared communities vision (Mehrhoff 115). The method proposed by Mehrhoff mirrors the Local Spatial Development Strategy proposed by *Shaping Neighbourhoods* seeking to “broaden local planning policy to incorporate transport, health and education agencies and work holistically towards sustainable development (Barton 6).” The Near Eastside Community Organization of Indianapolis also utilized a similar technique titled the Quality of Life Plan (See Precedent Study GINI).

In her article, “The Ethical Function of Architecture,” Kasten Harries also asks architects to consider community-oriented design;“we have to discover the importance of neighborhoods and regions and of an architecture which will articulate their character and establish their unity (Harries, 396).”

*Community Health*

In the book, *Health and Community Design*, the authors explore the impact of community design on human behavior and active lifestyle choices. Funded by a research grant from the Center for Disease Control (CDC), the authors investigate the interface of urban planning, architecture, transportation, community design, and public
health for the purpose of developing policy that promotes and protects public health. The research determined that the dominant forms of development in the post-World War II landscape are a primary barrier inhibiting an active lifestyle; furthermore, the research also indicates that the public health threats that pushed people out of cities initially – pollution, crime and crowding – are no longer impediments in post-industrial, American Cities (Frank, 2).

Healthcare spending is 17% of the GDP, more than any other nation (Health Care). After an investigation of the Department of Transportation (TOD) the American Public Health Association has made recommendations that “investment should shift toward transit, pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure in order to facilitate healthy, equitable and environmentally sound mobility (Urban Design 4 Health).” Furthermore, 17% of personal income is spent on transportation while only 6% of personal income is spent on healthcare. It seems ironic that the general public debates universal healthcare but does not ask for a reassessment of transportation spending (Consumer).

Today, while 4% of personal spending is on gasoline alone, speculation of eco-localization as a result of peak oil suggests that community-oriented developments would drastically increase in value by 2020 (North).

**Sustainable Communities**

The ecological sustainability of community-oriented design is widely published. In his book, Sustainable Urbanism, Douglas Farr examines design reforms for their ability to foster livable and sustainable environments. Advocating high-performance infrastructure and buildings, Farr also hopes “to help catalyze the adoption of Sustainable Urbanism to become the dominant pattern of human settlement by the year 2030 (Farr, 12).”
Shaping Neighbourhoods is a comprehensive manual for sustainable development through joint social equity, prosperity, and environmental integrity. Targeting planners, practitioners, and resource managers, “this guide is about enhancing the quality of neighborhoods as places to live, work and place. It advocates an inclusive, environmentally responsible model of neighbourhoods (Barton 1).” The authors identify key objectives for neighborhood planning, developed the Neighborhood Ecosystem Model, and provide a Public Participation Toolkit. Finally, the authors recognize three methods towards sustainable development the Community-Led Process [the current model of intentional communities], the Local Authority-Led Process [the model utilized by GINI], and the Investor-Led Process [the thesis proposal] (Barton 11-51).

In her book, The Natural Step for Communities, Sarah James examines green building programs, new urbanist communities, transit-oriented development and smart growth for their capacity to balance economic, social, and ecological models of sustainable development.

In Ecocities: Rebuilding Cities in Balance with Nature, Richard Register identifies principles for long-term sustainable cities advocating a paradigm shift towards permaculture (183). The author, founder of Urban Ecology and Ecocity Builders, is a key theorist in ecological city design and planning. The text contains information on the business, planning and leadership required to foster sustainable cities and provides tools for slowly transforming a city.

Community Place-Making

In his article, “The Phenomenon of Place,” Christian Norberg-Schulz identifies the genius loci as an attempt to reach harmony with place. In Roman Mythology a Genius Loci was the protective spirit of place. “Only in this way we fully grasp the genius loci, the ‘spirit of
place’ which the ancients recognized as that ‘opposite’ man has to come to terms with, to be able to dwell (Norberg-Schulz, 418).”

Connecting the concept of *Genius Loci* with community-oriented design, contextual relationships are a key concept in Critical Regionalism and Phenomenology and provide a solution against the estrangement of globalism. The authors of “Why Critical Regionalism Today” identify strategies to reconnect community with place by selecting “regional elements [that] are historically linked with [a] concrete urban *genius loci*, [elements that] are selected, de-familiarized, and recomposed in new projects (Tzonis, 490).”

*Community-Oriented Design Implementation*

To implement community-oriented designs, the North Carolina Institute for Public Health recommends a Community Action model based on 5Ps (Preparation, Promotion, Programs, Policy, and Physical Projects) to achieve healthy community goals.

*Community Metrics*

To verify developments are environmentally responsible, the U.S. Green Builders Council, Congress for the New Urbanism, and the National Resources Defense Council developed LEED for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND). “[The] rating system integrates the principles of smart growth, urbanism and green building into the first national system for neighborhood design (LEED).”

The rating system incorporates three main categories – Smart Location and Linkage, Neighborhood Pattern and Design, Green Infrastructure and Building (LEED).
Community Synergy

The focus on community can also lead to social synergy. The authors of *Shaping Neighbourhoods*, suggest that “Collaboration between local partners, [can lead] to synergy in the design and management of the built environment (Barton, 3).”

An example of synergy, Maurice Cox discusses the participatory design process as a “community consensus builder” in his article “Rebuilding Bayview: Community Design as a Catalyst for Social Change.” Cox represents a model design-leader as a mayor, architect, and urbanist, and he states “rebuilding community begins with the ability of ordinary citizens to influence the important planning decisions that affect their lives (Cox, Maurice, 102).”

A Literature Review of Intentional Communities

“All intentional communities have idealism in common – each one was founded on a vision of living in a better way, usually in response to something perceived as lacking in the broader culture. Many communities aspire to provide a supportive environment for the development of members’ awareness, abilities, and spiritual growth. Most seek to create a life that will satisfy shared human cravings: security, family, relationship, fellowship, mutual cooperation, creativity and self-expression, as well as a sense of place, a sense of belonging (Kozeny, 12).” Intentional communities contain many of the characteristics necessary for long-term, self sustaining, “communities in close association with one another can share ideas, resources, and mutual support, thereby benefiting from each other’s assets and experience (Kozeny, 17).” All link to a more holistic model of sustainable living.
A case study of a communal program called ‘Neighbor to Neighbor’ revealed that community gives greater meaning to life than the pursuit of pleasure (Bookman 428).

**Aspects of Intentional Communities**

Intentional communities adapt many of the same principles found in community-oriented design. At the local level, most intentional communities are multi-generational, providing mutual benefit for all ages. A case study of local programs such as eye exams, pharmacist visits, hospital relationships, and cooking classes also revealed a positive correlation between “aging in community” and urban sustainability (Bookman 429). A similar trend is also rising in retirement communities. An interview with the AARP senior vice president, Elinor Ginzler, revealed that an alternative “aging in community” model provides a multigenerational and holistic approach to retirement communities (Metcalf 36). In addition to multigenerational living, other key concepts include an emphasis on social capital, a local economy, and sustainable strategies.

Cohousing’s primary objective is fellowship with community members, and community decisions are often made by consensus. Key values include participation, cooperation, sharing and neighborliness. In response to these values, the built environment is often designed to promote frequent and spontaneous contact through concepts such a de-emphasis on cars, pedestrian and play areas, cluster housing, and a common house. Cohousing developments are found in urban, rural, and suburban communities (Kozeny, 14).

In their book, *Cohousing: A Contemporary Approach to Housing*, Authors Kathryn McCamant and Charles Durrett provide support for cohousing, which originated in Denmark in the 1960s. The authors are credited with importing the concept to America
(See Precedent Study, *Kathryn McCamant & Charles Durrett*). Their intent is to provide an overall sense of community (McCamant).

An ecovillage, on the other hand, may include a focus on fellowship, but the primary focus is on environmental sustainability often adapting the principles of permaculture. This typology is modeled after historical village clustering, deemed the least disruptive the natural landscape. Ecovillage developments are found in urban, rural, and suburban communities (Kozeny, 14). In *Ecovillages: A Practical Guide to Sustainable Communities*, Jan Martin Bang presents a collection of ecovillage case studies and provides design concepts for establishing an ecovillage – human scale, permaculture, and health (Bang).

In most Religious Communities, the community is primarily a tool for furthering the spiritual agenda of the group, and members must subscribe to the shared belief system before gaining access to the community. These communities are often remote and contribute to the stigma associated with Intentional Communities (Kozeny, 15). “When there is a media ‘cult’ scare in the news, some communities – most notably the secretive or isolated groups – experience unfavorable rumors and critical scrutiny from their neighbors. On the other hand, those deeply involved in local activities (thereby having regular face-to-face encounters with folks living nearby) typically experience very little change in their neighborly interactions and the degree of local acceptance (Kozeny, 16).” Similar to Religious Communities, Egalitarian Communities share an egalitarian belief in equality of members and income sharing (Kozeny, 15). Although these models are successful for many communities, the parameters of this typology do not match the thesis.
Finally, Student Co-Ops are very similar to cohousing, but they are associated with colleges and universities. They typically use the Rochdale Principles - voluntary and open membership, democratic member control, member economic participation, autonomy and independence, cooperation, concern for community (Kozeny, 15).

**Trends in Intentional Communities**

Statistics for the intentional community database reveal that the cohousing model experienced an increase from 25% of the listed communities to 35%, eco-villages and rural communities listed a 0% increase, and the urban model listed an increase from 26% to 30%. There are an estimated 100,000 individuals self-identify as living in an intentional community. The findings suggest that urban and cohousing models are expiring increases in size (Schaub 19-20).

In her book, *Finding Community: How to Join an Ecovillage or Intentional Community*, Diane Leafe Christian provides tools to help individuals find community and like-minded people interested in family-oriented design and ecological sustainability. She also provides a list of common mistakes to avoid. (Christian, Finding Community).

Moreover in her book *Creating a Life Together: Practical Tools to Grow Ecovillages and Intentional Communities*, Leafe also illustrates how to grow community. Utilizing case studies, she presents a step-by-step manual for establishing an Intentional Community. Leafe offers workshops on building community and she is also the editor of *Communities Magazine* (Christian, Creating a Life).

**Legal & Financial Issues**

The *Communities Directory* provides a broad overview of some of the financial issues intentional communities face (Kozeny, 16-17). In the article “Cooperation Law for a
Sharing Economy,” Janelle Oris covers legal issues associated with cohousing communities and other shared initiatives (Oris). The difficulty of group financing and the overlapping economy is difficult to report for the IRS, but there is a growing collection of lawyers interested in community transactional law (Community Development Law).

**Research Methods**

“The creation of a sustainable neighbourhood depends on the active commitment of local stakeholders. Public, private and community sectors need to pursue common community purpose. This co-operative principle is not about romantic community idealism; it is about co-ordination, it may mean working in partnership with other bodies, sharing ownership of neighborhood projects, or it may simply mean open/effective information exchange and consultation (Barton 42).”

Prior to our field study on World Tour, we had only minimal exposure to models for sustainable community development. This travel experience sparked an interest to explore how we may synthesize the design principles that we observed internationally into a culturally-relevant model for community development in the Midwest, United States.

The literature review reveals various models for community design at the master planning scale, but the process revealed only one example of community-oriented design applied to grassroots development projects. “Intentional communities” engender design principles to promote active living, attachment to place, and social cohesion. Therefore this typology presents a potentially democratic model for influencing the built environment, regardless of social values and political ideologies.
Similarly, while we are familiar with the concept of “architect as developer” and community-oriented practices, we do not have firsthand experience with these models. Thus, this research process is an attempt to investigate different types of intentional communities, to determine why this typology is prevalent on the West Coast, and to gain exposure to projects and designers that aspire toward social justice.

We organized field studies of local, regional and national projects and scheduled interviews with community members, design professionals and organizations committed to fostering healthy and sustainable living. In addition to field studies and interviews, we conducted a review of relevant literature in each field, investigated precedent studies and performed a market trend analysis. Each method offers valuable exposure to various facets of the overarching topic. The process, findings, and conclusions for each method are described in the subsets below.

**World Tour**

Our first method of inquiry began as a four-month long immersive learning experience through twenty-three countries and fifty-six cities. The World Tour utilized an interdisciplinary design approach for worldly analysis and observation, and it provided insight into the complex patterns that influence society’s relationship to the built environment – a whirlwind overview of community design.

The trip began with a question, what factors determine how cultures shape their built environments and are these relationships sustainable? An itinerary was prepared by leading Ball State faculty to highlight a broad arrange of cultures in urban and rural
environments, “visiting places, spaces, design professionals, buildings, gardens, and vernacular environments (WT4).”

Due to the rigorous itinerary and cultural language barriers, the methods used on this trip were primarily observations and analysis; however, we were able to correspond with a few city liaisons and other English-speaking citizens.

Preparing for the trip, we enrolled in a preparatory course to study the cultural customs, religious practices, and political system of twenty-five countries. The course helped prepare us for community analysis while studying abroad. During the trip, student coursework aligned with the itinerary and included theory, analysis, and colloquium courses. These three courses were then interwoven with a design studio that focused findings back to a hometown studio project. The coursework integrated research methods such as observation and analysis of various community cultures around the world, and we identified key relationships that might provide insight into our thesis.

We evaluated the economic, political, and cultural parameters that differentiate the midrise cityscape of Helsinki, Finland from the high-rise cityscape of Beijing, China. We compared the social agenda of Singapore’s government to the social housing model in Amsterdam, Netherlands. We investigated the sustainable, passive systems of Cordoba, Spain and the sustainable, active systems of Berlin, Germany. But these are just a small sampling of the worldly analysis that contributes to our assessment of American culture and the public realm.

Collectively, the findings are directly applicable to our pilot study in Indianapolis. Exposure to a broad spectrum of viable, culturally-sensitive community development models allows us to reflect on the cultural, environmental, and economic realities that
would directly affect our site. Furthermore, the tour provided a full catalog of community
design principles and presented a less ethnocentric perspective of the world, enhancing
our ability to evaluate local cultures and environments. These International precedents
introduce a multiple-solution mentality to the United States’ conventional one-solution
paradigm.

Local Cohousing Communities

After assessing the need for community design, an exploration of community
development led to the concept of intentional communities. Cohousing, one type of
intentional community, appears to have emerged from a philosophical and cultural
reflection on the potency of the individual in various social roles and communal
relationships (Kozeny 15). On a spectrum of collectivism and individualism, cohousing-
as a community typology - gravitates toward the center. In the center, one finds a
communitarian value system that emphasizes a balance between the desires of the
individual and the wellbeing of the community (Bess, 374-376). In the United States,
cohousing has become an increasingly popular method of social organization to the
incumbent liberal model that “in a misguided attempt to protect and promote the dignity
and autonomy of the individual, has undermined the associations and communities
which alone can nurture human flourishing (Kymlicka 181).”

It became clear that pockets of individuals nationwide identified societal factors that
inhibit the built environment’s ability to nurture social health, and these individuals
proactively sought to organize themselves in a way that more aptly provided the means
to thrive, individually and communally. We wanted to better understand the merits of this
typology, and how designers could facilitate a process that would efficiently and effectively translate the vision of a unified group into built form.

We completed a brief literature review on the topic and conducted informal interviews to evaluate the public’s perception of cohousing. Over the course of two days, we interviewed two students, two healthcare employees, and two seniors. The subjects were first asked about their general perception of cohousing. Then, the interviewers provided a definition and two examples of cohousing from *Cohousing: A Contemporary Approach to Housing Ourselves*. In an attempt to reevaluate the subjects’ original perspective, subjects were asked if they were familiar with any such examples.

The findings indicate that there is a high tendency for the general public to mislabel or stigmatize intentional communities. However, after providing a definition and example projects, the subjects exhibited a positive connotation with student co-ops and retirement cohousing. While this study could benefit from an increase in sample size and random sampling, the results indicate that without education, stereotyping might impede the reception of intentional communities. The results reveal that there could be success in introducing and marketing community-oriented development in conservative social and political environments such as Indianapolis. Having observed firsthand that some of the principles of intentional communities might work in the Midwest, while others will not, we noted that an effort could be made to de-stigmatize the connotation of labels associated with intentional communities and gradually infuse communitarian values into mainstream society with some success.

While there are many examples of community planning from a “master planning” or “urban design” scale, there are limited examples of community planning, in the United
States, from a “development” or “site design” scale. This gap was a key driver in the organization and investigation of our research criteria.

To further grasp the principles of cohousing and to identify parameters that might influence community design in the Midwest, we organized a trip to three nearby communities. We conducted a project review of intentional communities near Indiana utilizing the *Intentional Communities Directory* and then cross-referenced projects with published literature to identify noteworthy neighborhoods open to visitors. We plotted the findings on a map and contacted three neighborhoods in Ann Arbor, Michigan: Great Oak Cohousing, Touchstone Cohousing, and Sunward Cohousing.

After establishing contact with a community member, we arranged a tour of each neighborhood and asked for informal interviews with a handful of community members. On Sunday, October 10th between 2:00pm and 6:00pm, we conducted interviews and observations with the goal of recording community perception as a naïve observer. We were asked not to photograph residents, but the observations did help identify key concepts in cohousing. With a limited time frame, we asked five interviewees one question: What influenced your decision to join an intentional community? The findings highlight a desire for fellowship, but they also expose a financial benefit for some community members. This finding was significant for the thesis because it provided an economic incentive for developing intentional communities, especially considering the recently housing market. Our tour guide also disclosed some of the political, social, and economic difficulties that altered the group’s utopian perspective of community. These findings provided an initial glance at some of the obstacles intentional communities face, but they also helped identify potential networks and resources for navigating those impediments.
Local Community Leaders

We were reading of examples nationally, but wanted to understand what was happening locally. As the political atmosphere of Indianapolis is difficult to dissect, we chose to meet with leaders committed to advancing the quality of the built environment and the integrity of social infrastructure. We anticipated that connecting with these agencies would aid in future site selection, programming, networking, and funding strategies. We conducted a review of organizations such as IndyHub, the Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development, the Indianapolis Neighborhood Resource Center, and the Indianapolis Office of Sustainability. With very little time to conduct a thorough investigation, we sent out a contact request to our existing network to identify potential leads in these agencies. Fortunately, one of our colleagues worked with community leaders on the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI) through the John H. Boner Center, and she also connected us with the Indianapolis Office of Sustainability. These discussions also led to an informal study of Mansur Real Estate Services.

Quality of Life Plan for the Near Eastside

Abstract

The “Near Eastside Quality of Life Plan” is an example of a local plan to encourage community-development through identifying community goals, assets, and challenges. This model approaches community development from a master-planning perspective, but aspects of the plan can also influence community-development at a smaller scale. Today, the plan is drawing money and resources to the Near Eastside of Indianapolis.
Facilitating connections with people, the Quality of Life Plan is an example of how to spark local synergy for reinvesting in place.

![Figure 1. Great Indy Neighborhoods Map - neighborhoods that have or are developing Quality of Life Plans. Source: (Great Indy Neighborhoods)](image)

Significance

This case study explores a model of community-oriented design while also investigating the micro and macro political atmosphere in Indianapolis. Furthermore, the investigation helps identify a framework for future community development.

While incorporating community input for new development, the process depends heavily on public funding. If the community is willing to invest time into such an endeavor, can designers help address this new demand with alternative forms of funding and development?
Process

To explore the complex web of networks and information relevant to this study, the team first reviewed literature published by various local sources. In December of 2011, the team then met with employees of the John H. Boner Community Center that were involved in developing the Quality of Life Plan. Finally, the team toured the community with local leaders.

Introduction

The Near Eastside of Indianapolis is an archetypical, Midwest community plagued by job loss, crime, and brain-drain (Duffrin). Looking to address the social and economic factors negatively affecting the neighborhoods, local community organizations partnered with state and national organizations to help with the creation of a Quality of Life Plan for the Near Eastside (Great Indy Neighborhoods).

Local Initiatives Support Corporation (Federal Partner)

LISC is a national partner that provided the resources and knowledge for developing the framework for a Quality of Life Plan in Indianapolis.

The Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) is a national organization that works with local community development groups to help transition distressed neighborhoods towards a healthier and sustainable model for community living. “LISC mobilizes corporate, government and philanthropic support to provide local community development organizations with: loans, grants and equity investments; local, statewide
and national policy support; and technical and management assistance (Local Initiatives Support Corporation)."

“LISC is Building Sustainable Communities by achieving five goals: expanding investment in housing and other real estate; increasing family income and wealth; stimulating economic development; improving access to quality education; and supporting healthy environments and lifestyles (Local Initiatives Support Corporation)."

**Great Indy Neighborhoods (City Partner)**

A city-wide support network, Great Indy Neighborhoods encourages community involvement, establishes community initiatives, and implements change. “We need a holistic approach to healthy community building that harnesses individual energy and community resources to help our neighborhoods go from good to great (Great Indy Neighborhoods).”

The Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI) “is a set of initiatives established to support Indianapolis neighborhoods. The goals of these initiatives are to encourage neighbors to work together across traditional boundaries to: organize and get involved in their neighborhood; decide collectively on the priorities for their neighborhood; and act on those priorities to implement change in their neighborhood (Great Indy Neighborhoods).”

GINI supports the need for village living as an alternative to suburban living. “Even in traditionally urban neighborhoods it is often difficult to persuade new developers to build a development that fits into a “village” type area. Since the 1950s, a majority of new
development has been suburban style, to the detriment of neighborhood character and civic life (Great Indy Neighborhoods).

Figure 2. Village vignette from East Washington Street Design Charrette. Source: (College of Architecture and Planning 1).

GINI established eleven principles for healthy and sustainable neighborhoods and developed a workbook for implementing a quality of life plan. GINI challenges Indianapolis neighborhoods to form a Quality of Life Plan to incorporate these goals (Travis).

Table 1. GINI 11 principles for healthy and sustainable neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Leadership</strong>: Healthy neighborhoods value and cultivate skilled leadership and an active citizenry. Healthy neighborhoods possess a complement of local organizations, civic associations, religious communities, and/or community development corporations composed of the diverse, local array of racial, ethnic, and economic constituencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Vision</strong>: Healthy neighborhoods foster the creation of a “future community vision” and develop a holistic set of neighborhood strategies to achieve that vision. The ability to collaborate across barriers and sectors to successfully implement these strategies is recognized and valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Collaboration</strong>: Healthy neighborhoods exist within a metropolitan setting where governments and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the private, philanthropic, and independent sectors value and provide coordinated support for neighborhood association formation and growth, local leadership development, and holistic community development initiatives.

**Social**

4. **Services**: Healthy communities maintain the highest standard of health and human services.

5. **Education**: Healthy neighborhoods place a high value on intellectual and moral education. All local institutions and social structures take extraordinary measures to provide support to local schools. Parents and adults actively participate in the education of children. Children and young adults are involved in neighborhood associations and other local leadership forums that offer civic responsibility training.

6. **Culture**: Healthy communities offer a wide and varied array of artistic, cultural, recreational, and spiritual programs and venues to enrich the quality of life, nurture local talent, and foster creativity.

**Physical**

7. **Safety**: In healthy neighborhoods, police and citizens partner together to create a safe, crime-free environment. Healthy neighborhoods create safe and nurturing venues for children.

8. **Environment**: Healthy communities manage and invest in local properties and the common environment to maintain the community’s aesthetic and physical quality.

9. **Housing**: Healthy communities offer attractive housing as a community asset and a wealth-building opportunity for local families.

**Economic**

10. **Business Diversity**: Healthy communities possess a complement of retail and professional services.

11. **Economy**: Healthy communities have an integrated economic relationship with the surrounding region that provides both producers and consumers and generates economic opportunity. Healthy neighborhoods provide a setting where individuals can participate in the economy, either in the workforce or through entrepreneurial activity.
NESCO (Neighborhood Partner)

“In June 2005, through a NESCO initiative, the Near Eastside Collaborative Taskforce formed to address critical quality-of-life issues on the Near Eastside. The Taskforce was the driving force behind the selection of the Near Eastside as a demonstration neighborhood for the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI) and its designation as a redevelopment area with a housing tax increment financing district (HoTIF) by the City of Indianapolis (Quality of Life Plan, 4).”

A neighborhood support network, NESCO is umbrella organization of multiple groups serving the Near-Eastside of Indianapolis (Near Eastside). A smaller branch of Great Indy Neighborhoods, NESCO provides the framework and mission to identify common goals on the Near-Eastside and prevent the territoriality of fragmented organizations (Travis).

NESCO and many other community organizations, such as Indy-East Asset Development, are located in the John H. Boner Community Center, which acts the public face for many of these initiatives (John). Partnering with many community organizations, the community center helped facilitate the conversation necessary for implementing aspects of the Quality of Life Plan (Travis).

The Near Eastside is one of six Indianapolis Neighborhoods to develop a Quality of Life Plan, and it is now a demonstration neighborhood for community development.
The Near Eastside

The Near Eastside Quality of Life Plan combines the challenges and goals of twenty neighborhoods in an effort “to make the Near Eastside a great place to live, work, and play (Indy-East).”

“Once a thriving working class community, the Near Eastside was devastated by the closing of two manufacturing plants in the 1980s and with it the loss of thousands of well-paying jobs. Ancillary businesses followed – two of three large shopping centers shut. Homes were abandoned. Crime rose, as did high school dropout rates. Still, the mixed race neighborhood – about 60 percent white, 25 percent African American and 15 percent Latino – retained its activist can-do spirit, said neighborhood resident Marie Hanlon. Neighborhood groups, however, had for many years lacked the resources to work together on any large-scale neighborhood improvement (Duffrin).”

Figure 3. Existing conditions along 10th Street. Source (College of Architecture and Planning 2)

The Quality of Life Plan for the Near Eastside identifies values similar to those posted by GINI and established a direction for community development. The process included:

- Monthly meetings
- Establishing leadership
- Community asset map
- Early action grants
- 100 appreciative interviews with neighbors
- Community-wide visioning event
- Design workshop focused on East Washington Street
- Design Charrette

The plan is part of a larger effort to utilize local assets to generate a critical mass of participation and funding necessary for self-perpetuating development (Quality of Life Plan, 5).

Implementation

The Quality of Life Plan identifies existing neighborhood strengths and then suggests areas of improvement with a list of action steps, a time frame, lead organizations, partners, and performance measures. To date, the plan has influenced a number of community investments (Legacy Project).

1. Jefferson Apartments, a home-ownership incubator
2. Pogue's Run Grocer, the first food co-op in Indianapolis

3. Chase Near Eastside Legacy Center, at Arsenal Technical High School

Figure 5. Source: (Legacy Project)

4. Common Wealth/School 3 Project, multi-family apartment building

5. St. Clair Senior Apartments

6. MIBOR Centennial Project, multifamily and single family homes

7. St. Clair Place Home Ownership Project, home renovations and new construction

8. Clifford Corners, Mixed-Use development in the planning phase

9. ReBuilding Together, Home repairs

10. People's Health Center, health care center
This list continues to grow as organizations such as Indy-Asset Development (IAD) are working to introduce urban farming, pocket parks and green infrastructure (Indy-East).

**Synergy (local-investment)**

Aligning public and private interests, the Near Eastside Quality of Life Plan provides an opportunity for Indianapolis to highlight the strengths of community development through the city’s bid for the 2012 Super Bowl (Travis). Dubbed the Legacy Project, the public venture between GINI and the 2012 Indianapolis Super Bowl Host Committee provided a hook that helped the city land the national sporting event.

The proposal highlighted the Super Bowl’s direct and indirect impact on the city that will “create a lasting civic legacy and create impact far beyond game week (Legacy Project Overview).”
“The eventual outcome of the meeting is testament to the power of good planning to attract unexpected opportunity. A plan for the struggling Near Eastside – a neighborhood that has suffered some of the nation’s highest home foreclosure rates – so far has drawn not only $2 million in legacy funds but a staggering $70 million in additional investment, much of that leveraged under the spotlight of the legacy project…. The committee also viewed the Near Eastside plan as a model for neighborhood revitalization across Indianapolis, added Miles, who is CEO of a corporate partnership promoting regional economic growth. ‘We thought if we could do this and be successful using the deadline and excitement of the Super Bowl than perhaps it [could become] a template post-Super Bowl for people to rally around in other neighborhoods (Duffrin).’”

“A major part of the city’s bid to host the game was the National Football League’s so-called legacy project. Its playbook calls for spurring redevelopment on the city’s blighted near-Eastside by rehabbing or building about 300 housing units and constructing an indoor training facility at Arsenal Tech High School. Organizers, led by the John H. Boner Community Center and the Super Bowl Host Committee, hope the investment leads to a multimillion-dollar gentrification of the surrounding area (Olson).”

“The 2012 Indianapolis Super Bowl Host Committee’s leadership found a valued partner on the city’s Near Eastside. A coalition of neighborhood groups had come together in 2008 under the auspices of the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative (GINI) and the Local Initiatives Support Corporations (LISC) to create a comprehensive quality-of-life plan. Consisting of nearly 35,000 residents, the Near Eastside has been plagued by some of the highest rates of home foreclosure and abandonment in the country and throughout the state. As businesses have closed, crime rates have risen and school graduation rates and test scores have fallen dramatically (Olson).”
Catalyst (city-investment)

The efforts on the Near Eastside are also impacting the larger mission of the city. Aside from sparking five additional neighborhood plans, the urban investment is also influencing contributions from local businesses. Using the Quality of Life Plan as a model for community development, "organizations, including State Farm Insurance, Citizens Energy and Clarian Health, have begun lending to community development projects (East 10th)."

One such example, the Indianapolis Children’s Museum is spearheading a comprehensive plan for neighborhoods near North Meridian Street (McLaughlin). An effort to bring new investment into the declining neighborhood, the revitalization plan is mutually beneficial for the community and the Children’s Museum. “The idea is for the neighborhoods to agree on a clear vision that will attract outside investment, said Bill Taft, executive director of the Local Initiatives Support Corp., or LISC, which partners with the city on Great Indy Neighborhoods (McLaughlin).”

Analysis and Findings

The case study promotes strong partnerships based on mutually overlapping missions with various skills and resources. Local Initiatives Support Corporation, Great Indy Neighborhoods, and the Near Eastside Community Organization worked in tangent to provide a community framework for identifying neighborhood goals.

The case study highlights the effort required by numerous individuals and organizations to leverage state, federal, and private support.
The case study identifies community development ventures that already exist in Indianapolis, and it identifies potential partners such as the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) and Great Indy Neighborhoods.

The case study suggests a focus on community development leads to sustainable and healthy environments that are also affordable.

The case study reveals that a community development plan provides a direct link to the market data necessary to leverage funding for new development. Traditionally, a market data analysis is performed by developers to determine the feasibility of a project. If this data is being produced by public community sources rather than private commercial enterprises, an opportunity exists for design services to play a greater role in delivering an environment that meets these expectations.

Since a community development plan identifies potential funding sources, possible occupants, and existing consumer trends, an opportunity exists for designers to work directly with the community during the pre-design phase rather than waiting for an intermediary to contract schematic design services. Such a finding suggests that participating in pre-design services for community development might result in a higher percentage of work than pre-design services for traditional developments.

As the model of community development strengthens in the city of Indianapolis, new opportunities will emerge for designers to respond to this shifting market demand.
Office of Sustainability

Abstract

The following is an analysis of Mayor Ballard’s Office of Sustainability. The study investigates the current political atmosphere of Indianapolis with regard to sustainability. The findings suggest a partnership with the Office of Sustainability to generate a pilot study to test the merits of community-oriented design, smart growth development, and form-based codes.

Significance

The analysis is critical for interpreting and predicting policy roadblocks to the community-oriented development. Identifying overlapping goals with the city could help push through political barriers, and the community-oriented framework also presents the city with a model to influence synergetic improvements in local communities.

Process

The team first reviewed relevant literature published by various local sources, and in December of 2011, the team met with employees from the Office of Sustainability at City Market.

Introduction

The Office of Sustainability was founded by Mayor Ballard with a mission to transition the city of Indianapolis towards a sustainable agenda. “Mayor Ballard is serious about sustainability, and SustainIndy is his bold and innovative enterprise for making
Indianapolis more sustainable. The initiative is an action-based organization focused on reducing the environmental impact of city operations, working with private partners and helping pave the way for green economic development (SustainIndy)."

While individuals have a tendency to regard sustainability as a green initiative to protect the environment, the Office of Sustainability provides a balanced definition of sustainability in line with this thesis. “For SustainIndy, sustainability means using best practices to create lasting environmental, economic and community vitality - enhancing our quality of life now and ensuring that future generations of Indianapolis residents have an equally good quality of life (SustainIndy).”

Objectives

“The main charges of the Office of Sustainability are to lead sustainability efforts within city government; coordinate and collaborate on community sustainability goals - including acting as primary liaison to the City of Indianapolis Green Commission; and establish public-private partnership opportunities to move forward aggressively on achieving the vision of a more sustainable Indianapolis (SustainIndy).”

The third objective aligns with this thesis, especially since it hypothesizes that community development is a critical component to influencing holistic sustainability and efforts such as form-based codes and smart growth.

The Office of Sustainability is also a portal to national and local organizations dedicated to sustainability (Pumphrey). For example, the department maintains ties to Keep Indianapolis Beautiful, Inc, an organization that “unites people to build community and transform public spaces through aesthetics and environmental improvement (Keep
Indianapolis Beautiful).” Furthermore, the discussion identified the U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as a possible source for influencing mixed-income developments (Pumphrey).

Challenges
The interview revealed zoning and policy roadblocks that prevent the city-wide implementation of smart growth principles and form-based codes. As a conservative city, new techniques must be proven valid in local contexts before implementation city-wide (Pumphrey).

Findings
The study identifies the city’s definition of sustainability as a three pronged approach to balance environmental, economic, and community conditions. This definition meshes with the long-term sustainability defined by the thesis. This should provide less political objection to the mission of this pilot study.

This study identifies the Office of Sustainability and Keep Indy Beautiful as possible city partners. These partnerships are critical for influencing the sustainability agenda of Indianapolis towards community-oriented development.

The study identified the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as a possible federal partner in the mixed-income strategy of the thesis. The study supports the concept of a pilot study in Broad Ripple to provide evidence for form-based codes, smart growth, and community-oriented design in an effort to influence city-wide zoning changes.
**Mansur Real Estate Services**

**Abstract**

This study provides an overview of the Indianapolis development company, Mansur Real Estate Services. While traditional development influences the majority of Indianapolis’ built environment, Mansur’s business model suggests that the market is shifting towards holistic sustainability. The study suggests that Mansur’s model for urban development is closer to the community-oriented model of this thesis than traditional development companies.

**Significance**

As this thesis places attention on pre-design services and community-oriented development, it is critical to investigate the existing development landscape of Indianapolis. While an investigation of multiple development companies in Indianapolis would provide a more complete picture of the development landscape, an investigation of Mansur Real Estate Services highlights a local response to shifting market trends, and the company’s mission aligns with the thesis objective to generate a model for holistic sustainability.

As pre-design services have a large impact on the built environment, this study also encourages speculation towards the designer’s role in real estate development.

**Process**

Through discussions with Ball State faculty and practicing designers in Indianapolis, the team identified Mansur Real Estate Services as a development company with goals that...
potentially overlap with this thesis. The team reviewed relevant literature through various local sources, but in the interest of time, the team was required to draw many conclusions from informal discussions with design firms familiar with Mansur.

As the thesis also provides an overview of Jonathan Segal’s role as an architect and developer, the team has not yet contact local developers for interviews. However, as this thesis is launching pad for additional exploration, the team plans to contact Mansur at the conclusion of this thesis.

Introduction

Indianapolis is host to a variety of real estate development companies, but reviewing the competitive landscape, one company stood out for their focus on community projects in Indianapolis. Mansur Real Estate Services is “one of the Midwest's leading real estate development companies, creating more than $600 million in commercial real estate properties in five major metropolitan cities in the United States and abroad (Mansur).”

“Mansur began in downtown Indianapolis by redeveloping functionally-obsolete structures for new commercial uses. Many buildings left vacant found new uses as office and retail. New construction and land development soon followed, bringing Mansur into the residential urban and suburban markets (Mansur).” Today, Mansur recognizes the impact of real estate development on neighborhood vitality and is dedicated to community redevelopment (Mansur). These goals correlate with the community-oriented development model proposed by this thesis and allows Mansur to stand apart from development companies that do not place a strong emphasis on community values (College of Architecture and Planning).
Services

While Mansur’s community focus is unique to the business model, their services are not dissimilar from the traditional development model that provides a framework for orchestrating projects from conception to completion (Miles 5-7). Mansur provides construction management; design build contracting; site assessment; budgeting; value engineering; energy and engineering analysis; and post-construction client Support (Mansur).

Addressing the community market, Mansur steers these services to help revitalize communities. Mansur assists in removing investment barriers, isolating resources, producing realistic implementation strategies, and locating and allocating funds. To accomplish these goals, Mansur utilizes market feasibility studies, identifies community input, and pinpoints sources for public and private funding. Mansur can help communities leverage HUD program funding, city entitlement dollars, local policy options and tax credit initiatives (Mansur). These services are critical to influencing community development, and Mansur’s leadership is responsible for orienting business strategies to serve this market.

Leadership

Mansur’s focus on community development and sustainability might stem from their background in design fields.

Chairman and CEO of Mansur, Cornelius M. Alig, “earned a Bachelor of Architecture degree in 1978 from Tulane University in New Orleans, and a Master of Science in
Architecture and Urban Design in 1982 from Columbia University of New York. Prior to 1982, he was a practicing architect with two prominent Indianapolis firms (Mansur)."

Alig is also "involved with a number of community and cultural organizations, most notably the Indiana State Museum, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, Inc., Methodist Hospital Foundation, Inc., Athenaeum Foundation, Inc. and the Indianapolis Arts Center (Mansur)."

Credited with establishing Mansur’s residential development division, President and Principle, Charles R. Cagann “graduated from Ball State University, Indiana in 1972 with a degree in Urban Planning…. Project highlights during [Cagann’s] tenure include the Circle Centre Mall, Union Station renovation, and the Lower Canal improvements. Mr. Cagann is currently affiliated with the Ball State Indianapolis Center, Fostering Urban Strategies, Massachusetts Area Committee IDI/Riley Area, Fall Creek Place Homeowners Association and the Building Futures Institute (Mansur).”

A design background and community partnerships help Mansur pursue their mission to improve Midwest communities.

**Significant works**

The following is a brief sampling of urban, community-oriented developments.
Fall Creek Place

“Fall Creek Place is a neighborhood filled with a diverse mix of hard-working people who appreciate the benefits of downtown living. This innovative development features newly constructed homes along with restored historic homes in a neighborhood with new parks, new sidewalks, and other amenities all less than two miles from the heart of downtown. And, unlike many of the housing developments surrounding Indianapolis, it's a neighborhood that wasn't carved out of a cornfield overnight (Fall Creek Place).”

“Fall Creek Place involves the transformation of a blighted inner-city neighborhood into a healthy, mixed-income, and diverse community providing a range of housing opportunities, recreational amenities, and commercial support services. Fall Creek Place includes over 550 new and rehabilitated homes, including both new construction and rehabilitation activity. The development is a mixed-income initiative, with 51 percent of homes targeted to households at or below 80 percent of the city's median income (Mansur).”
Figure 8. Source: (Fall Creek Place)

Renaissance Pointe

Figure 9. Source: (Renaissance Pointe)
“Renaissance Pointe’s 350 new single family homes and townhomes have been designed in harmony with the character and architecture of the existing homes in this historic neighborhood, while showcasing all the livable luxury that contemporary homebuyers are seeking. Completing Fort Wayne’s newest neighborhood will be the restoration of at least 75 existing homes (Renaissance Pointe).”

“Equally as important, Renaissance Pointe will include rehabilitation of up to 100 existing owner-occupied homes. Renaissance Pointe will also include construction of 36 'live/work' townhome units along with approximately 95,000 square feet of new retail/commercial space at critical nodes in the neighborhood, along with a new $8 million, 60,000 square foot YMCA facility and greenway trail which will ultimately link to the downtown area. As the Master Developer, Mansur is working closely with the City of Fort Wayne, area homebuilders, lending institutions, and local stakeholders towards moving this initiative forward. Renaissance Pointe began infrastructure improvements and model home construction in 2007, and the project is anticipated to take 8-9 years to complete (Mansur).”

Figure 10. Source: (Renaissance Pointe)
Findings

The study reveals that the community development market is growing and that stronger partnerships are needed between designers and developers during the pre-design phase to envision and define project objectives for transitioning communities towards a holistic model of sustainability.

The study provides a local model for how design professionals can influence Indianapolis neighborhoods while the findings also reinforce the financial incentive for designers to get involved in community development.

This study reinforces the macro investment strategy for community development, but it does not explore the residential investment strategy for grassroots community development.

West Coast Tour

During the research phase of the thesis, we had very little “hands-on” experience with intentional communities. From a leadership perspective, this limits our credibility and confidence when making informed, design decisions. We also have some gaps concerning the programming and implementation of intentional communities:

1. What are national and regional factors that influence the development of intentional communities?
2. What are key factors that determine the success of intentional communities?
3. How do intentional communities relate to the core mission of community-oriented development?
Visiting distinguished intentional communities was determined to yield highest likelihood of answering these questions. The literature review revealed there are relatively few intentional communities in the Midwest compared to the West Coast. The *Communities Directory* revealed there are 325 intentional communities that fit parameters similar to our thesis – urban, open to visitors, and no common shared spiritual practices. Compared to 0 listing in Indiana, there are 70 listing in California, 22 listing in Washington, 15 listing in Oregon, and 5 listings in Arizona; these account for a third of the communities in the United States that fit our parameters in the United States (see Appendix B: Communities Directory). We determined that a tour of the West Coast would allow for the observations and analysis necessary to:

1. Identify core design principles for successful intentional communities
2. Identify partnerships that facilitate intentional community development
3. Analyze cultural and social values and their impact on developing intentional communities

Additionally, the West Coast region contains industry leaders in the areas of intentional communities, design leadership, and project synergy. We identified the following design leaders located in our target area and contacted them for interviews: David Baker, Jonathan Segal, McCamant & Durrett Architects, and Clare Cooper Marcus. We were able to schedule an interview with McCamant & Durrett Architects in Nevada City, CA on January 11th, 2011 (see McCamant & Durrett case study for interview notes). Clare Cooper Marcus provided knowledge of key projects worth visiting, though a visit with her was not possible. Baker and Segal did not return our calls. However, we did visit several projects designed by Baker and Segal, respectively (see respective case studies for site visit notes).
To plan for the trip, we cross-examined the results from the *Communities Directory* inquiry with highlighted projects from the literature review. A matrix was developed to evaluate each community, and the communities were ranked according to their significance towards the thesis (see Appendix A: Communities Matrix). The communities that contributed most to the thesis were plotted on a map, and a flexible route was drawn through the highest percentage of locations. Communities ranked with three to five stars (out of five) were contacted. Twelve of the 32 communities responded in a timely manner. Of the twelve, eight communities aligned with a route that would maximize our travel itinerary. The tour began January 3rd in Phoenix, Arizona and ended on January 18th in Seattle, Washington.

During this trip we conducted community observations, interviews, and analysis. The findings were used to further evaluate project locations and opportunities.

**West Coast Tour Findings:**

The observations we were able to make on the West Coast Tour helped to fill the gaps in our understanding of the nature, purpose and process of community building. We were able to answer our three main questions, and we were able to complement the best practices highlighted by the other research methodologies with firsthand field study. The questions are answered below. Additional analysis can be found in the subsequent case studies.

**What are national and regional factors that influence the development of intentional communities?** We determined that there are complex phenomena characteristic of, and even unique to, this typology. The main factor on a national level is a cultural one. There
is a stigma associated with the concept of intentional communities. The term “intentional community” frequently evokes associations with communes, communism, free-loving hippies, or fanatical religious groups. While intentional communities have taken root in some areas in the United States that are generally more socially progressive, the connotation still poses a threat to the acceptance of this typology in other areas. There is evidence that residents in these other areas desire some of the core values inherent to communitarian typologies, and yet there are far fewer successful intentional communities in these areas, particularly the Midwest. This suggests that perhaps the negative connotation hampers cultural acceptance and begs the question, how can community-oriented developments be marketed in such a way that does not elicit the associated negative connotation?

Climate is another factor that precipitates the physical expression of the intentional community. This factor primarily influences productive landscape, on-site energy production, material palette, passive systems, siting, and the programming of outdoor spaces. Climate does not preclude the formation of intentional communities, as there are dozens of communities in the colder climates of Sweden, Finland, and Denmark, though there is a noticeably higher concentration of intentional communities in favorable climates.

Furthermore, the interrelationships between the social, environmental and economic factors and how they combine to achieve goals of sustainability highlight the various means by which a community’s values – national or regional - might be expressed. Provided in the table below are the combinations of these factors and an example of how each factor might manifest in built form (see Table 1).
Table 2: Ways in which sustainability factors may manifest in built form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Manifestation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social                | community outreach; diversity; social needs | • Common house – place where people can share activities and space, democratic space  
|                       |                                      | • sense of belonging                                                          |
| Environmental         | clean air, water & land; reduced consumption & waste | • low-impact development, efficient land use, reduced auto-dependence  
|                       |                                      | • preservation/integration of natural spaces                                  |
| Economic              | capital efficiency; risk management; growth; ROI | • (Cotati) HOA ownership of retail space  
|                       |                                      | • individual ownership of house; shared ownership of common spaces  
|                       |                                      | • stronger market value                                                       |
| Socio-Economic        | social investments; local economic stimulation; job creation | • agriculture, chickens, cottage industry  
|                       |                                      | • social currency – exchange of goods and services  
|                       |                                      | • strength in numbers – unified voice                                          |
| Eco-Efficiency        | resource efficiency; product stewardship; life-cycle management | • energy/material conservation  
|                       |                                      | • responsible building methods and technologies  
|                       |                                      | • shared spaces offer greater quality and diversity of amenities than individual would likely be able to own |
| Socio-Environmental   | safety & health; environmental regulations; global climate change | • shared eco-sustainability goals and accountability  
|                       |                                      | • greater sense of place = greater sense of ownership                        |

What are key factors that determine the success of intentional communities?

Success appears to be contingent upon four main factors: vision, commitment,
organization and luck. Vision and commitment are closely linked. In order to know where one is going, one must have a vision for where one would like to go. The stronger the vision, the easier it is to find people who share or would like to support the vision. The greater the support, the easier it is to commit, as once a critical mass is reached, the momentum becomes greater than the sum of the parts.

This is why organization is a key to the success of the project. Without organization, the process can become costly, redundant, and preclusive to long-term success. Organization can, and must, come in many forms. The core group must be organized in a way that facilitates a productive process. This may come from leadership within the group, or in the case of McCamant & Durrett Architects, be facilitated by professionals who can streamline the design process. Regardless, organization requires creating a mechanism for effective decision-making, committing to a unified vision, consulting professionals, leveraging financial assets, and translating personal and collective values into built form.

Beyond the controllable factors, luck also plays a role. In the case of La Querencia (Fresno Cohousing), the vitality of the community continues to waver under the instability of the housing market.

How do intentional communities relate to the core mission of community-oriented development? The core mission of community-oriented development can be defined as the commitment to bolstering the social infrastructure of civil society – including families and neighborhoods, and promoting the welfare of the community. From what we gathered from interviews, it was the individual desire to form a more meaningful lifescape that initially catalyzed the spark to build an intentional community. Whether
they could articulate it or not, the residents of the intentional communities we visited appeared to value the simultaneous social nourishment of individual and community afford by this typology.

The physical organization of the communities is influenced by the balance of individual and collective spaces and built upon the value of promoting social cohesion. It is in this arrangement that a more vibrant cross-section of life exists. There are public and private thresholds built into the social programming. The design promotes social interaction by channelizing circulation along centralized spines, and creating nodes for spontaneous encounters. The pattern offers choices, including but not limited to: the choice to contribute to the synergy of a collective vision and experience the direct and immediate impact; and the choice to engage with people who bring a diverse array of experience, beliefs and perspectives in an environment that celebrates those differences. At the core of intentional community design is social design, and it is from this principle that we can begin to understand how to design forms and spaces that strengthen the pillars of civil society.

Case Studies

The following case studies provide insight into some of the successes, opportunities and challenges of today’s design leaders in community design. These studies illustrate innovative approaches to identifying and satisfying a social need for community.

McCament & Durrett Architects facilitate community formation by turning the mirror on their client to reveal the particular needs and desires for the project, and then supplying the tools to have them met. Jonathan Segal assimilates the role of the developer and by doing so has supplied affordable housing that adapts to diverse user needs. Finally, in his projects, developer Jonathan Rose addresses occupant health by establishing a
system of metrics and community partnerships, resulting not only in the greater well being of the client but the surrounding area as well. Additional precedent studies highlight how other projects and designers are aspiring to social justice.

**McCamant & Durrett Architects**

This case study reviews the impact of McCamant & Durrett Architects on the advancement of cohousing communities as a viable model of communitarian living in the United States. The study describes the passion driving the firm, explores key projects, and highlights their contribution to best practices in community development and sustainability. The study utilizes field study, interviews with residents and design professionals, and a review of relevant literature to generate a list of key replication aspects.

**Passion**

For the past 23 years, Kathryn McCamant and Chuck Durrett have taken their passion for sustainable community building and introduced to the United States a comprehensive approach to forming, implementing and maintaining cohousing alternatives that, prior to 1987, had only been found outside of the US. Through a participatory design process, the firm collaborates with their clients to shape each project into a direct reflection of the client’s needs and desires. This close design leadership, initiated from the beginning of the project, allows for communities to be constructed with an end goal in mind, and for sustainable components to be integrated intentionally and affordably from the onset of the design process. Taking cohousing development to the next level, McCamant has cofounded *Cohousing Partners LLC*, which serves as a liaison between cohousing groups and architecture & design consultants to meet the growing demand for cohousing
in California. By bridging the gap between client desires and built reality, McCamant & Durrett have proven that integrating design in the multiple phases of cohousing development provides a viable and desirable alternative to conventional community development. The success of this process is clearly communicated by the several accolades the firm has received since the introduction of their seminal book *Cohousing: A Contemporary Approach to Housing Ourselves* in 1988 (McCamant).

*Projects*

McCamant & Durrett Architects provides full architectural services and educational resources, including workshops that capitalize on the early stages of community development to evaluate the feasibility of potential sites and generate the best possible approach for community development. The firm has successfully applied these methods to projects focusing on: *cohousing communities, senior communities, affordable housing, childcare centers* and *town planning & mixed use developments*. Two projects of particular relevance to our thesis are *La Querencia* in Fresno, CA and *Frog Song Cohousing* in Cotati, CA. We visited these projects firsthand during our West Coast tour, and evaluated them in the SWOT analyses below. Nevada City, Pleasant Hill, and Bellingham were also visited but not included in our analysis because they did not offer additional insight beyond what the noted projects provided.

**Frog Song – Cotati, California**

*General Description:* Located in Cotati, California, Frog Song is an award-winning mixed-use urban infill project that incorporates 7500 square feet of commercial storefronts into a thirty-condo

*Figure 11. Frog Song public retail front.*
cohousing complex on a 2.3-acre site. The community revisits the “main street” concept by stacking residences above street-side storefronts. More information can be found at http://www.cotaticohousing.org/

Table 3: Frog Song Community project information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Part of a small downtown, next to a larger suburban city</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History:</td>
<td>The town takes on a hexagonal grid pattern shaped after the hexagonal barn belonging to the original landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership:</td>
<td>Individual, plus a share of the common space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>2.3 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>Infant to 80s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Areas:</td>
<td>Kitchen; Dining/Dance/Meeting Hall; Guest Rooms; Common Storage; Kids’ Play Room, Living Room; Laundry/Clotheslines; Workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in:</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visit: Frog Song was scheduled as a stop on our West Coast Tour itinerary. On January 10, 2011 we toured the community and met with the community for a group meal in the common house. After the meal, we continued our discussion with six members of the community. The members included an adolescent girl, an adolescent boy, each of their fathers who were also founding members, a single woman renting one of the units, and
a woman who was also a founding member. The conversation focused on the following topics:

- the vision, goals and values that fueled the formation of the community
- the dynamics of the group decision making/communication process
- the role of the community and the role of the architect throughout the design process
- their perceived strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats as a community
- the financial and legal structure

The interview revealed how driven the original members were to see this project through to construction. The original goals of the community were to create a place that fostered fellowship, stewardship for the land, and comfortable aging while raising younger generations with communitarian values. The members discussed the role of the group and architect in the creation of the community, and the obstacle of meeting the city’s requirement to incorporate retail space. Both children and adults expressed the importance of gathering nodes for planned and spontaneous events and the rewards of knowing one’s neighbors and living in proximity to where one works and plays. Among the perceived strengths of the community, the members appreciated the vitality of an intergenerational neighborhood in which diversity was celebrated. The social structure also allowed for on-site daycare by trusted caretakers, added security and social inclusivity.

We reflected on the experience and conducted the following SWOT analysis:
Table 4: Frog Song Community SWOT analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cohesive, strong social structure as the driving force behind the community formation.</td>
<td>• Gaps in generational structure. Few adolescents and young adults to contribute to or allow for community continuity.</td>
<td>• Activity from retail units affects comfort of residents in above units. Noise pollution is a primary complaint with regards to the relationship between residents and retail.</td>
<td>• Discord with neighbors, in particular, the patrons of the adjacent bar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design facilitates communitarian values (i.e. community garden, shared activity nodes, common house, responsibility to oneself and neighbor).</td>
<td>• Despite strong standing in the community, there still exist unresolved conflicts with neighbors.</td>
<td>• Common community vision helps define sense of place. Empowers community to shape local identity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public (retail front), semi-public (common house and outdoor activity nodes) and private spaces (individual residences).</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased community engagement by Frog Song residents, individually and collectively, sparks reinvestment in public realm, particularly downtown Cotati.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unique ownership model: residential/retail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Home Owner’s Association with common legal structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community has gravity with local politics (i.e. influenced preservation of neighboring wetland).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Site specific design (passive solar orientation, regionally sensitive materials and aesthetic, on-site energy generation and stormwater mitigation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On-site food production.
• Blend between suburban living with urban density.

Key Replicable Aspects: What set this cohousing community apart from others on our itinerary was the HOA’s ownership of the commercial space. Not only did it introduce an added source of revenue, but the community could decide on the type of tenants that would fill the units, thus shaping the character of the place. The retail units also served as a public interface for the community as a whole, exposing the greater community to an alternative form of urban living and altering common misconceptions regarding communitarian living.

Figure 13. Frog Song community site plan. Source: (Cohousing)
La Querencia – Fresno Cohousing, CA

*General Description:* La Querencia is a 2.8-acre, 28-home development located near an elementary school and within walking distance to a park and retail areas. Its strong focus on environmental sensitivity provides living accommodations for a range of family sizes and incomes. More information can be found at www.fresnocohousing.org.
Table 5. La Querencia site information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Located in suburban Fresno</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History:</td>
<td>a western railroad town known for its slogan “Clovis – A Way of Life”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households:</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership:</td>
<td>Individual, plus a share of the common space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>2.8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>children-elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Areas:</td>
<td>Common House which includes gourmet kitchen, media room, guest apartment, laundry facilities, mail room, children’s play room, terrace; pool, spa, gym, workshop, crafts room, teen room (adaptable), community garden &amp; landing areas along the walkway between homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in:</td>
<td>planning began 2004, moved in 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. La Querencia site plan. Source: (La Querencia)

Visit: We stayed in the guest apartment at La Querencia the night of January 8, 2011. As we approached the common house, two community members noticed we were out of
place and confronted us about our intentions. We explained we were meeting with one of the founding members and had reserved the guest apartment in the common house. They immediately cooled and confided their familiarity with our visit. This experience reinforced the social connection forged in a community. We were unknowns in a place that had created a strong identity. Before the night ended, we had crossed paths with two additional community members, both aware of our scheduled visit, who indulged us in casual conversation.

The next morning we met with a founding member and discussed the following topics:

- the vision, goals and values that fueled the formation of the community
- the dynamics of the group decision making/communication process
- the role of the community and the role of the architect throughout the design process
- their perceived strengths, weakness, opportunities, and threats as a community
- the financial and legal structure

The member traced the history of the community to the inception of the idea for the community in 2004. The member highlighted the importance of a common vision and defining the principles for group decision making. It was explained that while existing buildings codes prohibited certain alternative building methods desired by the community (i.e. straw bale, greywater reuse, composting toilets), their commitment to sustainability helped to expedite the permit process. The member also described how the architects facilitated a participatory design process through which the community determined the appropriate distance between the houses, the location and separation of common house functions into different buildings, and the configuration of the floor plans. The member also questioned how much the participatory process translated into a design that
reflected their group’s particular needs and desires when the final design so closely resembled all of the architect’s other cohousing communities. The member shared their challenge with selling the units as a result of a depressed market, citing the HOA’s decision to rent units in order to remain financially solvent.

From the interviews and observations we conducted our own SWOT analysis:

Table 6. La Querencia SWOT analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A definite sense of belonging to a community that values diversity of age, ethnicity, experience, and perspectives</td>
<td>• Neighbors (as well as residents) despise the color palette of the buildings</td>
<td>• Partnership, social connection with neighboring Unitarian Universalist Church</td>
<td>• Site selection made by land availability rather than interconnectedness with broader community. Not within walking distance to retail/commercial or other desirable destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared resources, meals, responsibilities, fun, spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential partnership with adjacent senior living facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balance of public and private time and space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cost savings afforded by economy of scale (HOA dues less than individual fees for municipal services and utilities)</td>
<td>• Significant number of vacancies as a result of depressed housing market</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Watering down of sense of community as a result of renters rather than homeowners, who might consider a more long-term investment in home and community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HOA – common legal/financial structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No shared finances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aesthetically beautiful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On-site food production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eco-sensitive materials, energy-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Replicable Aspects: The aspect of this community that stood out was that while the Common House contained a number of communal functions, some of the common house functions (i.e. exercise room, workshop, and teen room) were in separate buildings located on a different part of the site. This appeared to add vitality to the spaces between the buildings, expanding the diversity of opportunities for social interaction among various user groups.

Interview with Kathryn McCamant and Chuck Durrett

Our interview with McCamant & Durrett Architects led to some valuable revelations regarding the role of the design professional in facilitating the community-building process. While we do not have a transcript of the conversation, we gleaned the following lessons:

- Facilitation is about organizing people. How can a design leader take fifty strangers and help them imagine their potential as a community? In order to build community, one must focus on the individual. If the individual does not already believe it, the leader must show the individual how he or she benefits from a relationship with neighbors.

- Community can become a catalyst for revitalization. In the case of Emeryville Cohousing, a school was transformed into an intentional neighborhood, which in
turn sparked reinvestment (by public and private organizations) in the areas surrounding the community.

- **Houses can contain less when common spaces provide more.** Intentional communities can offer a financial incentive to homeowners. There is savings with the economy of scale afforded by community. Furthermore, buy-in to a community delivers value beyond monetary savings. Social currency is strong in places where neighbors take ownership of a place.

- **Proliferation requires a cultural shift.** While among residents the stigma of associated with communitarian lifestyles is lessening, it will take time for a mainstream understanding of what we (as a society) need to be deliberate about the development of our built environment and the creation of meaningful neighborhoods. ‘Community’ can be messy, so until the concept becomes ingrained in our conventionally individualistic paradigm, there will be obstacles in realizing communitarian goals.

- **Bring it to the people.** As Architect as Developer, tailoring each project to the client’s specific needs yields a more desirable and sustainable result that often provides a greater ROI in terms of triple bottom line.

*Power*

McCamant & Durrett Architects model effective leadership in the creation of intentional communities, which directly relates to our thesis exploration. Their model allows for broad industry partnerships, drawing from the synergy and collaborative spirit of various user groups who provide benefits otherwise underutilized by conventional community development. The particular lessons learned from observing their business practices, participatory design process and community partnerships are as follows:
• Create and strengthen lines of communications from planning stages to implementation and maintenance.
• Widen the dissemination of the process to broader markets and populations through well-placed, well-designed catalyst projects
• Augment sustainable development through a participatory process in the following ways:
  o Promote transparency in planning process can encourage a high level of community enrollment and ownership in decision-making.
  o Contribute to mutual knowledge and cooperation among individuals and community partners
  o Balance each individual’s voice with that of the community
  o Open dialogues among key players that can enrich the creativity and coherence of the final product, and open future opportunities for collective synergy.

Jonathan Segal, FAIA

This case study uses field study and SWOT analysis of select projects to evaluate the success of Segal’s model as architect and developer in facilitating community building.

Passion

Management (Miles, 5-7). As architects are typically involved in only a few of these steps, Jonathon Segal recognized the traditional service orientation of the architecture profession and the short-term development models for profitability, Jonathon Segal aims to cut out the middle man as an Architect and Developer. Segal encourages architects to balance design, cost, and function to determine the feasibility of projects, in this manor, Segal serves as his own client, contractor, and property manager (Architect as Developer).

“Jonathan Segal FAIA & Development Company has been awarded six national AIA Honor Awards for their housing work (Jonathan Segal Architect)” In the Jonathan Segal Documentary, prepared for the Mix 9 architecture show, the directors catalog his work from his first live/work residence for his family. Segal tells the audience, “Traditionally the architecture of the world has been created by architects who are doing civic buildings. With the advent of the architect working for the contractor and the developer, the architect has been regulated to just a messenger. We, in our process, by deem the architect, contractor and developer, control the buildings and make it a better place for people.” Taking on these multiple roles, Segal claims he can also spend more money, than a traditional developer, on exploration and experimentation. Segal also uses profitability and post-occupancy reviews to inform the design direction of future projects.

With many built projects in San Diego spurring revitalization in downtown, Segal is leaving a legacy behind him, but he also contributes this knowledge to the profession (Jonathan Segal Documentary). Segal is an AIA Fellow and he holds multiple lectures series to guide architects towards becoming their own clients.
Projects

Segal’s practice focuses on urban mixed-use and residential projects. “An architect, developer, and builder, Segal accurately predicted San Diegans’ ripening attraction to dense urban living. He and his wife and business partner, Wendy, correctly assumed a revitalized downtown would attract people looking for distinctively designed row houses and lofts that engage the street (Jarmusch).” During our West Coast tour, we visited the “K Lofts”, the “Q” and “the Union.” We conducted a SWOT analysis of only the “K Lofts” as we have determined that the “Q” and the “Union” do not offer additional applicable insight.

K Lofts

General Description: “K Lofts is a 9 unit rental project which was completed in 2005. Located on 26th and B Street in Golden Hill, each unit offers two-level interiors, sizable outdoor spaces, and utilizes innovative materials. (Architect as Developer)"

Table 7. K Lofts site information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Golden Hill area of San Diego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership:</td>
<td>Affordable housing, rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>0.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
<td>currently no vacancies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Visit:** Our visit was unscheduled, so our observations were limited to what we could view from the street and the information available on Segal’s website.

From our observations we conducted our own SWOT analysis:

**Table 8. K Lofts SWOT analysis.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Nine month, participatory design process
  - Community partnerships between and among residents, civic groups, local government agencies and community stakeholders
  - Public and private spaces that encourage social interaction, shared use of space and strengthen the sense of community within the project and with the surrounding area. |
| **Social** |
  - Residential only
  - A sense of place, but limited space for shared interaction |
| • Participatory process could be a social spark for community engagement in the area |
### Economic
- Affordable materials and simple construction techniques allowed the project to be built at $82/sf.
- Mix of affordable (50% of median income) and market rate units
- Adaptive reuse of the existing Circle K convenience store to minimize deconstruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental
- Higher density urban infill
- Aesthetically pleasing
- Adaptive reuse of existing buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Replicable Aspects:** K Lofts represent how affordable design can be constructed without sacrificing quality. The participatory design process empowered residents to define a product that met their spatial, formal, and budgetary needs. While the project benefited from Segal’s leadership as an architect/developer, it would not have been as successful without the synergy generated by the discussions between designer and community.

**Power**

Jonathan Segal is the premier Architect as Developer, and his firm structure allows for design leadership in the buildings industry. His model highlights the financial constraints and potential roadblocks for young architects (Bernstein). The particular lessons learned
from Segal’s design leadership, participatory process, and commitments to sustainable urban development are summarized below:

- Proactive leadership can translate an underdeveloped market into a profitable asset.
- Small projects tailored to the needs/desires of a small audience can result in high desirability, low construction costs and a high return on investment.
- Urban infill, adaptive reuse, small-scale projects integrate well into broader social and political context.

**Mubahay Court + Northside Community Center**

This precedent study evaluates the union of senior housing and a community outreach center using a SWOT analysis.

*General Description:* “A senior housing complex with an integrated community and senior services center in San Jose, this development serves a low-income elderly population. [The] complex features a mix of apartment configurations that allows for a greater diversity of tenants than a single-unit approach.
The private balconies, stoops, and gardens of these apartments echo those of the adjacent homes. By annexing the airspace over the community center, it was possible to fit the same number of units into a three-story—rather than four-story—building, maintaining the low residential scale of the neighborhood. Northside Community Center, the corner public park and meditation garden provide a welcoming green space for the entire community. (Baker)

Table 9. Mubahay Court site information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Japantown area of San Jose, CA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Affordable housing rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>1.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Areas</td>
<td>Corner public park, meditation garden, offices and classrooms, auditorium, lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>David Baker + Partners (Architect), City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team: of San Jose Department of Housing (government agency), San Jose Redevelopment Agency (government agency), BRIDGE Housing (client)

Visit: We were unable to schedule a tour, so we visited the public areas of the project noting the “community within a community” that occurs as a result of the proximity of senior housing to the community center, and the center’s connection with the surrounding community. With a simple material palette and conventional construction methods, Baker designed a rich human-scaled environment that evokes the local flavor while cultivating a distinct sense of place.

From our observations we conducted our own SWOT analysis:

Table 10. Mubahay Court SWOT analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proximity of housing to community center</td>
<td>• Limited user groups given the single demographic accommodated by the housing (seniors in need of affordable housing)</td>
<td>• Design allows seniors to engage with larger community in a meaningful way using the community center as an interface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community programs cater to senior housing and surrounding community, introducing strong connections among user groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balance of public and private space (i.e. corner public garden, meditation garden, court configuration of housing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Economic
- Community partnerships connect affordable housing with civic amenities thus providing a local supply for the local demand
- Simple material palette, and common construction materials and techniques minimize costs
- Reliant on government funding to subsidize housing.

### Environmental
- Aesthetically beautiful
- High density residential maximizes usable land (56 units/acre)
- Capture and celebrate rainwater with a fountain.

**Key Replicable Aspects:** The proximity of senior housing to a community center provides the means for an often neglected segment of the population to engage society. Furthermore, community partnerships between the housing authority, client, and architect allowed for affordable quality in the built environment. The concept of “community within a community” resonates strongly in this project.

**Swan’s Market – Old Oakland Neighborhood, CA**

This precedent study explores Pyatok Architect’s design of the Swan’s Market renovation. It most closely captured the synergy of an urban infill, mixed-use residential
development that was designed to strengthen community bonds in an existing urban neighborhood.

**General Description:** Stated in the Pyatok Architects portfolio, “North America’s 50th Cohousing Community is preserved in the 1917 Swan’s Market building in historic Old Oakland neighborhood. We are the most urban cohousing community in North America; a block from a major subway hub; 12 minutes from downtown San Francisco. Swan’s Market is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is an award-winning innovative mixed-used historic-preservation project, restoring an abandoned old market building. In addition to our cohousing community, Swan’s Market includes affordable rental apartments, retail stores, restaurants, professional offices, and the Museum of Children’s Art. The building is restored with the original glazed brick/ceramic tile exterior preserved and steel beams exposed. (Pyatok)"

### Table 11. Swan’s Market site information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>The most urban cohousing community in the US, a block from major subway hub; 12 minutes from downtown San Francisco.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History:</td>
<td>1917 Swan’s Market building in the Old Oakland neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households:</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership:</td>
<td>Individual, plus a share of the common space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>0.3 acres, mostly air rights in historic market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members:</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages:</td>
<td>children to elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Areas:</td>
<td>3,458 square foot common house includes guestroom, bathrooms, workshop, yoga/kid’s room, laundry room, exercise room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved in:</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Team:</td>
<td>Michael Pyatok &amp; Associates, Peter Waller, East Bay Asian Local Development Co. (EBALDC) (nonprofit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 23. Swan's Market ground floor plan. The plan shows the public face of the development, primarily retail, office and service programming. Source: (Pyatok)

Figure 24. Swan's Market second floor plan shows residential and community programs. Source: (Pyatok)
Visit: We visited Swan’s Market on Monday, January 10, 2011. As we did not receive a response to our email, our visit was limited to the public areas of the site which included the ground level plaza adjoining the Children’s museum, retail and office space. The market appeared to be closed for renovations and there was no activity at noon, when we were there. There was a strong sense of threshold even as we entered the plaza from the street. While there was an open staircase leading to the cohousing community plaza, the design of the space suggested that uninvited visitors were not welcome. The retail spaces were oriented to the market, both in location and in service. Most of the shops offered quick-service food and beverage in a relaxed atmosphere, likely catering to market patrons looking for prepared food. From our observations we conducted the following SWOT analysis:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capitalizes on a vibrant broader neighborhood context</td>
<td>- Limited day-time use</td>
<td>- Overlapping user groups increase activity and security throughout the day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community partnerships among retail, office, museum, affordable housing, and cohousing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Historical preservation captures history of the neighborhood and reinforces a sense of place. Adaptive reuse of existing building creates unique architectural character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Programmatic integration of public, semi-public and private spaces, i.e. public retail plaza is separate from (but connected to) shared cohousing plaza on second floor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diversity of long-term and short-term investors</td>
<td>- Prime location = high cost of living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active market provides and stimulates local business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban location drives higher, more stable property values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban density, diversity of land use</td>
<td>- Noise and light pollution from urban surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Utilizes existing urban infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interconnected with public transit and civic amenities, reduced automobile dependence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key Replicable Aspects:** Swan’s Market offered a unique look at how a cohousing community could be integrated into a mixed-use urban development. The farmers market makes the project a destination and stimulates local business. Furthermore the architectural character of the project draws from the historical narrative of the site while adding to the occupant’s visual and spatial experience.

**Jonathan Rose**

This precedent study includes a review of the firm’s projects and business model. The firm is located in New York, and was thus, not a stop on our West Coast Tour, but the firm profile and projects provide an example for how informed decision-making and community partnerships can improve community and occupant health in a profound way.

**Passion**

Jonathan Rose Companies is a green real estate policy, planning, development, and investment firm. It looks to an integrated, multi-disciplinary approach to provide green solutions for more resilient, competitive and equitable urban environments. According to the website, “founded in 1989 by Jonathan F.P. Rose as a mission-based practice, the firm is recognized for its ability to achieve visionary goals through practical strategies and affordable green urban solutions.” As a mission-based firm, Rose seeks to “repair the fabric of the world” by building communities that increase diversity and the overall health of the communities it houses (Affordable). Taking a holistic approach to community creation, Rose assesses the health of the people pre- and post-occupancy to evaluate the environment’s impact on health. It is through this process that Rose has
created an oasis for healthier living and become a leader in building affordable, sustainable housing.

**Projects**

Breaking down the silo between community activist and real estate developer, Rose has shaped a new dynamic for realizing affordable sustainability in the built environment. This paradigm enlists the community participation and the support of government and non-government organizations to empower a holistic design process with community and occupant health at the core. Examples of this kind of community synergy can be found in the projects at the *Renovation of Burnham Factory* in Irvington, New York, *Dinkins Garden* in Harlem, New York, and *Via Verde* in South Bronx, New York (Affordable).

**Burnham Factory Renovation**

As a model for green affordable Transit Oriented Development, the Burnham Factory renovation introduces 22-affordable housing units and a 10,000 square foot library into an historic building across from the Metro North railroad station. The project capitalized on the existing infrastructure to meet the community’s need for affordable housing. The project has won the several municipal, state, and regional awards.
Dinkins Garden

Dinkins Garden worked within a tight budget and a standard sized building type to bring affordable sustainable housing to Harlem. The result was the creation of a healthy living environment that offered recreational space, energy savings and job training opportunities for low income residents. The project, which boasts the new construction of 85 living units, a classroom and community space, reaps the benefits of a fruitful collaboration with Harlem Congregations for Community Improvement, Inc. Faith based groups organized a not-for-profit that provides safe residence for foster children aging out of the system. In addition, a youth academy serves to invest in the people who call this community home. As a pseudo-intentional community, Dinkins Garden is a beacon for community (Affordable).

Via Verde

Designed to LEED Gold standards, Via Verde hosts 222 residential units, 9,500 square feet of commercial retail space, and over 40,000 square feet of green roofs and open space for residents. Health was a key driver in the shaping of this project. With asthma rates in the neighborhood 17% higher than the national average, the design team sought to increase occupant health through the design of the environment. The mixed-use project serves a range of incomes by offering a variety of ownership options for the living units. The project, as a
whole, uses low-tech strategies such as cross-ventilation, solar shading and smart material choices for energy savings. The project takes it beyond environmental sustainability to community sustainability. A community food co-op and a health center emerge from the physical and spiritual identity created by the plentiful green spaces (Affordable).

**Power**

The projects of Jonathan Rose strive to create synergy among otherwise fragmented components of society. Focusing on making healthy environments affordable and sustainable, Rose has shown how putting quality and sustainability first can translate into wealth for all. His is a strong example of community-based programming, community empowerment, and the nurturing of what really matters: health and humanity.
Section Two: Guidelines for Community-Oriented Development

The Community-Oriented Design Guidelines are organized into three subsets: Village Identity, Pedestrian Emphasis, and Project Design. Augmenting each guideline is background information describing the intent of the guideline and some examples of ways the guideline may be achieved. These examples are derived from the works and writing of industry leaders, but are not proposed solutions. The format has been adapted from the Community Design Guidelines proposed by the Portland Bureau of Planning.

Village Identity

Guideline #1: Sense of Place

Enhance the sense of place and identity by incorporating site and building design features that respond to the area’s desired characteristics and traditions. (Portland 15)

Background: Broad Ripple Village, as a neighborhood of Indianapolis, desires to enhance the city as a cultural destination. It seeks to capitalize on its many physical and social assets, its cultural identity as a place for creative people to live, work, and play, and the commitment of home and business owners dedicated to cultivating a livable and diverse village experience. (Broad Ripple Plan)

Preserving the integrity of Village life may be achieved by:

A. Paying homage to the history and presence of the canal.

B. Ensuring that the structures and urban spaces contribute to the desired character envisioned by the Broad Ripple Plan.
C. Buildings should address the street and sidewalk with entries, balconies, porches, architectural features, and activities which help create safe, pleasant walking environments (Portland 30; Calthorpe 41).

D. Along streets where residential uses predominate, utilizing design elements that acknowledge established characteristics that serve to distinguish residential streets from the more intensely hardscaped main streets and streetcar alignment. Design elements that characterize the residential side streets include: landscaped setbacks; courtyards; front windows placed to preserve residential privacy; and façade articulation created by elements such as porches and other entrance treatments, bay windows, balconies, and vertically divided building volumes (Portland 31; Calthorpe 65).

E. Along commercial streets: building intensities, orientation and massing should promote more active commercial centers, support transit, and reinforce public spaces. Other desired site features include outdoor space for dining and other activities, and building frontage and setbacks integrated with the public realm (Portland 32; Calthorpe 65).

F. Incorporating stormwater management features in required landscape areas (Portland 35).

G. Encouraging infill and redevelopment along transit corridors within existing neighborhoods (Calthorpe 43).
Pedestrian Emphasis

Guideline #2: Pedestrian Network

Create an efficient, pleasant, and safe network of sidewalks and paths for pedestrians that link destination points and nearby residential areas while visually and physically buffering pedestrians from vehicle areas. (Portland 69)

Background: In his book *The Next American Metropolis*, Peter Calthorpe writes “pedestrians are the catalyst which makes the essential qualities of communities meaningful (Calthorpe 12).” A pedestrian network allows people to move among places. Pedestrian paths should encourage physical activity through comfort, interest and connectivity. They should be safe, attractive, convenient and enjoyable.

Creating a safe, pleasant walking environment may be achieved by:

A. Locating routes along or visible from all streets. They must provide clear, comfortable, and direct access to the core commercial area and transit stop. Primary pedestrian routes and bikeways should be bordered by residential fronts, public parks, plazas, or commercial uses. (Calthorpe 101)

B. Providing safe, attractive, and convenient pedestrian connections and transitions from open spaces to building entrances and other destination points. (Portland 69; Alfonzo 2005; Zacharias 2001)

C. Providing space for the different activities that take place along sidewalks and walkways.

D. Buffering pedestrians from vehicle and bicycle areas with the use of unique paving, planting strips, landscape features, site furnishings, and/or bollards. (Portland 71; Alfonzo 2005; )
E. Employing streetscape elements that promote perceived safety among pedestrians (e.g. street lights, first floor windows) (Alfonzo 2005; Handy 2006; McDonald 2008; Zacharias 2001).

F. Providing bicycle parking areas throughout core commercial areas, in office developments, and at transit stops, schools, and parks (Calthorpe 103).

G. Incorporating access to public transportation, linking the pedestrian environment to other urban areas. (Zacharias 2001)

Guideline #3 Nodes

New large scale projects should provide comfortable places along pedestrian circulation routes where people may stop, visit, meet, and rest. (Portland 73)

Background: The pedestrian experience may be augmented by providing activity nodes along the route. These nodes may provide the opportunity to socialize, to rest, or to observe the surrounding activities. Each place should contribute to a safe, attractive, enjoyable pedestrian environment. A node might host public art, seating, play equipment, plantings, or other points of interest.

Enhancing the pedestrian experience may be achieved by:

A. Increasing accessibility by providing pedestrian spaces in close proximity to shops and services (Handy 2006; Marcus 9; Portland 74)

B. Incorporating formal and informal seating opportunities in the design of planters and walls located along pedestrian paths. (Marcus 9; Portland 74)
C. Providing seating near kiosks and other points of interest along pedestrian paths. (Marcus 9; Portland 75)

D. Designing a regular, geometric plan; clearly defined, attractive pathways; architecturally differentiated landmarks; and clear demarcation of spaces to promote an environment of moderate visual complexity that maintains inherent order and prevents users from getting lost. (Carter 2003; Handy 2006; Zacharias 2001)

**Guideline #4: The Sidewalk Level of Buildings**

Create a sense of enclosure and visual interest to buildings along sidewalks and pedestrian areas by incorporating small scale building design features, creating effective gathering places, and differentiating street level facades. (Portland 77)

**Background:** The way that buildings relate to pedestrian space is essential to enriching the pedestrian experience. The sidewalk level is where most of this interaction occurs. As such, buildings should be designed to an appropriate human scale, with interesting details, and to promote a sense of enclosure. Sidewalk spaces can be defined by building walls, columns and trees, while awnings and windows can make the streetscape more inviting.

Enriching the sidewalk level of buildings may be achieved by:

A. Differentiating between the building facade at the sidewalk level and the floors above in nonresidential and mixed-use developments. This acknowledges the
varying uses in a building and allows treatment of the ground floor that is more
scaled to pedestrians. (Portland 77)

B. Placing building walls, columns, and trees to create a sense of enclosure within
the pedestrian path. (Portland 78)

C. Placing display windows along pedestrian paths. (Portland 79)

D. Minimizing building setbacks to maintain the architectural coherence and scale
that provides visual pleasure for pedestrians. (Alfonzo 2005; Calthorpe 79)

E. Incorporating vegetation (especially in open spaces), signs, awnings, and
furnishings as motivation for exploration and prolonged visits to the pedestrian
environment. (Zacharias 2001)

**Guideline #5: Light, Wind, and Rain**

*Enhance the comfort of pedestrians by locating and designing buildings
and outdoor areas to control the adverse effects of sun, shadow, glare,
reflection, wind, and rain. (Portland 85)*

**Background:** Pedestrian comfort can be enhanced by reducing the adverse effects of
sun, shadow, glare, reflections, wind, and rain in the design of public spaces (Portland
85). Design elements including trees, walls, overhangs, awnings, canopies, and arcades
may encourage outdoor activity even in inclement weather as long as protection is
provided.

Pedestrian comfort can be enhanced by:
A. Providing weather protection for pedestrians at building entrances and over pedestrian paths such as arcades, awnings, canopies, porches, and overhangs. (Alfonzo 2005; Calthorpe 80; Portland 85; Rodiek 2005)

B. Planting large trees along and near pedestrian paths to provide shade and reduce wind and rain. (Portland 86; Rodiek 2005)

C. Offer an environment that is physiologically comfortable at peak use times, in regard to sun and shade, windiness, etc. (Marcus 9; Zacharias 2004).

Project Design

Guideline #6: Outdoor Areas

Enhance village beautification, greenways and waterways to create greater quality of life for residents and visitors.

Background: Parks, plazas and other outdoor areas should provide a public focus for the neighborhood. As outdoor living rooms, these spaces should be physically and visually accessible to residents and visitors; they should reinforce the character of the surrounding area; and they should accommodate diverse user groups and activities. Outdoor areas should contribute to a better quality of life by providing areas for relaxation, reprieve from the city environment, and a source of positive feelings (Chiesura 2004; Marcus 9). Outdoor areas should be accessible to children and disabled people, provide a feeling of security, and allow users the option of becoming attached to the place and caring for it through involvement in its design, construction, and maintenance (Marcus 9).

Quality of life may be enhanced by:
A. Locating outdoor areas in close proximity to residences, offices, and core commercial areas and clearly conveying the message that the place is available for use and is meant to be used (Calthorpe 59; Marcus 9).

B. Collaborating with members of the public, private, and non-profit sectors to identify opportunities to enhance public outdoor areas (Banerjee 2001; Marcus 9).

C. Encouraging use by different subgroups of the likely user population, without any one group’s activities disrupting the other’s enjoyment (Banerjee 2001; Chiesura 2004; Marcus 9; Sugiyama 2009).

D. Providing seating near active areas. (Marcus 9; Portland 92).

E. Incorporating landscaping that enhances the user’s experience, such as shade trees, blooming flowers, and interesting fall color (Portland 92; Rodiek 2005).

F. Orienting outdoor areas to take advantage of sun and views (Portland 93; Zacharias 2004)

G. Providing a terrace, private garden, or balcony for each dwelling unit (Portland 94)

H. Providing common courtyards (Portland 94).

I. Creating usable outdoor areas for gardens and recreational activities. (Portland 95)

J. Using a variety of materials and textures to define open spaces and create interesting walking surfaces (Carter 2003; Portland 95)
Guideline #7: Core Commercial

Configure core commercial areas to accommodate mixed uses, orient to pedestrian spaces and transit, and integrate visually and programmatically with the neighborhood.

Background: Core commercial areas should balance pedestrian and auto comfort, visibility, and accessibility. Architectural details, façade articulation, and building scale should enrich the pedestrian experience. Retail on the ground level may give way to offices and residential units on upper floors in order to increase and stagger activity levels throughout the day.

Core commercial areas may be better defined by:

A. Using architectural elements, massing, and landscaping to accentuate the front entry (Calthorpe 78; Portland 99).

B. Using elevation changes to make a more prominent entrance (Portland 99)

C. Providing a plaza or open area adjacent to the front entrance (Calthorpe 80; Portland 100)

D. Connecting the building main entrance to the sidewalk with a well-defined pedestrian way. (Calthorpe 78; Portland 100)

E. Promoting the use of transit and pedestrian network by combining transit routes and pedestrian paths with retail and service opportunities (Calthorpe 58).

F. Minimizing building setback from public streets to augment the desired character of the area and create an intimate pedestrian experience (Calthorpe 79).
G. Varying and articulating building facades to provide visual interest to pedestrians.
Street level windows and numerous building entries are required in the core commercial area. Arcades, porches, bays, and balconies are encouraged (Calthorpe 80).

Guideline #8: Residential Areas

Design residential areas to promote diversity, walkability, and attachment to place.

Background: Good urban form tends to be compact, diverse and walkable, as characterized by the degree of connectivity to civic amenities. Residential solutions in an urban context are compatible with the existing infrastructure and promote the character of the surrounding neighborhood. Design should allow for the expression of resident identity and include places where residents may cultivate a sense of ownership.

Vibrant residential neighborhoods may be achieved by:

A. Providing a mix of housing types at a convenient walking distance from core commercial areas and transit stops (Calthorpe 58).
B. Creating residential densities of at least 10 units per net acre (Calthorpe 64).
C. Minimizing building setbacks while maintaining a sense of privacy (Calthorpe 84).
D. Connecting entrances to the sidewalk with a well-defined pedestrian way. (Calthorpe 78; Portland 100)
E. Articulating building facades to provide visual interest. Windows and entries should face the street. Front porches, bays, and balconies are encouraged (Calthorpe 85).
F. Incorporating outdoor areas that residents can manipulate individually or collectively (e.g., gardens, play areas) (Marcus 9).

G. Allowing users the option, either as individuals or as members of a group, of becoming attached to the place and caring for it through involvement in its design, construction, or maintenance; by using it for special events; or by temporarily claiming personal space within the setting (Marcus 9).

**Guideline #9: Landscape Features**

*Enhance site and building design through appropriate placement, scale, and variety of landscape features. (Portland 103)*

**Background:** Landscape features include vegetation, site furnishings, walls, planters and paving materials that serve to define outdoor spaces. Successful use of landscape features reinforces the relationship between architecture and landscape, visually integrating the site and adding a human scale to the outdoor environment. Vegetation can help mitigate heat island effect on urban sites, add to pervious surfaces, help control erosion, frame or screen views, provide shade, privacy and visual interest and serve as a buffer between pedestrians and moving vehicles. Landscaping has been noted to have a positive psychological impact on site visitors. In addition to a positive social impact, landscape features can help to attain environmental sustainability goals.

Site and building design may be enhanced by:

A. Protecting and planting street trees. Shade trees should be spaced no further than 30 feet on center. Tree species and planting technique should be selected to create a unified image for the street, provide an effective canopy, avoid
sidewalk damage, and minimize water consumption (Calthorpe 96; Portland 105).

B. Using plant materials along sidewalks and walkways to define routes, buffer pedestrians from moving vehicles, create gateways, and provide interest, color and texture (Carter 2003; Portland 105; Rodiek 2005)

C. Using a variety of plant materials in areas visible to the public (Portland 106)

D. Using plant materials to screen mechanical equipment (Portland 107)

E. Selecting vegetation to be indigenous or proven adaptable to the local climate (Calthorpe 75).

**Guideline #10: Parking Areas and Garages**

*Integrate parking in a manner that is attractive and complementary to the site and its surroundings. Locate parking in a manner that minimizes negative impacts on the community and its pedestrians. Design parking garage exteriors to visually respect and integrate with adjacent buildings and environment.*

**Background:** Parking is a serious issue for Broad Ripple that has led to a Village-wide parking feasibility study by Browning Day Mullins Dierdorf. The challenge lies in providing accessible, safe parking that connects visitors with their destinations and promotes an active and safe street life. Parking garages should not visually dominate the surrounding context, but should integrate with adjacent buildings to allow for convenient access and informal surveillance.

Parking challenges may be addressed by:
A. Reducing surface parking lots through the redevelopment and construction of structured parking facilities. Layout and configuration should accommodate future redevelopment (Calthorpe 111).

B. Mitigating "spillover" parking impacts by demarcating preferential parking zones in residential neighborhoods and short-term parking controls in core commercial areas (Calthorpe 110).

C. Sharing parking areas and quantities for areas with staggered peak periods of demand e.g., retail, office, and entertainment (Carter 2003; Calthorpe 109).

D. Satisfying parking requirements with on-street parking. Parking lanes should be 7 to 8 feet wide (Calthorpe 109).

E. Providing a clear pedestrian path that connects parking areas with destination points. (Calthorpe 109; Portland 111).

F. Screening indoor parking from pedestrians (Calthorpe 111; Portland 113).

G. Tucking parking structures behind retail use on the first floor of street-side edges (Calthorpe 112).

**Guideline #11: Crime Prevention**

*Use site design and building orientation to reduce the likelihood of crime through the design and placement of windows, entries, active ground level uses, and outdoor areas.*

**Background:** Studies suggest that physical deterioration and lack of personalization promote crime (Brown & Altman, 1981; 1983) so it is believed that strong place attachment and greater social cohesion may contribute to neighborhood safety. In these terms, projects designed to include places where residents and visitors may express
identity, interact with neighbors and allow for informal surveillance (e.g., windows facing public areas) may promote safer neighborhoods.

Crime prevention can be achieved by:

A. Providing a lighting system that includes pedestrian scale lights along walkways, energy-efficient porch and backyard lights that can be left on over time, and motion sensor lights that do not shine in rooms. (Portland 116)

B. Locating windows in active rooms and entrances to promote “eyes” on streets, plazas, and other shared outdoor areas. (Brown 2004; Portland 116)

C. Eliminating barriers to visibility. (Carter 2003; Portland 117)

D. Orienting entrances to public streets or to shared courtyards. (Portland 117).

E. Include places for gardens and other expressions of resident identity and pride for place (Brown 2004)

Guideline #12: Blending into the Neighborhood

Reduce the impact of new development on established neighborhoods by incorporating elements of nearby, quality buildings such as building details, massing, proportions, and materials.

Background: Preserving the integrity of Broad Ripple’s village life involves accommodating growth in a manner that minimizes negative impacts on the existing neighborhood. New developments may blend better into the existing village context by reflecting and incorporating architectural and site details common in the neighborhood. Furthermore, new projects may respect the character of the surrounding area by considering complementary scale, materials, form, and character. Architecture and site design should balance aesthetics with function. Creating story, empathy, play and
meaning through form displays a commitment to quality and beauty. Form should enhance interest. Materials should convey longevity and sustainability. In all, the design should reflect thoughtful consideration and resolution of community needs in a cohesive composition.

Blending into the village may be achieved by:

A. Divide large wall areas into distinct smaller planes that are more in keeping with the scale of surrounding development. (Portland 124)

B. Renovating and constructing new commercial buildings that serve the surrounding residential neighborhood with strong pedestrian connections (Calthorpe 85; Portland 125)

C. Encouraging infill to complement the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings. (Portland 126)

D. Using landscape materials to soften the impact of new development. (Portland 126)
Part Three: Application

Application

This section explores the application of the principles and guidelines to a particular site in urban Indianapolis. The model generated from the application of the design criteria serves as a demonstration for how a theoretical framework might manifest in physical form. It is not intended to be an end in itself, but rather the means for reevaluating the role of design leaders and community members in the process of building communities. The first step required the selection, inventory and analysis of a site. Next, we conducted a feasibility study to evaluate the project’s success as a viable, desirable, and profitable solution. Finally, we proposed a community-oriented development that integrated the best practices determined by our research.

Site Research

We chose Indianapolis as a laboratory for this thesis for a variety of reasons. First, local companies are increasing their focus towards community development and this improves our likelihood of finding a reputable industry partner. Second, Indianapolis has grown to be the 12th largest city in the United States, but it is one of the largest cities in America without an adequate public-transit system, preventing it from becoming a world-
class city (Annual Estimates). For this reason, Indianapolis is a model, post-automobile, Midwest City that lacks current pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods and commercial centers. However, a recent revival in downtown interests as well as a proposed public transportation system by Indy Connect, is leading to speculation that Indianapolis is on the brink of an urban revival. If this is true there are many urban sites ripe for development, and there are opportunities to encourage holistic sustainability through the model of community-oriented development.

As a primary focus of the thesis, site selection was a critical design step when approaching the proposal from a community-development perspective. First, the site must support the community program that reflects the findings of a context and market analysis. Second, the site must also be evaluated for its ability to spark synergy. We identified Zillow and IndySiteFinder as tools for measuring the critical impact of site location on economic stability and pricing in the housing market. This process assisted in making a highly informed site selection in tangent with community aspirations. We also evaluated site potential for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) through an investigation of IndyGo and proposals from Indy Connect. Relevant transportation initiatives highlighted a desire for revamping bus routes, introducing light rail, and providing additional parking. This would suggest that aligning any proposal for new development with metropolitan transportation goals would likely strengthen community cohesion and provide the physical connectivity necessary to propagate social revitalization – that synergistic spark! An appropriate site, therefore, is one that possesses or is able to accommodate the components necessary to demonstrate these goals compellingly.
We scouted Indianapolis for potential sites that would match the scale, density, context, and program necessary to facilitate the goals of the thesis. We performed a brief literature review of Indianapolis development zones, housing markets, and transportation trends and overlaid the findings with GIS data to pinpoint areas of key interest. We plotted potential development zones on a map, and on November 12th, between 10:00am and 7:00pm, we observed each site and conducted a quick feasibility evaluation. The findings revealed seven sites in Indianapolis that possess the potential for addressing the thesis goals. Each site is evaluated in the site matrix below:

Table 12. Site Matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wholesale District</td>
<td>Urban infill</td>
<td>Already significant development activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>Residential hotspot</td>
<td>Limited area for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial and retail</td>
<td>Limited age spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus route</td>
<td>High price point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited age spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No need for catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited area for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No need for catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Park &amp; North</td>
<td>Urban infill</td>
<td>Already plans for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>Proximity to Mass Ave cultural district</td>
<td>High price point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial and retail</td>
<td>Limited age spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus route</td>
<td>Limited area for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to Cultural Trail</td>
<td>Limited age spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No need for catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Walnut &amp; New Jersey</td>
<td>Urban infill</td>
<td>Limited access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>Proximity to Mass Ave cultural district</td>
<td>Limited access to commercial or retail activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Low density residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On Cultural Trail</td>
<td>Limited public exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Canal District</td>
<td>Urban infill</td>
<td>Limited access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>Canal (recreation)</td>
<td>Limited access to commercial or retail activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walking distance to education and health</td>
<td>No need for catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>care</td>
<td>Limited age spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 19th &amp; New Jersey</td>
<td>Medium density</td>
<td>Limited access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>Access to Cultural Trail</td>
<td>Limited access to commercial or retail activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Given the existing interest in developing sites 1, 2 & 3, we decided that these sites would not help us accomplish our goal of selecting a site that could serve as a catalyst for social investment in the public realm. It was already being done. Site 4 did not strike the right chord with us. As another goal was to interweave our project within the broader community context, the social and institutional scale of developments in the Canal District far exceeded the delicate balance of community partnerships that we sought. Site 5 lacked the density and diversity of land use that contributes to a vibrant walkable neighborhood. Site 6 fit the bill as a master-planned community, which reinforced the identity and character of the area, but limited the flexibility of programming and opportunities for spontaneity. Site 7 met the criteria we had set forth for social cohesion, physical connectivity, and potential to catalyze community synergy, so we decided to use this site as the location for our proposed community-oriented development.

A Demographic Analysis of the Target Population

A pre-design task often performed before selecting a site, a demographic study of potential development zones provides insight into the characteristics of target
populations. The team utilized *Indy Site Finder* to conduct a demographic study focusing on age, income, education, home ownership, and employment status.

The results informed the site selection process and provided programming options during conceptual design. The results suggest that Broad Ripple provides the highest likelihood of supporting the goals defined by this pilot study.

The following chart represents a sampling of the census data publicized by *Indy Site Finder* for a 5-mile radius around the target site in Broad Ripple.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13. Demographic Data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population (2002) (5-mile radius)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Population</td>
<td>213,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution (2002)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>13,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>36,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>8,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>12,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>33,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>33,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>29,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>9,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>7,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>14,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>10,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>3,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Distribution (2002)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>118,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>88,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6,513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 Total Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>92,369</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>51,893</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 Household Income Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$10K</td>
<td>7,385</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10-$20K</td>
<td>14,801</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20-$30K</td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30-$40K</td>
<td>11,457</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40-$50K</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-$60K</td>
<td>3,811</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60-$75K</td>
<td>8,037</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75-$100K</td>
<td>9,813</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; $100K</td>
<td>20,193</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 Employment by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec</td>
<td>15,463</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>20,237</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>14,918</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>19,089</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priv Hhd Occ</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>12,759</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators</td>
<td>4,602</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 Employment by Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>5,204</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>12,632</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>5,667</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>12,277</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.I.R.E.</td>
<td>9,949</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Repair Serv</td>
<td>10,323</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers Serv</td>
<td>7,531</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ent/Recreation Serv</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Serv</td>
<td>14,652</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Serv</td>
<td>7,929</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Serv</td>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 Total Number of Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Dwellings</td>
<td>102,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Dwellings</td>
<td>53,302</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied Dwellings</td>
<td>39,067</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 Education Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population Age 25+</td>
<td>142,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Gr 9</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr 9-12</td>
<td>16,768</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>15,712</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>34,160</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Degree</td>
<td>8,394</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach Degree</td>
<td>40,290</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Degree</td>
<td>22,642</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2002 Size of Household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>32,645</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Person</td>
<td>30,271</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Person</td>
<td>13,109</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Person</td>
<td>9,358</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Person</td>
<td>4,246</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ Person</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consumer Expenditures & Retail Sales

**Center:** 8030999  
**Distance:** 5 miles  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Per HH</th>
<th>Total $000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Consumer Expenditures (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$ Per HH</th>
<th>Total $000s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>252,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>80,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>239,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverages</td>
<td>8,177</td>
<td>751,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>281,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Furnishings and Equipment</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>182,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>8,534</td>
<td>784,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Operations</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>140,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>51,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>78,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>24,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>41,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>10,315</td>
<td>948,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3,938</td>
<td>362,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>139,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Insurance</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>52,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>135,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Retail Sales (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lumber and Building Materials</td>
<td>106,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint and Wallpaper</td>
<td>16,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>15,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurseries, Lawn and Garden</td>
<td>48,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Stores</td>
<td>384,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety and Other General Merchandise Stores</td>
<td>10,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>256,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy and Confectionery Stores</td>
<td>2,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center:</strong></td>
<td>8030999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance:</strong></td>
<td>5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Establishments</strong></td>
<td>10,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employees</strong></td>
<td>134,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Payroll</strong></td>
<td>4,877,271,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employees by Occupation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive and Managerial</strong></td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales</strong></td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clerical</strong></td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protectiv Services</td>
<td>7,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>18,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, and Fishing</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production and Related Operators</td>
<td>7,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Handlers</td>
<td>6,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Establishments by Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Employees</td>
<td>6,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Employees</td>
<td>1,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 Employees</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49 Employees</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99 Employees</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-249 Employees</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-499 Employees</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999 Employees</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-4999 Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-9999 Employees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000+ Employees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Businesses by Major Industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting (NAICS 11)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (NAICS 21)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (NAICS 22)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (NAICS 23)</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (NAICS 31-33)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (NAICS 42)</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (NAICS 44-45)</td>
<td>1,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing (NAICS 48)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (NAICS 51)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance (NAICS 52)</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental/Leasing (NAICS 53)</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical</td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (NAICS 54)</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises (NAICS 55)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support Services (NAICS 56)</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services (NAICS 61)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance (NAICS 62)</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment and Recreation (NAICS 71)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services (NAICS 72)</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services Except Public Administration (NAICS 81)</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (NAICS 92)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Establishments (NAICS 99)</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employees by Major Industry</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting (NAICS 11)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (NAICS 21)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (NAICS 22)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (NAICS 23)</td>
<td>3,603</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (NAICS 31-33)</td>
<td>7,305</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (NAICS 42)</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (NAICS 44-45)</td>
<td>17,561</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing (NAICS 48)</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (NAICS 51)</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance (NAICS 52)</td>
<td>10,776</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental/Leasing (NAICS 53)</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (NAICS 54)</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises (NAICS 55)</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support Services (NAICS 56)</td>
<td>6,034</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services (NAICS 61)</td>
<td>7,110</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance (NAICS 62)</td>
<td>25,726</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment and Recreation (NAICS 71)</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services (NAICS 72)</td>
<td>10,414</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services Except Public Administration (NAICS 81)</td>
<td>15,263</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (NAICS 92)</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Establishments (NAICS 99)</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Payroll</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting (NAICS 11)</td>
<td>135,579</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (NAICS 21)</td>
<td>483,996</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities (NAICS 22)</td>
<td>5,946,262</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (NAICS 23)</td>
<td>164,851,845</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (NAICS 31-33)</td>
<td>316,320,576</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (NAICS 42)</td>
<td>321,426,326</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (NAICS 44-45)</td>
<td>420,290,949</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing (NAICS 48)</td>
<td>34,753,458</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information (NAICS 51)</td>
<td>150,271,184</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance (NAICS 52)</td>
<td>644,716,664</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental/Leasing (NAICS 53)</td>
<td>168,103,226</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (NAICS 54)</td>
<td>477,810,059</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises (NAICS 55)</td>
<td>93,071,126</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support Services (NAICS 56)</td>
<td>185,598,763</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services (NAICS 61)</td>
<td>180,693,284</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance (NAICS 62)</td>
<td>959,248,056</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment and Recreation (NAICS 71)</td>
<td>82,862,962</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services (NAICS 72)</td>
<td>146,925,995</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services Except Public Administration (NAICS 81)</td>
<td>400,384,456</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (NAICS 92)</td>
<td>92,785,300</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Establishments (NAICS 99)</td>
<td>30,591,687</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Population Density**

Density is a critical component for community development, and Broad Ripple is approaching an urban density closer to smart growth principles. Much higher than the average Indianapolis neighborhood, 213,000 individuals live in a 5-mile radius of Broad Ripple Village – this averages to about 4.2 individuals per acre. While Massachusetts Avenue has a higher density at 5.4 individuals per acre, a Broad Ripple pilot study provides a catalyst necessary for encouraging urban density.

**Age Distribution**

Multi-generational living is a critical aspect of community development. While there are very few areas that provide this form of living in Indianapolis, Broad Ripple’s age spread could support various living arrangements with high age spreads ranging from 5-17 and 25-54. While the trend analysis identifies college campuses and walkable neighborhoods as highly desirable environments for seniors, Broad Ripple does not provide much housing with universal design principles or aspects of aging in place. This might provide an opportunity to introduce new housing types into the market.

**Diversity**

Broad Ripple also supports racially diverse. While the city of Indianapolis is 88% white, 9% black 3% other, Broad Ripple is 56% white, 41% black, and 3% other (Indiana QuickFacts).

**Business**

Combining the census data with GIS data, the findings suggest that there might be a need for community health services, hospitality services, and commercial space. The data also highlights Broad Ripple’s tendency to support locally owned businesses.
Expenditures

Transportation is the highest consumer expenditure in Broad Ripple. While the neighborhood is considered one of the most walkable neighborhoods in Indianapolis, this reinforces the need for a balanced community that supplies multiple facets of daily life.

Household

The housing data presents a mixed-income community supporting the sale strategy for units at multiple price points. The data also suggests a smaller household size of 2.3 persons per household compared to the city average of 2.5 persons per household (Indiana QuickFacts). Introducing family housing into Broad Ripple, the public/private threshold will be critical to the success of multifamily living.

Education

At least 85% of the population graduated from high school, compared to the state average of 82%. Furthermore 39% of the population has a bachelor’s degree or higher compared to the state average of 19% (Indiana QuickFacts). Along with the artistic nature of the neighborhood, this finding suggests that Broad Ripple has a large population of intellectuals, a critical component when proposing alternative forms of living.

Conclusion

Supplementing the demographic study with GIS maps and research from the West Coast Tour, Broad Ripple provides the intellectual and creative atmosphere necessary to test the pilot study. Furthermore the data provides the foundation for conceptual design and programming of the feasibility study.
**Feasibility Study**

In order to understand how the principles and guidelines will be applied, it is important to define the nature and scope of a feasibility study. A feasibility study is generally accepted as a type of systematic evaluation used to assess the desirability and practicality of a proposed project. Many of the components go beyond the scope of this project, but they serve as markers for possible next steps. For the purposes of conducting a feasibility study for our proposed site, the following aspects of development were adapted from the thesis objectives from the Master of Architecture in Real Estate Development program at Woodbury University (M.Arch RED).

1. Market analysis
   a. A market analysis of the existing competitive landscape (see Mansur case study)
   b. A demographic study of the target audience (see Site Research)
   c. A trend analysis of the projected landscape (see below)

2. Partnership Agreements
   a. A mutually beneficial partnership strategy identifying a business model for short-term investors and long-term investors (see GINI case study)

3. Funding Proposals
   a. An analysis of physical and fiscal resources required for development including a conceptual cost estimate (beyond scope)
   b. A financial and economic analysis of factors affecting the business plan (beyond scope)

4. Design
a. An analysis of policy roadblocks affecting community-oriented design
   (see interview with Office of Sustainability)

b. A analysis macro and micro political influences (see interviews with local
   community leaders)

5. Sales and Leasing Strategies
   a. A business model for short term investors and a transition to long term
      residential ownership (beyond scope)
   b. A property management plan (beyond scope)
   c. A sales and marketing plan (beyond scope)

The outline will provide a framework for the evaluation of our proposal. While we will
attempt to provide a thorough investigation, we have determined that the annotated
items above extend beyond the scope of this study and will not be included in the
evaluation. They were included in the outline to qualify the intent of a comprehensive
investigation.

We are not experts, but it should also be noted that traditional design services are
utilized in only a small percentage of these areas, and yet, these factors have a much
larger impact on the built environment. Additionally, this data is becoming increasingly
accessible, and “when facts become so widely available and instantly accessible, each
one becomes less valuable. What begins to matter more is the ability to place these
facts in context and to deliver them with emotional impact (Pink, 103).” This concept is
the heart of this thesis. It is not the role of the designer to design for the sake of design;
rather it is the role of the designer to facilitate the process of empowering people to
shape a world of meaning.
**Trend Analysis of the Existing Competitive Landscape**

Initially exploring the business approach of the thesis, we contacted Kerry Anne McGeary, a Phyllis A. Miller Professor of Health and Economics and Research Fellow at the National Bureau of Economic Research, to evaluate the economic merits of the thesis and to identify potential resources and contacts. Facing the market realities of a feasibility study, we conducted a brief trend analysis to identify national and local trends in demographics, location, and new forms of living.

At the national level, there are changing market demands that influence the development of neighborhoods towards locally connected, multigenerational neighborhoods. Experts in the area of living for the elderly believe “the development of existing and new urban quarters as inter-generational neighborhoods for young and old and the funding of community housing projects will gain increasing importance. Without such innovative solutions, local municipalities will be faced with the negative consequences of demographic change, for example the ageing of entire neighborhoods without the necessary supporting infrastructure or the increased financial burned of care provisions for the elderly. A study undertaken in 2006 shows that the current and, even more so, the next generation of pensioners are willing to consider new forms of living (Krings-Heckemeier 24).” A recent retirement trend also indicates a growing demand for senior access to cultural and social environments, especially gravitating towards college towns. This demand is projected to increase as the baby-boomer generation transitions into retirement (Dwight, 27). This is significant for designers as this demographic controls the majority of the nation’s wealth.

Analyzing this market shift, experts “hypothesize that single-person households and young couples without children will be more likely to consider and to choose to live in the
newer city-centre and waterfront developments... Older persons, we hypothesize, will be more conservative in their tastes, although so-called ‘empty nesters’, whose children have left home, may be more amenable to living in these newer neighborhoods (Senior, 43).” Reinforcing this theory, another study found that multigenerational living experienced a 30% increase since the 2000 census, and 70% of Coldwell Banker real-estate agents expect this demand will continue to grow (Schnurnberger).

These trends reflect the recent, national recession, but economists also speculate that location had a critical impact on the economic stability and pricing in the housing market. “According to Stan Humphries, the chief economist of Zillow, an online housing-research firm, if you plot changes in home values within a typical metro region on a satellite map, the result ‘looks like an archery target, with the outlying areas having experienced substantially higher total declines in home values’ than areas closer to the central city (Leinberger).” Humphries believes the statistics reflect a surplus of suburban housing and a market shift towards walkable neighborhoods. Supporting this claim, Humphries references Washington, D.C. housing and demonstrates that suburban neighborhood pricing dropped about fifty-percent while urban neighborhood pricing only dropped about 20 percent (Leinberger).

Industries and homeowners invested in housing have also detected a resilience of non-traditional developments. New Urbanists developers noticed that flexible, community-oriented plans fared better through the recession (New Urban Developers).

A key component of community-oriented design, multiple trends also reveal increasing public interest in the benefits of a local economy. Stacy Mitchell highlights just a few of these new findings in her article, “A New Deal for Local Economies.” A survey indicates that consumers are actively seeking out locally owned business, accounting for a drastic
increase in farmers markets, an increase in locally owned businesses and alliances, and a decrease desire in driving. These trends were evident during the 2009 holiday season when independent businesses outperformed chains store competitors, and new data shows big businesses are attempting to respond to this market shift. For example, Starbucks it testing the impact of de-branding stores in Seattle (Mitchell).

Local, Indianapolis trends also reinforce this conviction. “Research from the Indiana Chapter of the Urban Land Institute shows optimism for the central Indiana market. The Real Estate Trends in Indiana report, which focuses on the Indianapolis-area, indicates prospects for urban land use downtown and in the northern part of the city are up 13 percent, compared to last year’s report (Urban Land Institute).”

Organizations, state government, and constituents are also becoming increasingly interested in community and locality. The Indianapolis community has shown positive support for the Indianapolis Cultural Trail, an “urban bike and pedestrian path that connects neighborhoods, Cultural Districts and entertainment amenities, and serves as the downtown hub for the entire central Indiana greenway system (Indianapolis Cultural Trail).” Furthermore, the long-range transportation proposal, Indy Connect, recommends multiple modes of transportation, such as light rail and pedestrian pathways, to “increases the region’s competitiveness, economic development opportunities and mobility (Indy Connect).” Community leaders, government agencies, and business partners also identified local assets as the primary factor in developing the Quality of Life Plan for the Near East Side.

According to some local activist, increasingly local business trends are a sign for a “revived sense of place and connection (Farmers’ Market).” Furthermore, according Human Beliefs and Values, surveys indicate “there is evidence of an
intergenerational shift from Materialist to Postmaterialist value priorities in advanced industrial societies, as a result of rising levels of existential security (Inglehart, 5). If these trends indicate a value shift towards a postmaterialist society, then the current housing supply and public realm is disproportionate to market demand.

This shift in social values warrants further investigation of how to meet the demand with a socially-responsive model of living. The pilot study can serve as a testing ground for implementing holistic design practices that go beyond a developer-influenced model that pursues only an economic bottom line.
Site Context

Location

Bounded by the canal to the south, College Avenue to the West, E 64th Street to the North and Carrollton Avenue to the east, the site comprises approximately 5 acres within Broad Ripple Village, Indianapolis.

General Characteristics

The selected site is:

- An urban infill location within comfortable walking distance of parks, recreation trails, a school, and Broad Ripple's primary retail and entertainment district.
- Located on an existing bus route along an arterial road leading to downtown Indianapolis.
- A brownfield site requiring significant remediation of contaminated soil
- Currently populated with an existing landscape nursery and an apartment complex.
Figure 32. Site location.
Figure 33. Existing conditions diagram.
Opportunities

- improve pedestrian safety and experience
- strengthen visual quality and cohesion
- beautify streetscapes, greenways and waterways
- enhance village identity and character
- engage active and interested community members
- provide opportunity to demonstrate sustainability

Constraints

- crime – assaults, robberies, vandalism
- narrow sidewalks - devoid of character or congruent site furnishings, plantings
- parking shortage
- poor signage and wayfinding
- visual clutter, lack of cohesive neighborhood identity
- disruptive quality of nightlife “culture”

Participatory Process

As neighborhoods are as much a physical place as a social unit, a participatory process lends itself to addressing local concerns about critical issues and encourages social cohesion at a scale that has direct and measurable impact (Hou 2003). First, we determined that as design leaders we needed to tap into the existing public forum to generate a collective vision for the project. Second, we needed to develop a method for
addressing the critical issues and encourage an open exchange of information and ideas.

Having identified a strategic opportunity to advance place-making on local and regional levels, we contacted the Office of Sustainability and Envision Broad Ripple committee to gain access to relevant development initiatives. Conversations with representatives from each of these organizations offered valuable resources and insight into the community-building efforts currently underway. We learned through a conversation with a member of the Envision Broad Ripple steering committee, that twenty-three 2.5-hour community planning meetings and countless work sessions have contributed toward an updated master plan for the Village. The goals and objectives from the broader Village vision influenced our project’s design parameters.

In developing a method for addressing critical project issues and allowing for an open exchange of information, ideas and feedback, we launched a website with the capacity to document the process and elicit feedback. As a public forum, the website promoted accountability, transparency and accessibility of all project-related information (Howard 2004). Website traffic was low, but we hypothesize that with greater community engagement, more time, and better marketing strategies, this method would be a more effective communication tool in the design process.

While we strongly advocate a participatory design process for community-oriented projects of our proposed magnitude, the short time frame for completing our project precluded us from engaging the process with the rigor and thoroughness that would ensure its success. For this reason our process was limited to contacting key offices, organizations, and community members to ascertain community needs and a direction for the project, and making assumptions about phasing, funding strategies and
community partnerships. While not ideal, the process we used did reveal how a collective vision can spark synergy and impact change on a local level.

**Conceptual Development**

In order to reinforce a holistic design approach, the core concepts of the project are organized in terms of social, economic and environmental strategies. However, the driving forces influencing the design are public/private thresholds, community programming, water, and the concept of a residential village. In general, the concepts aim to preserve the character of a safe, enjoyable, and vibrant pedestrian environment.

The initial concept diagrams (Figure 27 & 28) show the relationship between mixed land uses and the adjoining neighborhood. As an urban infill, it is important to foster a pedestrian-friendly atmosphere while accommodating vehicular traffic in a way that maximizes the use of land for vital and vibrant community-oriented programming.
Figure 35. Initial concept diagram showing the relationships among mixed land uses, the canal, and the existing pedestrian corridors.
Figure 36. Initial concept diagram showing desired connections with the existing context.
Thresholds

Figure 2 depicts a continuous urban façade with community courtyards that would be available for the programs in the development as well as the surrounding neighborhood. Exploring the concept of creating public and private thresholds, the idea would be to provide community spaces of varying degrees of publicity and privacy. The thresholds include:

1. Private – Internal Community
2. Semi-Private – Immediate Neighbors
3. Semi-Public – Contextual Development
4. Public – Broad Ripple Village

Designation of the types of spaces lends itself to tailoring the design to the needs and desires of different user groups. For instance, a public promenade along the canal would be an acceptable public space that would not interfere with residential, office, and other activities. Public spaces would connect with pedestrian and transit corridors and would host more public programming like retail and entertainment. Furthermore, semi-public/private nodes and plazas would serve as break-out spaces for users to rest, socialize, or simply enjoy a beautiful day. This arrangement allows for visitors to the site to interface with the internal community in a meaningful way without interfering with the day-to-day activities of residents. Finally, private spaces for the internal community would be under the direct care and supervision by residents. Encouraging social cohesion and attachment to place, these might take on the form of porches, patios, balconies or rooftop gardens that catered to and could be customized by the owner(s).

We believe that all three configurations are possible in a small urban environment, and
that the proximity of the three typologies captures the delicate balance between the needs of the individual and collective.

Thresholds were also reinforced by elevation changes. Public spaces and programming is directly accessible on the ground level, is scaled to accommodate higher levels of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, and relates strongly to the contextual neighborhood as a gateway, a destination and a source of cultural vitality. Semi-public/private spaces are elevated to enhance the sense of entry into a space. The main interior plaza is elevated and “watched” by surrounding buildings in a way that would encourage visitors to be well-behaved. The setting is ideal for the internal community to interface with the surrounding community, designed with safety and comfort in mind. Furthermore, an area like this is likely to be better maintained than more public spaces as those who share it may take more ownership in a space that feels like “theirs.” The most private community spaces exist on top of the parking garage where access is controlled directly by stakeholders. The community green is a place for residents to relax, play, and social with their immediate neighbors.

Terraced Plazas - Early Concept Sketch

Figure 37. Terraced plazas augment the threshold between public, semi-public and private spaces.
Community Programming

Programming was a primary consideration. Calculating a careful blend of programs that would catalyze the synergy needed for community to succeed, we explored the types of land uses, quantity of units, and relationships among them. Given the needs and desires of Broad Ripple Village and the strengths of transit-oriented development, we determined that appropriate programs (Figure 30) would be:

- a boutique hotel - accommodate overnight visitors to the neighborhood
- retail – service, convenience, and boutique
- a community health clinic – neighborhood scale
- restaurant or microbrewery, perhaps
- fitness center – public pool for residents
- entrepreneur incubator – workspace and resources for solo ventures to find support
- senior living center – units and care
- live/work units
- a farmer’s market
- residential village
- parking structure – 450+ spaces
- public spaces – plazas, boardwalks, break-out nodes, streetscape improvements that are planned, not in residual spaces
Figure 38. Program diagram shows residential (yellow), commercial (red), health clinic (blue), public space, (green), incubator and community center (gold/orange).
Water

The public and private relationships are celebrated through four urban “watering holes” connected by an urban creek. The water is collected for irrigation, but the cascading creek also provides a source of recreation and sensory stimulation before returning to the canal system. Figure 29 depicts the concept of water collection and daylighting along a spine that transcends three elevation changes.

Figure 39. Water concept diagram shows where water is collected, channeled and displayed before returning to the canal.

Residential Village

The residential village concept combines aspects of communal living, such as a common house, meeting nodes, and urban proximity, with non-traditional programming partnerships to facilitate multi-generation living and broader community ties with an
entrepreneurial incubator, live-work units, and an assisted living facility. The design initiates a community ownership model for the core development, an urban heart, with further connections to a community clinic, a hotel, a restaurant, and a fitness center.

Figure 30 presents our exploration of different formal and spatial configurations for the residential village. The final sketch shows a central boardwalk that uses the orientation of the senior living center and incubator as a datum line. The outdoor spaces stem from the central path to create a blend of semi-public and semi-private gardens and plazas that cater to internal community activities.

Similar to the panels used to populate the building facades, a panel system was used to define the landscape. The panels correspond to their architectural counterpart as follows: water (glazing), boardwalk (wood louvers), permeable paving (brick masonry), turf (open), and vegetation (living wall). The panel system helped to simplify a set of design rules, as our proposal addresses the experience of the site and not the design minutiae.
Figure 40. Residential village concepts explore the configuration of spaces to create efficient corridors and nodes for multiple user groups.
Putting the Pieces Together

The concepts help to define the design as a cohesive and unified whole. From here we jump into the community-oriented development and explore some of its many components. The site overview inventories the different spaces and programs. The highlighted (yellow) numbers and corresponding labels reference areas that are depicted in greater detail.
Figure 4.1. Site overview.

1. Public Plaza
2. Retail Promenade
3. Boardwalk
4. Amphitheater
5. Clinical Promenade
6. Clinic Entry Plaza
7. Community Health Clinic
8. Grand Stairs
9. Boutique Hotel
10. Restaurant/Fitness
11. Public Plaza
12. College Avenue Plaza
13. Farmer’s Market
14. Senior Center
15. Plaza
16. Senior Living Units
17. Community Garden
18. Entrepreneur Incubator
20. Plaza/Pond/Park
21. Common House
22. Workshops
23. Common Green
24. Residential Village
19. Live/Work Units

*Highlighted areas depicted in rendered perspectives.
Figure 42. Site section

1. Proposed bridge
2. Community House
3. Community Health Clinic
4. Common House
5. Marketplace
6. Farmers Market
7. Senior Living Units
8. Studioed Garage
9. Residential Village Unit
10. Workshops
11. Boardwalk
12. Amphitheater
13. Assisted Living Center
14. Grand Stairs
15. Clinic Drop-off
Figure 43. Hotel and retail corner.

**College Avenue**

Retail and lodging - fronting College Avenue and the canal – are located along the most public boundary of the site. Local residents have access to service and convenience vending, while boutiques draw a trendier crowd. Its premium location along a bus route and a major artery into downtown Indianapolis, and across the canal from Broad Ripple’s core commercial district make it a cultural destination and social hub. Above the ground level retail, a boutique hotel offers overnight guests a wide spectrum of price points while boasting an eco-friendly agenda. Street trees and site furnishings buffer the pedestrian-friendly promenade from College Avenue's vehicular traffic. The corner plaza is not only a great place to meet up with friends, but also the nexus of mass transit, bicycle routes and pedestrian connections to the Monon Cultural Trail.
Public Spaces

Public spaces are essential to the integration of programming, architecture and landscape. Streetscape improvements enrich the public realm by making the pedestrian experience safe, visually interesting, and comfortable. Street trees, paving patterns, planters, benches, and lighting strengthen the character of the neighborhood and distinct sense of place. Here, a terraced passage marks a threshold from the public street to a semi-public plaza at the top. To the left, an incubator, geared toward supporting entrepreneurs, caters well to large population of the creative class. Minutes away from downtown Indianapolis, the incubator serves as an affordable location for generating ideas and innovation. To the right, a microbrewery taps the local taste for a unique dining experience. Al fresco dining adds to the character of a lively streetscape and sends the message to passers-by that “this is the place to be!”
Structured Parking

Broad Ripple Village has a severe parking shortage. In order to preserve the quality of pedestrian spaces and add to a vibrant streetscape, we propose that a 450 car garage would capture most of the Village’s parking shortage as well as service the on-site need. A four-story garage by itself, however, looks horrendous. Therefore, introducing street-side retail - with living above - along the perimeter of the garage helps to blend the structure in with the surrounding buildings and promote a safe and efficient use of pedestrian spaces. The section shows how the retail units along the street side of the parking garage make for a more visually pleasing pedestrian experience.

Figure 45. Live/work units, with retail on the ground level, provide street-side frontage to the four-story parking garage.
Figure 46. Conceptual building section shows the relationship of program to space.
Retail Promenade

The promenade provides service and convenience for local residents, while attracting a diverse user group with entertainment, restaurants, retail, and outdoor spaces. Retail and cafes spill out onto the shaded promenade for a truly vibrant public realm. There are places to sit, dine, socialize and people watch. The provision of movable seating allows for the space to be adapted to user preferences. The promenade also has protection from sun and wind and offers a view of the canal and adjacent commercial strip. A core structural frame permits tenants to easily outfit the interior to their needs and desires. Overall, the adaptability of form and space enables physical and social flexibility, adding years to the lifecycle of the development.
Canal

Celebrating the history of the canal, a boardwalk and promenade extend the pedestrian realm to the water’s edge. The boardwalk aims to turn the canal into a community asset and we propose to extend beyond the site, at least to the Monon Cultural Trail. An amphitheater serves as a prime gathering location for local events and nightlife. A central grand stairway follows a cascading waterfall up to a semi-public plaza at the heart of the development. Retail on the ground floor and lodging above, the hotel provides great views of the canal and core commercial district across the way. To the right, a community clinic and premium loft spaces continue the façade along the boardwalk. The landscape sports a simple palette of wood, steel, masonry, water and vegetation.

The following images show early character sketches and design exploration.
Figure 49. Promenade concept sketch showing the relationship of pedestrian circulation and resting nodes to the boardwalk below and balcony above.

Figure 50. Boardwalk and amphitheater design development. Originating from the center of the elevated plaza, a radial pattern informs the alignment of stairs, waterfall and planter.

Figure 51. Grand stairway section shows the terracing of both architecture and landscape. Terracing maximizes daylight, ventilation and views.
Figure 52. Farmer’s Market plaza.

Public Spaces

Raised above the ground level, this plaza hosts community-oriented public activities. The farmer’s market hosts an array of fresh local produce. Vendors are able to back their trucks up to an opening in the garage, while patrons are able to peruse the stands and enjoy their purchase in the sun. The aperture in the center of the plaza consists of a panel system that changes with the season. In warm months it becomes a playful water feature. In the winter, it becomes an ice rink. The panels can be removed to host a variety of activities. Seating, both fixed and movable, skirts the circumference of the plaza. The plaza is accessed from a bridge to the boardwalk, the restaurant, fitness center, incubator, senior living center and garage. Above is a third terrace that is home to the community garden and village green.

The following images show concept sketches and design development.
Figure 53. Farmer’s Market Plaza conceptual diagram.

Figure 54. Farmer’s Market Plaza perspective.
Community Green

The community green captures the spirit of a village. In addition to the forms and space reflecting the physical and social needs of the residents, the design is scaled and detailed to promote attachment to place through connection with neighbors and activities.

A diverse array of sizes, types and ownership models provides the opportunity for homeowners or renters to find a place that fits their needs just right. Open architecture enables the affordable customization of each unit to accommodate lifestyle, interior quality and family size while preserving the identity and character of the development. A residential village, stemming from cohousing, opens to a community green, common house, and workshops. The common house and workshops provide shared amenities (including but not limited to gourmet kitchen, media room, exercise room, woodworking
and craft equipment, and laundry facilities) to the internal community, which requires less of individual homes. Atop the garage, the residential village has access to a community garden, a splash pad, a playground, and ample open space.

In addition to some of the social strategies, the design employs these environmental sustainability strategies:

- Urban agriculture promotes local food production and social programs for children and seniors. Water harvested from rooftops irrigates the gardens.
- Stormwater is mitigated on-site using permeable paving, rainwater harvesting and storage, and vegetative swales.
- On-site energy production offsets on-site energy usage.
- Buildings use passive systems for solar gain and ventilation where possible.

The following sketches explore some of the details in the community green.
Figure 56. Roof top planting conceptual details.
Community Health

Promoting the virtues of multi-generational living, a senior center and senior living units connect a growing part of the population with the goods, services and recreation that support an independent lifestyle. The units front a quiet residential street at the ground level and a common green and community-supported garden atop the garage. It provides accessible design that encourages physical activity and promotes self-sufficiency by providing civic amenities in close proximity.

In an effort to improve the health and access to health care in the neighborhood, a community health clinic is located on the site.
Part Four: Conclusions

Conclusions

The conclusions discuss the successes and weaknesses of the two directions of the thesis study: research and application.

Successes

In the research stage, we took advantage of multiple methods of information gathering. The use of field study, literature reviews, interviews, case studies, evaluation of precedents, and trend & market analysis helped to create a comprehensive understanding of the design issues. Each method led to new avenues of information, which offered a seemingly endless source of data. However, there reached a point where we had to move forward with the data that we had. When we chose to progress to the application stage, the data from our research had formed a complex web of design principles and best management practices from which we could make informed decisions.

In the application state, we were able to synthesize a site-responsive, culturally-relevant model of community-oriented development that captured the vision of the stakeholders and advanced the regional agenda for holistic sustainability. Our proposed solution will
hopefully stimulate Broad Ripple Village’s conversation about community building and Smart Growth.

**Weaknesses**

Regarding the research phase, there were many relevant local, national and international projects that remain to be visited and analyzed. There also exists a large body of untapped literature to review. Furthermore, informing the site visits, case studies, and interviews, the questions that we investigated could have been more refined. Managing the sheer amount of information was an initial challenge; however, as the more in depth our research became, the clearer was the focus of our thesis. The challenge then became arranging the information in a meaningful, impactful and accessible way to our audience. Time was another limiting factor. Given the breadth and depth of the knowledge base required to conduct a comprehensive feasibility study of a specific site, twelve weeks was not nearly enough time to define project parameters, gather data, and synthesize a viable solution. We would have preferred more time for discovery and investigation. Completing pro forma analyses assessing the feasibility of our proposal would have been a valuable next step in the process.

The application stage would have benefited from a longer and more intensive exploration of design solutions. More involvement with and feedback from the community would have enriched the participatory process that was so important to our proposed model. Time was a limiting factor with regards to the rigor of community engagement.
## Appendix A – Community Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Communities</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Photo</th>
<th>Affiliations</th>
<th>Urban/Rural</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jimenez Creek Estates</td>
<td>Santa Clara, California</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Rural/Rural</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>32</td>
<td><a href="#">Jimenez Creek Estates</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchito Village</td>
<td>Rancho San Diego, California</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>42</td>
<td><a href="#">Ranchito Village</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe</td>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe, California</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>32</td>
<td><a href="#">Rancho Santa Fe</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Charmer</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><a href="#">San Diego Charmer</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrey Pines Estates</td>
<td>Torrey Pines, California</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><a href="#">Torrey Pines Estates</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University City</td>
<td>University City, California</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban/Rural</td>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><a href="#">University City</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Jimenez Creek Estates](#): [Visit Jimenez Creek Estates website](#)
[Ranchito Village](#): [Visit Ranchito Village website](#)
[Rancho Santa Fe](#): [Visit Rancho Santa Fe website](#)
[San Diego Charmer](#): [Visit San Diego Charmer website](#)
[Torrey Pines Estates](#): [Visit Torrey Pines Estates website](#)
[University City](#): [Visit University City website](#)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Size (sq ft)</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Bed/Bath</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>011 Buckingham</td>
<td>Del Mar, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>By Appointment</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley</td>
<td>Del Mar, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Valley</td>
<td>La Jolla, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Springs</td>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>$399</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Oaks</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>$399</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VibraSpring</td>
<td>La Jolla, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>Mediterranean</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012 Buckingham</td>
<td>Del Mar, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Markle House</td>
<td>Del Mar, California</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene, Idaho</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airtown Landing</td>
<td>Arvada, Colorado</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade Crossing</td>
<td>Arvada, Colorado</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Boulevard</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene, Idaho</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club</td>
<td>Arvada, Colorado</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater Crossing</td>
<td>Arvada, Colorado</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>8/8</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elysium Heights</td>
<td>Boise, Idaho</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra White Crossing</td>
<td>Arvada, Colorado</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinney Farm</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene, Idaho</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altamont Villas</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene, Idaho</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Waterside</td>
<td>Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>13/13</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandlake Estates</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene, Idaho</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>Craftsman</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvedere Crossing</td>
<td>Coeur d’Alene, Idaho</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>[Website]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY CENTER</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban Unmarried</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.communitycenter.org">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Ridge</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban Unmarried</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.legacyyridge.org">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiesta Del Oro</td>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.fiestadeloro.com">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Creek</td>
<td>Kirkland, WA</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Urban Unmarried</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.emeraldcreek.com">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverwood Estates</td>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.silverwoodestates.com">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Country</td>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.seattlecountry.com">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Estates</td>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban Unmarried</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.theestates.org">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood Commons</td>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lakewoodcommons.org">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside Commons</td>
<td>Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Urban Unmarried</td>
<td>By Appt</td>
<td><a href="http://www.woodsidecommons.org">Website</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale District</td>
<td>Walmart, space available for retail, access to highway, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West &amp; North</td>
<td>50-50% mixed use, potential for retail, access to highway, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westport &amp; New Jersey</td>
<td>Access to highway, future plans, mixed use, mixed use, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal District</td>
<td>Mixed use, mixed use, access to highway, mixed use, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th &amp; New Jersey</td>
<td>Mixed use, mixed use, access to highway, mixed use, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Ripple</td>
<td>Mixed use, mixed use, access to highway, mixed use, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrenceville</td>
<td>Mixed use, mixed use, access to highway, mixed use, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority &amp;</td>
<td>Mixed use, mixed use, access to highway, mixed use, future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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