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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Research Problem and Objectives

Data gathered by the USDA has consistently shown the decline of rural populations, but the 2010’s are demonstrating this trend at a nationwide scale for the first time.¹ Rural Midwestern communities are especially affected by this trend. In an effort to protect their towns, some are responding to this threat by promoting community development. Though there are many definitions and interpretations of this term, this concept is focused on making holistic decisions to manage change and better the lives of those within a community. One common element in rural towns that can be interpreted as both a burden and an asset is the historic infrastructure. Organizations, such as the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Green Lab and Main Street America, have offered solutions and presented case studies on how to integrate community development and preservation. After reading the work of organizations like these, there is clearly a need to investigate the intersection between community development and historic preservation at a rural level. Through the research completed for this thesis, it can be said that the use of historic preservation as a community development tool can provide opportunities to combat this wide-spread issue of population decline and the subsequent challenges that are associated with this loss.

While the concepts of community development and historic preservation have been widely studied on an individual basis, little research has been completed on the impacts of combining these ideas. What has been studied has focused primarily on urban contexts. Though a few organizations do look at preservation more comprehensively, some rely on an economic-

driven preservation mentality. One such organization is Main Street America, whose self-promotional statistics focus on monetary investments and gains through preservation work. This simplification of preservation has lead rural communities to only view this field as a tool for economic development. While economic vitality is often a component of community development, multiple studies have been completed on historic preservation’s economic impacts. This completed work can be used to further justify historic preservation as a community development tool as well as offer a comparable framework for future analysis. Another approach will be taken to validate historic preservation’s effectiveness because economic impacts of historic preservation will not be under the purview of this study.

Economic growth may be able to provide the most convincing statistics as to why historic preservation should be utilized, but additional studies provide other advantages. Reports written by Main Street America and research completed by the National Trust for Historic Preservation (National Trust) suggest that smaller, more historic neighborhoods in urban areas promote improved quality of life. Though this concept is more difficult to quantify than economic data, cities are beginning to understand the advantages of historic areas over modern developments. Where these urban areas are viewing quality of life as an opportunity to revitalize small portions of their population, rural towns could use this same idea to bring in new residents and retain their existing citizens.

By understanding the concepts of community development and historic preservation, and where they intersect, these ideas can be more intentionally integrated into rural areas. Lessons learned about the positive impacts of preservation in urban contexts, specifically the application of quality of life initiatives, can be reinterpreted to help resolve the challenge of declining populations in these small communities. Further justification will be explored through this thesis
by means of case study communities, resulting in a series of best practices for rural communities as well as an outline for possible future research.

**Methodology**

With these communities consistently facing declining populations, as well as a lack of resources to aid them in the stabilization of this trend, the goal of this thesis is to take the first steps towards creating a guide that could help these areas understand the positive effects of utilizing historic preservation. While such a guide is not feasible at this time, due to a lack of preexisting research and time constraints, the following thesis research is being written as a foundation for future research on the topic of historic preservation as a community development tool for rural areas. First, a greater comprehension of the rural context must be investigated to understand the specific challenges these areas face. The impacts of community development and historic preservation as separate concepts will be researched before investigating the integration of the two. For the sake of simplification, the term “community preservation” will be used in instances where preservation is being used as a community development tool. For the literature review, research in these fields will focus on organizations at the city and state levels that have successfully worked with these concepts at both a rural and urban scales, and subsequent studies and theories that have been developed. The role of quality of life will be further studied within the confines of community development and historic preservation. Additional research will include databases, such as GIS and reports from the Stellar Communities Program, written sources, and case studies. Three rural communities in eastern Indiana were selected to investigate the validity of historic preservation as a community development tool. Selected to be directly comparable, three primary questions were used to guide the study of these towns:
- What effects does local legislation have on the implementation of historic preservation and community development?

- How have funding opportunities assisted with the development of community preservation projects?

- How has the concept of quality of life been integrated into the development of community preservation projects?

Research based around these questions was completed through site visits, conversations with local leadership and persons involved in community development and historic preservation, as well as supplemental data from GIS, local ordinances, and Main Street reports. To conclude, an overall analysis of the research and case study findings will lead to initial recommendations for community preservation in rural areas as well as future initiatives that should be taken to help mitigate further population decline in these communities.
CHAPTER TWO: DEFINING CONCEPTS

Before an investigation of historic preservation as a community development tool in rural communities can begin, these terms must be understood individually. Each concept itself contains a wide range of variables, interpretations, and public opinions. For this reason, a broad range of studies and organizations were researched to comprehend the full extent of these fields. This chapter will act as an introduction to these concepts while the following literature review will begin to investigate work being completed in these fields. First, the term “rural” is examined under the lens of statistical data through the Census Bureau as well as other governmental entities. Community development is the second concept to be studied. National and local organizations alike utilize this approach to create long term impacts in the improvement of quality of life for a specific group or area. Finally, the field of historic preservation is studied specifically from its origins as a theory to the creation of a nationwide legislative action, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.

What is Rural?

While rural land can be found across the country in multiple climates, there are very geographically specific images that come with the definition. According to Merriam Webster, rural includes areas “of or relating to the country, country people or life, or agriculture.”2 This may invoke images of rolling corn fields and farmers traveling down gravel roads in large tractors, but neglects to capture the full breadth of rural life. Challenges facing rural areas may differ depending on the geographical context, so the focus area for this thesis will be on one state

---

that fits within this agriculture stereotype, Indiana. To better understand the idea of rural, multiple national government entities have attempted to define this area through statistics.

The mental image of rural may seem simple but defining such a term is a challenge. The United States Department of Agriculture’s Economic Research Service attempts to explain rural at the county level as those containing towns of less than 50,000 people.\(^3\) In addition to their own rural definition, the organization has also identified nine other definitions from other government entities. Though similar to some extent, agencies’ definitions differ in the scale and what methods of classification are used. Data to determine ruralness can come in the form of census blocks, towns, counties, Rural-Urban Commuting Area Codes (RUCA), socioeconomic factors, and land use.\(^4\) Some agencies may restrict their definition to only two or three factors, while others use as many as needed to fit within their expectations of rural. For example, the Federal Office of Rural Health Policy uses county, RUCA, and census tract data to define rural. In addition to this, the organization added another 132 census tracts not designated as rural by any data to fit their idea of rural.\(^5\)

Perhaps the most clearly explained delineation of rural was created by the U.S. Census Bureau. Though the differentiation between urban and rural has evolved over time, their classification is based on a town’s population, density, land use, and distance from an urban area. With regards to population, urban is divided into two types: urbanized areas and urban clusters. The former is a city of 50,000 or more people while the latter includes incorporated towns between 2,500 and 50,000. Density of a town must exceed 1,000 people per square mile (ppsm),


though a more lenient 500 ppsm allows areas that may contain large parks, parking lots, or other low-density areas to be included in the urban classification. This issue is also addressed under land use and distance. The land use criteria allows nonresidential urban land within a quarter mile to contain substantial amounts of solid surfaces, such as airports. Under the distance criteria, developments up to two and a half miles can be included in an urban area. This circumstance could be used for housing or shopping centers.⁶

In addition to classifying individual towns, the U.S. Census Bureau uses the Office of Management and Budget’s (OMB) county level designation, differentiating between metropolitan and micropolitan areas. To determine metro from micro, each county’s largest incorporated town is considered. Counties containing any portion of an urbanized area is considered a metropolitan while those with an urban cluster between 10,000 and 50,000 people is classified as a micropolitan area.⁷

Some counties adjacent to metropolitan counties may be included in the statistical area because the OMB has determined the county demonstrates a strong integration with the near-by urbanized area. This typically includes the migration to or from other counties in the form of commuters. Twenty-five percent of workers in the county must travel outside of the county for their jobs or

---


⁷ Ibid.
twenty-five percent of the jobs within the county must be filled by those outside of the county to be considered an exception to the metropolitan area.  

Rural can also be defined in terms of socioeconomic data, though this method of interpretation is not as commonly used. Esri Tapestry is one system that actively collects this information to better understand markets and classify neighborhoods with residents that have similar interests and characteristics. Fourteen “LifeModes” are divided further into a total of sixty-seven unique demographic groups that can be used to understand consumer markets and commonalities between residents. Alternately, these sixty-seven classifications can be grouped into six different “Urbanization” groups based on geographic location rather than lifestyle information. For example, the “rural” urbanization group is characterized by people who live in a single-family home in the country, in an area with less than 50 people per square mile, and over half of the homes are occupied by people above the age of 55. Having access to this type of demographic data adds another layer of understanding the elements that make up rural communities.

The concept of rural may have many statistical and literary variations, but is commonly understood with regards to low population. For the purpose of the research at hand, the term “rural” will directly relate to the U.S. Census Bureau’s data. Rural communities will be placed into one of four categories based on population and location in relationship to a metropolitan area. For population, less than 2,500 people will be considered “small” and 2,500 to 50,000 will be “mid-sized”. Though the Census Bureau considers the urban cluster classification as urban,

---

8 Cromartie and Parker, “What is Rural?”
9 Esri is the company that built ArchGIS, a mapping and analytics software used around the world.
this group of communities will be considered rural to follow consistencies between definitions and create a more encompassing study. Towns within a metropolitan area will be deemed “suburb” and those outside this are “remote”. Every rural town then gets a combined designation.

For example, a small city of 40,000 outside of a metropolitan area would be considered a “Mid-sized Remote Town”. This division based on statistical information allows for rural towns to be classified into more comparable groupings.

Though research for this thesis focused on the “Mid-sized Remote” group of communities, such a division may want to be further explored if research continues.

**Rural Challenges**

In addition to further subdividing the term “rural”, a greater understanding of the challenges these areas face is needed to appropriately relate the findings of the studies completed in urban areas to these smaller-scaled communities. This thesis will concentrate on the challenges created by declining population. Several subsequent issues can be directly correlated with population loss but analyzing the possible challenges that could face these Mid-Sized Remote Midwestern communities has provided a focus area. Information was found through various institutions and visiting with community leaders. Websites of organizations created specifically to address rural challenges are especially helpful because they often outline which of these concerns the group aims to address. When compared to additional research and

![Figure 2: Rural Classifications, created by author](image-url)
conversations with those in each of the case study communities, discrepancies become apparent. There appears to be very broad generalizations that are perceived to be concerns with all rural communities as well as those issues that are very real, but rarely studied.

Larger, typically nationwide, organizations tend to generalize challenges faced by rural areas even though they may not necessarily apply to all rural communities. One organization created to aid rural communities with their challenges is Rural LISC. Though the work completed by Rural LISC is relevant to some rural areas, three of their recognized “Rural Challenges” do not apply to the case study communities: lack of medical facilities, lack of technology and connection to internet, and the loss of land to urban sprawl.12

The challenge addressing access to medical facilities does not apply to any of the case study communities, which each contain either a public or private hospital. This is most likely because of each town’s status as a county seat. Across the entire state of Indiana, only sixteen counties do not have a hospital and eight of those are within a metropolitan area.13 For this reason, medical care is never mentioned among the three studied communities, and most likely is not a primary concern for much of Indiana. As for technological issues, none of the studied communities expressed a concern about cell service, internet, or other digital resources. This challenge is probably more evident in extreme remote areas, such as deserts or mountains, but could be an issue in agriculture-based communities of very small sizes that were not studied. The loss of land to urban communities seems to be of no concern to these towns, which is most likely due to their distance from cities. Shortages in land is more pertinent to those rural communities within metropolitan counties or in close proximity to urban areas. While each of these challenges

may have their place within specific rural communities, none of these concerns in the three Indiana case study communities.

The goal of this section is not to contest that these above challenges do not exist in rural areas, but rather bring the oversimplification of rural contexts to attention. The inability to specify which challenges are present, geographically or otherwise, or address other issues present in rural areas only reinforces the evidence of misconceptions and general lack of understanding of rural communities. For this reason, a combination of research and consultation with community leaders guided the recognition of a few challenges common between the case study communities. This is not intended as a comprehensive list, but rather those challenges that directly connected with population loss.

One of the defining features of rural communities is a small number of residents, but the challenge now faced in these towns is retaining what few numbers they have remaining. While the past few decades have consistently shown the trend of declining rural populations in non-metropolitan counties, 2011 was the first time that rural population loss was evident across the entire country.\textsuperscript{14} Two factors play a role in population change: natural change and net migration. Natural change, the ratio of births to deaths in a county, has been steadily decreasing since 2000.\textsuperscript{15} Since then, 970 non-metropolitan counties across the country have experienced more deaths than births, with almost one third of these counties joining the list since 2010.\textsuperscript{16} When migration out of rural counties is factored in as well, it is clear that the country is in the middle of a historic geographic shift. With regards to preservation and community development, this

\textsuperscript{14} Cromartie, “Rural Areas Show Overall Population Decline and Shifting Regional Patterns of Population Change.”
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
Overall trend in population loss means there is also a more limited number of residents who are able to commit their time to betterment of the town.

While the number of citizens who are interested in being involved in any organization or government entity is already limited, rural communities have an even smaller pool of people who are willing to be involved. Those with a specific passion for preservation or community development will cut this number down even further. This small group of individuals may struggle with being a part of too many organizations, political conflicts, or other biases. Because of the limited number of people willing to serve on a committee or in an organization, it may be difficult to bring in new ideas. Also, rural communities may not be able to afford paid staff members to lead organizations and instead must rely heavily on volunteers. This inconsistency in available workers, or commitment to the preservation efforts, can cause waves of decline and progress in these communities. A short turn over, along with possible inexperience in the fields of preservation and community development, may cause previous momentum to be lost and make it difficult to implement projects, especially long-term or large undertakings. Though these issues also occur in larger cities, the impacts are magnified when at the rural level. Communities across the country are
having to contend with getting residents involved in preservation and community development efforts, but a growing population of retirees may help this dilemma.

As the percentage of America’s 62-and-over demographic continues to steadily climb, rural communities are going to have to consider how they respond to the needs of this group. According to the US Census Bureau, 13% of the United State’s population was 65 and over, with another 26% in the 45 to 64 age bracket in the year 2010. Also, Rural LISC claims that three out of five baby boomers say a small town or rural area would be their ideal retirement location. Perhaps this interest in rural communities will offset the declining population trend. Despite this potential solution to one rural concern, this demographic will bring its own set of opportunities and challenges. On one hand, an increase in the retired population may boost the number of available volunteers for various organizations. The retention of this aging population could also cause their family members to stay in the area or bring them back to the community. Additionally, the needs of this demographic may demand a direct change in the physical environment. While all towns and cities should work towards ADA compliance, rural communities with an older population should especially be aware of the accessibility of buildings and paths of travel. Overall walkability or access to transportation is also important, since some of this population may not have access to a car or may no longer drive. Housing is especially relevant, since retirees may be looking to purchase a property to age in place. On top of this, affordability may be another factor to consider, especially with retirees potentially living off a restricted income. Cost of living should not be limited to the older population, as financial

---

18 Rural LISC, “What We Do.”
19 The concept of “aging in place” is based on someone finding a location to settle, typically for the rest of their lives. This requires thinking ahead about future limitations brought on by age, such as ADA compliance or inability to drive a vehicle, when investing in a property.
issues can affect rural communities as much as it does in urban areas. In addition to rural areas having to mitigate challenges specific to an aging population, these communities must contend with perceptions about the town.

The way a community is perceived by residents or visitors can make the difference between population retention or decline. Because perceptions can be positive and negative as well as relate to tangible and intangible community aspects, it can be a challenge to make everyone satisfied. According to one study, the issue of perception often revolves around the idea of change: an inability to change due to a lack of resources or influence, not wanting to change, not knowing how to change, or thinking there can’t be change. With this in mind, it is easy to see that perceptions can ultimately determine the successfulness of preservation and community development efforts. Even if there are residents who have the power to make change and there are resources available, the perception that no one can help may hinder progress. Then comes the mindset of those who do not want to change simply for their own personal reasons or may be unwilling to take risks. Not knowing how to change comes back to available services. While local organizations should provide assistance when asked, it should also be these groups that reach out to community members to educate them on topics relevant to their town.

Finally, the perception that change is not possible can directly relate to preservation efforts. The idea of preservation itself has many misguided conceptions that a building’s aesthetics must be maintained to a certain time period or being in a designated property or district means that no alterations can be made without significant restrictions in place. While this can be true in some circumstances, many preservationists view historic preservation more along

the lines of rehabilitation. Buildings should maintain their historically significant features yet be flexible enough in their repurposing to continue to be an asset to the community. Even the appearance of old buildings can bring about inaccurate assumptions. For example, a building that is vacant and perhaps showing some signs of age may be perceived as a safety hazard or a location where the homeless gather, though neither of these statements may be true. Residents will always have their opinions, biases, and misconceptions directed towards preservation and community development. While altering perceptions may be one of the most difficult challenges faced by rural communities, leaders can work towards overcoming this issue by educating citizens and proving the effectiveness of a preservation approach through quantitative data collection.

Even with the previous challenges focusing on people, most of these challenges also have some connection to the physical environment. With regards to place, the aging building stock and other crucial infrastructure systems are the most visually obvious. Because of a lack of other resources, including people, the aging built environment may suffer from a lack of maintenance. This may lead to prolonged vacancies or complete destruction of a building through neglect. Downtown buildings are especially susceptible to vacancies if the town struggles to retain businesses and the upper stories are not maintained. While these buildings may be available, they are not always configured in a way that is appealing to buyers. Historically these small downtown buildings held a business on the first floor and the floors above were used as residential spaces. Though this mixed-use building type is still used today, some may find this design limiting. On the other hand, older vacant buildings also come in the form of large structures, sometimes warehouses or other industrial buildings. It can be a daunting task to find a

---

21 Rehabilitation is often associated with the historically sensitive adaptive reuse of a structure. Further explanation of this term and other preservation methods can be found on page 22.
way to repurpose these white elephants because of the shear amount of funds needed to make the building habitable or finding a developer who is able to undertake such a demanding project. Restrictive floor plans or maintenance concerns that come with older buildings may deter some potential businesses or renters, forcing them to build their business outside of the historic commercial core. In rural communities, this may lead to a loss in property taxes and an overall reduction in capital that could be used to further the betterment of the area. For the larger historic sites, abandonment not only causes continuous decay, but also acts as a reminder of a once thriving area of industry.

Like any economy, rural areas must rely on the resources at their disposal, whether that is agriculture, manufacturing or other industry. Urban areas may be able to depend on a diverse range of income producing businesses that help keep the community thriving, even through times of economic downturn. In rural communities, a new industry or the loss of a staple business can have drastic implications. Stability is more likely to be retained when anchor institutions, such as schools or hospitals, are put into a community. Even then, rural economies may be susceptible to more drastic changes because of the lack of variety in workforce opportunities, inability to compete with other communities for industry, or even the political climate at the time. Because of the nature of rural industry, funding for preservation or community development projects may need to come from an outside investment source.

A lack of funding opportunities is often one of the primary factors that prevents much of this needed maintenance and community betterment projects. Though involvement in preservation programs like Main Street may allow communities greater access to funding, these are often very competitive and do not guarantee outside funding. While a one-time influx of funding, such as the use of a grant, can act as a catalyst for additional development, this money
usually comes with restrictions or limitations on how it can be allocated. Funding that comes from partnerships or other unique opportunities may be possible through local efforts, but often dependent on the circumstances in each community. A funding source like a trust or revolving loan may not supply massive quantities of cash flow but can create a consistent stream of money to assist the needs of the community.

The best example of rural communities competing for funding would be the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG). While there are various programs under the CDBG umbrella, the only grant money that rural communities have access to is through the State Program. Each year, HUD allocates a lump sum of grant money to each state based on a formula created from population, poverty, and housing needs. It is up to the State to provide further guidelines as well as the distribution of these funds. In Indiana, CDBG money is divided into five programs: Blight Clearance, Main Street Revitalization, Public Facilities, Stormwater Improvements, and Wastewater/Drinking Water. Each fiscal year is broken into three rounds of funding opportunities. For the 2017/2018-year, two rounds have been completed with the third having an application deadline of February 9th, meaning projects for this round were under review during the writing of this thesis.22 This includes nearly $11 million distributed to 23 communities in the first round23 and almost $15.5 million to 31 communities in the second round.24 Despite the opportunities that CDBG funding presents rural communities, its competitive nature means that a
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community cannot rely on this source to aid its economy. On top of being competitive, CDBG along with other grants or financing opportunities often require plans of action or other proof that the community will be able to execute the projects that will use the grants. This requires people well versed in preservation, community development, and the community as a whole, returning once again to the challenge of overcoming declining populations. The Analysis chapter will use these challenges to gauge the effectiveness of historic preservation as a community development tool by assessing projects’ abilities to provide solutions.

**What is Community Development?**

Much like the term “rural,” community development has a variety of meanings depending on the situation, though it differs in its lack of statistical backing. Each term alone can be defined in several ways. “Community” can be interpreted as a physical “unified body of individuals” or a mental “social state or condition.”

> Though these dictionary terms may seem confining, other professionals view the idea of community as creating a sense of belonging.

The concept’s latter half has a range of meanings including “to make visible or manifest,” “to create or produce especially by deliberate effort over time,” and “to cause to evolve or unfold gradually.” Any combination of these definitions could be used to create completely different meanings to “community development.” Despite the freedom of customizing the term to fit the needs of a community, there are clearly commonalities that can be gathered to create a holistic understanding of the term community development.

---


At all scales, community development is most effective when it includes a combination of community organizing, advocacy, and implementation. These areas define a crucial aspect of community development that must be present in order to fulfill a holistic approach. The first necessary ingredient for a successful community development initiative is community organization. In order to build upon a common goal, an organization must have the ability to understand what currently exists within a community, leverage assets, and overcome challenges to create the framework for a local support system. This idea allows a town to assess the needs and wants of the community as well as create a benchmark to compare progress through time. Advocacy is crucial to gain the approval and support of the community. By effectively advocating and educating the public, organizations promote a cause and increase buy in. The final concept is the implementation, or physical manifestation, of a community development organization’s mission and vision. Though a change may not be permanent, an alteration to a community’s environment creates a response, positive or negative, to which an organization can assess then use to continue community development efforts. These three ideas are by no means represent a linear process, but rather a continuously evolving workflow. Together, organization, advocacy, and implementation can guide community development. In addition to the processes behind community development, there are also commonalities in the vocabulary behind project goals.

Community development organizations often create a mission statement to clarify and communicate their desired outcomes. By looking at the similarities in the vocabulary used at both a local and national level, these simple statements can reveal the underlying motives of these groups which can be divided into actions and effected persons. Some of the most common verbs in these statements encompass the idea of implementing change including: strengthen,
improve, and revitalize. While usually providing an uplifting message, these buzz words are often used within a statement without further defining what they mean in the form of quantifiable goals. As an example, the terms “strong” or “strengthen” may be quantifiable in a weightlifting contest, but typically immeasurable with regards to community development. One exception is the organization Strong Towns which aims, “to support a model of development that allows America’s cities, towns, and neighborhoods to become financially strong and resilient.”

Though their mission appears unquantifiable at first, an additional website resource provides a list of yes or no questions addressing issues, such as walkability and available resources, that creates a benchmark for communities. Since numerical data can be either difficult to acquire or analyze, strength is instead quantified by visual cues, public policies, and existing infrastructure. By clearly defining the parameters of “strong”, Strong Towns gives communities quantifiable goals that organizations can build towards. While Strong Towns is just one example of a nation-wide community development organizations, locally-based organizations are where the community resident play a crucial role.

Community development is most effective when defined and implemented for the needs of an individual group. For this reason, one of the most common structures of local organization that is specifically designed to undertake community development practices is the community development corporation (CDC). CDCs are typically created by citizens to revitalize their communities or neighborhoods and may offer services to accomplish this goal. Usually a non-profit organization, CDCs benefit from the accessibility of funds through multiple sources including donations, grants, and municipal support. Towns may contain multiple CDCs with

---

each having a specific focus, such as affordable housing, or a single all-encompassing organization. While the former circumstance is more common, the latter is likely to exist in smaller communities where a single organization is expected to address all community needs as they arise.\(^\text{30}\)

It is often through organizations like CDCs that specific audience is selected based on the needs of a community. Not all organizations explicitly define a group in their mission statement, but community development at its core is based around people. For nation-wide organizations, this could be as broad as “rural” while more locally based groups may focus on a certain income level or demographic. Despite the scale, community development must define expectations for the interactions between the organization and the people they aim to assist. Often time connections are based around the idea of creating equality and increasing communication across varying demographics and social circumstances.\(^\text{31}\) This may be in the form of participation, organization, or empowerment. Much like the actions of community development, the interactions between of the organization and its chosen focus group need to be quantifiable. This may be simpler in some cases, such as participation. Terminology like “empowerment” can be as challenging to quantify as words like “strong”, but measurable goals should be put into place. This could be accomplished by organizing workshops and education opportunities, often an integral component to community development.

Even after researching the ideas behind community development, it is difficult to pinpoint a singular definition that can be used cohesively regardless of scale or circumstance. Like discussed above, community development is based around organization, advocacy, and


implementation. While these ideas do not have to exist with the same amount of focus, all are necessary to practice a holistic community development approach. Community development projects should identify their focus area and define desired outcomes through quantifiable goals. Though some may argue against the need for measurable achievements, the data provided by such actions will monitor progress and justify the future of community development in an area.

What is Historic Preservation?

Like community development, “historic preservation” as a complete phrase has been studied and defined by several researchers, yet the likes of Merriam-Webster have yet to give it a formal definition. Instead of sorting through a myriad of possible interpretations, the concept can be broken down into four widely accepted methodologies: preservation, restoration, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. Each of these represents a specific treatment to the historic infrastructure as defined by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior:

- Preservation: “process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and material of an historic property.”

- Rehabilitation: “making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey is historic, cultural, or architectural value.”

- Restoration: “the process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of mission features from the restoration period.”

- Reconstruction: “the process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.”^32

---

The scope for these four concepts has created the framework for historic preservation today, but they do not fully encompass the complexities of the field.

Though ideology behind historic preservation has changed over time, theories can be traced back to the nineteenth century. Two combative philosophies were present at this time. First was that of Eugene Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, architect and writer, who believed in restoring buildings to “a completed state which may never have existed at any particular time.”33 This perspective was contradicted by John Ruskin, English architecture critic, who believed that any change to a building’s original fabric was “the most total destruction which a building can suffer,” comparing the restoration of buildings to raising the dead.34 Modern practices recognize both men’s very distinct views of historic building preservation as academic investigations, but never conformed to either’s ideals. The American perspective on historic preservation evolved after years of private efforts that culminated with the implementation of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). With America blinded by its desire to expand its freeways and demolish any evidence of blight through urban renewal, it was this piece of legislation that outlined the importance and need to protect the country’s historic resources. With the passage of the NHPA, the government had codified the practice of historic preservation and put a system in place to oversee such work.

Historic preservation organizations can be found at the national, state, and local levels. While the nation-wide organizations tend to provide guidance, preservation practices are often implemented from a grassroots position. As a nation, the United States government is advised on historic preservation issues by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), an

34 Murtagh, *Keeping Time*, 3.
agency put in place by the NHPA. The responsibility of the board is to provide leadership and promote preservation practices in federal projects. Because the ACHP only councils the President and Congress, public historic preservation education and guidance falls under the purview of the National Parks Service (NPS), a subsidiary of the Department of the Interior. The NPS is in charge of the designation of sites to the National Register of Historic Places and assisting the public through the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, Preservation Briefs, Tech Notes, information on the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives program and other educational opportunities. Even though the NPS acts as the authoritative figure in historic preservation, using the Standards to guide the appropriate treatment of historic structures, state-wide entities allow for a more localized government organization.

State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) act as liaisons between local and national preservation organizations. The NPS may provide resources and have the final say in matters regarding National Register nominations, but it is the SHPO that often assesses preservation practices within the state. In the case of Indiana, the SHPO is housed within the Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) under the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. Though the Standards are nationally recognized, they are written in a way which makes them open for interpretation, meaning each state may approach preservation slightly differently depending on the opinions of those in the SHPO. In addition to giving preservation

---


36 There are four sets of Secretary of the Interior Standards to coordinate with the varying treatment methods: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction, and Restoration. Each has six to ten points that are used to determine whether a project is sensitive to the historic context. These are often used to justify historic tax credits.

37 The NPS offers a 20% tax credit for the rehabilitation of income-producing buildings that conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.


assistance state wide, SHPOs also overlook locally organized governments that want access to valuable state and national resources.

The Certified Local Government Program, implemented by the NPS and created through the NHPA of 1966, acts as another opportunity for communities interested in historic preservation to assert local governing power over projects. In order to become a Certified Local Government (CLG), communities must:

- Establish a historic preservation commission;
- Enforce legislation for the designation and protection of historic properties, usually through a local ordinance;
- Maintain a survey and inventory of historic resources;
- Facilitate public participation; and
- Follow requirements implements by individual state’s CLG Procedures.\(^40\)

Once a town becomes a CLG, the community’s historic preservation commission is responsible for the initial review of National Register Nominations and must provide comments and recommendations to the SHPO.\(^41\) CLG’s also have access to funds given to the state through the Federal Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) along with technical assistance from the SHPO staff. All communities have access to these funds, but CLGs have priority. The NPS also provides grant opportunities specifically for CLGs, such as the Underrepresented Community Grant.\(^42\)

At its essence, historic preservation is about saving places that people find valuable. The “place” component comes down to the physical buildings, structures, landscapes, and objects.


Designation is not a means to an end. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standard that best suits the needs of the historic place should be implemented. From there, a plan for protection and future goals can be created in relation to that place. Because the physical preservation of place has been so debated and the methods of preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction widely accepted, there is little need to further define these terms. The role that people play in preservation is much more subjective.

First, the issue of preserving the culture and values of people should be addressed. Though organizations like the National Trust and NPS have begun addressing these aspects of history, there is no definitive process to representing these intangible histories. Often it must be done through oral histories, or a physical manifestation with the corresponding historic place. Essentially, this is why a place has significance to a community, outside of architectural importance, which leads to the other human-centered component of preservation. There may be a strong cultural tie to a specific site, but preservation often comes down to a need for education and advocacy. Without having an understanding of overarching goals and importance of historic resources, preservation is driven by individual opinions and political gains. It is also crucial to understand the grassroots efforts that create the foundation. Preservation cannot occur without people who are willing to recognize and protect their history.

Community Preservation

Now that the ideas behind community development and historic preservation have been explored, they can be brought together to create a singular term: community preservation. Based off this research, there are three areas where community development and preservation overlap:
strong grassroots efforts, controlling change, and improving quality of life. The following is a framework that can be used to identify these types of projects.

First, is a strong grassroots effort. Though both community development and historic preservation have ties to state and national levels, the bulk of the work is being completed by the community for the community. This bottom-up approach allows residents to directly address their needs through organization and project implementation. Assistance can be given to these efforts from other local, state, or national groups.

Second, is the desire to control change. On one hand, community development is utilized to control experiences. On the other, historic preservation is implemented to control change to the built environment. The other aspect of community preservation that should be discussed is the balancing act between the community and preservation components. For example, preservation may be completed with only the intent of saving a historic structure or community development may only be implemented to help a specific group of people, without regarding the historic context. By merging the two concepts into “community preservation”, these projects will be identified as those that utilize the existing environment to control a person’s experience in that place. A focus should exist on preserving the community as a whole through population stabilization.

Just like quality of life can be used to justify historic preservation, a topic that will be explored in the literature review, this same idea is applicable to community preservation projects. By promoting personal health and high-quality aesthetics within a broader community context, the quality of life of the citizens will improve. More opportunities for social and emotional connections as well as showing commitment to bettering a place will create place attachment, a similar yet integrated concept. With quality of life promoting the resident retention and
appropriation, the author hypothesizes that rural communities that implement such community preservation projects will slow their rate of population loss or allow the town to grow in population. With this being said, research that has already been completed in these fields must be investigated.
CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW

While community development and historic preservation have been thoroughly researched individually, few organizations or studies promote the integration of the two. Even less can be found about these concepts in rural communities. However, the intersection of economic development and historic preservation has been extensively studied and may provide opportunities for comparison with community development. The overall lack of research acts as a limitation to this thesis, but it proves justification that future research is needed in the intersection of community development and historic preservation at urban and rural scales.

Community Development Organizations

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) published a working paper in 1956 discussing the concept of community development and the committee’s involvement, if any, at a global scale. Focusing on how to aid rural and “depressed” communities through self-help, it is apparent that the use of the term has evolved from its original purpose.\footnote{United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, “Unesco Working Paper for the ACC Working Group on Community Development,” (Paris, 1956), 2, accessed January 19, 2018, http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001797/179726eb.pdf.} Today, community development is often perceived as a practice that can only be implemented by vast amounts of financial backing and outside resources. At the time, community development was “a generic term used to describe the process by which local communities can raise their own standards of living.”\footnote{United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, “Unesco Working Paper for the ACC Working Group on Community Development,” 1.} Two primary concerns about this definition were addressed by the organization. First was the use of the word “development,” which could lead to the term’s misinterpretation of being synonymous with economic development. As suggested by UNESCO, perhaps the best way to separate the two is based on
the expectations of community members. Economic development suggests a direct increase in production, income, or facilities while community development encompasses a more holistic view with overall growth, improved life, and better allocation of resources as goals. As an issue that continues to persist today, UNESCO clearly attempted to set the groundwork for differentiating the two concepts. It was also found that the ambiguous nature of the statement allows the concept to be used across all scales of communities, yet has the risk of causing confusion when discussed at a global scale. For this reason, it was decided that UNESCO would limit their purview of community development to supplying technical assistance to agencies directly under their control. Despite a lack of influence at the community level and potential agency coordination concerns, this would keep interpreive powers at the local level, which still applies to this day. Though it is clear that UNESCO struggled with creating a definitive scope for community development, the base for future interpretation has been set, especially in terms of structure, process, and overarching goals.

Though it is typically best for community development to be formed out of grassroots initiatives, large scale organizations spanning across the country can provide guidance for such efforts. Because of the breadth of issues covered under the purview of community development, organizations may take on specific sectors to focus limited resources. The Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) is one such organization that “… forges resilient and inclusive communities of opportunity across America…” It was founded as a nonprofit organization to assist local community groups across the country primarily through grants and technical assistance. These resources can be applied towards affordable housing, health, education, and

economic development. LISC even has a division designated to aiding rural communities, simply called Rural LISC, making it one of the few nation-wide organizations to specifically address such areas.

While both LISC and Rural LISC focus on improving lives in communities through assisting local organizations, community organizing, and technical assistance, other organizations focus on improving the built environment to implement change. One such group is the Center for Community Progress, a non-profit organization focused on transforming abandoned, vacant, and deteriorated properties into valuable community assets. This goal is accomplished primarily through educational and technical assistance programs. While advocating for the improvement of infrastructure and the built environment is necessary and admirable, implementation is often difficult and troublesome.

Another non-profit, Project for Public Spaces (PPS), is one organization that fills this implementation gap. While there is still an advocacy portion of the process, PPS aims to physically transform space to build stronger communities. The organization has completed projects across the country including transportation plans, parks, downtowns improvements, and event planning.

Despite trends in organization structure, community development does not have to originate from a non-profit. HUD is one such federal entity that offers opportunities for building, “stronger and more resilient communities,” through government funding. Community Development Block Grants are distributed annually to entitlement communities (principal city in
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a metropolitan county or city above 50,000 people), states, and through other programs to assist areas in need. Though a community must meet specific requirements in order to receive funds and may only apply that money towards HUD approved areas, the hope is to act as a catalyst for additional development by leveraging additional funding sources. These restrictions may limit the number and types of organizations that receive funds, but provides a commitment by the government to aid in community development.

Because two of the three case study communities have been designated as Stellar Communities, an introduction to the program is necessary. The Stellar Communities Program is unique to the state of Indiana and is possible through a multi-agency partnership coordinated through the Indiana Office of Community & Rural Affairs (OCRA). This program began in 2011 as a way to recognize small communities that have created comprehensive community and economic development projects. Selected annually, two towns are chosen to receive funding that go towards quality of place improvements. Stellar was recognized at a national level in 2012 by the Council of State Community Development Agencies as an excellent example of a community development program. Between 2011 and 2016, $89.4 million has been invested by the state into these Stellar towns, with another $108.6 million contributed from within the communities.

Initially the program began by designating two non-entitlement communities (under 50,000). Two classes were then creating starting in 2015: towns under 6,000 and towns between

54 OCRA, Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority, and Indiana Department of Transportation act as the primary agencies that coordinate and implement the Stellar program, but several other organizations offer technical assistance.
6,000 and 50,000. With one community selected in each category, small communities were given a greater chance at receiving funds. 2018 marks a completely new set of guidelines. Instead of having two categories, towns must come together to form regions that will then receive funding from Stellar. These communities will still need to be considered non-entitlement to participate. Those interested in becoming a Stellar Community must then complete the application and designation process. This includes submitting a letter of interest, completing Strategic Investment Plans (SIP), and host site visits. The Stellar executive leadership then scores the communities and selects the new Stellar towns. Since 2011, sixty communities have participated in the process with only fourteen being selected. Of these fourteen, twelve are also Main Street communities. While the significance of this is unclear, it does suggest that Main Street communities have a greater ability to create a comprehensive plan and identify potential projects that could improve quality of life through community preservation projects.

The work that comes out of these Stellar projects all appear to have some common factors, which most likely correlate with the expectations of the review committee that select the winning communities. These common project types include housing, downtown revitalization, and streetscapes. Quality of life was also an underlying component to each community’s goals. Once a community has been selected, there are three stages they must complete. The first is an initial planning stage that could include property and grant acquisition. Next is considered a transitional phase which takes place during the second year of the program. The designs are executed, and projects begin to break ground. The final step is the implementation of the

58 A SIP is essentially a community vision plan completed by the town’s local government that identifies projects that will be completed with the Stellar funding.
60 Indiana Office of Community & Rural Affairs, “Stellar Communities Program.”
projects. While some of this may have been started in the previous step, this stage focuses on the completion of the plan in its entirety.61

With the timeline for Stellar project completion around four years, some of the early communities have completed their projects and are beginning to experience the results. In an effort to quantify the impacts of these public/private and state/local partnerships on these communities, the Sagamore Institute for Policy Research has been hired to collect data and compile research on the Stellar communities. The overall goal for the Stellar Communities Program is to help rural communities build sustainability, build capacity, foster regional impacts, and leverage quality of place through comprehensive and transformative planning processes.62

Findings from this study that relate directly to the case study communities and Stellar’s ability to mitigate population decline will be further discussed in analysis portion of this thesis.

**Historic Preservation Organizations**

The National Trust, a non-profit spanning across America, focuses their efforts on “protecting significant places representing our diverse cultural experience by taking direct action and inspiring broad public support.”63 Unlike the NPS, the National Trust practices preservation through both its physical implementation and by studying its impacts. Through their work, they aim to use preservation in order to create community, commitment, and passion. Though the National Trust provides no formal stance on their definition of historic preservation through their website, their values point to an emphasis on the human role played in preservation.64 Though

61 Sagamore Institute, “The Stellar Process.”
approaches to preservation are contrasting, yet compatible, the National Trust also advocated for local grass roots efforts through their subsidiary Main Street America program.

With priorities placed on aiding communities who are revitalizing their downtown commercial districts, the Main Street America program offers resources and assistance on preservation-based economic development in our historic commercial cores. Strategies to accomplish this goal are broken down into Main Street’s Four Points: Economic Vitality, Design, Promotion, and Organization. When applied through a thorough understanding of a community, these approaches can create a comprehensive plan of action. Though Main Street America exists alongside the National Trust at a nation-wide scale, the program is truly effective because of the assistance provided at the state and local levels.

Unlike the SHPO’s created through the NHPA of 1966, each state is not required to have a Main Street Coordinating Program. Though it is common for a state to have a Main Street organization housed within a government entity, they may also operate as an individual non-profit. There are a few examples of Coordinating Programs outside the control of a state, such as the city of Boston, Massachusetts, for which there is no state Main Street Coordinating Program. Because of this, organizations may have a range of staff depending on needs and structure put in place. For example, Indiana Main Street is under the umbrella of OCRA, and only staffs a state coordinator, but community liaisons under OCRA assist Indiana Main Street. In contrast, Main Street Iowa exists within the Iowa Economic Development Authority and staffs

nine full time employees and one intern. Regardless of size or departmental location, the Main Street offices are responsible for assessing city programs that apply for Main Street status, either as an Affiliate or Accredited program, and assist those that have been accepted into the program through the Four Points.\textsuperscript{69} National recognition gives communities access to training, funding, and a support network of like-minded communities, but also requires certain standards to be upheld. It is necessary to maintain a work plan, active board of directors, at least one paid professional staff, and create statistic reports which must be provided to the state organization.\textsuperscript{70} Regardless of the scale or association with the government versus non-profit, historic preservation has both qualitative and quantitative value.

One practitioner who has greatly impacted the way that historic preservation is viewed in communities is Donovan Rypkema. Though focused on the economic impacts of historic preservation, this work can be directly related to community development practices as well. In his book \textit{The Economics of Historic Preservation: A Community Leader’s Guide}, Rypkema outlines a series of reasons why historic preservation can be an effective tool for economic vitality across multiple scales and community types. Backed by years of research, the guide itself can be used as a tool for activists wishing to present the advantages of using preservation. Some of the primary themes that can be applicable to community development include preservation:

- Being used for long term development;
- As a way to compete with other communities;
- Keeping services concentrated in an area;
- Proving the community is committed to an area;

\textsuperscript{69} Accredited programs have been designated at the national level for meeting certain standards of Main Street America. An Affiliate is still recognized at the national level but has neglected to meet all of the requirements.

- Promoting community participation;
- Creating a connection between a community and its residents;
- Reducing building vacancies; and
- Providing opportunities for quality design standards\textsuperscript{71}

While this list presents only a small list of general themes discussed in Rypkema’s studies, there is a clear link between factors that affect economic vitality, community development, and historic preservation. These same arguments can be made to justify historic preservation as a community development tool, though future data collection and analysis specific to this area. Until then, more qualitative measures can be used to validate preservation as an effective community development tool.

Quality of Life: The Intersection of Community Development and Historic Preservation

Though “quality of life” can be used within other contexts, research on the concept is focused on the way it justifies community preservation. Often incorporated into the mission statements of organizations, this term is frequently used as a buzz word to justify work within these fields. The term is self-explanatory, yet difficult to quantify into hard data because of the numerous factors that could be studied. Some studies have attempted to take components that contribute to quality of life and attach value to them to create further justification that this concept is crucial when dealing with the built environment.

Quality of life is often studied under the lens of health care, but direct correlations can be found between health and place. One such example is the quantification of walkability through

Walk Score. This index from 0 to 100 rates areas on the ability to complete errands by walking with 100 being completely walkable and 0 being almost always car-dependent. Walking not only betters personal health, but also reduces CO2 emissions and may reduce vehicular expenses.\textsuperscript{72} While quality of life can be broken down into components like walkability, some are even creating Quality of Life Plans to take advantage of this concept’s holistic nature. One organization that is aiding in the completion of such plans is the Indianapolis division of LISC. Altogether, six plans have been created for Indianapolis neighborhoods and include features such as helping business development, improving schools, creating a sense of community, and rehabilitating the existing housing stock.\textsuperscript{73} Though quality of life has been widely accepted as a justification for completing community development efforts, work is still being completed to tie historic preservation to providing quality of life.

One resources that attempts to justify historic preservation as a means to increase quality of life is the book \textit{Historic Preservation and the Livable City}. Discussions are focused on the impacts of preservation in urban areas, but many of the same arguments can be applied to rural areas. While improvement in economic vitality have been proven benefits to implementing preservation practices, the authors reflect on additional factors that make preservation a viable tool more making cities “livable.” The basis behind their argument is that “people tend to live in cities that attract them and not in cities that don’t.”\textsuperscript{74} Through their research, the authors also found that certain criteria were commonly used to gauge the livability of cities:

- Good transportation;
- The importance of the type of urban fabric;


- Walkability;
- Mixed Use;
- A variety of neighborhood types and environments; and
- Sustainability\textsuperscript{75}

Direct correlations between this list and the benefits of utilizing existing historic infrastructure is undeniable. Through the extent of the book, the authors use urban case studies to investigate the impacts of preservation in urban areas and their ability to be livable. Though never explicitly related to quality of life, Allison and Peters’ livable city concept is directly comparable to the ideas behind quality of life. In addition to scholarly publications, national organizations are recognizing the benefits of historic planning methods.

Released in February of 2018, Main Street America’s, \textit{State of Main} Winter edition, was structured around “The Power of Small.” Here the organization has defined “small” as those projects that are “locally-driven and contextually sensitive” that also “leverages the DNA of a community’s existing fabric.”\textsuperscript{76} The other factor that makes small powerful is its generation of long-term results.\textsuperscript{77} While these types of projects may face challenges when it comes to regulation and capital, their ability to create unique places and opportunities to connect community members makes them valuable investments.\textsuperscript{78} Even though this information was directed towards urban areas, the ideas behind “small” development is directly applicable to rural areas, and can be used when working towards improving quality of life. While Main Street America is acting as an advocate for this small-scale locally-driven development, the National

\textsuperscript{75} Allison and Peters, \textit{Historic Preservation and the Livable City}, 15.
\textsuperscript{77} \textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{78} Heid and Beckerman, “Seeing Small,” 52-56.
Trust has worked towards proving that older, smaller neighborhoods have positive effects on the urban environment.

Probably the most significant and applicable study to prove the economic, social, and physical impact of preservation to an urban area was the, *Older, Smaller, Better*, report released by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in May of 2014. Though focused on urban, specifically studying Seattle, San Francisco and Washington D.C., the data gathering reveals evidence that,

“…established neighborhoods with a mix of older, smaller buildings perform better than districts with larger, newer structure when tested against a range of economic, social, and environmental outcome measures.”79

By overlaying a 200-meter by 200-meter grid over the case study cities, relative comparisons could be made on the statistical data that was found. The researchers also created a “Character Score” which combines the median building age, building age diversity, and granularity (size of buildings and parcels) to encompass aspects that may make an area “historic”.80 After comparing Character Scores of commercial areas with measures of urban vitality, which included jobs, population density, activity among others, the study concluded some significant findings:

- Older, mixed-use neighborhoods are more walkable;
- Young people love old buildings;
- Older business districts provide affordable, flexible space for entrepreneurs from all backgrounds;
- The creative economy thrives in older, mixed-use neighborhoods;

- Older, smaller buildings provide space for a strong local economy; and

- Older commercial and mixed-use districts contain hidden density.\textsuperscript{81}

Though the researches aim to continue modifying their methodology to prove their theories, this study acts as a baseline for future research and proof that there is a relationship between the built environment and their economic, social, and cultural viability.\textsuperscript{82} Though this study is again strictly focused on an urban context, lessons can be learned and applied to rural towns.

Many of these ideas discussed under the purview of quality of place can also be linked to place attachment ideals. Place attachment is based on the idea that people create emotional connections to a physical place, which is based on an individual’s personal experiences. For example, one of Main Street America’s arguments for smaller developments was the ability to create spaces that allows for the creation of connections between community members. Its these kinds of social interactions that also play a significant role in place attachment, though people can become directly connected to place through means other than socialization. One study completed on the significance of place attachment in community planning found that connections to place “can help inspire action because people are motivated to seek, stay in, protect, and improve places that are meaningful to them.”\textsuperscript{83} This same research showed that collective action in a community is more effective when there are emotional ties to a place. Ultimately, the psychology behind why people connect to place could help planners and designers understand how place contains meaning and how to best integrate those values into the design process.

\textsuperscript{81} National Trust for Historic Preservation: Preservation Green Lab, “Older, Smaller, Better,” 3-4.
\textsuperscript{82} National Trust for Historic Preservation: Preservation Green Lab, “Older, Smaller, Better,” 103.
While this kind of research approaches place attachment from a more community development focus, historic preservation also plays a role in this concept.

In Stephanie Meek’s book *The Past and Future City*, one of the most common reasons someone moved to a city was “to be some place rather than no place.”\(^{84}\) This was further attributed to feelings of uniqueness and authenticity, characteristics that the likes of authors James Howard Kunstler and Charles Montgomery claim modern developments and suburbia are lacking. Though these characteristics tie into the previously discussed quality of life themes, Meeks argues that it is these qualities that older buildings possess that keep people returning or staying in an area. She goes on to prove this point by bringing in results from the “Older, Smaller, Better” study as well as urban case study examples. Essentially, this attachment comes about through emotional attachment, which derives from either personal experiences or the perceived history of a place. Many studies have shown that historic buildings inherently bring about a sense of attachment, even going as far as calling it “love.” In the book *How Buildings Learn*, the author asked a young boy, “What makes a building come to be loved?” His response: age.\(^{85}\) While not all can claim such attachment to historic buildings, there is something to be said about this wide-spread appreciation for the historic built environment.

**Summary**

After reviewing existing research that relates to rural, community development and historic preservation, it was found that there is a large amount of material for these subjects individually, but little as they relate to one another. Despite a vast majority of the country being


classified as rural, there have been very few studies completed in these areas and how community development or historic preservation has impacted these towns. The area of community development as been extensively discussed, from UNESCO to grassroots organizations, but no singular definition can encapsulate the complexities and holistic nature of such efforts. In terms of historic preservation, the field has also been widely studied, but terminology defined by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards has created widely accepted approaches to this practice. Though organizations like Main Street America may work in both preservation and community development, economic impacts often outweigh community development factors because of their quantifiable nature. Quality of life and place attachment are two such factors that are often used to justify the use of preservation, but their qualitative nature has proven difficult to study. Some studies, like the “Older, Smaller, Better” report have begun to study preservation’s impacts in these matters. Now that the concepts have been defined and research in these fields has been studied, these ideas can be investigated from within the three case study communities. The following chapter will contain research completed on the towns and answer questions aimed to learn more about the role of historic preservation and community development in these rural areas.
CHAPTER FOUR: CASE STUDIES

Thus far, this thesis has studied the research completed on rural communities, community development and historic preservation, investigated the intersection between community development and historic preservation, and identified the importance of quality of life strategies to the concept of community preservation. While research through articles and data provides a foundation for understanding the role of historic preservation in rural towns, analyzing communities who have implemented such practices provides further evidence of its value. The case studies that follow will each provide a brief history of the town, outline the current scope of community preservation work, and answer the three defined questions that follow. After recalling these findings, the thesis will conclude with an overall critique and assessment of the overall effectiveness of preservation as a community development tool.

Case Study Methodology

The impact of historic preservation as a community development tool in rural communities will be directly studied through three rural eastern Indiana communities. These towns were selected based on the following criteria:

- Indiana Main Street community;
- Classified as “Mid-Sized Remote” in relation to rural definitions for this thesis;
- Within the same geographic region; and
- Active historic preservation efforts

A community’s designation as a Main Street town by Indiana Main Street means that the community has a basic understanding of how preservation can impact a town from a community development and economic perspective. This also demonstrates that there is some form of an
organization in place that has the ability to advocate for community preservation. The designation of “Mid-Sized Remote” narrows the community focus to a specific size and location. Metropolitan areas as well as communities under 2,500 residents were thus removed from possible studies, allowing for a stronger basis for comparison between the case study towns. The “Mid-Sized Remote” class also represents over one quarters of the total Main Street communities, making the findings from the study potentially applicable to these other towns. The isolation of a geographic region allows case studies to be compared to each other without having to factor varying contexts. Finally, the confirmation that each community is currently utilizing historic preservation as a community development tool insures that community preservation had some role on possible population trends.

Based on this criterion, the towns of Richmond, Greensburg, and Rushville were selected as case studies. The three communities are located in between the Indianapolis metropolitan area and the eastern boarder of the state. Each are county seats that fall within the “Mid-Sized Remote” classification but vary in population and scope of preservation practices. To determine the scope of impact of historic preservation practices implemented in each community, three specific questions will be answered for each community:

- What effects does local legislation have on the implementation of historic preservation and community development?
- How have funding opportunities assisted with the development of community preservation projects?
- How has the concept of quality of life been integrated into the development of community preservation projects?

Legislation relates directly to laws, ordinances, or other government programs that have been created to aid preservation in the community. This may include the creation of historic
districts, either local or national, design guidelines, or other ordinances. Each case study town has also utilized unique state or local project funding, either as a one-time influx of funds or a continuous grant program. This question aims to investigate how this money is being used, if at all, to create community preservation projects. Finally, the actual implementation of community preservation projects directed towards quality of life will be studied. Each community preservation project discussed in the case study communities will be analyzed through their effectiveness of improving quality of place based on the factors of aesthetics, healthy living options, amenities, opportunities for socialization, and possible emotional attachment.

The final component, which will be presented with the analysis section, will be to study the effectiveness of these community preservation projects in stabilizing population decline. While many factors contribute to a town’s overall population trend, comparing the timeline of community preservation projects to population statistics will be used to suggest a possible correlation. In addition to this, the Stellar designation of two case study communities means that other areas have completed similar community preservation projects that may already be seeing positive population impacts. By looking at population trends of past Stellar towns to the case study communities, additional justification of such projects could emerge. Overall, the goal of the case studies is to further understand the impacts of historic preservation to prove or dispute its use as an effective community development tool.

Through research and site visits, information has been gathered to analyze the scope and impacts of preservation on these rural towns. Tours of each community were crucial to not only visualize the changes made by preservation, but to also discuss successes and challenges with local community leaders. On site information was then supplemented with reports and preservation related legislation. Additional information was found through GIS, city websites,
and other local history sources. The compilation of this information and the resulting analysis make up the basis for the case study portion of this thesis.

Figure 4: Richmond Depot District, photo by author

Richmond

Brief History

Located at the intersection of Highways 27 and 40, Richmond is the seat of Wayne County. The small city of around 36,000 residents sits on the border to Ohio giving it the unofficial title of “Eastern Gateway to Indiana.” The community was settled along the Whitewater River by a group of North Caroline Quakers in 1806. Its location allowed it to prosper under trading and eventually became the county seat in 1873. As Richmond grew, industries including steel plow manufacturers, the nation’s largest producer of boilers and steam engines, and a maker of musical instruments came to town. This lead it to be known as one of the state’s leading centers for marketing and industry. Richmond’s population grew steadily until the 1970’s, which marked the first period of decline. The city has continued to face population loss since this time.

---

Richmond’s location along the National Road, the first federally funded road in the United States, ensured its continued prosperity over other rural eastern Indiana towns. Now U.S. 40, the road continues to act as a main thoroughfare through town. The downtown directly extends off of U.S. 40 which splits to accommodate the now one-way streets of Richmond. It was here that a gas explosion in 1968 devastated the area. Several blocks were affected in the destruction, which led to redevelopment in the area to fill in the voids. The downtown stretch was converted into a pedestrian mall, closing down the road in 1972. While pedestrian malls can be intentionally planned, urban planners in the 1960s and 1970s experimented with converting existing downtowns into these pedestrian-only areas with parking on the outskirts. After nearly twenty years of this layout, the street was opened back up to cars.

In addition to its position on the National Road, Richmond also benefitted from railroad development. Development in the 1850’s led to Richmond’s direct connection to cities like Chicago and Fort Wayne. Interurban lines were later created to give access to Dayton, Ohio and Indianapolis, but closed in the 1940s. The third and final Pennsylvania Railroad depot, designed by architect Daniel Burnham, opened in 1902. Activity along this corridor spurred development, appealing to all walks of life. Until recently, the depot and its adjacent commercial buildings had fallen into disrepair. After thirty-five years of sitting vacant, the depot was purchased and underwent revitalizations efforts that were then reflected in the rest of the district.

89 Wayne County Area Chamber of Commerce, “History of Richmond & Wayne County, Indiana.”
90 Ibid.
Current Scope of Community Preservation Work

With Richmond being the largest of the three case study communities, there is inherently a wider scope of projects and opportunities that present themselves as possible community preservation projects. To begin, there must be an understanding of the organizations that are in place to implement such work. The city is a CLG, meaning the local preservation commission is able to authorize preservation decisions that would otherwise have to go to the DHPA.

Richmond’s Center City Development Corporation acts as the Main Street organization for the city. As a nationally recognized Main Street, Richmond is one of only twenty Indiana Main Street communities that are considered Affiliate programs. This title requires Richmond to not only supply reports to the state but must also have a hired director on staff to coordinate preservation efforts. At the time thesis research was being completed, Richmond’s Main Street director has recently left for another job, so the position was vacant. By the completion of the thesis, an interim director had been hired, but not consulted for further information.

In addition to city-affiliated organizations, Richmond has multiple private groups who practice or provide community preservation services, though they primarily concentrate their resources on housing initiatives. Richmond Neighborhood Restoration, Inc. (RNR) is a non-profit organization that focuses on revitalizing neighborhoods through real estate development, specifically through the preservation of abandoned and blighted properties.93 A fairly young and

small organization, the group has successfully rehabilitated two houses with plans for future projects underway. Much like RNR, Richmond Columbian Properties is another non-profit organization that promotes community reinvestment. Though the organization focuses its attention on programs, the group also purchases houses to be rehabilitated. At the time of thesis research, the organization was involved with the rehabilitation of multiple properties along 10th Street. Richmond Columbian Properties has often partnered with Indiana Landmarks, who have provided a variety of funding opportunities through grants or loans, or technical preservation assistance. Indiana Landmarks, the statewide non-profit that provides preservation assistance to communities, has a strong presence in Richmond with over thirty easement properties to monitor and investment in one of the 10th Street properties.

Richmond has used multiple methods of implementing preservation in the community. Historic Preservation easements are typically put in place as the best tool for ensuring a building is preserved. Essentially, an easement is placed within a deed of a property which requires the continued preservation of the site. Because such an action is placing a restriction on the property, diminishing its selling value, property owners can get a tax deduction. The easement property is then monitored by an outside organization, Indiana Landmarks for most of Richmond’s properties.

________

95 Michael Flowers, in discussion with the author, February 13, 2018, Richmond, Indiana.
easements, to guarantee proper preservation practices are being implemented. Though easements are not often used, Richmond has several in place to protect the future of their built environment.96 In addition to these individually protected properties, Richmond also utilizes National Register and conservation districts.

National Register Districts provide no formal protection of the properties contained within, but may slow down projects that do not comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards if federal funds are being used. While there is often controversy over the impeding of rights by historic districts that impose design guidelines, National Register Districts have no such power. Only the town’s recognized historic preservation commission has the authority to establish design guidelines for local districts. In the case of Richmond, there are six districts listed on the National Register, but no locally designated districts. As an alternative, Richmond utilizes conservation districts. Only new construction has regulated design guides, but designation can prevent demolitions from occurring in these areas through a review process.97 By using these kinds of designations as a preservation tool, the hope is to protect historically significant structures and districts as well as improve overall quality of life in these neighborhoods.98

Now that a basis for Richmond’s organizations and preservation practices has been determined, an investigation of current projects can begin, starting with the Stellar proposals. At the time of this thesis research, Richmond had completed the initial planning phase and was working on the transitional and implementation stages. Designated in 2013, Richmond has now been a Stellar community for over four years, but there is still work that needs to be completed to

96 Michael Flowers, in discussion with the author, February 13, 2018, Richmond, Indiana.
97 Ibid.
finish their plan. Richmond’s overall goals were to improve housing opportunities and quality of place through the funding received from Stellar. These objectives would be reached through eight projects:

- Downtown Living;
- Façade Renovations;
- Vaile Neighborhood;
- 10th Street Corridor;
- 7th Street Corridor;
- Music City Place;
- 7th Street Park; and
- Main Street Corridor

Figure 6: Richmond Stellar Projects, image from http://positivelyrichmond.com
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The Downtown Living project plans to use Stellar funds to create a 50/50 grant program to promote the rehabilitation of second and third stories of the downtown structures to be converted into apartments aimed towards college students. Before this can take place, façade renovations must first take place. This aspect of the program began in February of 2015 and appears to be completed. As for the Vaile Neighborhood, Richmond was able to acquire approximately $5 million to demolish blighted properties and provide funds to homeowners for updates. The 10th and 7th Street corridor projects have yet to break ground but have been planned. Music City Place, formerly a YMCA, is currently under construction and will eventually contain fifty rental units for seniors. 7th Street Park, renamed Jack Elstro Plaza, was opened in October of 2016 and now contains space to hold community events, including a farmer’s market. In coordination with the downtown living and façade renovations, the Main Street Corridor project was completed prior to the other downtown projects. Richmond took the Complete Street approach and redesigned the downtown streetscape to include bike lanes, wayfinding, and rain gardens. In addition to projects being implemented through Stellar, there are other recent efforts that have been completed or are under way that can be considered community preservation projects.

In addition to the positive transformation occurring because of the Stellar funding, recent success can also be found in the Depot District. Connected to downtown by 10th Street, this collection of commercial buildings along Richmond’s railroad tracks has only recently recovered from a period of blight and neglect. One of the most prominent structures in the area is the
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Historic Richmond Depot, which sat vacant for thirty-five years before it was purchased in 2010. It was then rehabilitated to house the Better Homes and Gardens Real Estate First Realty Group in addition to the Economic Development Corporation of Wayne County, who joined them later. The adjacent commercial buildings stretching along North East Street and Fort Wayne Avenue are nearly full to capacity on the ground floors with restaurants, retail and other shops. Some claim that this area is busier than the downtown, especially at night. One feature that this area is missing is housing, though these types of projects are being developed in other parts of Richmond.

Besides the historic YMCA building, other large and previously vacant structures have been purchased by developers and rehabilitated into housing. This includes the historic Leland Hotel and Atlas Underwear Factory, both of which have been converted into affordable senior living. Because the Leland Hotel, now called Leland Legacy, is listed individually on the National Register, and Atlas is incorporated with the Richmond Railroad Station Historic District as a contributing structure, both used Historic Preservation Tax Credits along with

---
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HUD’s Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. The large scale of the projects suggests that the developers utilized both tax credits in order to make these projects financially feasible.\textsuperscript{109}

\textbf{Questions}

\textbf{What effects does local legislation have on the implementation of historic preservation and community development projects?}

Richmond’s City Council approved of the creation of the Historic Preservation Commission by means of an ordinance in 2000. The Commission consists of seven members who are in charge of conducting surveys, defining districts, and approving alterations to properties within Richmond’s local and conservation districts. Either property owners or the Commission may initiate the process of creating a district. First, the Commission must draw a map and create reports of the area they believe should be designated, or of an area that property owners have suggested. Boundaries of the district are determined based on a survey completed by the Commission, then each property within that area is given a designation of outstanding, notable, contributing or non-contributing. Once an area has been assessed, property owners are then notified of the possible designation. Over 50\% of the properties owners within the proposed area must physically sign a petition approving the creation of the district for the designation to proceed. In order to become a local historic district, an area must first be a conservation district for three years, at which point it is then reevaluated by the Commission. The conservation district can then become a local historic district after another signed petition confirms a 50\% approval by the residents, remain a conservation district, or lose its designation altogether. In addition to having the Commission approve a conservation or local historic district, the City of

\textsuperscript{109} Michael Flowers, in discussion with the author, February 13, 2018, Richmond, Indiana.
Richmond’s Common Council must also approve the district map. Once designated, the district must submit permits for specific types of work or may create their own set of design guidelines to be codified for the area.110

For conservation areas, a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) must be submitted to the Commission if a building will be demolished, moved, or any new structures will be added to the area. In local districts, alterations to fences or walls as well as any conspicuous change to exterior appearance for those buildings designated as outstanding, notable or contributing also require a COA. When assessing whether alterations to a property are historically sensitive, the Commission analyzes proportions, rhythm of the neighborhood, materials and textures, relationship between solid and void, and overall scale. For areas that are in the process of being designated, properties can be held under interim protect which prevents any structure the same protections as a conservation district for a limited timeframe. An amendment to the Ordinance in 2014 alters the interim protection clause. If a property is determined to be unsafe or blighted by the Richmond Enforcement Authority, the Commission does not have the power to place that property under interim protection.111 If a COA is denied, then the applicant must wait a full year before reapplying for the same work.112 The final section goes on to state that the ordinance will only apply to those who signed the petition for district approval and to all other properties after they have either been sold to a new owner or after twenty years.113

111 Common Council of the City of Richmond, Indiana, "Amended Ordinance No. 15-2014."
112 This is added to the ordinance to prevent overloading the Commission with COAs. Some property owners have been known to repeatedly submit COAs for the same work until approval, slowing down the process for others who have also submitted permits.
Even though the city based their legislation on a model ordinance template given to them by Indiana Landmarks,\textsuperscript{114} the Richmond’s version has included some unique language that has altered the effects preservation could have on the community.\textsuperscript{115} One difference in the ordinance language is the 50\% approval through a signed petition. The template has no such language, as any disputes against the creation of a local historic district come through in public meetings. Those districts where there is much opposition typically do not get approved by the Commission. The requirement for an area to be designated a conservation district before becoming a local historic district is also not standard. While conservation districts are often a common step that can be taken to historic district status, the template ordinance does not require such an extended process or the repetition of the 50\% approval petition. The ending statement that limits who must comply with the ordinance is unique to Richmond since the standard ordinance has no comparable clause. These three variations in Richmond’s historic preservation ordinance makes the process of creating a local historic district more time consuming and prevents a cohesive neighborhood feeling through pit marking improvements, ultimately minimizing the initial intent of the ordinance. Richmond resident and commission member Michael Flowers comments:

“Richmond has six sizeable National Register Districts crammed into 24 square miles. In contrast at the local level they only have 5 conservation districts (3 of which are single site designation and the 2 multi-property ones are small) and \textbf{no} local historic districts. The commission has attempted to amend the ordinance to allow for direct to local historic district designation but it has been months since the document went to Richmond’s legal department. The process is incredibly slow and there is no guarantee they will approve the changes to the ordinance.”\textsuperscript{116}

Overall, the process to acquire designation, the limited regulations at the conservation level, and the restricted purview of those regulations are preventing the designation of local

\textsuperscript{114} Michael Flowers, email correspondence with the author, March 26, 2018.
\textsuperscript{115} The model ordinance was acquired through Indiana Landmarks. If interested in the template, contact the organization.
\textsuperscript{116} Michael Flowers, email correspondence with the author, March 26, 2018.
historic districts in Richmond as well as the ordinance’s overall effectiveness to promote community change through preservation.

How have funding opportunities assisted with the development of community preservation projects?

In the case of Richmond, Stellar has presented a possibly once in a lifetime opportunity to make some critical improvements to the city. The Strategic Community Investment Plan estimated that the total cost of the projects would reach $19.9 million with $9 being contributed by the state agencies. While Stellar inherently selects communities that build upon their existing assets to promote community development, each of the projects completed or currently underway have varying benefits and challenges related to community preservation projects.

The greatest challenge that Richmond sought to address with Stellar funding was the housing crisis, which stems from the community’s aging stock of buildings. The town was looking to use funding to create opportunities for maintenance programs and more senior housing. This is addressed through the downtown living project and Vaile Neighborhood work. For the downtown living project, these new apartment units will allow the buildings to be used to their original mixed-use purpose. By creating living, working, and shopping opportunities, the downtown will hopefully see private reinvestment and overall revitalization. This outcome hinges on the city’s ability to bring in businesses and create competitively priced apartments.

While this work downtown will build upon what exists, the Vaile Neighborhood funds are the means of wiping the slate clean. Some of the $5 million will be used to provide homeowners funding for home updates, but most of this went towards the acquisition of vacant
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properties. Demolition of multiple properties followed, creating voids within the neighborhood. Though the goal was to remove some of the most blighted properties that would have cost thousands of dollars to rehabilitate, there is currently no evidence of future plans to rebuild homes on these sites. Whatever money remains for the homeowners appears to be unregulated. Though the area could benefit from both minor and major home improvements, the inclusion of design guidelines could insure the modifications had a lasting impact to both the houses and the overall cohesive appearance of the neighborhood.

The final housing project that Richmond is developing out of the Stellar funds is Music City Place. As previously mentioned, this once YMCA is currently being converted into senior housing. This project is an excellent example of a community preservation project for a few reasons. For one, the preservation of this structure, which is positioned along a major promenade, has the potential to bring additional private investment to this area once it is complete. Though other senior housing projects in other historic buildings have been completed, the use of both tax credits and Stellar funds is what makes such a project possible. Its prominent location provides the opportunity to change perceptions and catalyze additional work. Providing opportunities for a community, in this case seniors and surrounding neighborhoods, through the use of the existing environment is the essence of community preservation.

Though not explicitly preservation based, the Main Street corridor project can also be considered a community preservation project. Its features intend to promote walkability, common with the original design of downtown commercial cores, as well as bikeability. This not only creates a greater connection between the downtown and adjacent cores, but also promotes a healthier living style for the future upper story residents and creates an overall improved aesthetic. Similar community preservation connections can be made to the other corridor
improvement projects along 10th Street and 7th Street. One unique aspect on 7th Street is the Jack Elstro Plaza, which is identified in the Stellar Plan as 7th Street Park. What once was a full block of parking spaces has now been partially converted into an open park space for events. Though there were no elements that could be preserved on the site, the envisioning of the existing conditions into a more usable and community-oriented site has turned a vacant space into an asset. Adding programming, such as the farmers market and performances, will continue to add value in the long-term as long as the city continues to provide resources for maintenance and ongoing use.

How has the concept of quality of life been integrated into the development of community preservation projects?

There are three separate areas of Richmond that can be discussed in terms of quality of life: Downtown, 10th Street, and the Depot District. Quality of life will be looked at based on the proposed plans for the area as well as comments provided during the site visit. Based on the renderings available and the expectations of the outcome, the downtown should have a much-improved quality of life factor. The inclusion of housing with the commercial buildings will bring more foot traffic as long as there is access essential retail and restaurants. The variety and density of businesses, along this stretch of Main Street will hopefully increase with the improved facades and streetscape. It is evident from site visits, as well as a local attractions map, that there is currently a lack of activity in downtown that is needed to sustain itself.118 The improvements to the physical corridor will further provide a more walkable and bikeable, thus healthier, environment. The work being completed is on its way to improving quality of life, at least in the

short term. As mentioned, the monitoring of aesthetic alterations through design guidelines, plans for continued maintenance and programming, as well as continued growth in terms of amenities, will help guarantee the project’s success.

This type of approach could also be effective in terms of gaining place attachment. With Richmond being home to Earlham College, Indiana University East, and Ivy Tech, a statewide community college, it is easy for there to be a large turnover of residents over a short period of time. By having amenities that provide opportunities for social and emotional connection, in addition to the physical quality of life features, these typically short-term residents may decide to stay in Richmond. These needs are not just limited to younger generations as families are also in search for places to raise children, and seniors are looking for a location to age in place. Places like Jack Elstro Plaza and Music City Place adjacent to downtown have the potential to do just that. The Plaza specifically, if programmed and maintained, creates opportunities for formal and informal gatherings. This could be in the form of a casual get-together with friends, a public concert, or the farmers markets. As for Music City Place, the creation of a senior community inherently brings other family members and the chance to associate place with memories. Though it can be predicted that work to the downtown could bring a better quality of life, the projects must be finished in order to gauge how these affect residents.

The 10th Street corridor has few projects to critique individually so it will be studied as a whole. Also, the future improvement plans mean there is potential for change in quality of life. Though this corridor is one of the primary connections between the downtown and the Depot District, the promenade itself has had little investment in quality of life until recently. A majority of the stretch between the two commercial areas is residential with little opportunity for commercial development. Most of the housing that does exist is in need of reinvestment, which
is why Indiana Landmarks and Richmond Columbian Properties has begun rehabilitating some of the properties along this road. The bike lanes and general aesthetic improvements completed through Stellar could help invigorate additional interest and redevelopment in the area. On the other hand, street improvements do not support social and emotional connections, like a park, and do not make a community unique. The housing projects will be able to provide some social and emotional connections through potential new neighbors, but again do not initially promote strong ties to a place. Until the ramifications of the new projects are implemented, 10th Street will remain one of the weaker areas in terms of quality of life.

The Depot District, on the other hand, provides an excellent example of implementing projects that improve quality of place. Despite being an area of disinvestment only a few decades ago, private investment by business owners has allowed the area to host successful restaurants, retail, and other stores.\textsuperscript{119} There is evidence of consistent activity in the area and an overall upkeep of the buildings. Despite a lack of design guidelines, the historic character has been maintained and used to attract visitors. The upper story spaces are one area lacking investment, but there is the potential to return these back to their original housing purpose. The area is fairly walkable, but an overall lack of housing in the area forces residents to use their cars to get to the Depot District. Though there may be some missing components, the author would surmise that the Depot District has the highest current quality of life of the three mentioned areas. With regard to place attachment, the district can accomplish emotional and social ties through the businesses. Restaurants, coffee shops, and bars, all of which exist in the Depot District, provide a setting for social gatherings. By having such establishments, residents can establish a routine, get

\textsuperscript{119} Michael Flowers, in discussion with the author, February 13, 2018, Richmond, Indiana.
to know owners, and have “the usual”. Because this area has recently developed, there is still room to develop additional quality of life opportunities.

Summary

Overall, Richmond has a wide variety of organizations, projects, and initiatives that relate to community preservation. Organizations like RNR and Richmond Columbian Properties are working towards improving the quality of housing. Richmond’s designation as a Stellar Community in 2013 has created opportunities for community preservation projects such as downtown revitalization, streetscape plans, and additional housing. As the Stellar projects continue to develop, Richmond can build upon the momentum gained through the program to implement long term quality of life strategies. Despite the ineffectiveness of the local preservation ordinance, areas like the Depot District are utilizing preservation to create quality places.
Rushville

Brief History

Rushville’s population of just over 6,000 is located at the intersection of three Indiana state highways: 3, 44 and 52. The small town was first established in 1822 to become the seat of Rush County and became incorporated fourteen years later. Because the town was not located near a major river, early development came from milling. Later, the town would prosper from the horse racing industry. The 1890’s brought this “horse boom” along with three harness tracks to the town, one being at the site of Riverside Park. The races attracted other events including circuses and baseball games. In 1899, inclement weather prevented a race from being held, but “bogus records” were submitted to the American Trotting Association. Once the false race records were discovered, Rushville was banned from conducting races through the national organization and the town’s growth slowed. The town is perhaps most proud of its ties to the 1940 nominee for President, Wendell Willkie. During his campaign, Willkie ran his headquarters

---

out of the local Durbin Hotel. He later returned to Rushville, where he is now buried.122

Rushville’s population consistently grew since its founding and finally peaked in the 1960s. The town proceeded to lose one-seventh of its population between this time and the 1990s. The 2000s brought a brief period of growth, but Rushville has continued to decline since the turn of the century.123

Current Scope of Community Preservation Work

The city of Rushville is the smallest of the three case studies and has focused community preservation work within its downtown and adjacent blocks. Though the city is not a CLG, a Historic Board exists along with a zoning ordinance that addresses preservation practices in the single local historic district. The Heart of Rushville acts as the Main Street organization, but its state-level designation means they are not required to have a paid staff person. For this reason, the group is currently volunteer driven. There is an interest to pursue a National Affiliate accreditation and potentially take on a part-time staff person. In addition to Main Street, Rush County has an Economic and Community Development Corporation (ECDC). Though the organization admittedly does not make community development a top priority, Rushville was looking to change this perspective when they hired a Director of Special Projects and Community Development. This new position would not only promote community development projects but also be in charge of managing the Stellar plans.124

Rushville was designated a Stellar Community in 2016 in the 6,000 to 50,000 class. Because they are still in the early stages, the community was still focused on initial planning but

122 Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.
124 Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.
has begun transitioning into project completion at the time of the thesis research. The goal that accompanied their Strategic Community Investment Plan was simple: counter the decline Rushville has been experiencing for decades by improving quality of place and quality of life.\textsuperscript{125} To achieve this objective, seven projects will be implemented through the Stellar funding:

- The Overlook @ Riverside;
- Morgan Street Corridor;
- Flatrock Run Trailhead & Bike Hub;
- Campaign Quarters;
- Riverside Park Gateway Plaza;
- Downtown Commercial Building Revitalization; and
- Neighborhood Revitalization\textsuperscript{126}
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\caption{Rushville Stellar Projects, image from Joe Rathz in supplemented PowerPoint presentation}
\end{figure}


\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.
In addition to these projects, the city of Rushville is planning a series of complimentary projects that will be completed alongside the Stellar work to maximize the momentum gained through this work. This includes renovations to the Princess Theater, the addition of a Job Training Center downtown, and a Farmer’s Market.  

Of these projects, only a couple had physical progress being made at the time of the thesis research. One of these was the Campaign Quarters, which includes the rehabilitation of the historic Durbin Hotel and Knights of Pythias Building into apartments. The Durbin Hotel, built in 1885, is individually listed on the National Register while the Knights of Pythias, constructed in the early 1850’s, is on the National Register as a contributing part of the Rushville Commercial Historic District. The former building will hold nineteen senior apartments while the latter will have seven market rate apartments marketed towards families. Because these buildings sit adjacent to one another, they are being rehabilitated by the same developer and will be combined under the Campaign Quarters name.

Besides the downtown housing project, the city has also organized an owner-occupied rehabilitation fund that will allow homeowners to receive up to $15,000 for home improvements. Though money has not been distributed, applications for the funding are being assessed. All other projects are still in the planning phase, but are progressing as planned. This includes the Overlook, a new business incubator space south of downtown, streetscape improvements along Morgan Street, the Flatrock trailhead, and the Riverside Plaza.
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In addition to these Stellar projects, Rushville is working on completing some of the complimentary and other community preservation projects. The Princess Theater is one such project that is being completed simultaneously with the Stellar plans.\footnote{The Princess Theater was incorporated with the Masonic Temple that was constructed between 1913 and 1915. This structure is also listed as a contributing building within the Rushville Commercial Historic District National Register nomination.}

For years the local Masons occupied the second floor, but recently sold the property to the city so the entire building could be rehabilitated. When finished, a theater will return to the first floor along with a space for Ivy Tech Community College which had been previously located in a downtown building that was demolished. The second floor will then house City Hall. The city and Heart of Rushville received technical assistance for the theater work from Franklin Heritage Inc., a non-profit out of Franklin, Indiana that had rehabilitated their own historic Artcraft Theater. With an estimated budget of $3.8 million, funding has been secured by the city for the exterior and second floor, and a private donation was made for the theater work. The remaining funding for the Ivy Tech space has yet to be determined.\footnote{Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.}

Rushville has had to contend with buildings that are showing signs of deterioration. In an attempt to mitigate these issues, the Director of Special Projects and Community Development created a list of properties for the city to acquire for rehabilitation. Because of safety concerns, three of these buildings were demolished.\footnote{Brian Sheehan, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.} The two vacant lots in the middle of downtown have
been converted into Willkie Park and a parking lot that is utilized as a farmer’s market space during the summer. Murals are also a recent improvement to the downtown. One exposed wall at a downtown intersection has been painted with an image of Wendall Willkie. A second mural covers one of the newly exposed facades facing the new parking lot. This scene depicts an agriculture lifestyle with farmhouse and cornfield. These murals are a part of a larger initiative to integrate artwork into the downtown and improve quality of life.

Questions

What effects does local legislation have on the implementation of historic preservation and community development projects?

In the case of Rushville, the primary legislation that relates to community development and historic preservation is the zoning ordinance which was approved in early 2006.¹³⁵ There are a few sections that are of importance. Instead of having a separate historic preservation ordinance, these regulations are directly integrated into the zoning ordinance. Essentially, the
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clause only creates the Historic Neighborhood District. This district, which by most standards is very large, encompasses the downtown as well as several blocks of residential housing to the north, northeast, and west. Unlike Richmond and Greensburg, there is no process to creating additional historic districts. Under the ordinance, a COA is needed for demolition, moving of structures, new construction, alterations to walls or fencing, or changes to exterior paint colors of any structure within this district. The Historic Board will look at the height, scale, proportions, and materials of proposed alterations to determine compatibility.

When compared to the template ordinance, it is clear that Rushville’s ordinance is missing a large amount of critical language. For one, the ordinance neglects to establish a commission as well as any powers or responsibilities for the Historic Board or their Historic Preservation Officer. This lack of parameters for the Board provides no accountability or regulation on the appointment of Board members, which could lead to political conflicts. The ordinance also fails to provide regulations for the creation of other historic districts. The lack of
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such language suggests that the large district was created to encapsulate all historic buildings, preventing the need for future historic districts. In addition to these, the Rushville ordinance is missing clauses on interim protection and maintenance, which again minimizes the effects that such an ordinance is designed to enact.

A second section within the zoning ordinance does begin to provide some opportunities to merge historic preservation and community development. The Corridor Overlay District covers the downtown commercial buildings with more specific architectural and public space standards. Compared to the regulations put in place by the historic district, these guides are much stricter. Commercial buildings must consider entry way design, windows, and materials when making alterations.\footnote{138} Architectural guides are common in downtowns of communities that promote preservation but requiring certain features to be incorporated in public spaces is not. In Rushville, all development visible to the public must contribute to the enhancement of the community. This must be done through two of five options: a landscaped patio no less than 2,000 square feet, a water feature, a clock or bell tower, bus shelter, or public art.\footnote{139} If a project is unable to comply with the integration of these public space features, a donation to a public arts fund is also an alternative.\footnote{140} While this clause of the ordinance has taken a community development approach, the lack of integrating preservation language into the architectural standards could lead to drastic and incompatible alterations. The ordinance as a whole is not written in a way that promotes preservation to act as an effective community development tool.

\footnote{138}{"City of Rushville Zoning Ordinance," 41-45.}
\footnote{139}{"City of Rushville Zoning Ordinance." 43-45.}
\footnote{140}{Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.}
How have funding opportunities assisted with the development of community preservation projects or vice versa?

Like Richmond, Rushville’s unique funding sources come from their Stellar designation. With an estimated $18 million being invested in the community through Stellar, there are several opportunities to develop community preservation projects. Through eliminating the negative and extenuating the positive, Rushville is hoping to improve the town’s overall quality of life. 141

The projects most directly related to community preservation are the housing initiatives. The broadest scope of work being done is that through the Owner-Occupied Rehabilitation funding. Though it was initially intended to focus on residential properties within the downtown area, a lack of interest opened up the funding to residential property owners in the entire town. A maximum of sixteen homes can receive funding to make improvements. 142 While the initial concentration of these rehabilitation efforts could have potentially had a dramatic impact to a specific neighborhood, the town-wide distribution of the funds may weaken its effectiveness. Making improvements to a single house among a largely blighted area will not make the large-scale quality of life changes that Rushville was aiming to accomplish through this program. Regardless of location, sixteen houses have been given the opportunity to begin long-term changes to the town.

The Campaign Quarters project, on the other hand, has integrated both preservation and community development components. With both the Dublin Hotel and Knights of Pythias having been vacant and rapidly deteriorating, the rehabilitation efforts to convert them into apartments will preserve these downtown structures and could act as a catalyst for redevelopment in this part of town. Both of these structures have historical and architectural significance within the context

141 Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.
142 Sagamore Institute, “Rushville’s Planning & Implementation.”
of downtown and Rushville as a whole. The two structures are listed as contributing buildings to the Rushville Commercial Historic District National Register nomination and the Dublin Hotel is listed individually on the National Register.\textsuperscript{143} Their future use as housing will potentially bring in new businesses and increase activity to the area. This project would not have been possible without Stellar funds, grants for affordable housing, as well as brownfield tax credits.\textsuperscript{144}

In addition to these housing projects, Rushville is putting a lot of attention into their infrastructure and amenities. Starting in downtown, Stellar money is being used towards stabilizing these historic buildings as well as improving their architectural integrity. The city has recognized that neglecting to maintain these buildings leads to deterioration beyond remedy that ultimately causes the loss of the historic context.\textsuperscript{145} By investing in these buildings, it can be ensured that they are properly maintained, and businesses can continue to use the spaces to their full potential. Though not directly mentioned in the Stellar plans, future work could include converting the upper stories back to apartments. The stabilization of these buildings will provide long term community preservation.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{143} Hugh Smith, "Rushville Commercial Historic District."
\item\textsuperscript{144} Sagamore Institute, “Rushville’s Planning & Implementation.”
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
effects, but the inclusion of more historically sensitive design guidelines will provide a framework for ensuring the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards are followed in the years to come.

The projects that have the potential to make the greatest community impact outside of the housing work are located just south of the downtown. This underutilized space between the outer edge of downtown and Riverside Park will contain the Overlook @ Riverside, Flatrock Run Trailhead & Bike Hub, and the Riverside Park Gateway Plaza. Though work has not begun on these projects, land has been acquired and businesses have agreed to lease the Overlook building. This new building, which will be around 20,000 square feet of restaurant and retail space, will be accompanied by outdoor seating and parking.¹⁴⁶ Between this new structure and Riverside park will be the Flatrock Run Trailhead, which will act as the starting point for a new trail project that will circumnavigate Riverside Park, providing access to the park for all residents and visitors. In addition to the trailhead and businesses, the Gateway Plaza will provide a new entry to Riverside Park and strengthen the connection between the downtown and park through Morgan Street. This stretch of road will also receive Stellar funds to improve sidewalk and streetscape conditions as well as act at the first portion of a new Downtown Loop Trail.¹⁴⁷ As a collective, interconnected system, this group of projects has the ability to turn an area of little activity and investment into a community asset. Though there is no integration of historic preservation, this development leverages the existing Riverside Park, which has seen an increase of activity and income from the Live at the Levee summer concert series.¹⁴⁸ These improvements will bring year-round activity

¹⁴⁶ City of Rushville, “Stellar Projects.”
¹⁴⁷ Ibid
¹⁴⁸ Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.
and investment to the area and hopefully catalyze additional development in the adjacent downtown. Because this is so early in the planning stage, success can only be speculation.

How has the concept of quality of life been integrated into the development of community preservation projects?

Because the idea of quality of life was integrated into the Stellar projects, Rushville already has an understanding of its importance when it comes to bringing in new residents and retaining their population. Projects outside of Stellar are also implementing quality of life strategies including the Princess Theater redevelopment. Despite nearly all of these projects being in the planning phases, in progress, or recently completed, current quality of life can be assessed and impacts of these projects can be predicted.

Starting in the downtown, the area as a whole has potential for both positive and negative quality of life aspects. Some buildings, like one that holds a martial arts studio, has seen historically sensitive alterations, but several structures are suffering from a lack of maintenance, incompatible alterations, or both. This hurts not only the overall aesthetic of the downtown corridor, but tells visitors and residents that the community is not interested in investing in its infrastructure. For residents, losing the three downtown buildings to neglect can be discouraging, especially because they were demolished recently. The vacant lots have since been filled with Willkie Park and a parking lot. Willkie Park, which houses a gazebo and landscaping, is admittedly in need of programming and possible redesign. As for the parking lot, its use as a location for a farmer’s market has proven successful for the single year it’s been in operation. Events and activities like farmer’s markets do provide opportunities to increase quality of life,
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but because these are temporary the space in which they are held must also possess the ability to improve quality of life. The fact remains that it is still a parking lot, despite the mural overlooking the asphalt in an attempt to improve the feeling of the space. Murals may help tell a story or improve perceptions regarding aesthetics, but quality of life will improve more with amenities and taking care of the historic building stock. Essential amenities will be critical in the near future, as Rushville’s Walmart closed the end of February of 2018. While leaders are trying to view this as an opportunity to bring businesses to downtown, the building stock needs to be attractive to potential buyers or they will simply build in the outskirts. This is where the downtown rehabilitation and Morgan Street Stellar funds will be able to provide investment to the aesthetics of the downtown to aid in this business attraction. In additions to these, the Campaign Quarters and Princess Theater could produce the most impact on improving quality of life to Rushville.

Acting as bookends to the downtown, these community preservation projects will provide housing, entertainment, and education to the area. The Campaign Quarters apartments will give both seniors and families new choices for living. The senior apartments have the ability to fulfill an existing need, since the last senior housing project completed in downtown currently has a waiting list. By creating new housing opportunities and rehabilitating two vacant and deteriorating structures, this project will improve quality of life factors for the new residents and the surrounding neighborhoods. Foot traffic will inevitably increase along with the need for additional amenities, which will act as a catalyst for the other structures adjacent to the area.

The Princess Theater will provide other services that will benefit the downtown and city as a whole. While having city hall offices on the second floor may not bring a lot of activity to

151 Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.
152 Ibid.
the area, the city’s direct relationship with the building will ensure its continued maintenance. The theater and Ivy Tech extension will be the ones to bring activity to the area. Despite its hollowed-out state and lack of heat or air-conditioning, movie-goers have still been drawn to the space. The Heart of Rushville implemented a series of movie showings in the space as a fundraising effort and received a better response than expected. The amount of community support lead to a large private donation for the rehabilitation of the theater interior. Though the lack of volunteers may act as a hindrance, the Heart of Rushville is collaborating with theaters in Franklin and Greensburg to make sure the theater is a success.\textsuperscript{153} Adjacent to the theater will be the new Ivy Tech Community College branch, which was previously located in another downtown structure. An educational environment like Ivy Tech will mean that activity will increase in this part of downtown, acting as another catalyst for development. Both the theater and the college have the potential to bring in people from out of town. Such amenities have already proven to be a benefit to the community and will continue to improve the quality of life of Rushville into the future.

Downtown Rushville’s ability to create opportunities for social and emotional connections, thus place attachment, is one of its weakest features. For the most part, the businesses that currently exist downtown do not provide environments for people to socialize or grow emotionally attached to the community. Perhaps that best examples of this comes from the author’s own experience while on a site visit. Looking for a location to talk with Joe Rathz after touring the Campaign Quarter site, the interview had to be conducted from a bench outside a downtown business because there was no place to go in to socialize. New housing, a theater, and college will not only create opportunities for place attachment within their walls, but will

\textsuperscript{153} Joe Rathz, in discussion with the author, February 19, 2018, Rushville, Indiana.
hopefully bring other businesses that could increase connections between people and their environment.

In addition to the downtown, Riverside Park can be assessed based its current and future ability to improve quality of life. Parks inherently provide an improved quality of place, as long as they are maintained and programed. Green space along with places to play and exercise can improve health and well-being as well as promote social interactions. Though it isn’t uncertain how the space is used when formal programs aren’t planned, it’s clear the space was intended for large gatherings, specifically the Live at the Levee concerts. While these programs can bring in hundreds of people, thus increase quality of life, these are temporary like the farmers market. In order to effect quality of place in the long term, the space itself must invoke these betterment of life and emotional connection. Riverside Park currently suffers from being disconnected to the downtown and does not appear to be used to its full potential when programs are not taking place. The plans that are underway through Stellar will be able to supplement what already exists in the park to improve the connectiveness to other parts of town and also create more reasons for residents and visitor to come to the park.

Summary

Rushville is on the edge of a massive redevelopment undertaking. Having lost three downtown buildings to neglect, the city is working to prevent additional holes in the downtown from appearing by purchasing properties and making essential repairs. The city may be expressing an interest in the historic infrastructure now, but the ordinances may pose future challenges. The creation of a single almost city-wide district has included many historic buildings, but its attention to paint colors and inability to create additional historic districts
hinders preservation's ability to become an effective community development tool. While many projects underway are being accomplished through Stellar funding, the city wants to maximize the program's impact by supplementing these projects with other investments. This includes the rehabilitation of the Princess Theater, Durbin Hotel, and Knights of Pythias buildings in addition to new construction by Riverside Park. While these kinds of projects will be able to improve quality of life, a lack of a preservation ethic downtown, opportunities to socialize, and diversity of business types may present challenges future. Overall, the projects planned for Rushville have the potential to make some drastic changes that could help revitalize the town.

Figure 16: Broadway Street Downtown Greensburg, photo by author

Greensburg

Brief History

The town of Greensburg is located at the cross roads of State Highways 3 and 421 and connects directly to Indianapolis through Interstate 74, located along its northern border. It was established as the seat of the newly formed Decatur County in 1822. The local icon, a tree growing from the courthouse tower, was first discovered in the 1870’s. It was allowed to continue growing until 1888 when it was removed, but another sprouted in its place and the
county became known as the home of the courthouse tree. With the early establishment of railroads and interurban lines in the area, Greensburg began to prosper. The main industries present in the area were agriculture and limestone quarrying. Despite other rural communities in the area experiencing population decline, Greensburg has seen consistent growth since its beginning. This brought attention to Honda Motor Company in 2006, who was looking to build a new assembly plant. Greensburg was put up against four other possible locations, but was ultimately selected because of its community, infrastructure, and central location. Now with over 12,000 residents, the town’s highest population to date, Greensburg is continuing to prosper.

Current Scope of Community Preservation Work

Acting as the middle ground between Richmond and Rushville population sizes, Greensburg is a community that has taken a downtown-focused approach to community preservation. The city is not a CLG, though they have expressed an interest in achieving this designation. They do have a Historic Preservation Commission that enforces work completed in the downtown historic district. Main Street Greensburg is also considered a nationally recognized Main Street program meaning they have a hired staff member to coordinate programs.
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and promote preservation efforts. Unlike the other Main Street groups studied, Greensburg’s organization offers a unique revolving loan fund to be used on buildings in the Downtown Historic District. In addition to these groups, Greensburg also has the Alma Taylor Foundation, a non-profit organization that provides grants to promote economic growth through community development, historic preservation and the arts.158 These opportunities are present in the absence of Stellar funding, which Greensburg applied for in 2016, but was not selected for designation.

Despite not achieving the status of Stellar Community, Greensburg is still working towards implementing some of the projects outlined in their community vision plan.159 For now, the primary focus is on finishing streetscapes around the square and creating a cultural corridor to Rebekah Park where plans include the addition of an amphitheater and dog park. At the time of the thesis research, only Broadway Street had completed work. Improvements included brick crosswalks and sidewalk detailing, new parking options in the center of the street, landscaping, and light fixtures. Franklin Street, on the opposite side of the square, is where efforts for streetscape will focus next if grant money from the Office of Community and Rural Affairs is acquired. Washington and Main Streets will follow in the long term as funding
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159 The full Community Vision Plan for Greensburg can be found at: https://issuu.com/effectiveadvancementstrategies/docs/visionplan11217
becomes available. In addition to the streets, the courthouse and surrounding land is in the process of being repaired and redeveloped. At the time of the thesis research, the courthouse was under restoration and the lawn adjacent to Franklin Street was being prepared for the new plaza. Because this block is considered county property, the county contributed $1 million to the improvements.

Several downtown buildings have also undergone façade rehabilitations thanks to the grants and revolving loan funds. Instead of Stellar’s ability to complete a large amount of façade work at a time, the façade work in Greensburg is completed piecemeal. In an attempt to further improve aesthetics around the downtowns, murals have also been placed on a few of the buildings. This includes two interactive sets of wings where people may pose for pictures. Other smaller projects have taken place including the addition of mosaic tiles to the trash cans and the inclusion of plaques on the buildings that have used funding from the Alma Taylor Foundation.

Other than superficial changes, three buildings have been recently rehabilitated into senior housing including one downtown structure, a former YMCA building and an adjacent structure. While each of these projects utilized Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, none used the Historic Tax Credit though at least two of the structures were probably eligible. Despite not
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using the Historic Tax Credit, the rehabilitation of the YMCA and it’s adjacent ultimately saved the site from becoming a parking lot. All of these projects mentioned have the features of community preservation projects and will be further studied through the following questions.

Questions

What effects does local legislation have on the implementation of historic preservation and community development projects?

Greensburg’s local historic preservation ordinance was created in 2007 to establish a five-member Preservation Commission and set a foundation for future preservation work in the town. While the Commission is ultimately responsible for creating and approving of historic districts, residents can petition for their neighborhood to become a district. A survey must be completed to determine the boundaries of the district and classify the buildings as outstanding, notable, contributing, or non-contributing. The map may also divide the district into primary and secondary areas, with the latter being designated for the preservation of visual context. The Commission may decide to enforce a conservation district before designating an area as a historic district. In this case, an area would be controlled for the demolition, moving, or new
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construction of structures for a three-year period. At the end of this time, the neighborhood will become a historic district unless a majority of property owners object to the new designation. Final approval of all districts must go to the City Council. The ordinance also grants interim protection to structures that are on a historic district map that has yet to be approved, slowing down possible demolitions or alterations.

Certificates of Appropriateness are required in a historic district for demolitions, moving or a structure, conspicuous changes to the exterior, and any new construction. The Commission will gauge a project’s compatibility through the standard visual measures of height, proportions, rhythm with surrounding context, materials, and scale. The ordinance also includes a brief statement on maintaining structures “to prevent loss of historic material and the deterioration of important character defining details.” Overall, the historic preservation ordinance is thorough and allows for preservation to act as an effective community development tool. Because Greensburg essentially replicated the model ordinance, this justifies the effectiveness of the template. Its ability to create districts, up front or through the creation of a conservation district, as well as regulate major architectural changes, moves, and demolitions has given the Commission the authority to monitor change. Despite this, the Commission has only designated the Downtown Greensburg Historic District since the ordinance’s approval.

In May of 2011, the City Council approved the creation of the downtown historic district. This area consists primarily of buildings facing toward the courthouse, though some full blocks have been included within the boundaries. As of September of that same year, design guidelines were approved for this district to create a baseline for appropriate preservation practices. The guidelines cover multiple topics from appropriate masonry repairs and cleaning to

---

repairing and replacing architectural features. In general, it appears that many suggestions and recommendations have been directly taken from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards or the NPS’s Tech Briefs. This shows that someone preparing the document was knowledgeable in the field of preservation or knew where to find appropriate materials to then be shared. The creation of such guidelines will both create a cohesive downtown district as property owners make changes to their buildings and form a baseline for educating these owners about preservation practices. The management of quality aesthetics through preservation efforts enforced by the historic preservation ordinance and design guidelines will promote community development and promote long term positive effects on the downtown.

How have unique funding opportunities allowed for the development of community preservation projects?

Even though Greensburg has not achieved the Stellar designation yet, there are three funding opportunities that have promoted the creation of community preservation projects. The
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first is the Alma Taylor Foundation (ATF) which gives grants towards improving the Downtown Greensburg Historic District. Though money was gifted to the community from the Alma Taylor estate since 2001, the Foundation was created in 2009 for the sole purpose of managing the grant program and promoting community development through the rehabilitation and restoration of downtown buildings.\textsuperscript{165} The program is a 50/50 matching grant, so building owners must supply a minimum of 50\% of the project costs to receive funding. ATF will grant up to $20,000 per building project that involves rehabilitation of the exterior or interior of a commercial space which must be approved by the organization.\textsuperscript{166} It is common for the organization to refer to the Design Guidelines when approving designs and alterations, but may be stricter depending on the circumstances.\textsuperscript{167} Under the current requirements of the program, a building is limited to one grant from ATF, but future needs may cause a change in this requirement. Because ATF sets an annual allocation amount, any number of projects can be completed in a year depending on their grant amounts. This had lead to over $200,000 of grant money invested into twenty-two downtown buildings in Greensburg since 2009.\textsuperscript{168}

ATF is not the only local grant available to Downtown business owners. Main Street Greensburg also offers a 50/50 matching grant for façade improvements up to $5,000. Like the ATF, the Design Guidelines must be followed to receive the funding.\textsuperscript{169} In addition to the grant programs, Main Street Greensburg offers a low-interest revolving loan to downtown businesses. Made possible through local banks and a Downtown Enhancement Grant provided by the Office


\textsuperscript{167} Wendy Blake, in discussion with the author, February 6, 2018, Greensburg, Indiana.

\textsuperscript{168} Alma Taylor Foundation, “$200,000 Awarded to Downtown Buildings Owners by Alma Taylor Foundation.”

of Community and Rural Affairs, applicants can request up to $20,000. Those that use the loan must comply with the Design Guidelines as well, but may complete work on the exterior or interior of their building.\footnote{Main Street Greensburg, IN, “Economic Vitality,” n.d., accessed March 19, 2018, http://www.mainstreetgreensburg.com/economic-vitality.} An estimated 15 to 20 properties have used the Façade Grant and around six property owners have taken advantage of the loan opportunity.\footnote{Wendy Blake, in discussion with the author, February 6, 2018, Greensburg, Indiana.}

In terms of community preservation, both the ATF and Main Street grants provide opportunities for community preservation projects to be implemented. Though focused in the downtown, the rehabilitation and historically sensitive alterations to the existing buildings creates a sense of place and act as a means to promote community development. These programs may not be able to provide large amounts of upfront capital like the Stellar program, but these opportunities have and will continue to provide funding that promotes community preservation projects. This ultimately acts a stimulant for further investment in the Greensburg in the long-term and may attract other community investors like Honda.

How has the concept of quality of life been integrated into the development of community preservation projects?

There are multiple community preservation projects that have taken place in Greensburg including downtown façade work, streetscape, artwork and housing. Each of these has varying degrees of quality of life integrated into their overall community impacts. While there are some projects that have only been partially completed, each of these initiatives can still be assessed.

The downtown façade work, up to the time of the thesis research, has impacted quality of life through ensuring the continued use of the historic infrastructure and appropriate
rehabilitation practices that improve aesthetics of the downtown buildings. Business retention has remained strong, offering multiple retail and restaurant options that are walkable from the downtown housing projects as well as the adjacent neighborhoods. Vacancy rates of buildings has decreased over the past four years and new businesses have been coming into the commercial area.¹⁷² As for place attachment, the continued maintenance and overall aesthetic improvements bring in and retain businesses that create social and emotional connections. Greensburg hosts many events in their downtown, so these opportunities will only strengthen ties to the area. With funding sources like the AFT grant, preservation will continue to play a crucial role in community development through quality of life.

The streetscape project also has the ability to improve the overall aesthetic and revitalization of the downtown. The improvement in landscaping and parking accommodations along Broadway Street has proven to be a catalyst for development in the buildings along this street. Since its completion in 2009, more façade and rehabilitation projects have taken place along this side of the square than any other. As the project plans to move forward along Franklin Street, the side with the most vacancies, the hope is to rejuvenate investment in these buildings as well. This particular side of the square will also include a new plaza on the courthouse.

lawn. As the streetscape project continues to develop, residents and visitors will be able to experience the kind of quality environment that Greensburg is creating to improve experiences. Though the streetscape itself may not invoke social and emotional connections, the businesses and other improvements that come as a result might improve social and emotional connections. One such example is the courthouse plaza, which could provide opportunities for formal and informal gatherings.

The artwork initiative as the ability to create unique settings, but does not provide needed amenities, improve large-scale environmental conditions, or factors that drastically change quality of life. Though one is considered interactive, the two murals downtown are at a smaller scale and are not directly visible to those in the downtown area. Unless someone is aware of them, they could easily be passed up because of their size or location. These same critiques prevent these murals from become an effective method for creating social and emotional connections. The interactive wings may be a location to take a picture, but there are not opportunities for long term social and emotional connections. For these reasons, the downtown artwork may improve the aesthetics of some areas, but is not effective when improving long term quality of life.

The housing projects, on the other hand, provides Greensburg with opportunities to improve quality of life. By using previously vacant historic buildings, two of which were slated for demolition to increase parking, downtown was able to save the integrity of the downtown while increasing activity and residential population of the area. Quality of life was improved through walkable access to amenities, quality living in historic buildings, and an overall investment to the downtown area. This type of housing has the ability to increase density of an
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area which will in turn bring in needed businesses and the additional investment that can change an area. Place attachment comes along with these businesses and housing through social and emotional connections created.

Summary
Greensburg has been able to implement a number of community preservation projects despite not achieving a Stellar Community designation. Their streetscape plans, downtown façade work and housing projects have all been possible because of their strong preservation ordinance and funding opportunities from the Alma Taylor Foundation and Main Street Greensburg. The town received additional justification for their community development focus when Honda decided to build a new manufacturing plant on the edge of town, bringing in thousands of jobs and additional income for the community. For the most part, the projects implemented by Greensburg have had positive quality of life strategies results. Though the town is developing projects at a slower pace than that of Richmond and Rushville, the long-term effects may prove to be just as beneficial.
CHAPTER FIVE: ANALYSIS

Having researched the intersection of historic preservation and community development through existing publications and studies, then investigating this idea of “community preservation” projects in three rural Indiana communities, a further analysis can begin on how this research proves or refutes historic preservation as an effective community development tool. Effectiveness will be justified through three common themes that presented themselves through the case studies. Based on community development’s ability implement change through improving quality of life, legislation’s effectiveness will be gauged on its ability to regulate this change, specifically to the built environment. Through funding opportunities, the implementation of historic preservation projects over new construction will provide additional basis for its effectiveness in mitigating population decline. This will be analyzed by comparing population trends, including rate of change, of all the Stellar Communities through 2015 as well as the case study communities. Finally, the ability to improve quality of life through preservation will be gauged on its ability to address challenges specific to rural areas. For this chapter, all of the projects in each community will be compared against one another to further prove effectiveness of preservation across multiple rural conditions.

Regulating Change

After studying the preservation ordinances of each town and speaking with local leaders, one point is clear: no matter how vague or strict an ordinance is, people will ignore the regulations if they are not enforced. While every ordinance presents a fine for those who violate the law, people are still either unaware of the regulations on their building or do not care to follow the regulations for other reasons. Across every community there was some story about
property owners, or even the ordinance itself, that challenged the ability to regulate change in the community.

In the case of Greensburg, which has a thorough ordinance along with design guidelines for their historic district, there is the challenge of addressing those who are not aware of these regulations and those who want to be more energy efficient. The Historic Commission has recently discussed how to increase the awareness of the regulations and design guidelines in the downtown district. In a commission meeting in January, one member commented how scaffolding would appear on a downtown building without any advance warning or COA being submitted to the Commission. The organization, as well as Greensburg Main Street, have sent letters and given brochures to business owners, but they still complete work without consulting the Commission. Some of this miscommunication is blamed on absent property owners who fail to inform their renters about regulations, but the Commission is actively working to resolve this challenge. This includes possibilities such as additional historic district signs to the downtown area, sending additional letters, or having business owners sign a “terms and conditions” stating that they have read the ordinance and design guidelines and understand the regulations they must follow. Despite their efforts to work with business owners, some blatantly ignore their restrictions. One such example is a business owner who placed polka dots on her downtown building.175

In addition to a lack of communication, Main Street Director Wendy Blake said that she has also had issues with building owners who believe that their historic buildings are not energy efficient. One such example is a local attorney located just off the downtown square in a small

historic structure with standard storefront glass. Without submitting a COA or receiving approval from the Commission, the owner took out the windows and filled the resulting voids with vinyl siding and smaller residential-sized windows.\textsuperscript{176} Despite being aware of the violation to the design guidelines, the smaller windows were thought to increase energy efficiency. Compromising historic features for the benefit of saving money on heating and cooling is unfortunately common, especially in the era of urban renewal and the energy crisis. This kind of thinking is what makes Blake believe that energy efficiency incentives hurt preservation.\textsuperscript{177} While arguments towards embodied energy have often fought for preservation, building owners may still see features like historic single-paned glass as an energy waste. Though the attorney eventually returned the building’s storefront back to its original design, the conflict between energy efficiency and preservation is worth further study, especially for rural communities.

Greensburg has also had some challenges with having the Commission be too strict on the application of the design guidelines. The example that stands out is a brief disagreement about the content of the murals to be placed around the square. During the planning phase for the murals, the wings in particular, the Commission was initially against the designs because they did not contain historic content that pertained to the city of Greensburg. There was also an issue with applying the mural directly on the building. To resolve the conflict, an Indiana Landmarks representative came to Greensburg to work between the entities involved. The Commission was then convinced that the murals did not have to strictly be related to Greensburg history, though some elements were integrated into the mural of the wings. The application of the mural to the historic buildings was resolved by applying them to removable panels.\textsuperscript{178} Though this challenge

\textsuperscript{176} Wendy Blake, in discussion with the author, February 6, 2018, Greensburg, Indiana.
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{178} Wendy Blake, in discussion with the author, February 6, 2018, Greensburg, Indiana.
was easily resolved without further conflicts, this example does bring to light that preservation may sometimes be taken from a purist point of view and actually prevent change from occurring. This comes down to those in leadership positions and their opinions in the field of historic preservation. In the end, preservation must enforce respectable and compatible changes to the built environment.

In Richmond, the ordinance itself also provides a barrier for creating change through community preservation. Though most of the language used in the document is fairly standard for a preservation ordinance, there are a few aspects that make it difficult for the Commission or property owners to create local historic districts, thus apply design guidelines that can regulate change in neighborhoods. First is the need for fifty percent approval by the property owners within the district in the form of a written petition. Advocates for the district may struggle to overcome such an approach because of the large time commitment to both promote and acquire signatures. Michael Flowers comments:

“Going out and getting 50 percent of the property owners to sign a petition requires substantial efforts. This limits Richmond to single site and small districts. The evidence is in the size of Richmond’s districts... As a result of this requirement Richmond has only 2 multi-property conservation districts, the others are single site, and the 2 multi-property ones in Linden Hill and the Richmond Railroad District are both very small. In contrast to the local conservation District of Linden Hill the National Register East Main St.-Glen Miller Park District is much larger.”

In comparison, Greensburg’s ordinance does not require any majority approval in the creation of a district. However, the Commission may decide to phase the creation of a historic district, in which case an area would first become a conservation district. After three years, historic district designation can be declined if a majority of the property owners in the district object to the new designation. Where Greensburg’s ability to rely on the Commission to
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designate districts without majority approval of owners provides greater opportunities to create historic districts, Richmond’s requirement to go directly to the people acts as a hurdle.

The same can be said about how conservation districts are integrated into the ordinances. Greensburg uses these district types as an option for those areas that may not want to go directly into the historic district designation, but Richmond requires an area to become a conservation district first. In addition to this, the district must complete the petitioning process again to acquire local designation. Michael Flowers states:

“... [the model ordinance] automatically converts [a conservation district] to a historic district after the two or three year waiting period unless a majority of property owners oppose it in writing. In the case of Richmond after going through the difficult effort of establishing a conservation district the commission or whoever they have working on the project must then again do the same process of getting signatures, holding public meetings, sending letters, and getting an ordinance passed through city council for a historic district. It is unlikely that such a second effort will happen and if it does it will be years down the road.”

While this designation does create some basic protections, from demolition for example, the requirement to start as a conservation district may cause preservation momentum to be lost or slow down potential community preservation initiatives.

The final component of Richmond’s ordinance that hinders the ability to create local districts is the applicability clause. This section determines that only those property owners who sign the district petition or bought a property within the district after it had been designated are required to follow the ordinance. All other property owners become subject to the ordinance once the district is twenty years old. While it is unclear why such a clause was added to the ordinance, its inclusion makes any long-term community preservation efforts difficult to achieve. There may be a majority of the property owners in the district who follow the ordinance, but
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neighborhood cohesiveness and quality are lost when up to 49% of the district do not have to obey the law. In the end, this ordinance prevents any positive changes that typically occur in historic districts from taking hold making it an ineffective tool for the development of community preservation projects.

This inefficiency in creating local districts can have additional repercussions that may affect community development projects across the city. Though the city of Richmond has generic architectural standards integrated into the Unified Development Ordinance, it does not have comprehensive quality design guidelines. These are often used to create a cohesive and unique aesthetic based on the historic character of an area. Without any local historic districts to which design standards can be attached, it could become difficult to create such an environment that improves quality of life. The Stellar work being completed in the downtown is taking the first step in creating a regulated design. As a part of the façade renovations, a series of design guidelines have been written to create a unified aesthetic to the new facades downtown and ensure that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are being followed. It is unclear how these standards will be policed after the project is complete. If Richmond wants to ensure the work being completed under Stellar has long-term effects, they would permanently enforce these guidelines by working towards designating the downtown as a local historic district.

Rushville presents a few additional challenges that have not been addressed in Greensburg or Richmond. While the ordinances from the other case study communities were
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fairly comparable, Rushville’s historic neighborhood district clause was directly integrated into their zoning ordinance. This is a perfectly acceptable approach to creating a historic ordinance, but the law itself falls short in several instances. As mentioned back in the case study section, the sheer size of the historic district makes it difficult to create design guidelines in the future as the area encompasses commercial, residential, as well as several architectural styles and periods. This untraditional scope prevents more specific regulations or design guidelines from being created for neighborhood needs and provides only a blanket set of guides that does not protect the architectural integrity of the area. Though the area is protected from demolitions or the moving of buildings, there is no requirement for a COA for architectural changes to the structures, only for color. This prevents any sort of cohesive aesthetic from being established and is not conducive for the improvement of quality of life in the area. In addition to the size and limited protections put in place, the ordinance does not provide a method for designating additional historic districts, which will become an issue once other areas of town become historic. Overall, the historic district clause provides little to no opportunity to regulate change or improve quality of life so therefore hinders the ability of preservation and community development to create positive change in the community.

Despite the passing of the historic ordinance back in 2006, the city of Rushville has been the one who has prevented it from being an effective community preservation tool. For one, the ordinance was not followed for the first four years. It wasn’t until after 2010 that the ordinance was enforced, but even then the city is challenged by those who appose the regulations. Like Greensburg, some business owners make changes without consulting the Board out of ignorance or general uninterest. Chairman of the Historic District Board Joe Rathz admits that sometimes it comes down to choosing between a new business and enforcing the zoning ordinance.
Businesses have come to Rushville searching for a storefront, but challenge the regulations put in place, sometimes threatening to move to the edge of town or leave Rushville altogether. Rathz stated:

“When you are a small community, how do you turn away development?”

In a community where everybody knows everybody, it is difficult for things to not get political. If the mayor upsets his constituents, he won’t get reelected. This may lead to additional flexibility within the ordinance.

Even though ordinances are created to regulate change, the case studies prove that much more goes into an effective ordinance than a list of actions that require a COA. The language used, or lack thereof, is the first line of defense against implementing change. Being too restrictive, like the 50% signed petition in Richmond, or too vague, like Rushville’s ordinance, prevents residents from taking an interest in the area and makes the ordinance ineffective from a grassroots perspective. An effective ordinance and design guidelines, like that which exists in Greensburg, are just a single component. Communications from the commission or board to business owners and residents is crucial to ensure they are informed and comply with the guidelines. While some business owners may complete incompatible work out of ignorance, some simply do not like being told what they can and cannot do to their property and ignore the ordinance altogether.

Those who do not know the quality of life benefits that come from community preservation projects that are enforced by such regulations may see the ordinance as only a hindrance. In the case of Rushville, new businesses challenge the ordinance, forcing the city to choose between enforcing the district guidelines or a new business. Despite the attraction that
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new businesses bring, perhaps Rushville should not appeal to those who are not willing to comply with the guidelines. In the future such a business may continue to challenge regulations put forward, making the guidelines unenforceable and minimizing any potential positive community effects. When it comes to regulating change through an ordinance, the language should be concise, yet effective, as well as enforceable. Beside the physical ordinance, the commission, board, or other organization needs to educate the effected residents and businesses to not only tell them of the regulations by also how such preservation practices can improve the community through aspects like quality of life. If the community as a whole does not back such community preservation efforts, then such an approach will not reach its full potential.

**Effects of Funding**

Because rural communities often struggle with a lack of funding opportunities, capital from programs such as Stellar Communities and Greensburg’s grants and revolving loan provide the means to accomplish projects. When faced with the decision on how to distribute such funds, all three communities looked towards community preservation work. This proves that these rural towns not only see the value in their historic infrastructure, but also have a desire to build upon what already exists. To reinforce the completion of these community preservation projects, each of the funding sources presented in the case study communities showed a preference towards, or required, the towns or business owners to work within the preservation realm. Those projects that provide a holistic solution to multiple challenges in the community, or have the potential to create additional investment in an area after its completion, are especially important for Stellar communities. With the help of the Sagamore Institute, the implications of the Stellar funding
have been tracked and studied to investigate the program’s effectiveness in revitalizing rural Indiana communities.

Now that Stellar has been active for seven years, quantitative data for some of the early communities have begun to show trends of progress since the completion of their Stellar projects. While the Sagamore Institute’s study does address population as well as issues regarding poverty and median household incomes, the population change data neglects to take into consideration the overall trends that had been occurring prior to the Stellar designation. Comparing populations from 1980 to 2016 showed a general increase in population for seven of the twelve communities studied in the 2016 Annual Report. While not disputing this data, there are trends of both growth and decline that are missing from this data. Because rural communities have consistently shown declining population trends across the country, the thesis is not only interested in bringing growth back to these areas, but any sort of stabilization to this population decline.

To expand on the population data gathered by the 2016 Annual Report, population statistics were gathered for the Stellar communities designated between 2011 and 2015. By looking at population trends from 1970 until 2017, there can be a greater understanding of how the 2016 Annual Report’s population change pre- and post-Stellar designation as well as Esri’s predicted 2022 population fits into the greater context. Because the 2016 and 2017 communities are still in the planning or early implementation phase, they will not be added to the data since any population change could not be attributed to the Stellar projects. This excludes Rushville since it is one of the case study communities.
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First, there will be a comparison of the 2016 Annual Report’s pre- and post-Stellar population change to the larger population change between the years 2010 and 2017. For the purpose of the 2016 Annual Report, pre-Stellar population is the year before designation and post-Stellar population was one year after implementation. For nearly all of the Stellar communities, this percentage does not accurately depict overall population change for the community, especially in the first few years of Stellar designations. The 2011 community of Greencastle saw little population change in relation to the year before and after designation, but saw growth across the 2010-2017 period. North Vernon, designated the same year, saw 8% growth in the initial Stellar period, but an overall population loss of 2% over seven years. The 2012 Stellar communities both saw long term growth where initially both were losing population after Stellar. The later Stellar communities have similar discrepancies. Bedford continued to decline in population, but at a slower rate during designation. Richmond and Wabash’s population decline remained constant, but at a slower rate than previous years. Crawfordville shrunk in the long term compared to the growth during designation. Huntingburg and North Liberty grew, but not as drastically as during the initial Stellar designation period. Despite the inconsistencies between the immediate population changes during the Stellar population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Population Change Comparison</th>
<th>Pre-Post Stellar</th>
<th>2010-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greencastle</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vernon</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingburg</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawfordsville</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Liberty</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensburg</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 24: Comparing Sagamore Institute’s Pre-Post Stellar statistics to overall population change, created by author
designation and the seven-year trend, long term population trends show a commonality between nearly all of the Stellar communities: population stabilization.

While the 2016 Annual Report states that half of the Stellar communities have declined in population between 1980 and 2016, only three of these show a consistently declining population over this period: Bedford, Richmond, and Wabash. The other communities display growth patterns, though some cases like Delphi it is rather sporadic. The population statistics are able to show long term changes, butcharting the rates of change between these time periods provides an additional layer of information that reveals a common thread. Despite each of these communities having unique contexts and circumstances that cause population growth or decline, nine of the ten Stellar communities are demonstrating a stabilization trend. Both population growth and decline are happening at slower rates even through Esri’s predicted 2022 populations for each community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Population Change Between Decades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greencastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawfordsville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2022 predicted data supplied by Esri

Figure 25: Comparison of rate of population change, created by author
Whereas some community leaders may only want growth for their community, population stabilization has its benefits. For one, a consistent population allows projects to focus on the maintenance and improvement of what already exists in the community. Drastic periods of growth lead to quick development schemes and large population loss forces the city to focus on mitigation efforts. Stabilization allows for more accurate planning efforts, a focus on improving quality of life and amenities, and the other small details that are ignored when combating population swings. A slower rate of growth or decline also suggests that the community is reaching capacity. This could include infrastructure, workforce, schools, or political. Once a community has improved upon what already exists, then they may consider planning for population growth.

The only community to not show population stabilization is Richmond. While the town is still declining in population, and less than in previous years, Esri predicts that Richmond will lose more of it population between 2017 and 2022 than 2010 and 2017. Because every other Stellar community up to this point has demonstrated stabilization, this suggests there are other underlying issues within Richmond. Based of the case study research, a lower quality of life and concerns with the housing stock may be just a few aspects that contribute to this increased population decline. Because several of Richmond’s Stellar projects are underway, it will be interesting to compare Esri’s 2022 prediction to the city’s actual population in the future.

Even though Rushville has yet to see the effects of the Stellar funding in its community, the predicted population for 2022 shows the future trending towards stabilization. Like Richmond, Rushville’s population spiked in the 1960’s and has declined ever since. With the Stellar and complementary projects looking to be finished within the next few years, there is a chance that this future projection has a smaller decline than predicted or possibly slight growth.
In addition to Stellar’s funding opportunities, Greensburg’s low interest revolving loan and grants offer capital to invest in the historic downtown building stock. Though the amount of money put into Greensburg through these programs does not reach the investment level put into the Stellar communities, their ability to provide funding into the future will make them a continued asset for years to come. With each of these sources requiring the use of the Design Guidelines to receive funding, they ensure that community preservation practices are integrated into every project. This in turn can increase quality of life and mitigate rural challenges. When compared to the Stellar projects, Greensburg shows a trend of stabilization like many of the other communities, which further confirms community preservation’s ability to mitigate drastic population changes.185

Regardless of whether funding is coming from Stellar, grants, or loans, the common factor between all of these sources is the focus on a community preservation approach. Because of this, it is important to ask: does the community preservation work happen because of funding or does the funding come about through a community preservation focus? Rural communities often have to overcome a lack of resources, including funding, so perhaps there is validity behind completing community preservation simply to receive the funds. This could be compared to a donation being made towards the construction of a building, and the donor wants partial design control. With that being said, it be difficult to balance the value and quality of life components that come with community preservation and control over a project.

Perhaps the best example of this comes from a missing funding source for several of the case studies’ community preservation projects: Historic Preservation Tax Credits. Of all the projects mentioned in the case study towns, only the three senior housing complexes in

185 Additional tables and charts with population data for the Stellar and case study communities can be found in Appendix B.
Richmond are confirmed to have used the tax credits. In Greensburg, Blake stated that many property owners are overwhelmed by the requirements. With other funding sources available and the smaller size of the projects being completed, the time and effort put into the paperwork is not worth the money they would be receiving. Rushville has similar circumstances. On top of the requirements, many absentee property owners just do not care to upkeep their structures, let alone attempt to receive tax credits to make repairs. Those that are in town do not have the capital to begin such projects and may not wish to take the time to complete the paperwork and research. For these reasons, it is clear that the Historic Preservation Tax Credit is not conducive in rural contexts because of the small projects, large amount of paperwork and research, and general lack of knowledge about the program. The future of rural communities could greatly benefit from a tax credit aimed towards these smaller projects that included a more refined process.

Overall, the ability for Stellar communities to consistently experience population stabilization suggests a correlation with the types of projects implemented in these towns. Because these projects primarily focus community preservation aspects, it can be suggested that the completion of this type of work plays a significant role in such an outcome. This can be further verified by the work being completed in Greensburg, though their funding sources are unique to their community. Essentially, improving and building upon what exists allows for the management of change. For this reason, it can be said that the application of outside funding sources towards community preservation-based projects is directly related to population stabilization in rural communities.
Addressing Rural Challenges

As previously mentioned, quality of life relates directly to a community’s ability to be aesthetically attractive, provide opportunities to improve health and well-being, create social and emotional connections, as well as other factors. The ability to improve these aspects must often come through overcoming challenges faced with these rural towns. Though this thesis focuses on the possible mitigation of population decline through community preservation work, other subsequent challenges have also been investigated. It is through resolving these issues that community preservation work can be further justified. For the purpose of this section, projects have been divided into housing, facades, streetscapes and additional amenities for assessment. Specifically, the challenges of an aging population, perceptions, maintaining buildings or filling vacancies, and lack of diverse business types will be used to critique each area.

The housing development projects completed by all three case study communities use holistic solutions to address rural challenges and improve quality of life. Nearly all of the projects are marketed toward senior living, confronting the challenge of an aging population. For those that used the low-income housing tax credit, the expiration period at fifteen years will allow the property owner to decide whether to transition away from senior housing to possibly market rate or family oriented based on the needs of the community at the time. All of these projects used existing buildings or spaces that were vacant, which turned derelict structures into community assets. Finding a productive use for abandoned structures has the ability to change perceptions about the community’s future. The only challenge that was not addressed with these projects was diversity of business types.

The other housing project that was used in Rushville and Richmond was owner-occupied incentives through the Stellar funding. While still impactful, this approach is not as effective in
mitigating challenges. These funding opportunities do have the ability to help aging populations in these homes. For example, funding could be used for the addition of an ADA ramp or complete basic maintenance repairs that homeowners may not be able to afford otherwise. Changes to the housing stock have varying ways of altering perceptions. On one hand it could bring positive thoughts with the proper use of guidelines and preservation practices to historic structures, or the removal of blighted properties like in Richmond. On the other hand, pit-marked improvements, like what will happen in Rushville, may minimize the effects and cause little change to perceptions. Also, if blighted properties are removed, but nothing is done to the land, perceptions become more negative. Despite the potential challenges with owner-occupied financing, the housing projects completed address multiple rural challenges and are actively working towards improving quality of life in these communities.

Façade work completed in the three case studies also provides a holistic solution to multiple challenges. Though none directly address the needs of an aging populations, this demographic will still benefit from improved quality of life. This type of work does have the ability to alter perceptions, especially as it pertains to the success of the downtown. The maintenance of the building stock will show investment in the community and has the potential to attract new businesses to town. Though in the case of Rushville, these new businesses challenge the aesthetic guidelines put in place by the historic ordinance. While maintenance alone may please some, the creation of a cohesive aesthetic and high standards for design is what will prove to increase quality of life in the long term.

Streetscape work in all communities acts as both connecters and catalysts for revitalization. The connection aspect is more prevalent in Richmond and Rushville. The former uses multiple streetscape projects through the Stellar funding to improve aesthetics and provide
more walkable routes around downtown and to the Depot District while the latter uses these same ideas to connect the downtown to the Riverside Park development that is in the planning phase. Though there are plans to continue the streetscape around the square in the future, the focus on improvements to Broadway Street in Greensburg has proved its role as a catalyst for additional investment. As stated earlier, more rehabilitation work has been done to the structures along Broadway than any other side of the downtown. This suggests that a change in perceptions created opportunities for more positive changes to occur. An overall emphasis on walkability and creating safe environments for walking between areas can appeal to aging populations.

Streetscapes themselves may not inherently bring in a diversity of business types, but the improved aesthetics may draw business owners to the area.

Through the Stellar funding in Rushville and Richmond, these communities are also creating additional amenities to improve quality of life and address their challenges. In the case of Rushville, the Riverside Park development will create more amenities around the existing amphitheater and green space. Though there are no historic buildings to be filled, new construction will include a business incubator structure that will bring in retail and restaurants. The addition of a trail system within the park will increase accessibility to everyone. The improved aesthetics and connections to the downtown has the ability to change perception of the area, which at the time of the research seemed underutilized. In Richmond, the Jack Elstro Plaza will provide a new use for a site that was once a parking lot. New green space, restroom facilities, and stage will provide opportunities for new programming. Though it does not directly affect diverse business types, the space’s use as a farmer’s market means that there is an economic component attached to the site. The park is not utilizing historic buildings or directed towards the aging population. Despite these shortcomings, the improvements to the area will
have a lasting impact on perceptions of the space. Though these additional amenities do not typically use historic buildings or address the aging population, their ability to bring in new business opportunities and improve the perceptions of a community are critical to the overall quality of life and mitigation of rural challenges.

Summary

Through the three case study communities of Richmond, Rushville, and Greensburg, research has been used to justify the use of historic preservation as an effective community development tool. Community preservation projects in these towns can regulate change and address challenges specifics to rural towns. Funding opportunities through the Stellar Communities Program or local sources allow for these types of projects to be possible. With preferences and regulations put on these funds that enforce both community development and historic preservation work, it can be determined that these projects have a crucial role in the stabilization of rural population changes. Even though ordinances and design guidelines exist to help property owners understand the importance of quality design and preservation practices, enforcing such laws prove to be a challenge. The completion of such projects may be hindered by a lack of knowledge of appropriate preservation practices, limitations set by the ordinance, or an unwillingness to comply due to a restriction of rights. Overall, these case studies provide a base for which best practices and future research can be developed.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS

Through research completed on community development, historic preservation, and their intersection at an urban context, a general understanding of the application and benefits of these concepts was learned. Three rural Indiana case study communities were then studied to reveal the impacts of these concepts, or community preservation projects, at a smaller scale. By asking questions regarding ordinances, funding opportunities, and impacts regarding quality of life, further analysis could be completed to understand the scope of impact. At the end of it all comes a series of best practices that can be taken from this research. This list is geared towards those at the local level, specifically in Mid-Sized Remote communities because of the limited scope of research. Some of these may be pertinent across other types of rural communities, though may need modification to fit their specific needs. Future research is suggested to further justify the positive implications of using historic preservation as a community development tool in rural areas.

Best Practices

1) **Build capacity with local Main Street organizations or create a CDC to implement and advocate for community preservation projects.**

The analysis on each case study’s ordinance reveals that no matter the thoroughness of the language or the design guidelines put in place, it will only be effective through educating and advocating for preservation work. Some may not be aware of regulations while others do not wish to follow them. Whether it is through a paid staff person or a group of volunteers, people need to organize their efforts to inform the public about the advantages of taking a preservation approach to community
development. These people are the ones who need to understand the challenges faced in the community and how historic preservation and community development can be utilized to resolve them.

2) **Plan for the long-term**

Stellar’s Strategic Investment Plans are an excellent example of how to plan long term projects. Their ability to bring interested parties together to plan funding sources, create holistic projects, and think critically about the future of the community. Not all plans need to be this extensive. Smaller projects can still encompass the ideas of preservation, community development and quality of life. This could include building maintenance plans, finding a buyer for a vacant property, or revitalizing an underutilized space. Setting up long term funding options like Greensburg can also ensure the use of preservation and community development practices into the future. Long term planning is also crucial when looking at population trends. Understanding the direction the community is going and how to plan efforts to guide this change will ultimately guide the work being completed.

3) **Quality over quantity**

This can cover many different areas of preservation and community development. While growth may be the end goal for many communities, stabilization may be a more achievable and responsible approach. Communities need to understand their carrying capacity and concern themselves with bettering the lives of those already within the community before looking to expand. In terms of projects, work should not
be completed for the sake of doing work. All three case studies demonstrated quality projects that had holistic effects to entire community. Quality is especially relevant in topics such as housing, building maintenance, and other amenities. Control over this can be done through direct involvement by interested parties or the creation of design guidelines or other standards. In this case, remember the first point in this section.

4) **Community preservation is strengthened through quality housing projects**

The best examples of community preservation work in each case study community were the housing development projects. Each of these utilized vacant historic buildings to solve challenges within the community and create assets out of eye-sores. Based on the needs of the community and availability of developers and vacant structures, other communities will be able to learn from these successes. If large scale buildings for housing are not on hand, communities should look towards upper story units above downtown buildings for opportunities.

5) **Partnerships are crucial for success**

Understanding the weaknesses of the community and being able to ask for help is a crucial step towards mitigating challenges within a town. Partnerships can be at multiple levels across different project types. Stellar is one such partnership that has provided funding and planning assistance to communities. Local banks have worked with Greensburg Main Street to create the revolving loan. Rushville has also partnered with multiple parties, both in and out of town, to revitalize the Princess Theater building.
Future Research

Because these is an overall lack of research completed on the intersection of community development and historic preservation in rural contexts, there is much future research that can be done. Some specific areas of focus have become clear through the research completed for this thesis. At the national level, a further investigation of rural communities and their variations should be studies. This will guide those who wish to help rural communities through more specialized approaches and methods to resolving challenges faced in each rural situation. An organization like the National Trust could also put forth an effort to study the impacts of historic preservation in rural communities, much like what was completed for the “Older, Smaller, Better,” study. Though the methodology would have to change due to a smaller scale, such research could further quantify and justify the use of preservation in these towns.

The condensed timeline of this thesis did not allow for long term study opportunities in these case study communities. With organizations like the Sagamore Institute completing research on the Stellar communities, the study could be built upon to understand the specific implications of community preservation-based projects in these towns. The qualitative and quantitative gather of information through surveys, interviews, and data could be completed alongside this preexisting research. This study could also extend beyond the purview of Stellar communities and investigate those that applied for but did not receive Stellar status and comparable communities that have made no attempt to work with Stellar. Such investigations could justify the implications of being involved in the process, not just receiving funds. By comparing to other communities that have not been involved, further evidence of its value can be quantified. The effectiveness as Stellar as a state program can also be investigated through
looking at other state-wide community development programs to compare impacts made to Indiana community to other states.

Additional research can be built upon from the questions posed in each case study community. The effectiveness of local preservation ordinances in mitigating change in rural communities is one such area. By being able to understand what type of language encourages preservation practices and what does not, rural communities can begin to construct legislation that they can enforce. The second component to this is researching advocacy and education of residents. Because this is such a crucial component of gaining support for preservation, research should be completed to understand best practices to promoting preservation in a way that encourages residents to comply with design regulations and know the benefits of taking such an approach.

Further research should also be conducted on the relationship between funding opportunities and preservation. As discussed in the analysis section, it is possible that preservation work is only being completed for the purpose of acquiring additional funding. The lack of using such funds, like the Historic Tax Credit, suggests that rural communities do not take such an approach. These communities that are challenged by a lack of funding would rather pay for rehabilitation through their own means than work through the paperwork of the tax credit. In order to appeal to these smaller projects, national and state organizations should consider investigating the allocation of funding towards these types of rural projects.

Quality of life and its role in both preservation and community development in rural areas needs much research. Where urban areas have been studied and convinced of its effectiveness to a point where new development is taking the form of historic precedents, rural areas to be convinced to appreciate and build upon what exists. Such research would require
years of survey work in rural communities that are actively utilizing preservation and community development. Through health initiatives, aesthetics, social, and emotional connections, quality of life will be just one way to convince communities of the positive impacts of community preservation.

With community development and economic development having so many common factors, research should be completed that ties these two aspects together. Hard economic data combined with quality of life improvements would only solidify preservation’s use in both urban and rural communities. Such a study could be completed similar to Donovan Rypkema’s approach of economic development. With a guidebook and statistical evidence supporting preservation as a community development tool, rural and urban areas alike could begin to set a trend that could compare to urban renewal wave.

In conclusion, this thesis has been able to clarify concepts to how they apply to rural contexts and begin to develop an understand of the implications of preservation and a community development tool. The use of such community preservation practices in the case studies has proved to play a role in the mitigation of declining population trends as well as combat challenges that accompany population loss. It is the hope of the author that rural communities will continue to be studied through the lens of historic preservation and community development to understand and aid these communities in the challenges that they face. Though building upon what was learned, perhaps community preservation practices can stabilize rural communities to a point where they can focus on proving a quality life for those within their community now and into the future.
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## APPENDIX A - CLASSIFIED INDIANA MAIN STREET COMMUNITIES

### Indiana Main Street Town Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Main Street Designation</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Other Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avilla</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargersville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batesville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>Stellar 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech Grove</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>URBAN CLG</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boonville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownstown</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge City</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churubusco</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay City</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coatesville</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia City</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connersville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corydon</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Stellar 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawfordsville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>Stellar 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>Stellar 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillsboro</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkirk</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellettesville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>URBAN CLG</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flora</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesville</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfort</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas City</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greencastle</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensburg</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greentown</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagerstown</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford City</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingburg</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffersonville</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendallville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knightstown</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Porte</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeville</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrenceburg</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logansport</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinsville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan City</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mooresville</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nappanee</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Albany</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Carlisle</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Castle</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Suburb/CLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noblesville</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Liberty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Manchester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendleton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Sun</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roachdale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelbyville</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipshewanan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td></td>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>CLG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Whitley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell City</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>URBAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veedersburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vevay</td>
<td>Nationally Accredited</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincennes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winamac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Mid-Sized</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>County Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolcott</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodburn</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Breakdown of Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main Street</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>CLG</th>
<th>Stellar</th>
<th>County Seat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small/Remote</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/Suburb</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-sized/Remote</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-sized/Suburb</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B-POPULATION DATA FROM STELLAR AND CASE STUDY COMMUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greencastle</td>
<td>8852</td>
<td>8403</td>
<td>9208</td>
<td>9810</td>
<td>10326</td>
<td>10690</td>
<td>10973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vernon</td>
<td>4582</td>
<td>5768</td>
<td>6357</td>
<td>6606</td>
<td>6728</td>
<td>6592</td>
<td>6497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphi</td>
<td>2582</td>
<td>3042</td>
<td>2666</td>
<td>3038</td>
<td>2893</td>
<td>3007</td>
<td>3073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>8899</td>
<td>9133</td>
<td>8468</td>
<td>8482</td>
<td>8644</td>
<td>8758</td>
<td>8851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>13087</td>
<td>14110</td>
<td>14153</td>
<td>13858</td>
<td>13413</td>
<td>13067</td>
<td>12872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>43999</td>
<td>41349</td>
<td>39738</td>
<td>39106</td>
<td>36812</td>
<td>36283</td>
<td>35490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingburg</td>
<td>4794</td>
<td>5376</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td>5775</td>
<td>6057</td>
<td>6233</td>
<td>6362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>13379</td>
<td>12985</td>
<td>12491</td>
<td>11702</td>
<td>10666</td>
<td>10420</td>
<td>10237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawfordsville</td>
<td>13842</td>
<td>13325</td>
<td>14261</td>
<td>15655</td>
<td>15915</td>
<td>15852</td>
<td>15868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Liberty</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensburg</td>
<td>8620</td>
<td>9254</td>
<td>9497</td>
<td>10369</td>
<td>11492</td>
<td>12356</td>
<td>12900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushville</td>
<td>6686</td>
<td>6113</td>
<td>6043</td>
<td>6670</td>
<td>6341</td>
<td>6147</td>
<td>5979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greencastle

North Vernon

Delphi
Princeton

Bedford

Richmond