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Section One:

Development in Postwar America

Introduction

Background Development
Introduction

The mid-1990's represent a significant anniversary in the history of the development of the American city. Approximately five decades earlier, substantial housing demand combined with dramatic changes in mortgage markets and the federal funding of highway construction to promote the rapid expansion of the residential subdivision and the suburb. For almost two decades, during the Great Depression and World War II, people continued to marry and have children, but no new homes were being built. At the close of the war, 3.5 million Americans were in the market for new housing (Boulton p62). Released from the rationing policies of the war years and encouraged by federal loans and mortgage insurance, housing developers quickly adopted the same mass production techniques that in war time had produced tanks and planes.

Simple and affordable homes were sited and mass produced in large subdivisions on the fringe areas of established communities. The company of developer William Levitt alone built seventeen thousand homes between 1947 and 1951 (Boulton p62). Architectural critics were quick to label the tract housing of the 1940's as *instant slums*. These homes were condemned as a "multitude of uniform, unidentifiable houses, lined up inflexibly, at uniform distances, on uniform roads, in a treeless communal wasteland" (Boulton p63). The homes that were produced solved a potential housing crisis, relieving congestion in the cities and providing the option of home ownership to households in all but the lowest income groups. However, many of the residential areas that were created lacked the relationships with each other and the larger community that is the difference between a collection of subdivisions and a neighborhood.

As these developments have aged, many have decreased in appeal as places of living. Suburbs decline for basically the same reasons as central cities. Their housing stock is aging, while consumers increasingly demand newer and larger units. Demographic, economic, and environmental changes have made many older residential areas seem less attractive to newcomers. Private investment has lagged, while public resources have been focused elsewhere (Levy p21). In essence, these areas are urbanizing and now face issues similar to those which for decades have characterized central city neighborhoods. Many of these 1940's and 1950's subdivisions are at a point in the urban neighborhood life-cycle where home owners begin to defer maintenance, infrastructure is in need of upgrading, and population characteristics have shifted to include unemployment, poverty, and low educational attainment. Solutions for the suburban dilemma are complicated by the unique circumstances created by urbanization and the design characteristics of the communities.
The mid-1990's also represents a significant anniversary for the concepts of neighborhood planning. The policies and events of the 1940's attracted attention to the needs of America's central cities and aging neighborhoods. Since that time, revitalization policies have come and gone; the results being the identification of the factors of decline and the creation of a procedure for reclaiming urban residential communities. Although the details of revitalization programs vary from community to community, each generally follows a standard regimen of infill construction, structure maintenance and rehabilitation programs, and infrastructure repair. Accompanying these physical programs are social policies aimed at increasing labor skills, providing child and health care, and raising incomes. In most cases, these programs are based on the historic character of the homes, family ties to the area, or proximity to central city employment sources and cultural features.

Paralleling the development of widely applicable programs for neighborhood revitalization has been an alteration of the values directing suburban development. Community has become a commodity, with many developers altering physical designs to include the front porches, alleys, pedestrian paths, and mixed land uses that contribute to the establishment of sense of place. The now declining subdivisions created in the postwar decades do not possess the features of traditional neighborhoods that are the basis for revitalization, nor due they represent an opportunity to practice the new innovations in suburban design.

This thesis is designed to answer the question of to what extent these postwar suburban communities represent a new frontier in neighborhood revitalization issues, needs, and strategies. Central to the discussion is an understanding of (1) the driving forces of the 1940's and 1950's, (2) the process of neighborhood change, (3) the concepts behind traditional neighborhood revitalization strategies, and (4) the post-modern quest to create suburban communities with old-fashioned sense of place. The development of revitalization guidelines for these communities also is dependent on the defining of the urbanization of suburbia and the application of suburban characteristics to models of neighborhood change. Strategies for the renewal of these communities require a combination of established neighborhood planning policies and the design theories used to create sense of place in suburban developments.

The Far Eastside community of Indianapolis will serve as the case study for the exploration of these issues. More appropriately described as a collection of subdivisions than a true community, a majority of the Far Eastside was developed during the later years of the postwar housing boom. In the 1990's, a majority of the housing stock will reach the age of 30 and require its initial series of external repairs, amenities updates, and capital improvements. As a whole, the area faces the increasing pressures of the process of urbanization. Dwelling units and commercial structures are in need of updating or repair, infrastructure has aged, private investment has declined, and the population has diversified. In the last thirty years, unemployment rates have increased, incomes have fallen, and populations with special needs have increased their presence locally. A result of the driving forces of the area's development, the automobile dominates socialization and the physical characteristics of the Far Eastside.

As the existing community declines, new development has continued on abundant vacant and agricultural land within the area. This new development has taken the form of high density single family homes, apartment complexes, and strip commercial facilities similar in character to those which exist presently in the area. This ongoing development places increasing pressures on local natural resources, social services, and infrastructure; compounding the effects of the urbanization process. Key to the future of the Far Eastside is the development of a revitalization plan that both encourages investment in the existing community and manages the new growth. Also significant will be the establishment of a hierarchy of place through the residents recognition of their subdivision as an element of the Far Eastside, and the Far Eastside as a functional element of the City of Indianapolis. Conditions and trends in this community are expected to result from the driving forces of the postwar suburbanization and the consequent urbanization.
Implications for the Planning Profession

The period 1950 to 1955 marked a watershed in American life as, for the first time, more people were suburbanites than residents of urban or rural communities. The process was significantly impacted by the events of the mid-1940's as a refurbished housing industry - supported by pent up demand, highway construction, and government loan guarantees - produced one million units annually. Eighty percent of these new dwelling units were in the form of single family detached homes. Many were located in the countryside; recently opened for metropolitan growth by highway construction. The result of this growth and development has been a transformation of American metropolitan life. This transformation has over-run traditional concepts of community, civic pride, and neighborhood. In spite of these radical changes, little attention has been paid by design professionals to the dilemma of aging suburbs or the implications of the alteration of life styles. On the golden anniversary of the proliferation of suburban development, designers and planners would seem to have a decreasing role in the process of community making and remaking. (Duany p7)

The decline of these postwar subdivisions provides a new frontier for the practices of neighborhood planning and community development. The circumstances of their decline also call to question several long standing ideas about how land uses and the subdivision process should be regulated. The driving forces that sponsored the development of subdivisions in the 1940's and 1950's resulted in communities governed by the needs of the automobile. They were isolated from each other and the larger community, and often described as wastelands. The housing stock, characterized by small dwelling units with few amenities, opens the door for rapid filtering in the event that other aspects of the area's bundle of services should decline. Without substantial remodeling, homes are unable to compete in the larger metropolitan market. These declining subdivisions lack the characteristics, the sense of community, the identity of place, the references to history, and the proximity to jobs and commerce that have traditionally been the basis of neighborhood revitalization. The vary separation of land uses which in part guided their development is now a serious hindrance to the redevelopment of these communities.

The physical qualities required to build a sense of community are known; smaller streets, a return to alleys and rear garages, higher densities, sidewalks and pedestrian paths, and a mix of land uses (Duany p7). These practices have been widely accepted in the creation of new subdivisions. The Walt Disney Corporation is the latest to adopt these principles, building a new community where community is the commodity. For designers, the suburban dilemma provides the challenge of applying these design principles, in combination with housing rehabilitation, economic development, and social service programs, to existing communities. While the primary implication of conditions in these areas is that of meaning for the traditional practices of neighborhood revitalization and economic development, some widely accepted planning practices are called into question. Are the current land use and subdivision regulations resulting in the creation of communities which are certain to be tomorrow's slums? How should the profession address the issues of transportation, density, and land use interaction in new developments?

Delimitations

Due to the site specific characteristics of all revitalization programs the details of the strategies proposed for the case study area will not be applicable to other suburban communities. Based on a comparison of case study versus generalized driving forces and characteristics a judgement will be made as to the applicability of a set of basic guidelines for stabilization.
Limitations

This study is limited by a general lack of literature and precedent regarding the decline of suburban communities. Although the development of these areas is well studied by historians and designers, their current characteristics are yet to be thoroughly documented. The foundation for discussing the topic, therefore, results from research on a combination of related sub-topics. Used to assemble a basis for the case study is an examination of the driving forces of postwar suburbanization, the resulting characteristics of the communities, the process of neighborhood change, typical strategies for neighborhood revitalization, and the design of suburbs with sense of place. The conclusions made are further limited by the typical shortcomings of data collection - citizen participation is influenced by a number of personal biases, structural conditions surveys are limited by the point of view of the individual(s) conducting the survey.

Hypotheses

The following hypothesis and assumptions provide the basis for the research. They serve to more properly define the primary question through the development of a set of sub-questions and sub-issues. This secondary set of hypothesis will be addressed in the process of discussing the extent to which the decline of the postwar suburban residential areas provides a new frontier for the strategies of neighborhood revitalization.

- **Hypothesis 1** - The decline of the suburban communities is the result of traditional filtering in combination with yet to be identified consequences of urbanization.
- **Hypothesis 2** - Traditional neighborhood planning practices are not summarily applicable to declining suburban communities.
- **Hypothesis 3** - The culture of the automobile created in the postwar suburban communities complicates the application of traditional revitalization strategies.
- **Hypothesis 4** - The revitalization of these residential areas depends on their integration with each other and the larger community (including industry, commerce, and recreation).
- **Hypothesis 5** - The application of the design principles for creating place in new suburban developments will be a key component in revitalization strategies.

Definitions

The following terms have either broad or arbitrary meanings and are defined as they are meant to be used in the exploration of the thesis topic.....

- **Community Character** - Describes those aspects of an area which are unique and to which residents relate when comparing this place with others. This character provides both an impression of the area and its role (uniqueness) in the larger community. In this study, community character is interchanged with the terms sense of place and sense of identity.
- **Traditional** - The term traditional is used to refer to central city neighborhoods and revitalization programs that have been developed to date. The term old-fashioned is selectively substituted for traditional.
- **Postwar** - Postwar subdivisions and suburbs are those which came into being in the period 1945 through approximately 1970.
- **Neighborhood** - The term neighborhood has several meanings, each of which is a version of another. For the purposes of this study a neighborhood is a portion of a community as recog-
nized by its residents. Although dominated by homes, this area also contains places of employment, commerce, recreation, and education. The term is further associated with a specific social environment in which neighbors interact with each other and share a feeling of belonging.

Methodology

The extent to which the postwar communities represent a new frontier for the concepts of neighborhood planning will be established through the development of a strategic action plan for the Far Eastside redevelopment area of Indianapolis, Indiana. The process developed for the case study is a combination of methods documented by Roger Ahlbrandt in Neighborhood Revitalization and Bernie Jones in Neighborhood Planning: A Guide for Citizens and Planners. Supportive material is provided by Conserving America's Neighborhoods, written by Robert Yin. The stages of the process are (1) the development of foundation information, (2) the collection of case study data, (3) the analysis of case study data/issue development, (4) goal setting, (5) plan development, (6) the drawing of conclusions and implications, and (7) the creation of guidelines for the application of conclusions. (See Graphic 1.01)

- **Foundation Development**

  Foundation development will take the form of an extended literature review. The exploration of published material documenting the driving forces of postwar suburbanization, the processes of neighborhood change, the process of neighborhood planning, and the current trends in suburban development will provide a basis for conducting the case study. The literature review will provide a generalized background of the driving forces and development patterns of the postwar subdivisions. The review also will provide a basis for determining the applicability of conclusions drawn from the case study to other declining suburban communities.

- **Data Collection**

  The Far Eastside area contains approximately 30,000 residents. A majority of the development in the area occurred in the 1940's and 1950's. The area is characterized by a mixture of single family detached residences and large scale apartment complexes, strip commercial development (along major thoroughfares), and isolated light industrial facilities. Data collection will focus on the information needed to create a listing of area strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The collection of data will take the form of a series of profiles documenting (1) area history and development patterns, (2) demographics, (3) economics, (4) land uses, (5) housing, (6) transportation and circulation, (7) community character, and (8) services.

  The history of the area will provide a description of the driving forces behind local development and the resulting patterns of development, and an examination of the systems currently affecting the community. This section will be created through the use of secondary accounts of the history of Indianapolis and the Far Eastside. The demographics profile will explore the conditions and trends of the area's population, households, age groups, racial and ethnic composition, occupations, employment characteristics, income and poverty status, and educational attainment. This data will be collected through the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Trends will be determined based on the comparison of data from 1970, 1980, and 1990.

  The community economic profile will be based on conditions and trends in area property values, industry (presence of major employers), loans made locally by financial institutions, and building permits
issued. This information is available through reports published by the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development and Indiana universities which have conducted studies locally. Land use information is also available through the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development. The land use profile will describe the portions of the community devoted to commerce, industry, residences, recreation, and public/semi-pubic facilities; and explore the relationships between those uses.

The housing profile will consist of U.S. Census data describing the value, age, vacancy rates, and rents paid locally. Structural conditions are available through the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development will also be included. Profiled will be the conditions and trends affecting the local stock and an indication of its status in the market. The transportation and circulation profile will feature a description of local street and sidewalk conditions, local street hierarchies, and the availability of alternate means of travel. Data is available through the Indianapolis Department of Capital Assets Management and the Metro Bus System.

Community character information will be gathered through field observations of the site and primary source analysis of nodes, linkages, and districts within the community. Included in the services profile will be a description of area educational opportunities, police and fire protection, and child and health care facilities.

The purpose of the data collection process is to establish an indication of conditions and trends in the area. Citizen participation will be a key element of the creation of each of the previously described profiles. This community input will take the form of interviews with community leaders based on a discussion of area strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. The bulk of citizen input into the process will be the result of the authors participation in a Ball State University Community Based Projects charrette occurring in the Far East Side and a year-long series of community planning meetings conducted by the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development.

Data Analysis

The analysis of case study data will take the form of needs and resources assessments based on the identification of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats identified through data collection. The result of the data analysis will be a community profile appropriate for the setting of revitalization goals. The data analysis will also result in the categorization of the neighborhood (as suggested by Jones) and the identification of the status of area decline (as suggested by Ahlbrandt). The needs assessment will be based on shortcomings in (1) the ability of social services to accommodate special needs populations, (2) structural and market conditions of the housing stock, (3) land use interactions, (4) strength of community character, (5) employment opportunities and private and public investment, and (6) the conditions of infrastructure locally. The resources/assets assessment will be derived from area strengths; (1) the availability of financing, (2) the quality, quantity, and availability of social and public services, (3) history and character elements, and (4) resident activism.

Goal Setting/Plan Development

The analysis of data and the identification of area needs and assets will lead to the formation of goals to be accomplished as elements of the revitalization strategy. The community goals will focus on means to capitalize on opportunities, avoid threats, and utilize strengths to counteract weaknesses. A significant aspect of the goal setting process is the matching of needs with available resources and the identification of potential new resources. The formulation of goals will translate into the creation of action steps to achieve those goals. Plan development will involve the identification of options for realizing set goals.
and the choosing of the most appropriate strategies. Appropriateness is defined by the costs and benefits of programs; such as impact and efficiency.

- Conclusion Formation

The conclusion formation step will answer the question of to what extent the postwar suburban communities present a new frontier for the planning profession. Also addressed during this phase will be the factors of suburban decline (versus traditional urban processes) as displayed by the Far Eastside, and an examination of the case study implications for the identification of a suburban urban neighborhood lifecycle. This section will also provide a discussion of the ways in which planning practices may have contributed to the decline of the community and hinder revitalization strategies.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the success or failure of the exploration of the thesis question is dependent on the extent to which the results of the case study may be applied to declining suburban communities in general. Also a factor in judging the results is the successful completion of a feasible revitalization strategy for the Far Eastside. As these postwar subdivisions; born of the American dream of home ownership, continue to decline they will demand the attention and resources of our nation's cities. The fringe of metropolitan areas is in many ways a frontier in terms of design, planning, and the defining of life-styles. These areas feature the clash between urban and rural, the debate of open space preservation, and perhaps also the revitalization needs of aging neighborhoods.

Organizational Structure

The Far Eastside Strategic Action Plan document is divided into three sections. Section one provides an overview of the characteristics of development in postwar America. This section includes the Introduction and Chapter 2 - a discussion of the driving forces of suburbanization, the process of neighborhood change, various strategies for neighborhood planning, and the most recent trends in community design. Section one is intended as a generalized background, providing an understanding of the conditions and trends explored in Section two - the profile of the Far Eastside community. Included in Section two are Chapters 3 through 8 which provide information and analysis concerning local demographics, the services available, land use and housing, economic development, transportation and circulation, and community character. Section two concludes with a resources and issues summary which serves as the foundation for Section three - the Far Eastside strategic action plan. Included as elements of the action plan are a review of local strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, a definition of area goals, and proposals for potential short-term social, economic, and physical programming. This section includes the document's conclusion, a discussion of community and stabilization tactics for suburban areas. Also included, in the form of appendices, are a historic structures inventory, a profile of local funding options, and a guide to implementing impact zones in Indiana (the result of one of the physical programming action steps).
CHAPTER 2

Background Development

Introduction

Key to the creation of a revitalization strategy for the Far Eastside and other postwar urban communities is an understanding of several background factors. As stated in the discussion of limitations, central to the development of the thesis is (1) an understanding of the driving forces of suburban growth as they existed in the 1940's and 1950's, (2) an analysis of the factors of neighborhood change, (3) a listing of the typical elements of neighborhood planning strategies, and (4) an exploration of trends in community design. The exploration of these subtopics provides a basis for addressing the conditions and trends in the case study community. They further provide a foundation for applying conclusions drawn in the case of the Far Eastside to declining suburban areas in general.

Driving Forces of Suburbanization

The most comprehensive views of these driving forces are provided by Contemporary Urban Planning, written by John Levy, The Suburbs, written by John Palen, and Readings in Urban Analysis, edited by Robert Lake. All three authors agree that, in the decade immediately following the conclusion of World War II, the primary driving force of suburbanization was pent-up housing demand (accumulated from 1930 to 1945). Households continued to be formed in those years, but the economic conditions of the Great Depression and the rationing policies of the war effort significantly limited housing construction. The rapid suburbanization, however, continued for years beyond the period required to restore an adequate supply of housing. The authors attribute this sustained growth to numerous factors. Their discussions, however, key on alterations in mortgage markets and federally funded highway construction.

Prior to the Great Depression, their was little public influence on the practices of mortgage lending. Banks protected themselves from risk by requiring large down-payments (generally one half to one third the price of the home), and only lending in the short term (typically three to five years). At the end of the term, the entire remaining unpaid balance would come due. The large down-payment and uncertainty over refinancing prevented a majority of the nation's households from owning their own home. During the depression, construction activity slowed, and the federal government identified the restoration of construction employment as a key to stimulating the nation's economy. The means chosen to increase the demand for housing was the expansion of opportunities for home ownership. The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) began to guarantee mortgages. Borrowers paid a small premium which contributed to a fund reimbursing banks in the event of default. Mortgage lending became essentially riskless for banks.
They were willing to lend 90 to 95 percent of the home's purchase price for long terms; typically 20 to 30 years. The instrument which financed the construction of much of America's suburbs, the low-down-payment, long-term, fixed-interest mortgage thus came into being. This federal policy change resulted in two related occurrences. First, the direct risk in mortgage lending was reduced. Also, secondary mortgage markets were created. Banks were even more willing to lend for long terms because they could sell the mortgages should better investments become available. During the war effort, these lending practices were only able to be applied to dwelling units for war workers, as materials were rationed and prioritized. Following World War II, the nation faced a shortage of 7 million urban housing units (So p44). Rationing policies were lifted and mortgage lending programs were extended to include Veteran's Administration (VA) housing programs. Although the impacts of this policy were delayed until the close of the war, Congress' goals of stimulating residential construction and extending home ownership opportunities were achieved on a massive scale.

The alterations in the mortgage market were radical. Banks were suddenly eager to make loans to millions of middle and lower-middle class families who otherwise would have been rejected. Families with a steady breadwinner could realistically expect to receive mortgages. The process of home ownership was further aided by the streamlining efforts of developers. Closing costs were low, and all necessary paperwork could be completed in a matter of hours. The government lending policies promoted the purchase of suburban over city homes. Young veterans and civilians alike could purchase new and yet to be built VA and FHA approved suburban homes with no down payment and comparatively low mortgage rates. In the case of Levittown, New Jersey circa 1955, new homes sold for $8,900. Veterans were required to present a $100 deposit which was refunded at the closing. Non-veterans needed only a $450 down payment (Palen p59). The purchase of existing city homes required larger down payments and took a considerably greater amount of time. Existing homes in the city required inspection to verify that they met FHA standards. This process took from one week to several months. In the case of new suburban housing, once a developer's plans were approved, all of the standardized models that were built automatically qualified. A family could drive to the new subdivision, choose a lot, put down $100, and complete a majority of the required paperwork in the course of one afternoon.

At the close of World War II, there was one automobile for every five Americans; by 1980, that figure had increased to one automobile for every two Americans. Automobile ownership increased from 25 million in 1945 to 40 million in 1950 to 62 million in 1960, 89 million in 1970, and 122 million in 1980 (Levy p19). This proliferation of automobile ownership was paralleled by the expansion of the nation's highway systems. Following the conclusion of the war, highway construction by states was increasingly encouraged by federal subsidies. This effort peaked with the passage of the National Defense Highway Act of 1956 which initiated the construction of the interstate highway system. The process of highway construction opened vast portions of the nation to metropolitan development. Practical commuting distances increased and suburban residence for city workers became increasingly feasible. Distance from the city became measured in time rather than mileage, and developers put up billboards advertising their tract developments as being "Only 25 minutes from here" (Palen p60). Non-metropolitan development sites became increasingly accessible and competitive with urban areas. In addition to residences and commercial establishments, formerly urban manufacturers relocated to non-urban areas in order to take advantage of lower wage rates, lower construction costs, and lower taxes. This exodus was encouraged by the expanded highway system which placed formerly remote areas within overnight trucking distance of metropolitan markets. By the early 1960's, the establishment of these employment centers along the beltways surrounding metropolitan areas had allowed for further residential decentralization and created the suburb to suburb commute.
Levy and Palen further add to the discussion a description of both the history of the subdivision process and the context in which the postwar construction boom occurred. According to Palen, by the time America entered World War II, the pattern for mass suburbanization had already been established. Prior to World War I, the upper class had established elite suburbs along street car lines at the metropolitan fringe. In the period before the second World War, cities were growing both physically and in social and economic importance. The development of suburbs was a significant part of that growth. By 1930 these suburban communities had a combined population of 17 million persons; a figure 45 percent as large as the central-city population (Palen p50).

The suburbs built between the first and second World Wars represented the first steps toward mass suburbanization. The growing upper-middle class use of automobiles placed a premium on living in a quality suburb, not too distant from downtown offices. The pre-World War II suburbs were built to include the best of both worlds. They appealed to personal concepts of anti-urbanism, were able to boast of their greenery, and provided an alternative for households seeking relief from growing immigrant populations in the central cities. At the same time, they offered all of the urban advantages. These advantages included cultural and nightlife, as well as municipal gas, electric, and telephone utilities. Affluent suburban residents obtained all of the practical advantages of living in the city while escaping its costs and problems. The 1930's also witnessed the expression of the American Dream, of which home ownership was an important element. As stated by President Hoover, "To own one's home is a physical expression of individualism, of enterprise, of independence, and of freedom of spirit" (Palen p51).

The result of the upper-middle and middle class movement to the fringe areas of comminutes was the establishment of comfortable suburbs. Middle class women's magazines such as Good Housekeeping advertised the benefits of such communities, describing the mythical house with the roses surrounded by a white picket fence - complete with access to all of the urban advantages. While the elite suburbs had featured individually designed, architecturally detailed homes, these new developments were characterized by more utilitarian models which were often mass produced from simple sets of plans. The homes were individualized by variations in the orientation or materials. First the street car and then the automobile had opened suburbia as a place of residence for the middle class, and simple/ moderately-priced homes were required to accommodate this growing segment of the suburban population.

The suburban bungalow of the 1930's had perfected the art of mass-produced housing long before the postwar boom occurred. Companies such as Sears and Montgomery Ward offered complete homes through their seasonal catalogs. Sears alone sold 100,000 mail order homes between 1908 and 1937 (Palen p55). Everything from plans to lumber, to fixtures would be promptly delivered to the nearest railroad station. Many of these housing retailers, including Sears, were forced out of business by the advent of the Depression in 1937. Between the turn of the century and the depression, the concept of suburban living had evolved considerably. At the start of World War II, the patterns for mass suburbanization had been established. Suburbs had already lost their status as the exclusive homes of the affluent. However, in the prewar era, most American's were still renters rather than owners and suburban living remained beyond the reach of the average household.

The rapid suburbanization of the 1940's and 1950's occurred in an environment of economic boom and great optimism. Employment and incomes were rising rapidly. The nation had more wealth to spend on land development, housing, and automobiles. Thanks to the federal programs, mortgage financing and transportation were available on attractive terms. The veterans and civilians moving to the suburbs were great in number, but also differed from the earlier suburbanites in that they represented the diverse characteristics of American society. Suburbia was being enlarged, but also ethnically, economically, and religiously decentralized.
While supporting the concept of the liberalization of mortgage lending practices and the federal funding of highway construction as the primary driving forces of the postwar suburbanization, Palen lists several additional factors. These factors include (1) the location of available land, (2) housing costs, (3) housing preferences, and (4) demographic changes.

Following the conclusion of World War II, open land for building was almost by definition suburban land. By 1950, cities had largely developed all of the land within their legal boundaries. Without annexation, any new growth would have to be suburban growth. By the end of the war, their was an extreme need for new housing, and this demand could only be met in the suburbs. Families were not fleeing the city, rather they were seeking out available land - suburban land.

Economics was also a significant factor in propelling young families into suburbia. Homes in these new subdivisions were both more available and less expensive than the homes in the city. The monthly principle and financing costs were lower in suburbia, as were taxes. Developers rarely included the extras such as city water, parks, sewers, curbs, and schools. In time, the demand for these items and the taxes required to pay for them increased in the suburbs. However, the initial costs were low and the gradually increasing quantity of services was appealing to households at the beginning of their careers who expected their incomes to increase with time.

Also, according to Palen, these new suburbanites overwhelmingly preferred single family homes set on individual lots. In actuality, their was not much of a choice even if consumers had wanted one. Apartments were not covered by the government loan programs, and town houses were not being built. In the event that there were an abundance of other options, the single family homes would have been overwhelming favorites. Some families stood in line for days to place an order for a standard tract house.

Finally, Palen suggests that postwar suburbia was caused by demographic changes. The return of the veterans and the economic prosperity created a marriage boom which was followed directly by the baby boom. The attraction of the suburbs for couples in the family formation state was an extremely powerful decentralizing force (Levy p20). Approximately 10 million new households were created in the decade immediately following the war (Palen p62). Existing housing in cities and towns was not enough to absorb this increase in the number of families. In the tight postwar rental market, these families with young children were not welcome; more or less being forced into suburbia. They required space to grow families - a need that was eagerly filled by suburban developers.

Palen describes the veterans and others moving to the new suburbs as being both great in number and diverse - as they represented a wide swath of American society. Previously, suburbia was dominated by middle-class residents apply described as WASPS's. Following the conclusion of World War II, the suburbs were not only enlarged, they were also ethnically, economically, and religiously diversified. The new residents were Catholics and Jews as well as Protestants, and they were factory workers as well as executives and managers. The suburbs were evolving to more closely resemble mainstream America, with one exception - postwar suburbs remained racially divided, with virtually all newcomers being Caucasian. African-Americans were explicitly not welcome in a vast majority of the new communities. The existence of racism introduces "white flight" as an additional element of the postwar suburbanization process. (Palen p57)

Like Levy and Palen, Robert Lake viewed the postwar suburbanization as a step in a process that began decades earlier. Lake also notes the significance of both the alterations in the mortgage markets and the federal funding of highway construction in stimulating the suburban housing boom. He contributes to
the discussion an evaluation of the process and institutional context in which these events occurred. His arguments are focused on the key actors in the postwar suburbanization process and the factors that influenced their decisions. In particular, Lake identifies large developers and the federal government as the primary players in postwar suburban residential development. The decisions of the period are viewed as being made by large operators and powerful economic institutions supported by the federal government. The average consumer had little choice in the pattern that resulted.

What was new about this postwar phase of the suburbanization process was the ability of large builders to acquire raw suburban land, divide it into parcels, install the necessary infrastructure, employ mass production techniques, and sell the finished product to large numbers of consumers. Prior to the growth of the postwar suburbs was the alteration of market conditions, the development of new production methods, and the decision by builders to develop suburban locations. In 1945, despite the fact the number of new homes required to compensate for deterioration and family growth was between 1,000,000 and 1,500,000, new construction totaled only 500,000 units per year (Lake p175). Compounding this problem were the shortcomings of the residential construction industry. At the close of the war, the business of home construction was primarily in the hands of small local firms which lacked the capacity to reduce the shortages that developed. These firms were unable to employ permanent labor forces, develop a research and marketing staff, acquire materials for bulk rates, or purchase substantial plots of land.

Between 1946 and 1947, the number of housing units produced quadrupled. In 1950, the housing industry produced more new units than in any other year in history (Lake p176). These changes were made possible by the increase in the size, number, and importance of large residential developers. In the years immediately following the war, home construction came to be dominated by large, national construction companies. The typical large builder was able to reduce costs and increase profits through the direct purchase of materials, the maintenance of large inventories, the development of more efficient subcontractor relationships, and the specialization of the labor force. This type of builder was also able to apply government financial aids and housing research to their work. Government research laboratories worked with the large firms to advance materials and equipment, develop more efficient land development and site planning processes, and establish faster and less expensive construction methods. The concepts of mass production and prefabrication, when applied to housing by these large builders, resulted in faster construction and significant increases in volume. In 1949 the cost of producing a standard house was $9,500 for a small builder and $8,750 for a large builder. In turn, the selling price of the home was $12,400 for the small builder; $9,250 for the large builder. The profits equaled 5.7 percent for the small builder and 10 percent for the large builder (Lake p177). The large builder was further distinguished from its smaller scale counterpart in the suburban orientation of the developments undertaken. The mass production techniques required large parcels of inexpensive land typically found near the city limits or in the suburban areas beyond. To these developers, the suburbs offered open/inexpensive land, free from restrictions with the promise of excellent transportation routes. The result of the dominance of these firms is displayed by the fact that suburban residential construction occurred at a rate three times that found in the central city during the immediate postwar period.

Lake also offers further analysis of the federal government's role in encouraging the process of suburbanization. He asserts that the legislation creating the loan program and mortgage insurance played a significant role in defining the characteristics of the construction that resulted. Legislators agreed that suburbanization was the preferred built form for this new construction. Although the federal housing acts contained a combination of incentives for new suburban construction and central city redevelopment, Lake views the trends in the funding applied to these two distinct aspects as a measure of the priorities of the government. The original Housing Act of 1949 authorized $1 billion for new construction loans and $500 million in grants for slum clearance and redevelopment over a five year period (Lake p183). In 1950,
Congress increased the FHA mortgage insurance expenditures by $2.25 billion, amended the FHA regulations to encourage the production of three and four bedroom homes, provided incentives for large scale and suburban construction, and reduced the low-rent public housing authorization to 75,000 units per year. This trend continued for the duration of the bill, with annual increases in the scope and scale of suburban construction financing and annual decreases in allotments for central city oriented projects. The federal government also joined with real estate firms and large construction companies in advocating home ownership. Government personnel were placed in communities to circulate brochures, conduct meetings, and organize local home ownership drives.

The various federal government programs combined to encourage small builders to grow large, and large builders to grow even larger. For the government, these large builders represented the potential for developments that would be more meaningful economically. Large builders were more readily granted credit advances and eagerly sought out by the FHA due to the large quantity of mortgages they could facilitate. FHA's overall concern for economic soundness (driven by the banks that participated in its programs) gave priority to new development in the suburbs based on the belief that central city neighborhoods were bad credit risks.

The characteristics of the individual suburban developments was also shaped by FHA policy. Planned suburban neighborhoods were made impractical by the restrictions governing the design of new homes and their placement on individual lots. The Practice of Local Government Planning, edited by Frank So, expands on Lake's description of the FHA requirements. A national minimum standard was created by the FHA's mortgages insurance requirements. This minimum was eagerly conformed to by the large developers. It specified that residences were to be located in uniform owner occupied districts, on curved streets with green front yard setbacks and two trees per lot. This pattern was further codified by its inclusion in the 1948 American Health Association publication Planning for the Neighborhood. Among the requirements set forth by this document was the condition that.....

"The usual residential neighborhood will not contain certain of the facilities regularly needed by its residents. These include centers of employment, high schools, major shopping centers, specialized health services and similar features to be found in the larger district." (AHA p8)

The resulting FHA town is described by Lake as easily identified by the failure of its design. At the time of their construction, these developments were widely criticized by architects and planners. Architectural critic Lewis Mumford labeled the suburban communities as instant slums. He described Levittown, Long Island in particular as a "multitude of uniform, unidentifiable houses, lined up inflexibly, at uniform distances, on uniform roads, in a treeless communal wasteland" (Boulton p63).

According to Lake, large builders (once established) and real estate firms became significant players in the design of legislation. In 1942, the Realtors Washington Committee was formed to represent and promote the industry's position in Congress. This committee was backed by a variety of groups representing building materials manufacturers, lumber companies, subcontractors, and prefabricators. The house builders lobby became one of the most powerful in Congress, advocating programs that facilitated the production and sale of new suburban homes. Aside from a full time Washington staff which prepared statements and organized letter writing campaigns to influence Congressional committees, the lobby spent large sums of money on advertisements to persuade the consumer of the merits of home ownership and new construction.

Lake contradicts the significance of consumer preferences for single-family detached homes as
stated by Palen, based on the fact that no realistic alternatives were available to them due to the efforts of the large home builders and federal program requirements. In conclusion, Lake asserts the belief that suburbanization prevailed because of the decisions of large operators and powerful economic institutions; supported by the programs of the federal government. In reality, ordinary consumers had little impact on the basic pattern that resulted. Postwar suburbs and subdivisions resulted from a specific decision making process and institutional context; with the subsequent problems being in turn the result of that process.

The land use and housing stock characteristics of the postwar subdivisions, as described by Lake and So (and critiqued by Mumford), are interrelated with the dominance of the culture of the automobile in the design of these communities. Peter Calthorpe's "The Post-Suburban Environment", published in Progressive Architecture describes the automobile as the defining technology of the built environment. In the words of Calthorpe.....

"[the car] sets the form of our cities and towns. It dictates the scale of streets, the relationship between buildings, and the speed at which we experience our environment. More important, the auto allows the ultimate segregation of our culture: old from young, home from job and store, rich from poor, and owner from renter."

More than anything else, the car wants to go fast, and that speed has many implications for the built environment. It requires a street system with many lanes and few intersections. It dictates the need for sweeping turns, and large parking areas. For the postwar subdivision, the devotion to the automobile had several significant effects. It resulted in a strict separation of land uses, the creation of large roads and parking areas, and the segmentation of neighbors from each other. By designing for the automobile, the large builders of the postwar era neglected the needs of the pedestrian and created communities lacking in important social interactions and sense of place.

More than any other development, Levittown, Long Island, has come to symbolize the driving forces and characteristics of the postwar suburban developments. Both John Palen and Robert Lake devote a significant portion of their discussion to the this community. Additional information on Levittown is provided by Expanding the American Dream; written by Barbara Kelly and "The Buy of the Century"; written by Alexander Boulton and published in American Heritage.

Levitt and Sons provides an example of the role of large residential builders during the postwar suburbanization. The firm was founded in 1929 by Abraham Levitt and his sons William and Abraham Jr. During the 1930's, the company built custom upper-middle class homes in suburban Long Island. The advent of World War II and the accompanying ban on most civilian construction influenced Levitt to pursue government contracts for the construction of low cost housing for defense workers. Their earliest contract called for the construction of 2,350 mass-produced homes in suburban Norfolk, Virginia. The company's experiences with mass-produced government housing provided an opportunity to experiment with prefabrication, the principles of mass-production, and home building on an unprecedented scale. This experimentation was complemented by William Levitt's experiences in the military where he learned the basics of minimal time construction techniques. By the close of the war, the Levitt company had grown in size and available capital and was ready for further expansion. They were poised to do for home building what Henry Ford had done for the automobile industry. (Lake p178)

In 1947, Levitt acquired 4,000 acres of former potato farms on Long Island; approximately 30
miles from New York City. At this site, the company revolutionized the home building industry. By 1948, the company claimed to be completing more than 35 houses per day and 150 houses per week. By 1950, Levittown was described as an "accomplishment of heroic proportions with its homes being the "deals of the century"; "the best homes for the money in the United States" (Lake p179). Levittown was not designed as an upper-middle class housing development. It was built for young working and middle class ex-G.I.'s. The finished product was a community of 70,000 persons living in over 17,000 homes built side by side in uniform rows. Each sold for a price of $7,990.

Levittown, Long Island - 1955

The development of this project was accomplished through the application of the techniques of mass production learned by the Levitt's during their war time experiences. A fleet of Levitt owned trucks would travel new-laid roads dropping neatly packaged bundles of materials at 100 foot intervals. Custom designed machines followed the trucks, digging rectangular foundations in which to embed heating pipes. Men, materials, and machines then moved passed each building site, each group performing one of 26 standardized operations before proceeding to the adjacent unit. When possible, every part and system was pre-assembled, precut, or prefabricated in a factory and assembled on site by machines designed for exactly that purpose. The entire process was synchronized, with materials reaching the site minutes before the arrival of the assembly team. The homes were built on identical concrete slabs laid out on identical 60 by 100 foot lots. Even tree planting at the site was made routine. One crew would machine dig a similar hole in front of each lot, another would drop a tree off a truckbed at the hole, and a third would plant the tree in the hole. In the words of Robert Lake, "Levitt was less a builder, more a manufacturer of homes" (p179).

The Levitts were able to accomplish this at a price below that of comparable homes, while still making a profit far greater than their competitors. The difference was the means by which Levitt organized his corporation; radically altering
conventional distribution channels. To keep costs down and to aid in the prevention of strikes, lumber for the community came from Levitt's own company. It was cut from company-owned timber by company-owned machines to the exact sizes needed for specific homes. Nails and concrete blocks were made in the company's factory, by contractors employed only by the Levitts. Any materials that Levitt could not produce were purchased in bulk through the company's own wholesale division. The entire process eliminated middlemen and markups, and drastically reduced transportation costs.

The Levitt company further benefited from an overwhelming capital position and an efficient partnership with government. Levitt possessed the largest line of credit ever offered to a privately owned home builder. He had easy access to government credit and financial aids. The company received product advances from the FHA; including commitments to finance 4,000 homes before the land had even been cleared. The purchase process benefited greatly from the incentives provided by the VA and FHA programs. For the typical $7,990 homes, veterans were required to put no money down, received 30 year loans for as little as $59 per month, and paid closing costs of $10 (Palen p65).

The final elements of Levitt's success was the simplification of both the marketing and the purchase processes. Full page ads directed consumers to a display building adjacent to the construction site. The building contained fully decorated model rooms, a scale model of the completed development, and sales people ready to answer questions and take deposits. Levitt organized the financing and title transfer process into two half-hour steps. Clerks were able to authorize up to 350 home purchases per day (Lake p180). Readily available were banks, a mortgage broker, and the construction superintendent. Thousands of FHA and VA mortgages could be arranged in a matter of minutes. For the inexperienced home buyers entering the market, Levitt offered a process easy to understand, in addition to security and reliability. In 1947, Levitt undersold his nearest competitor by $1,500 still retaining a profit of $1,000 per home.

Despite the harsh criticism of designers such as Lewis Mumford, Levittown was an immediate and overwhelming success with the public. Aside from his other innovations, Levitt also spent more money on consumer research than any other developer in history. Both community and the individual homes were designed to match consumer preferences. Just prior to its opening, young couples lined up for days to sign up for one of the homes. On a single day in 1949, 1,400 families signed Levittown purchase contracts (Palen p66). As described by Boulton, among this group were Jim and Virginia Tolley. William Levitt pointed to a plot on a map and advised the couple to buy the home he would built on that lot. He promised sunshine in the winter months courtesy of a large picture window, and shade in the summer from overhanging eaves. The Tolley's, who had previously lived in a three room apartment in New York City, bought the home. As was the case in most of the new suburbs, the homes of Levittown were not available to everyone. Like his fellow veteran Jim Tolley, Gene Burnett drove with his fiancee to explore the advertised features of the new community. The Levittown salesman refused to give him an application stating that "the builders have not at this time decided to sell to Negroes". The pattern of racial exclusion was set in 1947 when the rental contracts were designed prohibiting "the premises to be used or occupied by any person other than members of the Caucasian race." (Boulton p65)

The Levittown houses were extremely well built, being the result of the most innovative techniques and materials in existence. The typical model was small, detached, and single family in design. It included (at no additional cost) radiant heating, a fireplace, electric range and refrigerator, built-in television, and a Bendix washing machine. These features were contained in a 12 by 16 foot living room, a kitchen, two bedrooms, and a bathroom. The attic space was unfinished but offered the possibility of later conversion into two additional bedrooms. Like the auto manufacturers, Levitt offered a new model each year featuring slight variations over the previous version. Some latter additions included car ports rather than garages, and built-in closets and bookshelves.
The houses of Levittown, although uniform in original design were not, however, destined to stay that way. The population that came to inhabit them were not "conforming in every outward and inward respect" as suggested by Mumford (Boulton p63). Rather, they were individuals, with individual needs and tastes. In a very short time, their homes came to reflect these differences. What the residents of Levittown did have in common was an optimism and the capacity for economic growth and advancement. A majority of the community's residents were young couples at the beginning of their careers. As their income status advanced, some of the first life-style changes made took the form of additions to their homes. By 1957, it was widely announced that not a single Levittown home could be found that was not altered in some way.

Kelly describes the original Levitt owners as being "short on money and long on energy and ingenuity". They were young and able to wait for the fulfillment of the their unique housing needs. The houses of Levittown supplied exactly what their owners required - a start. Also provided was basic shelter and a considerable piece of land. Beginning in most cases with the finishing of the attic space, the area's original residents used their sweat equity to raise the value of their homes and their community. The home owners built sense of place and community as they helped each other add rooms and plant trees. Kelly attributes a significant amount of the socialization that occurred in the community to the exchange of tools and expertise between home owners. By 1957, the community had become overwhelmingly middle class.

As the community nears its 45th anniversary, additional changes have begun to take place. According to Kelly, residents point out a lost sense of pride in their community. Gardens are no longer maintained, and the exterior materials of homes are in need of repair. Some homes have been subdivided and converted to rental units. Both the community and its residents have aged and changed. Area demographics have come to include empty nest and extended households. Economically, most families now require dual incomes. Although the community is generally more affluent, the pioneers are approaching retirement and finding the physical and economic costs of upkeep to be serious burdens. Inflated land costs and home values have increased the incidence of leasing and extended vacancies. As stated by Kelly, Levittown and other suburbs have evolved into communities with new and often contradictory problems. Most of these issues revolve around the economics of housing.

---

The rapid suburbanization that occurred following the conclusion of World War II represented a step in an evolutionary process that began decades earlier. The suburbs lost their status as exclusively the home of the upper and upper-middle classes due to a combination of powerful driving forces. Pent up demand resulting from almost 15 years of stagnation in the housing industry in turn resulted in a the need for large scale residential construction. The logical location for this construction was the fringe area of metropolitan communities. The housing boom was further stimulated by federal government programs of mortgage finance which were originally intended to stimulate the economy. The subsidization of highway construction also played a significant role. Born of the potential need to transport war materials between coasts and the idea of encouraging commerce, these roadways were also endorsed by central city mayors seeking an increase in consumers for their business districts. These central city strategists neglected to consider the fact that the roads also lead out, away from the center. For the sake of efficiency, these federal programs favored large builders. As with any political process the lobby of the real estate industry and financial institutions was also significant in providing a direction for the housing crisis relief legislation. In setting criteria for the receipt of funding, the federal loan and mortgage insurance programs in effect establish a minimum set of design standards for the new suburban construction; design standards that profit driven private developers were content to follow. Returning veterans and civilians alike (excluding the discriminated-against racial minorities) flocked to these the subdivisions, as they were the only sources of available, inexpensive housing. For several decades after their inception, land and housing values in these communities continued to rise in large part due to the sweat equity invested by their owners. As they have
continued to evolve, however, the quality of life in the subdivisions has been negatively impacted by the automobile culture and minimum design standards that drove their creation.

Factors of Urban Neighborhood Change

The process of urban neighborhood change is well documented; with general agreement between authors on the typical characteristics of decline and renewal. Neighborhood Revitalization, written by Roger Ahlbrandt, Neighborhood Change, written by Charles Leven, and Internal Structure of the City, by Larry Bourne each base their discussions of neighborhood change on similar principles. Each work derives its factors of neighborhood change from the principles of filtering. Leven adds to this a discussion of arbitrage, and Bourne includes traditional theories of urban growth and development.

According to Ahlbrandt, neighborhoods decline because they are no longer able to attract property owners who are both financially and physically able to adequately maintain the housing stock. The downgrading of a neighborhood occurs when there is either an absolute decrease in the number of households living wanting to live in the community and/or a decrease in the economic status of incoming residents. This downgrading is usually proceeded by a combination of social, racial, or economic events that reduce the demand for home ownership and rental property. Ahlbrandt examines neighborhoods decline from an investment standpoint. He defines a neighborhood as a distinct housing sub-market. This sub-market is identified by the combination of its social, historic, political, geographic, and economic characteristics. Social aspects defining a neighborhood include the shopping and visiting patterns of residents and relatively homogeneous socioeconomic characteristics. Historical considerations are based on the presence of a unique district or the former boundaries of a self-governing community prior to annexation. Wards or council districts are the basis of political considerations, while geographic aspects include hills, rivers, or railroads. The economic elements defining urban neighborhoods are based on the delivery areas for government services. Due to the fact that the combination of these boundaries vary over time, the ultimate definition of neighborhood is provided by the uniqueness of its total living environment. Neighborhood change is defined as taking place when the outlook of residents, investors, financial institutions, and local governments concerning the future viability of the area is altered. The preferences of households are the most significant factors in both defining a neighborhood and determining change. (Ahlbrandt p6)
Ahlbrandt's suggests that, within a metropolitan area, neighborhoods compete for residents. The choices of both home owners and renters are influenced by home prices, as well as the other attributes of a neighborhood in comparison with other options found locally. Housing consists of more than just the physical unit. Housing can be considered a bundle of services defined by the characteristics of the neighborhood that surrounds the dwelling unit. Determinants of the quality of a neighborhood include (1) its location in relation to jobs, recreation, shopping, etc., (2) the availability of transportation, (3) the quality of public and private services, (4) the characteristics of the local population, and (5) the availability of preferred architectural characteristics and lot sizes. All of these factors contribute to the total livability of an environment and the value placed on its bundle of housing services. This livability is a critical factor in attracting and retaining residents and therefore has important effects on the viability of the neighborhood. Neighborhood stability depends on the ability of the housing sub-market to attract and hold stable households. The choices of these households are made based on the price and quality of the housing stock itself, and the royal quality of the living environment.

Ahlbrandt discussion has particular significance for the postwar suburban communities through his statement that "although lesser priced housing may compensate for an inferior living environment and enable a neighborhood to attract stable population in the short run, this situation may not persist over a long period of time as tastes change and additional housing choices become available". Neighborhoods that are no longer competitive will experience a decrease in demand. The households with alternate choices will move out, and those with fewer choices (typically due to lower socioeconomic status) will move in.

Neighborhoods are often considered to have a life-cycle; they experience a transition through several stages of decline. For each neighborhood, the process is unique, however generalizations can be made. Without government intervention or private sector reinvestment, the result of the downgrading process is abandonment. Neighborhood changes a very dynamic process, with the direction of that change being either up or down. At any point in the cycle, the process may be reversed or halted by government intervention or changes in the patterns of private investment. The stages of neighborhood decline, as described by Roger Ahlbrandt are as follows.....

**Stage 1: Healthy Viable Neighborhoods.** This includes new neighborhoods where new construction of single and multifamily housing is occurring on parcels adjacent to existing, well-maintained homes. The characteristics of this type of neighborhood includes a high rate of home ownership, limited ethnic and racial change, stable household compositions, a smoothly functioning real estate market (mortgages are readily available, vacancy rates are low, and property values are increasing), above average family incomes, high employment rates, and sufficient public services.

**Stage 2: Incipient Decline.** In this stage, the first outward signs of neighborhood decline, the deferral of maintenance and repair, appear. As the neighborhood ages, maintenance requirements increase because of both wear, and as a result of the unit becoming technically obsolescent. In order for a home and a neighborhood to remain competitive, remodeling is necessary. As the neighborhoods begin to lose its competitive edge, the characteristics of stage one became altered. Home ownership, income, and the sufficiency of services decline. Changes in the household, ethnic, and racial composition occurs. The real estate market loses strength; with residential properties being converted to multiple units, population density increasing, and the encroachment of other land uses.

**Stage 3: Clearly Declining.** Basically, in this stage, the conditions described in stage 2 become more significant. Maintenance and modernization become critical as reinvest-
ment has been differed over a long period of time. The rate of home ownership declines further, and these households are replaced by those of a lower socioeconomic status (most likely large families and those with single, female heads). Banks lose confidence in the future viability of investments in the area and mortgages become increasingly difficult to obtain. Property values begin to decline in comparison to the city-wide averages. Public sector services and investment decline and are increasingly unable to accommodate the expanding needs of the population.

Stage 4: Accelerated Decline. Dis-investment by both the public and private sectors increases, and the socioeconomic level of the population continues to decline. Only those households with the fewest housing choices remain in the area. The real estate market no longer functions. The housing stock is deteriorated, with increasing rates of vacancy and demolition. Absentee landlords dominate residential ownership. The structures are old, and cash flow is negative due to high maintenance costs and low rents. Municipal services are neglected, and property values fall. Also declining rapidly are population densities.

Stage 5: Abandonment. At this stage, the neighborhood has declined to the point where current land uses are not economically feasible. The only remaining residents are those with no other housing alternatives. Most buildings are either abandoned or badly deteriorated. Public services are either nonexistent or inadequate to meet the growing needs of area residents. Private sector institutions have completely withdrawn from the area. The private sector is also no longer solely capable of promoting reinvestment, as the costs of land assembly and preparation are very high.

Ahlbrandt describes filtering as the process through which existing housing (and the neighborhoods in which it is included) gradually decline in value and becomes available to lower socioeconomic groups. As households move to upgrade their dwelling unit, the existing units increase the supply available for sale in the market. If this supply is in excess of the amount demanded at the given price, then the price will decrease. Assuming that quality remains constant, this translates into improved housing becoming available for the lower socioeconomic groups. Filtering results from both new construction and the out migration of residents. Neighborhood decline is closely related to socioeconomic changes in the population that result from resident turnover.

Although neighborhood decline is usually the result of the erosion of the economic base of the neighborhood, the specific actions of both the private and public sectors may also be significant. The real estate sector may have a negative impact through aggressive sales tactics, or the selling of homes to households with insufficient experience or income to assume the responsibilities of maintenance. The expansion of neighborhood institutions, such as hospitals or educational facilities may have mixed results. In some case, these expansions result in land use conflicts and apprehension on the part of the home owners. If the services to be provided are highly valued by area residents, the growth of the neighborhood institutions will increase overall livability. The construction of highways has a similar impact on neighborhood health. In some instances, the proximity of these routes results in uneasiness on the part of home owners, in others it provides valued access to other parts of the community and encourages investment.

According to Ahlbrandt, the stabilization and improvement of neighborhood economic levels are the key to community vitality. Investment in the neighborhood is encouraged by increasing income levels which raise the demand for home ownership and rental properties. The decline of a neighborhood is the result of a loss of competitiveness in comparison to the total housing market of the community in which it is included.
A decrease in the demand for housing has a significant impact on the behavior of both home owners and investors. The factors that influence the actions and decision making processes of these two groups are the basis of neighborhood change. Home owners have both a psychological and a monetary stake in their neighborhood. The neighborhood has meaning as the place in which they live, and the home itself is a significant capital investment. Home owners remain in neighborhoods based on the strength of neighborhood ties, the direction of changes in neighborhood livability, the price of the home in the market, and the availability, price, and quality of housing in other neighborhoods. During the early phase of neighborhood decline, home owners are very reluctant to move. They are unaware of the extent of property value decline. Also, moving involves certain psychological and monetary costs that the home owners are unwilling to incur. As decline continues and becomes more apparent, the home owner is more willing to move as the household incurs the costs of decreasing neighborhood livability. Property value declines provide incentives for moving as households wish to preserve their investment before conditions decline further. Decline in adjacent neighborhoods also provides an incentive to relocate. As these households place their homes on the market, a surplus develops and market prices fall. This process allows lower income groups to move into the community; furthering the process of decline. This decline impacts not only the local housing market, but also the social structure of the neighborhood. The home owners most likely to sell are those with the fewest ties to the neighborhood (young families) and those with the greatest number of housing choices (high income households). Those that remain have the strongest ties and the fewest number of housing choices. They are often low income and have special social service needs. The households with the greatest ability to reinvest in their homes and the neighborhood relocate, leaving a population largely unable to upgrade their housing.

According to Ahlbrandt, declining neighborhoods are also characterized by the presence of investors with goals contrary to those found in stable communities. Home buyers in declining communities are often motivated by the price of the homes available. They do not intend to remain in the neighborhood for the long term and therefore minimize the maintenance of their property. This lack of neighborhood commitment also tends to disrupt the local social fabric, lessening the desire of other households to remain in the community. Declining neighborhoods also witness the purchase of homes by households lacking the financial and technical resources to maintain the homes. Investors in rental property in declining neighborhoods typically do so for speculative purposes. Do to uncertainty about the future value of their investment, maintenance is deferred. These landlords attempt to maximize their short term profits by neglecting capital expenses. In the event that cash flow from these investments becomes negative, the landlords may be inclined to abandon the property.

Ahlbrandt described the demand for housing at a given location as a function of (1) the level of income of the potential consumers, (2) the price of housing in the area in comparison to other locations, (3) the quality of the neighborhood, (4) the availability of financing, and (5) the quality of housing in alternative locations. In order to reverse deterioration, property owners must be provided with incentives to reinvest in their structures. The physical improvement of the housing reinforces neighborhood stabilization. Other signals of neighborhood improvement include the formation of block clubs and citizen groups that address area concerns. These groups serve as a stimulus for neighborhood pride and commitment.

Larry Bourne provides additional input on the theory of filtering through the inclusion of "Filtering and Neighborhood Change" by Wallace F. Smith in his book. Smith describes filtering as an indirect process for meeting the housing needs of lower-income households. As new units are built for upper income households, those they give up are available for use by the lower income groups. While endorsing the filtering theory, Smith’s article discusses the merits of filtering as a means of providing affordable housing. Included is a history of the development of the concept and its perceived impacts on public policy.
The concept of filtering is attributed to 1930 studies conducted by Homer Hoyt. Hoyt developed the sector theory for describing the growth and development of cities. As the city grows, Hoyt asserted that the fashionable residential district moves outward from the center. Homes left behind by the affluent become occupied by the poor. This process results in the formation of a wedge shaped area of residences emanating from the city's core. This wedge contains a spectrum of income groups; with the poor at the central core, the wealthy at the fringe, and the middle classes in between. Hoyt implies that the movement of the population through the housing stock is the open markets way of making use of a durable, but yet deteriorating product. Although often the subject of criticism by other scholars, Hoyt's sector theory in general and the notion of filtering in particular has stood the rest of time with few modifications. Smith's exploration of filtering are motivated by the notion that this market driven process provides homes of questionable quality to the lower income groups.

Charles Leven supports the belief of the other authors that housing is more than simply the provision of shelter, but also includes a broader bundle of services. When people buy or rent a dwelling unit, they are purchasing the right to use that unit. This includes the structure itself, in additional to the services offered in the community, accessibility to shops, jobs, recreation facilities, and churches. Also elements of the bundle are the socioeconomic status of neighbors and their housing. The amount of money a household is willing to pay for a particular home depends on its structural qualities, the scope and quality of public services, and the characteristics that define neighborhood quality. The value placed on a dwelling unit by a household represents that household's appraisal of the bundle of housing services. Leven asserts the importance not only of the household’s appraisal of the current situation, but also their expectations for the future. For households, the value placed on a home and a neighborhood is the present value of the future stream of services expected from the property. Key in this determination of value are the perceptions of households in addition to the actual conditions. The manner in which families perceive their neighborhood is more influential in their decision making than the actual conditions. More often than not, households are provided with less than complete information regarding the status of their community.

Leven's theories of arbitrage are based on the filtering of households rather than the housing units. This filtered can be active, in which case households move to locations with improved bundles of housing services, or passive. Passive filtering occurs when the bundle of services in the households neighborhood decreases. The arbitrage model resulted from Leven's studies of central city decline and is based on the idea that families are continually moving toward the urban fringe. Leven portrays the community as Hoyt did, with low income groups at the center and affluent families and stable neighborhoods at the fringe. The arbitrage process describes a series of moving boundaries which sweep outward from the center of the city. These boundaries separate income groups but also can be linked with Ahlbrandt's stages of decline. The theory of arbitrage is dependent on the mismatch of the housing market as households move in anticipation of decline. This anticipation is self-fulfilling and leads to the movement of these waves of declining neighborhood conditions. The mismatches between supply and demand allow for the transition of homes and entire neighborhoods from high to successively lower income occupancy. The transition ends with the abandonment of dwelling units as they decline to the point at which it is no longer profitable to maintain occupancy. Leven describes the suburbs as being impacted by the first of these waves of transition which have already affected a majority of the larger metropolitan community. (Leven p143)

Although a majority of the discussion of neighborhood change focuses on the process of decline, additional emphasis has begun to be placed on revitalization and what could be described as upward filtering. The works of Leven, Ahlbrandt, and Bourne, in combination with Understanding Neighborhood
Chang; by Rolf Goertz, Conserving America's Neighborhoods; by Robert Yin, Neighborhoods that Work; edited by Sandra Schoenberg and Patricia Rosenbaum, and Neighborhood Conservation; edited by Robert McNulty provide a description of the theoretical elements required for neighborhood revitalization. The authors generally agree that in severely distressed neighborhoods, significant public investment is required before the private market can be stimulated. They focus their discussions on neighborhoods in the early stages of decline; communities with stable populations and housing that is structurally sound enough to merit reinvestment.

Ahlbrandt points out that revitalization does not benefit all neighborhood households, and in some cases may have negative impacts. Increasing demands for housing in neighborhoods will cause rents to rise. This process will reduce the housing options of the lower income group households. Those unable to afford the higher rents will be forced out of the neighborhoods. Ahlbrandt states the public investment strategy for neighborhood revitalization should be flexible enough to take into consideration the characteristics of the residents. In the case of a neighborhood with a high proportion of low income rental households, objectives may be limited to the maintenance of the housing stock. In other neighborhoods, all aspects of the living environment may be the subject of investment. In all cases, the revitalization process is subject to a specific set of players. The most significant of these actors are the public sector, financial institutions, private sector institutions and organizations, and the local citizenry.

The public sector plays an important role through its delivery of neighborhood services. Public decisions to reduce programming and services in a particular area can quicken the rate of decline by decreasing the value of the local bundle of services. On the other hand, investment in neighborhoods can serve to reinforce stability. A neighborhood with good schools, abundant street lighting, well maintained streets, and available recreational facilities has a competitive advantage over areas lacking these qualities. The quality of police and fire protection, garbage collection, and code enforcement also help to upgrade and maintain community livability. Neighborhoods with abundant public sector resources have higher qualities of life than others. This quality is reflected in the market value of the property and the demand for housing. Increasing property values and high housing demand provide an incentive for reinvestment on the part of property owners. For these types of public sector investment to successfully stabilize a neighborhood, the incomes of the residents must be high enough for them to afford the upgrading of their housing. Landlords will only be willing to upgrade their units if they can be assured of the in-migration of residents able to afford higher levels of rent.

The influence of financial institutions is the result of their lending decisions. The availability of mortgages and their terms play a significant role in the ability of consumers to afford to buy a piece of property. Buyers can be excluded from the market if mortgage financing is not available or down payment requirements are high. The lack of available financing results in a reduced demand for housing and an unstable market. The ability of a property owner to receive a return on his investment is diminished, and maintenance will be deferred. The provision of home improvement loans is another means by which financial institutions affect revitalization potentials. Neighborhood revitalization is dependent on the presence of a stable housing market; one in which a willing buyer and seller can easily complete a transaction. This cannot occur if financial institutions are not able to provide credit.

The lending decisions of financial institutions are based on the characteristics of the borrower, the structure, the neighborhood, general market conditions, and the availability of property insurance. Changes in lending practices are responses to changes in those variables and the level of demand for loans in the area. Restrictions on lending activities result from basic economic conditions such as borrowers becoming less bankable (they have lower incomes or are higher risks), structures having a shorter economic life, and neighborhoods entering a stage of decline. In order to increase the involvement of private sector financial
institutions, it is necessary to either decrease risk or increase public sector neighborhood support.

Other private sector institutions and organizations, such as churches, hospitals, schools, and commercial facilities also influence neighborhood change. These institutions make location decisions based on the same principle as home owners. The decision by these types of organizations to locate in a neighborhood can serve as a basis for revitalization. Their presence helps to convey neighborhood strengths, and they can serve as sources of financing for neighborhoods improvement projects.

Citizens play a significant role in neighborhood revitalization through the pressure which they are able to place of the institutions of the public sector. Typically, higher levels of public sector commitment are required to alter private sector attitudes about particular neighborhoods. Without citizen pressure, the public sector has little motivation to alter its practices. Elected officials are most responsive to the issues that are of greatest concern to their constituents. In most cases, public policy is designed to maximize votes. The greatest public attention is given to the districts of the community which participate the most in local elections. Programs are developed which benefit the maximum number of voters. Citizen pressure is required to convince government officials to devote resources to neighborhoods that otherwise would not have been considered. These elected officials in turn are able to apply pressure to the bureaucratic city departments to facilitate change. Under normal circumstances, these city departments have a monopoly on the provision of services and are unaffected by consumer demands. Only policy changes and directives from local officials can modify their service schedules. The organization of citizen groups alone can also have a positive affect on the stability of the neighborhood. Citizen involvement is an indication of their desire to remaining in the neighborhood. Participation in these groups builds sense of community and strengthens the social fabric of the area. Neighborhood pride and sense of place is increasingly seen as a commodity and an element of the bundle of housing services by home buyers.

|||

Neighborhood decline is a process of disinvestment. Decline will occur in a given housing submarket as that area fails to offer competitive housing choices. Consumers are able to find better housing choices and investors can receive higher rates of return in other neighborhoods. In order to reverse decline, the psychology of investors - home owners, landlords, financial institutions, and other private sector organizations - needs to be altered. The filtering up process requires the intervention of the public sector through the conscientious delivery of services. Also necessary is the reduction of risk for financial institutions and the extension of private sector credit into struggling neighborhoods.

Neighborhood Planning Strategies

Although neighborhood planning strategies vary form community to community, several authors have attempted to describe the basic steps and principles of the process. Neighborhood Planning: A Guide for Citizens and Planners, by Bernie Jones, A Fragile Movement, by Juliet Saltman, and Neighborhood Policy and Planning, edited by Phillip Clay and Robert Hollister, each provides a similar outline for neighborhood planning strategies.

Clay and Hollister describe neighborhood planning as that which is concerned with generating certain physical changes in small areas through a partnership of residents and the public and private sectors. They define the major elements of neighborhood planning as those in which city's actually participate in as part of an effort to direct neighborhood development. The discussion of Clay and Hollister provides an outline of neighborhood planning based on the perspective of urban systems and processes. The elements of concern include (1) the setting of priorities and goals, (2) the allocation of resources, (3) the manage-
ment of population change, (4) models of citizen participation, (5) regulatory policy, and (6) the interaction of the public and private sectors.

In the past, the redevelopment of the downtown core area did not extend to the adjacent, traditional neighborhoods of low and moderate income families. Current neighborhood planning practices specifically focus on these traditional neighborhoods. The basis of that focus is not exclusively economic or physical, but rather is directed at the improvement of living conditions for residents in existing housing. As the process of rebuilding the core areas of cities is still in progress in most cases, this activity competes with neighborhood improvement goals for limited municipal financial resources. The choices that cities have to make require careful examination of goals and a conscientious placement of priorities. The complexity of urban neighborhoods and the urban systems affecting them require cities to identify the most serious problems, the most realistic opportunities, and the most efficient use of resources.

The practice of neighborhood planning creates new management and development responsibilities for local government. These new responsibilities go beyond the traditional custodial activities of the city departments. The complexity of the resource allocation process requires new program designs, implementation strategies, evaluation procedures, and budgeting. It may also influence the creation of new organization structures for government departments and new roles for professionals.

Unlike cities and regions, which can be defined by politics and economies respectively, neighborhoods define themselves through their social functions. Their internal systems are based on networks of social interaction, commonalities between resident backgrounds, and areas of historical significance. Neighborhood change often involves alterations in the demographic characteristics of the local population. Neighborhood planning directly involves the management of population shifts that occur as neighborhoods age and change.

Citizen participation is also an important element of the neighborhood planning process. The first neighborhood organizations to participate in public policy and planning did so through advocacy. These organizations had little expertise in management, negotiation, financing, or contracting. Their presence was often the result of the development of a certain crisis, and their involvement in neighborhood affairs tended to cease when that crisis was resolved. Since that time, these organizations have reinvented themselves in many communities in the effort to establish grassroots control over neighborhood destiny. The develop-
ment of these community development organizations is in many cases the result of partnerships between the neighborhood associations, city government, nonprofit social service agencies, and/or private sector businesses. For the process of neighborhood planning, the primary concerns revolving around the participation of neighborhood residents and groups is the representativeness of the input provided. Do the individuals composing and dominating the planning process represent the views of the neighborhood as a whole? It is important that these organizations and the plans that result for their input act in the interest of the public. (Clay p208)

Hollister and Clay also view the regulatory functions of municipal government as playing an increasing role in the planning and implementation of neighborhood programming. Regulatory tools such as code enforcement, insurance and mortgage disclosure, architectural standards, real estate taxes, building inspections, the siting of public facilities, and zoning provide an alternative to the expenditure of shrinking municipal funds. Using these regulatory powers, the city can encourage self-help for neighborhoods, provide incentives for private investments, and restrict uncooperative property owners and investors. The use of the regulatory tools in this manner in a means for cities to help neighborhoods improve themselves thorough a process that is both very influential and inexpensive.

Finally, Hollister and Clay point out that neighborhood planning (and all city planning) requires a more comprehensive investigation of how best to use financial incentives in response to the varying levels of risk that are present for private development across the community. The provision of excessive incentives leads to overdevelopment and an inefficient use of resources. Neighborhood planning requires that cities examine their residential areas and commercial and economic districts; assessing the risk present at each location. The result of this assessment is the listing of the relative opportunities and risks for private reinvestment. This information in turn, would provide city governments with a more efficient schedule for allocating resources and private sector businesses with valuable site feasibility information.

Complementing the discussion provided by Clay and Hollister is Jones' model of neighborhood planning. The elements of the planning process begin with the collection of data and conclude with the with the monitoring, evaluating, and updating of the plan. The steps in-between are devoted to the identification of issues and the development of alternatives for their resolution. The seven steps of the model area as follows.....

*Step 1: Collecting Information.* Data collection takes the form of an environmental scan devoted to the identification of area strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats.
Neighborhood planning requires knowledge of both conditions in the neighborhood and larger forces and systems that affect it from outside. The neighborhood planning process considers an area as a physical, social, and economic entity, and requires data from each of these three broad categories.

The physical data required includes that describing the features of the natural environment, the existing land uses, current zoning, circulation patterns, the availability and quality of utilities, housing stock characteristics, community facilities and services, urban design features, and general physical conditions. The social information necessary for the planning process focuses on the history of the area, its demographics, and the general socialization characteristics. Data concerning the types of employment available, the characteristics of the labor force, and the resident's purchasing power is also important. While each of these items of information is important for gaining a comprehensive understanding of the conditions and trends in the community, the greatest priority is given to information on existing land use, zoning, circulation, housing, community facilities, and demographics. This information is both the most revealing and the most readily available and quantifiable.

**Step 2: Pinpointing Issues.** Once the data has been collected, it must be organized and sorted so that community issues can be identified. An important part of this process is the categorizing of the neighborhood based on its characteristics and the role it plays in the large community. Some common descriptors of neighborhoods include outlying, mixed use, old/established, and strictly residential. Following the generalized categorization, the information must be integrated to better identify and describe the issues present. The issues developed should include problem areas, positive aspects that require support, and neutral statements describing the neighborhood. The issue statements are intended to provide a transition to the setting of community goals.

**Step 3: Setting Goals.** The establishment of goals provides a statement about the courses of action to be taken in reference to the issues that have been identified. Jones suggests the use of the PARK method of listing goals to be attained. The goal statements should provide a description of the items to be *Preserves, Added, Removed,* and *Kept out.*

**Step 4: Developing and Selecting Among Alternatives.** Following the establishment of goals, it is necessary to devise policies, strategies, and action steps in the pursuit of those goals. A wide variety of alternatives is available for the achievement of each goal. The best alternatives are those that balance results and resources, ultimately achieving the goal in the most efficient manner. The development of alternatives involves the progression from general to specific statements. Those statements include the original goals, in addition to policies, strategies, and a listing specific actions to be taken.

**Step 5: Putting the Plan Together.** The final document will include the policies, strategies, goals, and action steps developed in step 4, in addition to the baseline information collected and descriptive maps, photos, and charts. Each of these elements needs to be assembled into one coherent package in which each item adds value to the others.

**Step 6: Implementing the Plan.** The most appropriate tools for implementing the plan are the city's budget and citizen action. Basically, these tools are manifested by zoning regulations, subdivision regulations, site plan, reviews, historic preservation, the provision
of infrastructure, and the establishment of financial incentives. Implementing the plan involves a careful planning of action steps, and an evaluation of needed resources and their locations.

According to Jones, plans with the greatest possibilities for implementation include precise and specific action steps, clearly presented priorities and timeliness, cost estimates where appropriate, and alternative sources of funding. Another influential factor is the developing of commonalities between the goals of the plan and other actions taking place or proposed in the larger community.

**Step 7: Monitoring and Updating the Plan.** The long term task of planning is reinforced through the short term monitoring of and response to specific problems and issues that develop. Neighborhoods are dynamic places constantly in a state of transition and change. They are linked to the larger community by interrelated economic, political, social, and physical systems. After the plan is completed, any number of events might occur that alter the appropriateness of its goals or the feasibility of its action steps. The most useful plans are those that allow for alterations and updating should events warrant such action.

The process of neighborhood planning faces several significant limitations. First, neighborhoods are very different in each other and it is difficult to categorize neighborhoods or generalize about the approaches that are appropriate to accommodate their needs. Second, neighborhoods are social units. The status and values of the community area function of the attitudes of consumers, and planning policies need to relate to long-term resident, in addition to newcomers and absentee investors. The psychological impression the community makes on all types of investors is a significant aspect of its redevelopment potential. The third limitation focuses on the fact that ant city residents are increasingly cynical about their communities. This makes confidence building another important aspect of the planning process. Fourth, within cities are specific political ideological, racial, and class meanings associated with neighborhoods. These meanings can provide focus ad the basis for the defining of needs and boundaries. Unfortunately, they can also prevent the effective mobilization of the residents of the community. These different associations within neighborhoods breakdown attempts at cooperation by residents. The unity of the community is essential for the success of the planning process. For many years, planners have dealt only with cities, regions, or a substantive (but generalized) problem set. This perspective neglects the places in which the problems are felt and in which individuals are attempting to address the issues. In the words of Clay and Hollister, "neighborhood planning provides us with a chance to do better".

**Building Suburban Communities**

Most dictionaries define community in terms of surroundings. For some individuals it is a place where pedestrians are the focus of development, where children walk to school, where a bookstore or coffee house provides an informal gathering space, and where neighbors congregate on front porches. For others it is a feeling of familiarity, and easy access to necessities. Regardless of the definition, the capturing of his feeling has become the latest trend in the design of residential subdivisions, with developers attempting to include sense of community as a commodity. Several designers and architectural firms have gained prominence for their new town concepts that include elements of old-fashioned neighborhood in order to create communities with character and identity. These concepts are best described in *Site Planning and Community Design for Great Neighborhoods* by Frederick Jarvis, *Towns and Town Making Principles* by Andres Duany, *Creating Community Anywhere* by Carolyn Shaffer and Kristin Anundsen, and *The Geography of Nowhere* by James Kunstler.
Shaffer and Anundsen define community as a group or environment that requires members to share trust, honesty, compassion, and respect. They describe community as a dynamic entity that is created when a group of people (1) participate in common practices, (2) depend on one another, (3) make decisions together, (4) identify themselves as a part of something larger than the sum of their individual relationships, and (5) commit themselves for the long term to the group's well being. The key to the establishment of community is commitment. In the past, the groups that fit this definition were functional communities; those that support social and physical well being but not the internal dynamics. According to the authors, many urban neighborhood and small towns represent these types of communities. It is, however, increasingly common for families, as well as the growing number of singles, to have little or no daily contact with those that live only a door or two away. Earlier generations relied on family and community for different functions than they do today. Relatives and neighbors helped each other give birth in the home, looked after community children, and gave up personal ambitions to carry on a family business or care for an aging parent. Institutions and professional have taken over many of these traditionally community roles. People look to hospitals, schools, and nursing homes for care and education. They are born in and die in institutions. If they need a loan, they visit a bank. Community is no longer a given with the old characteristics no longer fitting modern realities. Shaffer and Anundson view the changes in American culture as promoting the development of conscious communities. These types of communes can develop amongst coworkers, club members, and professional and are focused on the members needs for personal expression, growth, and well being. In either case, community thrives on the diversity of its members.

The types of community that are increasingly present today are more fluid than their predecessors. They may or may not have a geographical base or a clear organizational structure. The group may be maintained despite a constant turnover of membership. The form and functions of these new communities are highly variable. Shaffer and Anundson provide the example of a neighborhood association in which regular business meetings are but a very small part of overall interactions.

According to Shaffer and Anundsen, the functional communities of the past are becoming increasingly unavailable. The new forms of community that are become available, are those of the conscious type which are better able to fit our mobile, changing society. The traditional communities provided their members with numerous benefits that are not available in many present neighborhoods. Everyone participated in a community rhythm - working, playing, and celebrating together. The sense of security and place that was found in these neighborhood resulted in a sense well being that extend to all individual members of the community.
In contrast to the observations of Shaffer and Anundsen, the other primary authors describe a need to create comfortable, affordable homes in well designed neighborhoods that include a strong sense of community. According to Jarvis, prospective home buyer value basic qualities in communities, such as identity, convenience, and safety. While tradition is important, also valued are innovation and uniqueness. These communities should include variety, interest, and choice balanced by harmony, unity, and sameness. Also important are privacy and security. According to Jarvis, the creation of a great neighborhood is dependent on balancing these often conflicting community qualities. For example, a community should be related through a common fabric, interconnected links, and consistent themes while achieving a specific identity through the presence of town squares, landmarks, and distinctive natural features. Residential neighborhoods are part of larger communities. While each neighborhood should have its own identity, it should also have a distinctive role in the larger metropolitan area. Likewise, afford ability and luxury are balanced through the provision of units at a reasonable cost that include efficient amenities, natural features, and distinctive qualities. In much the same way, tradition is linked with innovation, unity with variety, safety with excitement, and separation with convenience. Each of these attempts at balance is intended to provide for the creation of a great neighborhood and is government by the significant of sense of community and place.

Andres an Dauny and his partner Elizabeth Plater-Zybeck could be considered the pioneers in the development of suburban communities which feature small town sense of place. Some of the dominate themes for these new developments are the use of smaller lot sizes in high density settings, the provision of alleys and garages behind homes, the reintroduction of sidewalks, tree-lined streets, and front porches, and the use of a pedestrian system of movement. The use of a grid-like street system is used to slow traffic and increase the options of the pedestrian. Also significant is the mixing of land uses. Community is built through the uniting of places of residence, work, shopping, and socialization. The designs not only unite land uses, but also provides for the mixture of public, private, and semi-public spaces that encourage casual contact and the development of community ties.

The Dauny/ Plater-Zybeck designed community of Seaside, Florida (much like 1945 Levittown) is often looked on as a representation of this new direction for suburban residential design. At Seaside, each home is made of wood with peaked tin roofs and generous porches. No two homes are alike, but each shares a common design theme. Cars are provided with no special accommodations other than the option of parallel parking along the community's brick streets. The small yards are enclosed by picket fence and linked to each other and community facilities by pedestrian paths. Included is a town center which features a grocery store, an open air market, a post office, and several eating and drinking establishments. Three gazebos line the shore, providing a gateway to the sea.

The master plan was finalized in 1982. The design features a modified grid street system, with a commercial district at the center, a diagonal grand boulevard, and blocks of homes connected by alleyways and footpaths. The town center is designed to include apartments, providing affordable housing for the community, specifically the owners of shops locate below. The homes were sited in high density configurations, accenting the street as a public space. Public buildings, such as the post office, are placed in the town center and other prominent point to enhance the possibilities for casual social interaction. At some points, gazebos are placed at intersections to restrict the flow of cars and enhance pedestrian transit. Finally, the plan preserves the beach as a place for all residents.

While, Shaffer and Anundsen suggest that society no longer merits the establishment of these geotropically based communities, the rate of home sales in Seaside and developments like it would seem to provide a contradiction. Regardless of the actual ability of these types of residential developments to become true neighborhoods, the novelty of the concept is significantly affecting the direction of suburban
design. The growing popularity of these communities, in combination with the revitalization efforts in center city neighborhoods places increasing pressure on the aging postwar developments which lack the commodity of community.

Summary

The background development establishes a stereotype of postwar communities, the stages of decline, and present day suburban design. Also provided is a set of standards by which to evaluate the appropriateness of the Far Eastside as a case study. Like other postwar communities, it is expected to be characterized by a comparatively recent development history, with most construction occurring in the last 50 years. It is also expected to be characterized by convenient access to major transportation routes, strictly segregated land uses, and collections of mass produced housing. The housing stock is expected to be based on simple models, sited on curvilinear streets and cul-de-sacs. The characteristics of the housing stock will most likely include general affordability resulting from a small number of total rooms, few amenities, and the maximization of available space. Population characteristics will have evolved from the original domination of young working class couples and their children. Absent from the early history of the community will be ethnic and household diversity, unemployment, and poverty. Families are expected to be the dominant household type and youth the dominant age group.

Current conditions in the Far Eastside are expected to portray the evolution of this original community, with the diversification of the population and the maturation of the housing stock and infrastructure systems. Given the stages of urban decline, it is expected that the current conditions in the Far Eastside will include an increasing deferral of home maintenance, declines in income and home ownership, alterations in household, ethnic, and racial composition, and land use conflict. The community is also expected to display declines in both public and private investment.

Also expected to be absent from the Far Eastside (or at least deficient) are community organization and sense of place. It is likely that most residents are unaware of the role of their subdivision in the larger community. The segregation of land uses, dominance of the automobile, and lack of focal points and sidewalks will characterize a community devoid of identity and sense of community. Each of the expected characteristics - declining social, economic, and physical conditions, low-amenity housing, and absent sense of community - will have negative impacts on the overall quality of life in the Far Eastside. Further, these factors will result in a poor foundation for efforts to build that quality of life. Revitalization policies are expected to focus on the restoration of quality of life through the creation of sense of place, the rehabilitation of the housing stock, and the provision of expanded social and cultural services.
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Introduction
The current characteristics of the Far Eastside result from the combination of local occurrences and national trends. The most significant factor in the development of the Far Eastside has been local reaction to the driving forces of the postwar housing boom and accelerated suburbanization process. While this trend began nationally in the late 1940’s, its full impact was not felt on Indianapolis until the mid-1950’s and 1960’s. The area now recognized as the Far Eastside is the result of these postwar driving forces interaction with local transportation, environmental, and financial systems. The area is generally characterized by the presence of a collection of subdivisions that relate poorly with each other and the larger community. The Far Eastside is dominated by an automobile culture that has dictated land use patterns, community character, and the socialization process. In recent years, the subdivisions of the Far Eastside have begun to display the early signs of decline. Incomes have fallen in comparison to those of the city as a whole, the housing stock has aged and special needs populations have increased their presence locally.

Recognizing the issues developing in the Far Eastside, the City of Indianapolis has designated the area a priority for planning and stabilization. In the last five years, the Far Eastside Community Development Council has been formed through the contributions of the Pew Charitable Trust for the purpose of facilitating community activism and the development of a community stabilization program. While the Far Eastside shares several important commonalities with what could be termed traditional declining communities, the original driving forces of local development created a set of conditions very much unlike those which are the subject of the typical neighborhood revitalization programs.

Context
The Far Eastside is located approximately six miles east of Indianapolis’ central business district. (See Graphic 3.01) The bulk of the area also lies beyond the Interstate 465 beltway. The boundaries established by the city and the community development council are Pendleton Pike on the north, German Church Road on the east, 30th Street on the south, and Shadeland Avenue to the west. Post Road and 38th Street draw the area into quarters, serving as the primary north/south and east/west thoroughfares respectively. The Far Eastside consists of approximately nine square miles, the western most one of which is physically separated from the remainder of the community by the interstate highway. Among the significant area contextual features are the Marion County line (one mile east of the neighborhood), Ft. Benjamin Harrison, and similarly developed residential subdivisions. To the west of the community are older city neighborhoods, several of which are of historic significance.
Conditions and trends in the Far Eastside have been impacted by the complex set of city-wide systems of which the area is a part. Metropolitan systems of public education, law enforcement, infrastructure, social services, and resource allocation play very significant roles in the local community. Also important is the regional system of natural features which includes local streams and woodlots. Generally, the Far Eastside affects, and is affected by, the economic, political, and social trends that are present in the metropolitan area and central Indiana. Complicating the systems at work locally is the political environment that resulted from the 1970's creation of the Indianapolis Marion County Unigov. While essentially uniting all of Marion County under one government, many aspects of the original towns and townships remain. The northern portion of the Far Eastside, for example, lies within the City of Lawrence - a quasi independent community within the Unigov system. Other aspects of the Far Eastside political structure are the responsibility of the City of Indianapolis and Lawrence and Warren Townships. The community is served by three different school systems (Indianapolis, Lawrence, Warren Township), three different law enforcement agencies (Indianapolis and Lawrence Police and the Marion County Sheriff), and three overlapping political jurisdictions. The inconsistencies in the local political system are significant through the contributions they make to a lack of local identity. This situation also poses a threat to the process of implementing neighborhood improvement programs.

![Context: Indianapolis-Marion County](image)

### History

Obvious and expected parallels exist between the growth and development of the Far Eastside and the City of Indianapolis as a whole. Also, a majority of the area's history is dominated by the local manifestations of national trends, particularly the trends of postwar suburbanization. Warren and Lawrence Townships, in which the Far Eastside is located, remained dominated by agriculture for more than a century after
road to pass through the area in the 1840's. In 1850, the Bee Line Railroad was constructed parallel to Pendleton Pike, and together these features served as a stimulus for growth. Early physical development in the area took the form of a series of small towns that were founded along this corridor. The most significant of these new towns were Irvington (which was located approximately two miles west of the current Far Eastside boundary) and Lawrence. Despite the growth of Lawrence into a city and its expansion into the current Far Eastside, a majority of the area remained characterized by farmsteads, dirt roads, natural features, and rural character through the 1930's. (Indiana Historic Sites and Structures, p5)

As was the case for almost all of America's metropolitan areas, the immediate postwar years were a time of dramatic change for the City of Indianapolis. The depression had ended, and the local economy grew at a rapid pace. Between 1949 and 1969, factory employment in the City of Indianapolis more than doubled (Indianapolis Regional Center Plan, p34). A majority of these factory jobs were provided by large national manufacturers and corporations which located new facilities on the fringe of the previously developed area. Accompanying the increase in factory jobs was an increase in population and the demand for housing. The postwar federal policies further enhanced the appeal of the fringe area of the community, and areas such as the Far Eastside became the focal point for this new development. In the 1950's, Chrysler, RCA, Ford, and Western Electric opened substantial manufacturing facilities near the Far Eastside. The job opportunities they provided were complemented by the expansion of the facilities at Fort Benjamin Harrison. These developments altered the rural characteristics of the area and provided a driving force for intense residential development.

During the 1960's, people from across Indiana and the nation were attracted to the Far Eastside by the still expanding employment opportunities, inexpensive housing, and rural character. Subdivision after subdivision was sited and built in the area. In the late 1960's, these high density collections of ranch style homes became mixed with higher density apartment complexes and clusters of townhomes. Cul-de-sacs were the preferred street type, and the automobile was the primary driving force of community design. Throughout the period of rapid residential development, commercial growth was occurring in the form of strip-style facilities along the major area roads. Also a significant occurrence of the 1960's was the construction of the interstate highway system. The presence of the 465 beltway impacted the Far Eastside in two ways. First, it physically divided the community into two parts. Second, the junction with Pendleton Pike provided further incentives for growth. This growth took the form of strip commercial and limited warehousing facilities.

In a 1995 interview for the Far Eastside Oral History Project, a 31 year resident of the area commented on some of the characteristics that prompted her and her husband to move to the area in 1961. For her, the area was appealing because of convenient transportation, a "clean" living environment, and affordable housing. The area was dominated by young families "just starting out". A majority of the couples were in their late 20's to 30, "with each family having 3-4 young children". The resident also recalled the lack of trees that resulted from the mass housing projects and the inconveniences created by congestion on the two-lane dirt-surfaced Post Road.

Through the 1970's, the area continued to grow and prosper. Residential and strip commercial development continued and infrastructure was updated to meet the needs of the expanding population. In this decade, the Indianapolis - Marion County Unigov was created, uniting the area under one government.

The 1980's and early 1990's marked a time of contradiction in the history of the Far Eastside. RCA, Chrysler, and Western Electric closed their facilities in the area, and the federal government initiated a dramatic downsizing of Ft. Benjamin Harrison. The jobs that had served as a catalyst for growth and a driving force of prosperity in the community were gone, and the area began to undergo changes. Incomes
decreased and unemployment climbed. The early 1990's also marked the 30th year that a majority of the housing stock had been in existence. This point in the housing life-cycle is typically characterized by initial round of maintenance and upgrading needs. Many of the homes came to require at least external repairs. Also aging and in need of repair were roads and other elements of area infrastructure. Beginning in the 1970's, but becoming a significant trend in the 1980's was the introduction of ethnic diversity to the Far Eastside. Originally excluded from the subdivision process, minority groups (particularly African-Americans) began to relocate to the area in large numbers. While these changes were occurring, other portions of the area continued to develop. The southern portion of the area became the site of increased light industrial development, while the easternmost land (still dominated by agriculture) continued to be subdivided for residences.

In 1994, the Far Eastside was selected by the Indianapolis Foundation to participate in the Neighborhood Preservation Initiative. The NPI was formed by the Pew Charitable Trust for the purpose of learning how to sustain the viability of "working class neighborhoods which are relatively stable yet challenged by the same forces that threaten more distressed neighborhoods". The program focuses on youth issues, physical revitalization, economic opportunity, and crime prevention. The Far Eastside will receive approximately $1,000,000 from Pew through 1997, with $400,000 matching funds input by local agencies (NPI Executive Summary p1). Funds from this grant will be applied to the area through the Indianapolis Foundation in the form of the Far Eastside Community Development Council.

Despite the recentness of a majority of the physical development in the area, the Far Eastside does contain a number of historic sites. The Warren and Lawrence Township Historic Sites and Structures
Despite the recentness of a majority of the physical development in the area, the Far Eastside does contain a number of historic sites. The Warren and Lawrence Township Historic Sites and Structures Inventories describes 28 structures in the area as having "contributing" historic quality (See appendix). These properties are described as being built prior to 1940, but not of outstanding or notable quality. Their significance comes through the role they play in the "continuity of the area's historic fabric". The structures listed as historic in the Far Eastside are mainly the homes from the farmsteads that originally dominated the area, and select outbuildings that have remained untouched by development.

Development Patterns & Driving Forces

Development in the Far Eastside originated along the northern border - Pendleton Pike - in the form of the Town and eventually City of Lawrence. Prior to World War II, the expansion of the city southward dominated the physical development of the area. Following the war, physical development spread through the area from west to east. As new subdivisions were created, most were annexed as portions of the City of Indianapolis. From the postwar era through the present, development in the area has been dictated by the automobile. Residential construction has taken the form of self-focused subdivisions and apartment complexes. Street patterns are based on a system that fills the plotted mile squares with series of cul-de-sacs and gently curving avenues. At the same time, commercial development expanded along Pendleton Pike and occurred in nodes at the intersections of 38th Street and Post and Mitthoeffer Roads.

Current development patterns in the area have taken the form of light industrial development, continued residential subdivision, and commercial rehabilitation. (See Graphic 3.02) In recent years, the
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Shopping Centers and the Ramada Inn, Jenn-Air serves as one of the area's largest employers. Construction of new light industrial facilities in the southern portion of the neighborhood has continued through the present. Housing development in the area has taken the form of infill construction on large agricultural plots missed by the original housing boom and the expansion of subdivisions to the east. The infill construction is occurring on land near the interstate highway and consists mainly of moderately priced townhomes. In the eastern, agricultural portion of the Far Eastside, the subdivision process has continued. A majority of these new residential developments are similar in character to those that currently exist in the area. The price range for a majority of these single family detached homes is $50,000 to $90,000. The remainder of development in the area has taken the form of the rehabilitation and remodeling of commercial facilities with business turnovers.

Several significant driving forces are currently at work in the Far Eastside. These driving forces play a significant role in current social, economic, political, and physical development trends. They will also be significant in the design and implementation of revitalization and stabilization programs. These driving forces include (1) the process of urbanization, (2) the continued appeal of the area as a place of suburban living, (3) the close proximity to interstate transportation routes, and (4) the dominance of the culture of the automobile.

- Urbanization

Since approximately 1980, the Far Eastside has faced issues associated with increasing urbanization. This once agricultural and then suburban community has come to be characterized by high popula-
tion densities, congestion, poverty, crime, housing stock decline, and population diversity. This ongoing process of urbanization places increasing pressure on infrastructure system, social services, natural features, and overall quality of life.

- **Suburban Living**

Despite the decline and urbanization that dominate a majority of the Far Eastside, the eastern most portions of the community remain appealing locations for suburban living. Families and individuals are attracted to the area by the availability of open land, the family environment, and the quality of the Warren Township school system. The continued expansion of the population contributes to the stresses placed on natural resources and infrastructure in the area.

- **Transportation**

Through the close proximity of Interstate 465, the Far Eastside remains an appealing location for development due to the access to culture, entertainment, employment, and consumers that the highway provides. This transportation driving force continues to provide incentives for strip commercial, light industrial, and middle income residential development in the area. While this driving force results in increasing pressures on infrastructure and natural systems, it does provide a potential basis for economic stabilization and growth in the area.

- **Auto Culture**

Perhaps the most significant force driving conditions in the Far Eastside is the automobile culture that grew out of the factors of the original postwar suburbanization. The driving forces present at that point in the areas history resulted in a community in which land uses are strictly separated. Home is separated from work, shopping, and entertainment. The present Far Eastside community has inherited these land uses patterns and a weak basis for socialization and community building. The lack of character and sense of place that has resulted from reliance on the automobile poses a significant challenge to the stabilization process. The significance of the automobile also places additional stress on infrastructure systems.

The seemingly contradictory development patterns currently present in the Far Eastside are the result of the complexity of the driving forces impacting the area. While the process of urbanization and the culture of the automobile detract form quality of life, the access to transportation and open land provide
incentives for increased development. Capitalizing on these forces of change will be the key factor in establishing feasible stabilization programs. The presence of these particular driving forces expands the scope needed to develop a comprehensive plan for the area's future. While economic incentives are needed to encourage investment in the establish potions of the community, growth management controls are also required to moderate the impact of continued development on infrastructure and natural systems.

**Neighborhood Organization**

A large number of neighborhood organizations are active in the Far Eastside. As the facilitator of the Neighborhood Preservation Initiative programing in the community, the Far Eastside Community Development Council acts as an umbrella for the remainder of the groups. Area neighborhood and civic organizations include the Lawrence Township Citizen's Council, the Mitthoeffer Business - Neighborhood Association, the Oaklondon Community Development Association, the Warren Township Development Association, the 38th and Shadeland Community Association, the 38th and Franklin Neighborhood Association, and the North Eastside Civic Association (NECA). Each of these groups have service boundaries that include at least a portion of the Far Eastside community. NECA is the most active of these groups; organizing community cleanups and building the capacity of its staff through participation in workshops and training programs. Several of the other organizations are still in the process of building momentum and membership, and have yet to officially be recognized by the city or develop regular staffs.

Through the process of applying for consideration in the NPI, a number of city-wide agencies made commitments to the Far Eastside. Their role is expected to expand in the coming years. One example of the mobilization of city-wide agencies for the benefit of the Far Eastside occurred in 1994, as the Marion County Sheriff's Department, the Naval Reserves, and the Indianapolis Office of Youth and Family Services combined to build a new park in the community.

A wide variety of other groups sponsor events locally and play an important role in the community. These include the area's seven public elementary schools, one public middle school, one private elementary school and sixteen churches. Three of the churches provide community services such as food and clothing pantries, which each playing an important role in providing a forum for community activism. The resident associations of the Far Eastside's many apartment complexes also serve as a means of organizing small groups of area residents. Other elements of the area's organizational resource base include the Bel-East Little League and the Little League Central Regional Headquarters.

**Citizen Perceptions**

Citizen input into the planning process for the future of the Far Eastside has taken a variety of forms. The most significant opportunities for citizens to make known their perceptions of the area and voice concerns for the future have come through (1) a year long series of public planning meetings conducted by the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development (IDMD), (2) a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats forum conducted by the Indiana University Center for Urban Policy, (3) a series of interviews conducted as elements of the Ball State University Far Eastside Charrette, and (4) a series of interviews conducted as an element of the Far Eastside Oral History Project.

- **IDMD Public Planning Meetings**

A total of twelve public meetings were conducted by the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development in the Far Eastside between October 20, 1994 and October 17, 1995. Participating in the
series of meetings were a total of 51 area residents and business people. Also present on various occasions were representatives from a number of city and state agencies.

The primary result of the series of meetings was a listing of prioritized issues that participants believed should be dealt with during the planning process. At the introductory session, participants were divided into small groups for discussion and the listing of their priorities. A combined list of the issues was made, with the participants ranking each as high medium or low. Each sheet was then scored to develop an overall listing. The twenty issues with the highest concern were as follows.....

(1) lack of street lights
(2) lack of activities for youth and teens
(3) business closings/vacant buildings
(4) lack of sidewalks on major thoroughfares
(5) closing/deterioration of apartment buildings/housing
(6) need for more police patrols
(7) gang activity/other crime/suspected drug traffic at some businesses
(8) need for good planning
(9) lack of preschools
(10) need for better use of recreation areas
(11) lack of latchkey programs
(12) lack of industrial recruitment and jobs
(13) lack of child care
(14) need for improvements to major thoroughfares
(15) need to relieve congestion at 42nd and Franklin/42nd and Pendleton Pike
(16) need for better bus routes and more frequent circulation
(17) impact of Ft. Harrison closing
(18) lack of parks
(19) flooding in areas/lack of ditch maintenance
(20) need for minor rebuilding and resurfacing of residential streets

In the year following this initial introduction session, 11 additional sessions were held to expand on the priorities identified by the participants at the first meeting. The most significant issues expressed by participants fell into the general categories of youth issues, public transit, capital improvements, parks, and land use.

The discussion of youth issues focused on a general lack of activities for persons in the under 25 age group. Meeting participants recognized the unique needs of several age groups within the general youth classification. They identified a lack of child care options as a serious issue for the very young. Teenagers lacked both an activity center and activity programs. Persons 18 to 25 lacked job opportunities and entertainment facilities. The participants established the development of a year-round youth recreation center as the most important step in accommodating the needs of youth. This facility or combination of facilities was described as needing to provide both organized activities and an informal place for youth to gather. Also significant was the need to introduce youth to a variety of activities, provide an employment assistance program, and improve the transportation options to and from existing and proposed recreation centers. The participants believed that the youth issue was severely compounded by a lack of sidewalks in the area and a public transportation system that did not provide adequate linkages between the homes of the youth and existing activity centers, shopping, and entertainment. Also noted was the need to boost the pride of the youth in their neighborhood and community. One option for greater youth involvement was the establishment of a summer work program through financial contributions from area businesses.
The discussion of specific transit issues resulted in the participants expanding on observations made during the identification of impediments for area youth. It was generally perceived by the meeting participants that the public transportation system failed to link their homes with places of employment, entertainment, shopping, and recreation. Of greatest concern was the fact that persons living in the Far Eastside and working in another subdivision were required to ride the bus downtown, then transfer to another route in order to reach their final destination. In most cases, this process resulted in a 45 minute commute to work. The participants felt that this public transportation shortcoming significantly limited the employment opportunities of area residents. Compounding the issue was the lack of sidewalks in the community, which restricted the safety of pedestrian travel.

Capital improvement issues also focused on the lack of sidewalks in the area, in addition to a lack of street lights in some areas and the deterioration of residential streets. Participants also cited congestion on major thoroughfares at safety hazards at points where school children were required to cross major roadways.

The discussion of park and open space issues generally focused on the lack of developed parks in the area and the abundance of open space and natural features that could be capitalized on to fill the need. Meeting participants also discussed a general lack of recreational facilities locally, including basketball courts, volleyball courts, baseball and soccer fields, swimming pools, and places for picnicking and hiking.

The discussion of land use issues focused on the potential future use of the large amounts of yet undeveloped land located within the boundaries of the Far Eastside. Participants were concerned that continued residential growth would significantly compound the existing problems. While recognizing the economic benefits of development, residents also described this growth as resulting in a larger population, with a larger set of needs. Of particular concern was the potential for an increased population to further expand youth, congestion, and capital improvement issues.

In general, participants at the series of community meetings viewed their neighborhood as declining. While recognizing the vacant land and access to transportation as both their greatest strengths and opportunities for improvement, the participants described a need to carefully manage these incentives for growth while the community remained characterized by infrastructure and social service shortcomings. Youth and transportation related issues by far dominated the concerns of the participants. While crime was also listed as a significant issue, much of the crime discussed was perceived as the result of idle youth.

**Indiana University SWOT Analysis**

The Indiana University team developed its listing of neighborhood strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats through facilitating two strategic planning meetings with local business owners, residents, and CDC staff. A total of nine persons were involved in the process. Of the participants, two were business owners, two were CDC staffers, one was a former resident of the area and current IDMD staffer, three were long time residents, and one was the property manager at a local apartment complex. The primary strengths of the area were listed as (1) excellent access to major roads and interstates, (2) an abundance of small to mid-sized employers, (3) a sizable local workforce with high school graduation rates equal to Marion County, and (4) a high number of local employers in the construction, wholesale trade, and manufacturing economic sectors. The area weaknesses that were listed focused on the increasing urbanization the area and the shortcomings of the public transportation system. In particular, participants listed as weaknesses (1) decreasing home ownership, (2) roadways operating above capacity, (3) underserved consumers, (4) lack of youth activities, (5) a perception of crime, and (6) inadequate public transportation.
### Action Steps for 2001

**Housing**
- Move toward a balance in housing (owner vs. renter occupancy)
- Increase availability of senior citizen housing
- Improve property maintenance
- Condemn and remove burned out/vacant structures

**Business**
- Maintain current retail
- Attract additional small scale retail
- Reuse/rehabilitate existing, vacant structures
- Improve property maintenance
- Eliminate unauthorized street vendors
- Separate business use from housing

**Traffic/Roads**
- Improve road conditions/maintenance
- Improve traffic patterns
- Install new interchange at I-70 and German Church Road
- Widen north/south roads to mitigate increasing traffic

**Infrastructure**
- Improve public transportation system
- Create two "vital" neighborhood gathering places
- Create a community activity center (Boy's Club, YMCA, etc.)
- Build identity and name recognition for the area
- Encourage neighborhood-based schools

---

This listing of current strengths and weaknesses was complemented by the development of a listing of threats to future quality of life and potential opportunities upon which to capitalize. Dominating the list of opportunities was (1) the improvement of local roadways, (2) on-going residential, commercial, and light industrial development, (3) affordable housing, and (4) an abundance of available land. Threats to future community quality included the multiple political jurisdictions into which the area was divided and a lack of sense of place and community.

Also a significant element of the strategic planning session was the development of an informal work plan for the future. (See Graphic 3.03) That plan focused on the topics of housing, business, traffic and roads, and community infrastructure issues. The steps of the plan focused on "realistic", short-term goals that could be accomplished by the year 2001. Significant attention was devoted to building the capacity of the community to plan for its future, and the development of the resources and structure to mobilize responses to issues. Seen as key to this mobilization was the promotion of neighborhood needs to the city government through increased activism of residents and representation in zoning and code enforcement.
- Ball State University Charrette Participation

The Ball State University sponsored Far Eastside Community Charrette took the form of a three day workshop in the area. The event focused on developing suggestions for improving the physical elements of area, establishing sense of place, and identifying potential opportunities to build community character. The first step of the process was the gathering of community input through interviews with both specific groups and any residents who walked in on the work sessions. Some of the interviews included sessions with area youth (student at John Marshall Middle School), a property manager of a local apartment complex, a group of residents from a local apartment complex, and members of the 38th and Shadeland Neighborhood Association.

The youth group consisted of students from the Youth Council at locally based John Marshall Middle School and their advisor. They focused their discussion on the lack of activities in the neighborhood for persons for their age group. Of greatest priority for this group was the establishment of a community center, a place for both informal and organized activities. Also significant was the need for a place for youth to "hang out". According to the youth, their options for recreation were limited by small parks designed for very young children, and the distances between their homes and activity centers such as Washington Square Mall and the Ransburg YMCA. The youth group described the neighborhood as "just there" with no outstanding features or identity.

The apartment complex manager commented on a high demand for housing in the area. Currently his apartment complex contains some boarded units, however the remainder are 100 percent occupied. Listed as area strengths were affordable housing and an abundance of jobs. Seen as problems in the Far Eastside were inefficient public transportation, idle youth, and the increasing negativism with which residents viewed the area.
The residents of the local apartment complex were disturbed by the ways in which the area had changed over the past decade. Most disturbing was the loss of sense of place and community pride. These participants also were concerned with the failings of the public transportation system and declines in the maintenance of local properties. Very rarely did they participate in community activities beyond their apartment complex. They cited a general decline in the commitment of residents to the area. Seen as one impediment to the identity of the larger community were the many fences that separated both collections of single family homes and the various apartment complexes. These participants viewed the keys to the area's future as (1) the development of activities to restore the interaction and pride of residents and (2) the improvement of local transportation options.

The representatives of the 38th and Shadcland Improvement Association discussed the issues of economic development that existed in their service area. Their organization had developed for the purpose of fighting adult businesses and the perceptions that these facilities created. Their primary concerns were for the declining quantity and quality of retail establishments in the area, and the declining image of the community in the minds of city-wide investors. For this group, the area's negative image was the most significant issue, as it threatened investment and economic development.

**Far Eastside Oral History Project (Preliminary Report)**

The Far Eastside Oral History Project is an ongoing attempt by IDMD to gain a better impression of changes in the community. When complete, this project will consist of fifty transcribed interviews with randomly selected area residents. The preliminary report from these interviews consist of the observations of a long-term area resident, a short-term area resident, a local church minister, and an individual that grew up in the Far Eastside - moved away - then returned. In general these interviews provide a description of the changes that have taken place in the community over the past three decades. Important commonalities between the interviews were concerns over (1) a lost sense of community, (2) an idle youth population, (3) declining maintenance of commercial and residential properties, (4) land use conflict, (5) decreases in the quality of local consumer opportunity, and (6) the negative perception of the community that exists in the city. Those interviewed generally agreed that steps needed to be taken to restore community character, encourage property management, and improve the pride individuals placed in their community. The lack of activities and gathering spaces for the area's youth was also a concern.

Residents of the Far Eastside have been presented with numerous opportunities to provide input into the planning process. During each of these input sessions, the same issues dominated the discussion. Those that participated in the community meetings are concerned with the overall decline of their community. They perceived negative changes in community character and neighborhood pride. They are aware of a lack of activities for neighborhood youth. They are concerned about the limitations that a negative image, congestion, crime, and unkept properties place on quality of life and future private investment. In general, resident input is consistent with the idea of the Far Eastside as undergoing a process of urbanization. The issues perceived by the public are the results of the aging of their community. Based on the citizen input, the most significant issues are (1) the services provided to the youth population, (2) the development of community character and pride, and (3) the mixing of programs to encourage reinvestment in existing properties and manage the development of a current abundance of agricultural land.
Summary

The overview of the community presents a strong initial comparison between the Far Eastside and the stereotypical postwar community. Despite the occurrence of the majority of local development in the 1960's, rather than the 1940's, this growth would seem to have been driven by the national postwar trends. The Far Eastside developed rapidly due to the close proximity of transportation routes and an abundance of inexpensive, available land. Land use in the area is segregated - dictated largely by the automobile. Commerce focuses on primary transportation routes, and public parks and gathering spaces are few. The local housing stock is dominated by small efficient homes sited in high density configurations. A majority of the residential streets are either curvilinear or cul-de-sacs. While most of the subdivisions and apartment complexes were designed with their own signage and character elements, the area as a whole is, at first glance, devoid of distinct edges, nodes, or focal points. In recent years, urbanization has occurred locally, and trends would indicate that the Far Eastside has entered the first stage of neighborhood decline. Maintenance has been deferred on some dwelling units, homeownership has declined, incomes have fallen, and the population has diversified. As expected, a strong sense of community is not present locally. While residents relate to their immediate neighbors, they have little feeling for the larger community. The area includes none of the physical creators of community; no system for pedestrian movement, no strong identity of place, no mixing of activity centers, and no hierarchy of spaces.

In some respects, the Far Eastside does differ from the stereotypical postwar community model suggested by the review of the related literature. First, rather than resulting from an ongoing process by one or a handful of builders, the area is a collection of small scale subdivisions and apartment complexes. The presence of the apartment complexes adds density and diversity to the local housing stock that are not present in the hypothetical case. Second, the Far Eastside is characterized by a complex and fragmented political system that adds potential complications to revitalization programming. Third, the Far Eastside is the subject of increasing, rather than decreasing, public investment. The commitment of the City of Indianapolis to the area only promises to increase in the near future. This expanded public presence locally has the potential to stabilize the area and reverse decline. These localized conditions aside, the Far Eastside is a typical postwar development. Similar deviations from the stereotype are certain to have occurred in every metropolitan area, as the national trends combined with local conditions. Far Eastside residents were most concerned with a lack of sidewalks, congestion, inadequate social services, and a "need for good planning".
Introduction

Within every community exists a unique set of social and economic characteristics and relationships. Some of these elements represent weaknesses in the social or economic fabric that binds the community together or future threats to the integrity of that fabric. Others reveal the strengths of the area, in addition to potential opportunities for improving the local environment and total quality of life. Demographic conditions and trends present in the Far Eastside are a reflection of its development history. Visible are the family orientated, middle class characteristics upon which the area was built. Also evident are the impacts of recent declines in employment opportunities, physical conditions, and quality of life. The social and
economic functions present within the community are linked to the systems of the larger city. Local conditions are viewed in this context; with an awareness of the affects of city-wide trends, systems, and driving forces.

Due to discontinuity between the boundaries established by the Bureau of the Census and the geography of the Far Eastside community, the following profile is an approximation which includes some partial counts of split census tracts. In 1970, the Far Eastside was included as a portion of tracts 3302, 3307, 3308, 3602, and 3604. In 1980 and 1990, the area was represented by tracts 3308.01, 3602.01, 3604.02 and partial counts of tracts 3302.02, 3307, 3308.02, 3602.01, and 3604.04. (See Graphic 4.01)

Population Characteristics

Over the past three decades, the population of the Far Eastside has experienced several significant trends with implications for community quality of life. The local population increased steadily, from 26,943 persons in 1970 to 28,935 in 1980 and 29,335 in 1990. (See Graphic 4.02) In contrast, the population of the City of Indianapolis as a whole fluctuated in the three decades, declining in 1980, but rebounding by 1990. This pattern is consistent with local development trends, but does not compare with the rapid growth rates that the area experienced in the 1960's. The continued, but slowing population growth locally reinforces the concept of the community as being relatively healthy, entering only the earliest stages of decline. In 1990, approximately 56 percent of the Far Eastside population had moved in the preceding five years. Of those persons, 66 percent moved to the area from elsewhere in Marion County. Similar migration occurred in the Far Eastside in 1970 and 1980. In each decade, the City of Indianapolis experienced slightly less significant population turnover and slightly less movement from within the county.
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The population of the Far Eastside has also been consistently younger than that of the city as a whole. In 1990, the Far Eastside median age of 29.5 years compared with a median of 31.8 years for the city. This trend is largely attributable to the dominance of the under 18 age cohort in the local population. Despite the steady decline in the presence of youth locally (from 42 percent of the population in 1970 to 30 percent in 1990), this age group remains dominant in comparison to Indianapolis totals. (See Graphic 4.03) In 1970, persons under 18 represented 37 percent of the Indianapolis population. In 1990, they represented 25 percent. The significant presence of youth in the Far Eastside can be traced to the original 1960's development of the area as a home for young families. Also contributing to the age differential is the comparatively minor presence of persons over the age of 65 in the local population. The local over 65 age cohort increased from 4 percent of the population in 1970 and 1980 to almost 6 percent in 1990. (See
Graphic 4.04) For the city as a whole, persons over 65 represented 9 percent of the population in 1970, 11 percent in 1980, and 12 percent in 1990. Again, the origin of the Far Eastside community as home to young families serves as an explanation of the absence of senior citizen. However, this age group is growing in significance locally, and will require special attention in planning for the community’s future.

Another recent trend in the local population as been a general increase in ethnic diversity. The portion of the Far Eastside population represented by Caucasians decreased from almost 99 percent in 1970, to 85 percent in 1980, and 66 percent in 1990. The local African-American population registered a corresponding increase from under 1 percent in 1970 to almost 32 percent in 1990. (See Graphic 4.05) A similar trend has occurred city-wide, with the portion of the population represented by African-Americans increasing from 17 percent in 1970 to 21 percent in 1990. In the case of the city as whole, both population groups increased in terms of the actual number of persons. In the Far Eastside, however, increases in the number of African-Americans present contrasted with declines in the Caucasian population. Between 1970 and 1990, the number of Caucasians locally decreased by 28 percent, while the number of African-Americans increased by 4,867 percent. The presence of all other ethnic groups increased by minimal amounts in both the Far Eastside, and the City of Indianapolis between 1970 and 1990.

The population figures provide evidence of the process of urbanization that is occurring in the Far Eastside community. The evidence of this urbanization includes the increasing ethnic diversity, declining rate of persons under 18, and increasing rate of persons over the age of 65. The process of urbanization is by far not restricted to population characteristics. As this trend becomes more evident, the manner in
which it is accommodated will significantly influence future quality of life in the Far Eastside. Other implications of the local population characteristics include:

- the potential for increasing pressures on infrastructure and natural systems from the increasing population;
- an increasing need for policies and programs that accommodate the health care, transportation, and socialization needs of the senior citizen population;
- an ongoing need for programs of socialization, recreation, employment, education, and transportation for the significant youth population;
- and an increased awareness of cultural issues in response to ethnic diversification.

**Household Characteristics**

The characteristics of Far Eastside households reinforce the issues observed in the population characteristics. The number of households in the Far Eastside increased from 8,106 in 1970 to 11,068 in 1980, and 11,307 in 1990. Corresponding with the increases in the number of households, were decreases in the number of persons per household. That figure decreased locally from 3.34 in 1970 to 2.63 in 1990. In comparison, the City of Indianapolis also was characterized by increases in the number of households and decreases in the number of persons included in each household. Also significant locally and city-wide were decreases in the presence of family households and corresponding increases in the percentages of non-family households and single person households. (See Graphics 4.06 and 4.07) In Indianapolis, the presence of family households decreased from 79 percent in 1970 to 64 percent in 1990. In the Far Eastside, 86 percent of households were family households in 1970, compared with 68 percent in 1990. In the Far Eastside in 1990, non-family households and single person households represented 31 and 25 percent of the total respectively. The number of each household type increased for the city as a whole (with family household growth being exceeded by the other categories). However, in the Far Eastside, significant increases in the number of single person and non-family households compared with decreases in the total number of family households present.

Also a significant trend for both the Far Eastside and the city as a whole has been the increasing presence of female headed households. This household type grew rapidly in terms of both actual numbers and percent locally in the last three decades. In the Far Eastside, female headed households increased from 7 percent of the total in 1970, to 14 percent in 1980, and 20 percent in 1990. In contrast, female headed households in Indianapolis increased from 9 percent of the total in 1970, to 13 percent in 1980, and 14 percent in 1990.

The local household characteristics reinforce the observations regarding the urbanization of
the community. No longer dominant are the families that originally developed the area. The most significant household trend locally is the increasing presence of female headed households. These families are characterized by unique employment, transportation, and child care needs.

Educational Attainment

Over the course of the last three decades, the Far Eastside and the city as a whole have experienced similar rates of high school graduation. However, in recent years, the Far Eastside rates of college graduation have compared negatively with those for the city as a whole. Far Eastside high school completion rates have risen from 67 percent in 1970, to 76 percent in 1980 and 1990. For the same time periods, Indianapolis high school graduation rates rose from 55 percent, to 67 percent, to 77 percent. For both entities the percentages of persons not attending high school have decreased significantly, while the high school dropout rates have declined slightly. In 1990, 20 percent of Far Eastside and 16 percent of Indianapolis persons over 25 had failed to complete high school upon entry. Also in 1990, 4 percent of Far Eastside adults, and 7 percent of Indianapolis adults had no high school educational experience. (See Graphics 4.08 and 4.09)

The percentage of Far Eastside adults receiving at least a bachelor degree remained steady at 11 percent from 1970 to 1990. City-wide, the percentage of adults possessing at minimum a bachelor degree increased from 11 percent in 1970, to 16 percent in 1980, to 21 percent in 1990. In the Far Eastside in 1990, 30 percent of adults had received some college education. That figure increased from 12 percent in 1970 and 17 percent in 1980. For Indianapolis as a whole, persons receiving some college education
increased from 11 percent in 1970 to 14 percent in 1980, and 24 percent in 1990.

The education attainment profile portrays the Far Eastside labor force as unable to compete with the larger community in terms of jobs requiring high levels of education. However, the Far Eastside matches the city in terms of high school education rates. The most significant issue portrayed by the examination of local educational attainment is the need to provide those with some college experience a convenient and inexpensive means of completing their degree.

Labor Force Characteristics

The characteristics of the local labor force provide further indications of the process of urbanization locally. Labor force participation increased locally from 72 percent in 1970 to 78 percent in 1990. This compares with a 62 to 70 percent increase in the Indianapolis labor force participation rate for the same time period. Also increasing locally was the rate of unemployment. In 1970, 5 percent of the Far Eastside labor force was unable to find employment. That figure increased to 6 percent in 1980 and 7 percent by 1990. (See Graphic 4.10) For Indianapolis as a whole, unemployment fluctuated over the past three decades. Of persons in the Indianapolis labor force, 4 percent were unemployed in 1970, 7 percent were unemployed in 1980, and 5 percent were unemployed in 1990. Potentially a factor in the local unemployment rate is the inability of local employment opportunities to evolve with the characteristics of the local workforce. The result is a mismatch between available jobs and the skills of the labor force. Also, the labor force statistics portray the impacts of development patterns locally. In the 1970's, the local economic and employment base remained strong while that of the city as a whole weakened.

Also a significant labor force characteristic is the means by which persons reach their place of employment. In both the Far Eastside and Indianapolis as a whole, the automobile is the dominant form of transportation to work. In both the neighborhood and the city over 90 percent of laborers use a private vehicle to go to work. Also in both cases, over 75 percent of laborers drive themselves, rather than car pool. In 1990, in the Far Eastside, 2 percent of the population used public transportation, 2 percent walked to work, and an additional 2 percent worked in the home. Indianapolis displayed nearly identical figures for that year. While the use of public transportation has declined in the city as a whole (from 7 percent in 1970) it has increased in the Far Eastside. In 1970, less than one percent of the Far Eastside labor force used public transportation (compared to 2 percent in 1990). While only a slight increase, citizen input suggests that bus routes provide an inadequate link between Far Eastside laborers and places of employment; restricting the use of this type of transportation. Mean travel times to work in each decade in the Far Eastside were slightly higher than the Indianapolis figures. In 1990, the average local laborer traveled 21.5
minutes to work compared to 20.8 minutes for the average Indianapolis resident. Figures for each entity represent slight increases over those from the previous decade.

In the 1980’s the city improved its economic standing, while the Far Eastside suffered the closing of several significant employers. The loss of these jobs is also a significant factor in the increased unemployment rate. Another consideration in the examination of the local labor force is the potential impact of the closing of Ft. Benjamin Harrison. In 1990, approximately 19 percent of Far Eastside laborers were government employees. This compared with a city-wide figure of 14 percent. Labor force characteristics portray the following issues as present locally:

- Programs of economic development are needed to offset the job losses of the 1980’s;
- Programs of worker retraining, training, and skill update are needed to match local labor force skills with local job requirements;
- Marketing schemes are required to attract either the firms or the labor force necessary to create a balance between skills and job requirements.

Occupational Trends

Between 1970 and 1990, both the Far Eastside and the City of Indianapolis experienced similar trends in the distribution of laborers among occupations. In both cases, the technical, sales, and support sector of the economy was dominant in the 1970’s, with more diversified patterns developing by 1990. City-wide, the technical sales and support sector decreased from 44 percent of laborers in 1970 to 35 percent in 1990. In the Far Eastside, the same sector decreased from representing 48 percent of employees in 1970 to representing 36 percent in 1990. In general, for both the city and the neighborhood, jobs in this technical sector, as well as precision production and operators were replaced by executive and service occupations. The transition in the Far Eastside was more dramatic, with the blue collar production, technology, and operator occupations losing dominance and being integrated with service type occupations. The diversified occupational base represents a positive in terms of economic stability, but has potentially negative implications for community incomes. (See Graphic 4.11) Service occupations in the Far Eastside increased from 8 percent in of the total in 1970 to 17 percent in 1990. This compares with an increase from 12 to 14 percent at the city level. The comparatively limited number of service employees present in the Far Eastside
in 1970 further reinforces the concept of the area as depending on nearby manufacturing jobs. The closing of local factories and the transition to a more service oriented economy locally is a factor in increased unemployment. For those employees that successfully changed occupations during the economic transition, their new jobs most likely are characterized by comparatively lower wages and fewer benefits.

The process of urbanization is evident in the occupational trends locally. The Far Eastside has evolved from a suburb thriving on nearby manufacturing jobs to an urban place with a diversity of occupations, increasingly based in the service and professional sectors. As described by labor force characteristics, this occupation trend poses a threat to the community through the imbalance that is created between the skills of the local workforce and the jobs available.

Income and Poverty Status

In comparison with the city as a whole, the median income for the Far Eastside decreased significantly during the 1980's. The 1970 median of $10,719 compared with an Indianapolis Median of $10,819. Median incomes in the city and the neighborhood in 1980 were each approximately $17,400. In 1990, however, the Far Eastside median of $24,338 represented only 83 percent of the Indianapolis median income ($29,152). Also in 1990, Far Eastside per capita income ($11,840) represented only 81 percent of Indianapolis' ($14,614). Median family income in the Far Eastside in 1990 was 83 percent of that at the city-wide level. (See Graphic 4.12)

Between 1970 and 1990, the poverty rate for persons in the Far Eastside increased from 4 percent to 13 percent. (See Graphic 4.13) In Indianapolis as a whole, that figure increased from 9 to 12 percent. In the Far Eastside the percentage of persons living in poverty under the age of 18 remained steady from 1970 to 1990 at 48 percent. The percentage of persons in poverty represented by those under 18 for the city as a whole decreased from 41 percent in 1970 to 38 percent in 1990. However, while the percentage of Indianapolis poor represented by those over 65 increased between 1970 and 1990, the same figure for the Far Eastside declined. In 1990, persons over 65 represented 4 percent of the Far Eastside and 11 percent of the Indianapolis poor. In the case of each entity, the percentage of families, and female headed families living in poverty increased. The percentage of Far Eastside families living in poverty increased from 3 percent in 1970 to 12 percent in 1990. Nine percent of Indianapolis families lived in poverty in 1990, a figure which increased from 7 percent in 1970. The percentage of Far Eastside female headed households living in poverty increased from 18 percent in 1970 to
23 percent in 1980, and 33 percent in 1990. For Indianapolis, that figure increased from 17 percent to 26 percent to 28 percent for the same time periods. (See Graphic 4.14)

Income and poverty status conditions in the Far Eastside further reinforce the population and community profile that has been developed. The increased percentage of families in poverty and decreased median income display the impact of alterations in the local job market and the process of urbanization. Income related issues include:

- the need for programs to support the female heads of households - increasing education and employment opportunities through improved child care and skills updating;
- and the need to advance the job skills of employees in general and bring balance to the match up of jobs available and the skills of the local labor force.

Assessment

The exploration of Far Eastside socioeconomic conditions and trends reveals several factors that threaten the quality of life of the community. Most, if not all of these factors result from the process of urbanization that is occurring locally. During the 1950's and 1960's, the Far Eastside developed as home to lower-middle class working couples and their young children. These families were primarily Caucasian, as ethnic minorities were typically excluded from the suburbanization process. The area thrived due to the close proximity of employment opportunities. Since that time, as displayed by the demographic profile, the area has become increasingly urban in character. Population densities have increased and the composition of the population has evolved to more closely resemble that of Indianapolis as a whole. Significant local demographic trends have included:

- an increasing presence of senior citizens;
- a decreasing presence of youth, but an increasing presence of threatened youth;
- increased ethnic diversity due to a combination of the influx of minorities and "white flight";
- increased household type diversity, particularly the presence of female headed households;
- increased poverty;
- increased unemployment;
- decreased income in comparison with the City of Indianapolis as a whole.

Several population subgroups, therefore, stand out as being in need of special programs to ensure the future overall health of the community. These subgroups (or special needs populations) are (1)
persons under the age of 18, (2) persons over the age of 65, (3) female headed households, and (4) members of the labor force who were unable to adjust to the changes in the local mix of employment opportunities. While the percentage of the local population represented by persons under the age of 18 continues to decline, figures remain significant in comparison to the city as a whole. This population group requires programs of recreation and transportation. Also, despite the fact that the percentage of persons over the age of 65 present locally is less than that for the city as a whole, they have grown in prominence and will most likely continue to do so. In the near future, this group will require specialized transportation, socialization, and health care. Female headed households are in need of programs that assist the parent find employment with flexible hours and affordable child care. Unemployed and underemployed labor force members living in the Far Eastside possess the most complex set of needs. Currently a mismatch exists locally between the skills of the labor force and the jobs available. In some cases, more convenient means of transportation to alternative job sites may be needed, in others the solution may call for worker retraining and skill update programs.

Local strengths are based in the fact that the neighborhood is experiencing only a very early stage of decline. Still present is a solid core of homeowners, a comparatively large percentage of family households, and a diverse occupational mix. These factors provide a basis around which to build policies and programs aiding the special populations of the community.
Services Profile

Introduction

The process of urbanization impacting the Far Eastside has resulted in increasing needs for services. Of particular concern are the previously identified special needs populations - persons over 65, persons under 18, female headed households, and the unemployed. While the Far Eastside has an abundance of private sector consumer opportunity, the services increasingly required are those typically provided by the public sector and nonprofit groups. The community is disadvantaged in that, as a suburban area, it is not the subject area for such agencies despite growing needs. Particularly in communities such as the Far Eastside, the bundle of services provided is significant due to its expanded implications for quality of life and potential stabilization programs. Housing and therefor neighborhoods are attractive through the bundle of services associated with them. As the actual shelter and amenity values of the local housing units themselves is comparable low, the area is heavily reliant on the remainder of this services bundle for its stability. Especially significant for the Far Eastside are education, recreation, culture, consumer opportunity, and employment opportunity. It is likewise important that the extent of social services, such as child care and food pantries reflect the needs of the community's special needs populations. It is the availability and affordability of these programs that determines whether or not the threats to local quality of life become community weaknesses.

Education

Portions of the Far Eastside are included in the service areas of the Indianapolis Public Schools, the Lawrence Public Schools, and the Warren Township Public Schools. Present in the area are seven public elementary schools and one public middle school. Also a part of the community is the Faithway Christian School. The presence of three separate school districts within the community has contributed to the absence of sense of place locally and posses a barrier to neighborhood unity.

A majority of the Far Eastside's students attend the Indianapolis Public Schools. The Select Schools program employed by IPS allows parents to select the school their children will attend. Students may apply for attendance at any school in the city, with IPS providing transportation only to the facilities within the district in which the student lives. The Far Eastside is included in IPS District 3, which consists of approximately the eastern third of the city. While the core program at every school is the same, course work at each facility is based on one of several teaching philosophies. The IPS elementary schools located in the Far Eastside are Schools 93, 102, 113, 103, 98, and 105. (See Graphic 5.01) While these schools are the
closest to area students, 16 other elementary schools are located within District 3. Course work at Schools 93 and 102 focuses on a traditional reading and math program. Activities in all academic areas focus on practice, drill, and reinforcement. Also available at School 93 is an academically talented program for students in grades 2 through 5. School 113 is one of two continuous progress schools in the IPS system. At this facility, students work at their own pace, with instructor input being provided as needed. Grading systems judge the student against their own work, not that of the other students. School 113 also contains the IPS Math/Science/Technology Academy. The academy is a program which provides students with outdoor classroom experiences, in addition to the resources and flexibility to encourage invention and the use of multimedia. Schools 98 and 103 are the only basic studies schools in the Indianapolis system. Curriculums at these schools emphasize the traditional academic elements of reading, writing, and arithmetic. These schools in particular are equipped with computer labs and other items of teaching technology. The other Far Eastside facility, School 105, has an arts and science focus. While following a traditional curriculum, special emphasis is given to the arts and science. This emphasis is provided by special performances and guests and field trip experiences. Students are also instructed on the ways in which science affects the other subjects and experiences. School 105 also offers an academically talented program. Other elementary schools in IPS District 3 include curriculums based on economic education, academics and the arts, and SPARCS (each student is taught based on their individual learning skills). Additional special elementary programs offered in the district include the Center for Inquiry, the Evans Academy for Communication Arts, and Montessori and Open Concept education options.

Far Eastside School Systems

Five IPS middle schools are included in District 3. Located within the Far Eastside is John Marshall Middle School. Education at John Marshall focuses a Pre-International Baccalaureate program. Students are exposed to international events and encouraged to pursue higher education. Computers and other technologies are used in the math, science, language arts, social studies, and Spanish courses. The remain-
der of the District 3 middle schools have curriculums based on traditional teaching methods and programs.

Arlington High School, is the only high school within District 3, however students with their own transportation may apply to any of the six Indianapolis high schools. Arlington High School boasts the receipt of several awards, including those for its arts and music departments, its parent involvement, its Security Dads program, and its Student Assistant Program. Included at the facility is the Center for Computer Application which provides students with a variety of computers as well as the technology to study robotics, pneumatics, and hydraulics. Arlington also offers specialized anatomy, astronomy, zoology, and telecommunications programs. Located at the Arlington campus, is the IPS College Preparatory Academy, which is built around programs strengthening the student’s academic skills and post-secondary options. The program includes off-campus and community service experiences. Available through the other IPS high schools are programs focusing on technology, business and finance, the humanities, performing and visual arts, and aviation.

![John Marshall Middle School](image1)

![One of seven Far Eastside elementary schools](image2)

Despite the diversity of opportunities available through the IPS programs, the presence of the Lawrence and Warren Township school systems has been a driving force in the development of the Far Eastside. Issues in the IPS system include the perception of crime and low-quality programs. The Select Schools program used by IPS has been widely criticized for poor organization and transportation, in addition to the problems of removing the neighborhood focus of the elementary and middle schools. In some portions of the city, the closing of the neighborhood school has resulted in a decline in community spirit and placed a distance barrier between parents, students, and extracurricular activities.
A majority of Far Eastside students not within the IPS system attend the City of Lawrence schools which are based on a traditional education program. Indian Creek Elementary School is located within the boundaries of the Far Eastside, and Lawrence Central High School is approximately one-half mile from the area's northern boundary. The remainder of the students are enrolled in the Warren Township system. In comparison with the Indianapolis school system, Warren Township facilities are generally regarded as safe, clean, and of exceptional quality.

While social service agencies, public schools, and churches in the community provide referrals to skill update, post-secondary, and job training facilities in and around Marion County, none of these facilities operate specifically within the Far Eastside. The primary source of job training and skill update programs locally are the individual employers, which operate on an employee by employee basis.

Parks & Recreation

Several parks and recreation programs are available to the residents of the Far Eastside though a combination of public and nonprofit agencies. The Indianapolis Parks Department operates three facilities in the area. These facilities include one community, one neighborhood, and one sub-neighborhood park. Other area recreational resources include the Little League Regional Center, the parks of the City of Lawrence, and an abundance of undeveloped open space and natural features. Despite this abundance of open space, the community is underserved by its parks and recreation system, and lacks a public space for large scale community gatherings.

The largest park in the Far Eastside is 30th & German Church Community Park, located in the easternmost portion of the community. Classified a community park by the City of Indianapolis, it is intended to include programmed recreational activities, sports, and open space and natural areas. The park at 30th & German Church was acquired in 1971, and consists of approximately 40 acres. Included at the site is one soccer filed, three softball fields, one basketball court, four tennis courts, one volleyball court, and one playground. Grassy Creek runs through the site providing a water amenity. Duberry Park is located in the central portion of the community, adjacent to School 98, and has been designated a neighborhood park. It is intended to be accessible primarily by foot or bicycle and include a variety of types of recreation. Acquired in 1967, the park consist of 27 acres and includes a pond, a football field, two softball fields, a basketball court, two playgrounds, and a picnic shelter. The remaining area park operated by the City of Indianapolis is Bellamy Park, also located in the center of the community. Bellamy Park is a sub-neighborhood park acquired in 1962 and occupying five acres. The park includes a football field, a soccer field, and a playground.
Other area recreational assets include the Little League Regional Center and the parks system of the City of Lawrence. The Little League Center includes a gathering hall, a kitchen, dormitories, and several baseball fields. Immediately to the north of the Far Eastside are four neighborhood parks operated by the City of Lawrence. These facilities, however, are not within walking distance for a majority of the residents, and no safe bicycle route is available.

The Far Eastside as a whole is underserved by its parks and recreation programs. The three local parks operated by the City of Indianapolis are poorly located, and serve only households within a few block radius. The most substantial of the facilities, 30th & German Church Park is located a considerable distance from a majority of the population and is not accessible by public transportation. The nearest recreation center is one mile southwest of the community and includes only one gym. The nearest golf course is located two miles to the southwest; the nearest swimming pool is one mile west of the community.

The driving forces that guided development in the Far Eastside were not compatible with the concept of the dedication of land for public purposes. The process did, however, result in the retention of parcels of vacant and agricultural land throughout the community. Combined with the abundance of undeveloped land at the eastern border of the community, numerous opportunities exist for the development of a system of community parks. The land also presents the opportunity for the construction of a community recreation center for the provision of activities for all age groups. Currently, the community relies heavily on the Little League facility and the area schools for indoor recreation facilities and programs.

Culture & Entertainment

According to a 1995 report by Indiana University’s Center for Urban Policy, 26 entertainment establishments were present in the Far Eastside. The survey included as an entrainment establishment museums, and hobby, craft, video, and electronics stores. Also include were computer retailers and movie houses. Of the 26 local entertainment facilities, one was a museum, one was a dance studio, one was a theater production company, two were membership sports centers, and four were general amusement centers. Include in the area are a roller skating rink and a go-cart track. A majority of these facilities are located along Shadeland Avenue and Pendleton Pike and are inaccessible to most residents other than by automobile. Also located in the community are 39 restaurants and 17 bars and pubs. These facilities were primarily located along Pendleton Pike and at the intersection of 38th Street and Post Road.

Fast food restaurants dominate outside the home dining options in the Far Eastside.
Despite the seemingly large number of entertainment and dining places located within the Far Eastside, the area remains underserved by these types of facilities. Quality and accessibility are the primary issues relating to culture and entertainment locally. Of the 26 entertainment businesses, all but eight were retailers of electronics, hobby, and sporting goods. Of the 39 restaurants, a majority are fast food facilities more designed for passersby traveling Pendleton Pike than the residents of the neighborhood. Not present in the community are movie theaters, fine dining facilities, book stores, or social clubs. Offsetting a portion of the area's entertainment shortcoming is its proximity to the interstate highway system and the remainder of Indianapolis. Surrounding the community is a city rich in culture and entertainment. However, the lack of such facilities locally place stress on quality of life in the Far Eastside.

Healthcare

Based on the reports of the Indiana University Center for Urban Policy, the Far Eastside is also deficient in terms of services provided by private health care facilities. In 1995, seventeen facilities providing healthcare were located in the area. Of those facilities, two were medical doctors, five were dentists, three were chiropractors, two were optometrists, one was a nursing care facility, and one was a dental laboratory. The Far Eastside contains only one pharmacy independent of a medical or retail facility. As was the case with entertainment and dining, a majority of these facilities are located along Pendleton Pike, and are accessible to a majority of the population only by car. The hospital nearest the Far Eastside is approximately two miles west of the community. (McCormick p11)

Consumer Opportunity

Consumer opportunity in the Far Eastside follows locational patterns similar to those displayed by healthcare, entertainment, and dining facilities. The area's retail and wholesale facilities are concentrated in strip commercial centers along Pendleton Pike and Shadeland Avenue and at the intersections of Post Road and 38th Street and Mitthoeffer Road and 38th Street. Local consumer opportunity includes (1) food at home, (2) vehicle expenditures, (3) gasoline and motor oil, (4) household furnishings, (5) personal care products and services, and (6) apparel and services. (See Graphic 5.02) (McCormick p10)
facilities include supermarkets, convenience stores, and specialty stores such as meat or fish markets. In 1995, the Far Eastside contained 18 retailers of food for in the home. These retailers included fifteen grocery stores, one meat market, and two bakeries. A majority of the retailers designated grocery stores were convenience stores. Most of the facilities were located along Pendleton Pike or at the intersection of Post Road and 38th Street. (McCormick p12)

- **Vehicle Expenditures**

  Vehicle expenditures include car washes and detailing and repair shops. In 1995, there 39 retailers of vehicle related services in the community. Again, a majority of these retailers were located along Pendleton Pike. Included in the community are five auto supply stores, four car washes, three transmission repair facilities, and ten general garages and shops.

- **Gasoline and Motor oil**

  Included in the Far Eastside are nine gas stations, again with the majority sited adjacent to Pendleton Pike. In recent years, a number of the gas station facilities at the center of the community, particularly the corner of 38th Street and Post Road, have gone out of business or relocated to Pendleton Pike.

- **Household Furnishings**

  Retailers of household furnishings include those supplying interior and exterior home improvement supplies, redecorating items, furniture, and appliances. The Far Eastside is home to twelve such
retailers, including four wallpaper and paint suppliers, two furniture stores, three floor covering stores, and one upholstery shop. These facilities are located primarily in the area of Shadeland Avenue and do not include any large, all-purpose home improvement retailers. (McCormick p12)

- **Personal Care Products and Services**

Retailers of personal care products include those selling tanning, hair-care, cosmetics, and soaps and shampoos. Fourteen Far Eastside retailers located throughout the community provided such services. Those fourteen retailers included nine beauty shops and five barber shops.

- **Apparel and Related Services**

This category of consumer opportunity includes retailers of clothing and shoes, in addition to tailors and shoe repair shops. A total of nine apparel retailers currently serve the Far Eastside. A majority of these retailers are located along both Pendleton Pike and 38th Street. They include three shoe stores and six clothing stores. A majority of the clothing stores specialize in women’s apparel. (McCormick p12)

## Employment Opportunities

Included in and around the Far Eastside are a number of firms from a variety of industrial sectors. In 1995, Purdue University surveyed those firms to gauge local employment opportunity and issues. The Purdue survey sampled firms from three geographic areas of the community - the interior, the south side industrial park, and the Pendleton Pike/ Shadeland Avenue commercial corridor. A total of 94 surveys were completed, 41 from the industrial park, 28 from the interior, and 25 from the Shadeland/ Pendleton Pike corridor. The survey found a combination of full and part time employment in the area, with part time employment dominating service type firms and full time employment dominating manufacturers and wholesale. The average wage rate for the manufacturing, service, and wholesale employers was approximately $8 per hour. Retail employees averaged $5.72 per hour.

![Jenn-air - a leading Far Eastside employer](image)

The manufacturing, service, and wholesale firms were the most stable in terms of employee turnover. These firms also employed the lowest percentage of local residents. Of those employed by the manufacturing sector, 25 percent resided in the Far Eastside. This compares with 71 percent of retail employees, 58 percent of service employees, and 23 percent of wholesale employees. Most businesses surveyed expected to hire new employees during the course of 1996 primarily due to general job turnover. In greatest demand by all firms will be general laborers, clerks, and sales personnel. Thirteen of the firms
surveyed expected to hire managerial or supervisory personnel. A majority of the positions becoming available offer entry level wages and benefits. Positions in the retail sector include as benefits employee discounts and profit sharing. Benefits offered by manufacturers and wholesalers included life, health, and dental insurance, sick days, and retirement plans.

Each firm surveyed described hiring programs that accepted applicants from any geographic area, with no preferences given for Far Eastside residents. Included by firms surveyed as problems with hiring locally were a general lack of education, lack of dependability, high turnover rates, and a lack of experience. The dominant qualifications for employment in all sectors and all geographic locations were (1) attitude and work ethic, (2) math and reading ability, (3) technical degrees, (4) experience, and (5) a computer background.

Social Services

The social service needs of Far Eastside residents are accommodated by organizations at the city, community, and local level. Groups such as the United Way, as well as the city, state, and federal governments fund hundreds of services that provide for all residents of the City of Indianapolis. City-wide programs are available to provide items from infant clothing to adult education, counseling to health care, and food stuffs to legal services. Many, if not most, of these programs and facilities operate on sliding fee sales to accommodate those in need. The United Way annually updates and makes available a list of services to aid residents in meeting their needs. Most of these services are coordinated either through the Community Centers of Indianapolis (CCI) or neighborhood centers and churches. In the Far Eastside, a majority of social programs are administered either through the Greenleaf or Forest Manor branches of CCI, local churches, or the Metro Advocacy Ministry.

Community Centers of Indianapolis is a nonprofit organization which coordinates the delivery of social services through fourteen multi-service and community centers in the Indianapolis area. Each CCI center has boundaries defining the area which it serves. While most services are limited to the residents of the area, some specialized services such as substance abuse counseling, employment assistance, and day care are available to any Marion County resident meeting eligibility criteria. Many of the centers also provide space to other service providers who serve neighborhood clients. Located at 3724 Mithoeffer Road, Greenleaf Community Center’s service boundaries are 56th Street and the City of Lawrence line of incorporation to the north, Washington Street to the south, County Line Road to the east, and I-465 to the west. The Greenleaf service center opened in 1986 and has since expanded from two employees to seven full-time staff members.

CCI programs available through the Greenleaf center include access to case management and emergency assistance, senior social involvement, and senior hot lunch. The case management program assists persons dealing with interpersonal, economic, and environmental problems and develops a service plan to meet long term needs. Included as elements of case management are income management, housing, education, employment, and medical care. The Greenleaf emergency assistance program supports the basic human needs of local residents by subsidizing food, clothing, shelter, and utilities on an emergency only basis. For the area’s seniors, the center provides daily social programs which include arts and crafts, music, community service projects, bingo, grocery shopping expeditions, and other excursions and outings. Also provided by the center are on-site meals during the lunch hour. Co-located at the Greenleaf center are juvenile probation, budget counseling, tax preparation assistance, career advancement training services (GED), Youth Substance Abuse Prevention Services, and the Marion County Cooperative Extension Services. Greenleaf also operates a food pantry and referral services to area churches. Of those churches, Calvary Temple, Oaklendon Christian, and Old Bethel Methodist operate food pantries.
The portion of the Far Eastside located west of Interstate 465 lies within the service boundary of the Forest Manor Multi-Service Center. Forest Manor offers programs similar to Greenleaf in terms of case management, emergency assistance, and senior social involvement. Also offered at this center is a program of school age child care. This program includes a latchkey program before and after school May through September and a summer day camp during June through August. The program provides supervised care for the children of parents who are working, in school, or in a training program. Co-located at the Forest Manor facility are food stamp application services, the Family Service Association, Tax Preparation Assistance, G.E.D. classes by IPS, and Student Fellowship application services. Also available at the center is a food pantry.

Also active locally are the Catholic Social Service and the Metro Advocacy Ministry. The Metro Advocate Ministry is a city-wide organization founded in 1985 to assist families and individuals with social service needs. MAM is founded through donations, the United Way, and a variety of grants. The agency acts as an advocate for struggling families with utility companies, social service providers, housing providers and landlords, health care providers, and legal services. Life enhancement skills training is provided by MAM through cooking and nutrition classes, parenting skills workshops, and money management classes. The agency provides transportation and child care for participants. Catholic Social Services, also a city-wide agency provides emergency bill assistance and operates a clothing pantry in the local community.

Public Services

Public services include police and fire protection and postal and library services. In the Far Eastside, these services are provided by a variety of agencies dictated by the three political jurisdictions into which the
community is divided. In every case, the division of these services has a negative impact on their quality and the social linkages within the community. Police protection is provided by a combination of the Indianapolis Police Department, the Lawrence Police Department, and the Marion County Sheriff. The portion of the community included in the City of Indianapolis participates in the community-based policing program and has been assigned a liaison officer. The remainder of the Far Eastside is patroled based on the regular schedules of the policing agencies. Similarly, the area is divided between the Indianapolis Fire Department, the Lawrence Fire Department, and the Warren Township Fire Department. IFD station 34 is located in the area - on Franklin Road south of 34th Street. Lawrence Station 1 is located approximately one half block north of the community, also on Franklin Road. Two of Warren Township’s fire stations are located immediately south of the community. Station 44 is located on 30th Street east of Shadeland; Station 45 is also on 30th Street, east of Mitthoeffer Road. No public libraries are located within the community. In the vicinity, however, is the Lawrence branch of the Indianapolis Public Library at 7898 Hague Road and the Warren branch of the IPL located at 9701 East 21st Street. Also absent from the area is a branch post office. The nearest post offices are in Lawrence at 4430 N. McCoy and approximately one-half mile northeast of the community in Oaklandon at 11825 Broadway.

Assessment

The profile reveals the presence of significant shortcomings in the local bundle of services. Areas attractive to private investment are those which maintain a high quality of life. That quality is measured in large part through the services provided locally. The Far Eastside, in particular is susceptible to declines in the bundle of services due to the weaknesses in the shelter value of its housing stock.

Particularly significant in the case of the Far Eastside are the shortcomings in parks and recreation, consumer opportunity, healthcare, and employment opportunity. The absence of adequate park space and recreation programs locally is an obstacle to the development of community character. However, the same driving forces that were responsible for the lack of developed parks locally have also provided a potential solution in the abundance of undeveloped land that remains throughout the community. The land resources are available locally for the creation of a large regional park or a network of neighborhood parks.

Consumer opportunity shortcomings focus on the absence of retailers of higher order goods in the area. A majority of consumer facilities are strip-style and designed for automobile traffic. Most significant is the absence of clothing, home improvement, and home furnishing stores. The retail establishments that are present locally supply mainly lower order goods, are of questionable quality, and are accessible only by car for a majority of residents. No true community or neighborhood shopping centers are present in the Far Eastside. Similar issues exist in the health care and culture/entertainment service areas. The approximately 30 thousand residents of the Far Eastside are served by a total of one pharmacy and two doctors. Likewise, entertainment is limited to a go-cart track and roller skating rink. No community health centers or fine dining or cultural experiences can be found locally.

For a community originally built around an abundance of employment opportunities, the absence of such opportunities now represents a serious threat to area stability and decreases the incentives for private investment. Job opportunities available locally are primarily dependent on regular turnover. The positions that are available are typically entry level with comparatively low wages and small benefit packages.

The shortcomings in social services locally increase the significance of the presence of the special needs populations. The only recreational options for youth in the area result from the IPS Bridges to Success program which opens John Marshall Middle School athletic facilities after school hours, during the
summer, and on weekends. Despite the availability of numerous programs for youth available through the Community Centers of Indianapolis, the Greenleaf Center lacks both the facilities and the staff to add these programs locally. An evaluation of the role played locally by Greenleaf will be essential for solving local social service issues. Expanded programs and facilities will be musts in any future neighborhood planning. As with youth services, a variety of programs beneficial to the female heads of households and the unemployed have been designed by CCI, but not implemented through Greenleaf due to a lack of facilities and staff. The female-headed households are in desperate need of programs assisting with locating employment and child care. They are significantly impacted by the presence of only one facility for child care locally. The unemployed are in need of programs that will help modify their skills to become compatible with the jobs available locally. The one positive aspect of the area's social services was the availability of programs for the senior citizens. Growing in prominence locally, this group will require an increase in programs directed toward their needs. The lunch, socialization, and transportation programs currently in place will provide a basis for serving the future needs of the senior population.
Land Use & Housing Profile

Introduction

The Far Eastside contains approximately 5,800 acres of land; with the three most prominent uses being single family residences, agriculture, and vacant land. Together, these three land uses represent 3,944 acres, or 69 percent of the Far Eastside. Single family residences alone account for 1,972 acres (34 percent). Of the remaining land, 11 percent is devoted to medium density residential uses (apartment complexes), 7 percent is light industrial, 6 percent is commercial, 3 percent is in special use (churches and schools), 3 percent is in park space, and less than one percent is utilized by heavy industry, office space, and duplex residences. The land uses of the Far Eastside represent thirty-one different zoning classifications (See Graphics 6.01, 6.02).

Current land use patterns in the community are reflective of the development patterns and driving forces that originally shaped the Far Eastside. Commercial uses form a corridor along Pendleton Pike and Shadeland Avenue. Clusters of commercial activity are also found at the primary intersections in the interior of the community. Light industrial facilities occupy the southern portion of the area between Franklin and Mitthoeffer Roads. The easternmost quarter of the area is largely undeveloped and dominated by agricultural uses. Significant plots of vacant and agricultural land are also dispersed throughout the interior of the community - passed over by the original development boom. The remainder of the area is residential - a collection of subdivisions of single family detached homes and apartment complexes. The
northernmost portion of the Far Eastside is dominated by mobile home parks.

The primary land use issue in the Far Eastside is the need to provide incentives for the improvement of existing properties while managing the development of vacant and agricultural land. The combined vacant and agricultural properties represent 2,030 acres of developable land. Unmanaged development on this property will place increased pressures on local infrastructure and natural systems. Other significant land use issues include poor physical relationships between the various uses, particularly the light industrial and residential uses in the southern portion of the community, and an absence of developed park space.

![Land Use Map]

**Land Use**

Residential/Housing

Residences are the most significant land use in the Far Eastside in terms of both their physical presence and their implications for social and economic quality. The quality of the housing related bundle of services locally is the key element in defining overall neighborhood quality and encouraging private investment. The most basic aspect of this bundle of housing services is the shelter value provided by the individual units. Shelter value includes the quality of the construction, any amenities present, and the ability of the units to be easily updated as consumer demand changes. In 1995, housing occupied 45 percent of the acreage in the Far Eastside. Of that acreage, 75 percent was used by single family detached homes, 24 percent was used by apartment complexes, and the remaining one percent was used by duplexes. The character of the Far Eastside residences is consistent with the driving forces that shaped the community. The majority are single family detached ranch style homes sited in high density configurations in curvilinear and cul-de-sac streets. Apartment complexes have been sited primarily in two clusters at the center of the community. Considerable variations are displayed in the design and tenure of these complexes. The older units are simple in design and include a mix of cooperatives, market rate rental units, and subsidized housing. Many
of the newer designs are more elaborate, with some taking the form of exclusive gated communities. According to the U.S. Census, the total number of dwelling units in the Far Eastside has increased from 8,244 in 1970 to 12,147 in 1980, and 12,724 in 1990. This expansion of the housing stock approximately matches population growth in the area during the same time periods. As was the case with population growth, the rate of housing stock expansion slowed from 47 percent in the 1970's to only 5 percent in the 1980's. In comparison, the housing stock of the city as a whole expanded by 15 percent between 1970 and 1980 and 13 percent between 1980 and 1990. (See Graphic 6.03) As of 1990, the Far Eastside represented 4 percent of the city's housing stock.

Both the Far Eastside and the City of Indianapolis displayed diverse types of housing in 1990. Locally, single family detached homes represented 41 percent of the total. Of the remainder, both groups of 5 to 9 units and groups of more than 10 units composed 15 percent of the housing stock. Mobile homes and groups of 2 to 4 units each represented 8 percent. In the city as a whole, 55 percent of dwelling units were single family detached homes, 16 percent were apartment complexes of 10 or more units, 10 percent were complexes of 5 to 9 units, and 8 percent were in groupings of 2 to 4 units. Mobile homes represented 3 percent of the Indianapolis housing stock. (See Graphic 6.04) In 1990, the dwelling units of the Far Eastside were comparatively smaller and more crowded than those of the city as a whole. The median number of rooms per unit was 5.1 for Indianapolis and 4.7 for the Far Eastside. The median number of persons per room locally was 2.24, versus a city-wide median of 2.14. Also in 1990, three percent of Far Eastside dwelling units were overcrowded (having more than 1.0 persons per room) compared with two percent of Indianapolis units.

Approximately 41 percent, or 5,217 units, of the 1990 Far Eastside housing stock had been constructed in the 1960's. An additional 32 percent had been built in the 1970's, and 13 percent in the 1980's. (See Graphic 6.05) Less than two percent of the local housing stock had been built prior to 1939. In comparison, the construction dates for the Indianapolis housing stock were dispersed evenly over the decades since 1940. Approximately 20 percent of the city's housing stock had been constructed prior to 1939. Of the remainder, 20 percent was built in the 1960's, 17 percent was built in the 1970's, and 16 percent was built in the 1980's. While the Indianapolis housing stock is comparatively older, maintenance
requirements city-wide occur in cycles - with approximately 20 percent of the housing stock requiring routine maintenance each year. In the Far Eastside almost all of the dwelling units reach maintenance requirement benchmarks simultaneously. In the 1990's, over 40 percent of the local housing stock will be 30 years old. A majority of those units will require some form of external repair, amenities upgrades, or capital improvements such as new roofs, windows, or kitchens.

In 1990, median home value in the Far Eastside was $47,600, compared with a city-wide median of $61,400. (See Graphic 6.06) Median home values for the two entities had been approximately equal in the two preceding decades. Similar trends were displayed by the median rent paid locally as compared with that paid in the city as a whole. Far Eastside median rent increased from $132 in 1970 to $226 in 1980 and $311 in 1990. For Indianapolis, median rent increased from $97 in 1970 to $184 in 1980 and $345 in 1990.

The monthly costs of housing in the Far Eastside compared favorable with those in the city as a whole for both renters and home owners. Generally, units of both tenure types were affordable, as a majority of residents in each payed less than 30 percent of their monthly income for housing. In 1990, a majority of Far Eastside home owners (61 percent) experienced monthly costs of less than 20 percent of their income. (See Graphic 6.07) Of the remainder, 16 percent experienced costs between 20 and 24 percent of their income, 11 percent experienced costs between 25 and 29 percent of their income, and 13 percent experienced costs over 30 percent of their income. In the Indianapolis home ownership market, 64 percent of residents experienced costs less than 20 percent of their income; while 14 percent experienced costs greater than 30 percent of their income. A majority of the households which payed more than
30 percent of their monthly incomes for housing in both the local community and city-wide earned less than $20,000 per year.

In 1990, 42 percent of Far Eastside renters paid less than 20 percent of their monthly income for housing (See Graphic 6.08) Sixteen percent paid between 20 and 24 percent, 9 percent experienced costs between 25 and 29 percent, and 33 percent of renters experienced costs in excess of 30 percent of their monthly income. For Indianapolis as a whole, 36 percent of renters paid less than 20 percent of their incomes for housing, while 36 percent experienced housing costs greater than 30 percent of monthly income. As was the case with homeowners, the majority of renters experiencing costs greater than 30 percent of monthly income earned less than $20,000 per year.

In 1990, 89 percent of Far Eastside dwelling units were occupied. Of the occupied units in 1990, 53 percent were renter occupied and 47 percent were owner occupied. Local rates of renter occupancy have increased steadily from 33 percent in 1970. In 1980, 50 percent of local dwelling units were occupied by renters. (See Graphic 6.09) The city as a whole likewise experienced declining occupancy rates and increasing rental occupancy rates. City-wide rental occupancy rates climbed from 38 percent in 1970 to 43 percent in 1990. Portions of the dramatic increase in renter occupancy rates in the Far Eastside can be attributed to the construction of apartment complexes rather than single family homes in the 1970's. However, a significant number of local homes have been converted to renter occupancy in recent years.

Both the Far Eastside and the city as a whole have also experienced increasing vacancy rates in the last three decades. In the Far Eastside, the vacancy rate increased from 6 percent in 1970 to 9 percent in 1980 and 11 percent in 1990. (See Graphic 6.10) Indianapolis vacancy rates increased from 6 to 8 to 9 percent for the same time periods. In 1990, a majority (79 percent) of the vacant units in the Far Eastside
were listed as for rent. Of the remainder, 8 percent were for sale, 2 percent were boarded up, and 7 percent were described as "other vacant". For the city as a whole, 51 percent of dwelling units vacant in 1990 were for rent, 12 percent were for sale, 8 percent were boarded, and 22 percent were described as other vacant.

Occupancy trends in the Far Eastside reflect the increasing ethnic diversity of the community. A most of minority households moving into the area are entering the rental housing market. The percentage of rental units occupied by African-Americans increased from 2 percent in 1970 to 20 percent in 1980, and 43 percent in 1990. The presence of African-Americans in the Indianapolis rental market increased from 20 percent in 1970 and 26 percent in 1990. While local homeownership remained dominated by Caucasians, African-Americans and other minority groups also increased their presence in this market in the last three decades. In 1970, less than one percent of Far Eastside owner occupied housing units were inhabited by African-Americans; that representation increased to 4 percent in 1980 and 11 percent in 1990. In comparison, African-American representation in the Indianapolis home ownership market increased from 12 percent in 1970 to 14 percent in 1990. (See Graphic 6.11)

Over the course of the 1990's, over 40 percent of the local housing stock will reach the age of 30. Some homes in the community will require new roofs, foundations, windows, and furnaces. Many will require superficial external repairs. Evidence of this general housing stock decline is supplied by increasing vacancy rates and the results of the IDMD survey (512 single family detached units in need of superficial repair). Policies for the neighborhood's future need to include incentives for investment in the housing stock, programs in support of homeownership, and the creation of an emergency repair program. The conditions of the local housing stock also support the observation of increased urbanization occurring in the community. Trends displayed by the Far Eastside's housing stock include declining rates of home ownership, declining physical conditions, increasing vacancy, and increasing crowding.
Structural Conditions

A 1994 Far Eastside structural conditions survey conducted by the Indianapolis Department of Metropolitan Development found a majority of community structures to be in excellent condition. However, the area as a whole also showed signs of aging and decline. The survey graded each structure based on its overall condition. Structures in excellent condition received a grade of A, structures in need of superficial repair received a grade of B, grade C was assigned to buildings requiring minor rehabilitation, and grade D was assigned to structures requiring major rehabilitation. Dilapidated buildings were assigned an E. Of the approximately 5,755 single family dwelling units in the Far Eastside, 512 (9 percent) were labeled B quality, 7 were of C quality, and the remainder were in excellent condition. Of the 20 apartment complexes in the community, 15 were in excellent condition and five contained structures in need of some repair. Two complexes requiring only superficial repairs, one complex requiring a combination of superficial and minor repairs, one complex included units requiring superficial, minor, and major repair, and one complex included units graded in each category.
The relationship between community residences and other land uses varies within the community. In select locations land use conflict is a significant issue. The most prominent of these locations is in the southern portion of the community between Franklin and Mittheffer Roads where residences are sited adjacent to light industrial and warehouse facilities. In the reminder of the community, a lack of interaction between residential areas and other land uses is the primary concern. The only available means of movement from subdivision to subdivision, from subdivision to school and church, and from subdivision to commerce is through the use of a car. The Country Square East apartment complex provides a good example of this problem. To the north of the complex is a small creek and beyond that a subdivision of single family detached homes. To the west is a commercial complex, to the south is John Marshall Middle School, and to the east is an undeveloped field. The residents of the apartment complex are separated from the water feature, commerce, and agricultural land by fences, and from the school by the traffic of 38th Street. No sidewalks or pedestrian paths are available to assist with movement between these uses. Similar conditions exist throughout the community and have significant implications for socialization and character. This separation of neighbor from neighbor, home from commerce, and home from school and church disrupts the traditional socialization patterns that build community. They also pose a significant barrier to the success of local revitalization programing.

Examples of the standard Far Eastside housing stock

Also a significant issue for the housing stock of the Far Eastside is the comparably low shelter and amenity value of a majority of the individual units. The homes built in the area in the 1960's were attractive to investors because of their affordability and access to transportation routes and community services. As displayed in the services profile, the services offered by the community have declined in quality and quantity over the course of the last three decades. With these aspects of the bundle of housing services in decline,
Multi-family Housing Profile

The Greystone Court Apartment complex is located in the interior of the community at the intersection of 46th Street and Post Road provides a worst case scenario for describing the conditions of the Far Eastside multifamily housing stock. The complex includes 10 structures, three of which are completely boarded and abandoned. Four additional structures in the complex contain individually boarded units. This complex contains the only dilapidated structure in the Far Eastside. Included at the site are 100 units each of studio and one, two, and three bedroom apartments. The complex also includes 65 efficiency units. Monthly rents for units in Greystone Court range from $225 for an efficiency apartment to $485 for a three bedroom apartment. Of the 465 total units, 276 are able to be rented, indicating that they are not boarded. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development subsidizes approximately 10 percent of the households in the complex through its Section 8 program. Tenants pay at least 25 percent of their incomes toward rent, the remainder is supplied by the government. Greystone Court averages a 30 percent vacancy rate. Issues in the complex include the safety of the structures, crime, and a lack of recreational facilities. The complex has changed hands repeatedly over the course of the last decade, and is currently managed by Ace Management of Indianapolis.

A example of the typical Far Eastside apartment complex is provided by Country Square East, located in the easternmost portion of the community at the Intersection of 38th Street and Mittheoffer Road. The complex is one of several local facilities operated by Gene Glick, a prominent complex manager throughout Indianapolis. All of the 225 units in the complex received an A rating in the IDMD housing survey. The complex includes 25 efficiency units, 100 one bedroom units, and 100 two bedroom units. Monthly rents range from $310 for efficiency units to $449 for two bedroom units. The complex includes approximately 10 to 20 percent Section 8 subsidized units. Complex managers described an 18 percent vacancy rate which has declined in recent years. Issues at Country Square East include a lack of recreation space and a poor physical relationship with surrounding land uses. A fence separates the community from adjacent greenways and commercial facilities.
the quality of the shelter and transportation element of this bundle becomes more significant. In comparison with the remainder of the Indianapolis market, the homes of the Far Eastside are small, generally lacking in historic value, and inflexible. They offer few opportunities for expansion or the addition of amenities. These housing stock characteristics provide a poor basis for encouraging investment and upward filtering.

In general, the Far Eastside has a variety of housing options; most of which are made available through the diversity of apartment complexes in the community. This variety of options, however lacks scope, and the area is dominated physically and socially by the collection of single family dwelling unit subdivisions. The primarily housing issues locally are (1) the increasing requirement for maintenance and repair, (2) land use conflict and a lack of physical linkages, and (3) the implications of the dominant design characteristics of the housing stock.

Commercial

Commercial facilities occupy 6 percent of the land in the Far Eastside. Commercial facilities are located primarily along the Shadeland Avenue/ Pendleton Pike corridor and at two locations in the interior of the community. (See Graphic 6.13) Retail and service establishments in the community are also products of the original driving forces that shaped the area. All of the area commercial centers are "strip-style" in design and are intended to cater to the needs of the automobile. The commerce issues locally focus on the poor relationship between these facilities, each other, and other community land uses. As was the case with the local housing stock, many of the local commercial structures are at the point in their life-span where they will require an initial series of repairs and upgrades. The 1995 IDMD structural conditions survey found 16 commercial buildings to be in need of superficial repairs. One commercial structure was in need of minor repair. The Far Eastside contained eleven vacant commercial structures in 1995.

The retail strip of Pendleton Pike

The Shadeland Avenue/ Pendleton Pike commercial corridor contains mostly retailers lacking in a particular geographic focus. The area is dominated by gas stations, fast food restaurants, and budget rate motels. Also included on the corridor are several convenience stores, auto repair shops, car washes, and a grocery store. One of the community's largest employers, the Ramada Inn is located in this area at the junction of Pendleton Pike and Interstate 465. According to local neighborhood officials, several of the establishments on Shadeland Avenue are characterized by high incidences of drug trafficking and prostitution. The commercial facilities are designed to be accessed by automobile, with pedestrian travel along Pendleton Pike being made unsafe by the vehicle traffic. Most of the structures in this commercial strip are
occupied, but require superficial repairs and facilities upgrades. Included in this corridor are the Jenn-air Corporation, the K-mart Plaza, the Esquire Shopping Plaza, and the Pendleton Pike Drive-in (currently vacant). The K-mart on Pendleton Pike is the largest retailer in the community. Esquire Shopping Plaza features a grocery store and is the former home of the Macy's Outlet Store. Macy's was the latest in a line of retailers to establish and quickly thereafter vacate stores in the anchor space of the shopping plaza. Issues facing this area of commerce are high turnover rates, crime, and traffic congestion.

The concentrations of commercial activity located at the intersection of Post Road and 38th Street and Mithoeffer Road and 38th Street are more community focused. The anchor of the 38th & Post cluster is the Northeastwood Shopping Center which includes a grocery store and a Big Lots retailer. Also located at this intersection are several fast food restaurants, a bingo hall, and several branch banking centers. Four of the commercial structures at this intersection are currently vacant. Their reuse is limited by the presence of underground fuel storage tanks and other environmental hazards resulting from their former use as gas and service stations. The 38th and Post commercial cluster is the closest approximation of a community gathering space and focal point in the area. The retailers of the Northeastwood Shopping Center are some of the most stable in the community. At the intersection of Mithoeffer Road and 38th Street are additional fast food restaurants, gas stations, branch banks and a liquor store. The strip commercial space at this intersection is home to the Greenleaf Community Center and the offices of the Far Eastside Community Development Council. Like those of Pendleton Pike, the structures in these commercial clusters are aging and in need of superficial repair.

The commercial facilities of the Far Eastside provide mainly low end goods and items of daily convenience. The retailers of the Shadeland Avenue/ Pendleton Pike corridor rely on the travelers of these major thoroughfares for their consumer base and are therefore designed to accommodate the needs of the
Despite the local customer base of the commercial facilities found in the interior of the community, they too are primarily accessible by automobile. No physical or sociological link exists between residences and the retailers they frequent weekly for basic goods. The potential exists for both of the interior sites to play significant roles in the expansion of community character. The 38th & Fost facility is located at a natural focal point - the geographic center of the community. The potential exists for this area to become a community gathering space and true neighborhood commercial center. The commercial establishments at the of 38th Street and Mitthoeffer Road share the intersection with John Marshall Middle School. This area can build off of the presence of youth and play a secondary role in the hierarchy of physical places to be established in the community.

**Industrial**

Industrial uses occupy approximately 8 percent of the land in the Far Eastside. (See Graphic 6.14) Seven of that eight percent is occupied by light industrial and warehousing facilities, the remaining one percent is accounted for by a single heavy industrial company. With the exception of Jenn-air and a hand full of small manufacturers, local industrial activity is concentrated in the south central portion of the community between Franklin and Mitthoeffer Roads. All of the industrial structures were listed as being in excellent condition by the IDMD survey, and none of the facilities are vacant.

Industry is the fastest growing land use in the Far Eastside, with numerous warehousing and light industrial companies locating in the community to take advantage of abundant land and convenient access to the Interstate highway system. For this type of land use, the proximity of transportation routes remains an economic amenity. These industrial facilities provide a majority of the job opportunities in the area.
They also represent the greatest amount of private investment to occur in the community in the last decade. Continued access to rail and road transportation routes and an abundance of available sites in this portion of the community offer the potential for continued industrial expansion.

The primary issue related to industrial development in the community is the conflict that occurs with area residential uses. Land use conflict occurs at the northernmost edge of industrial activity where this land use abuts residences. A lack of buffering at this point negatively impacts the adjacent housing units. Negative impacts also result from the heavy truck traffic that moves through the community between these facilities and the on-ramp to Interstate 465. The movement of these trucks places stress on the infrastructure systems, contributes to the congestion of roadways, and creates noise pollution for adjacent dwelling units.

Despite the problems associated with this use, further development of industrial activity in this portion of the community should be encouraged. The facilities provide much needed jobs, and are the primary source of private investment for the community. The issues resulting from the presence of this land use can be resolved with buffering and the establishment of designated truck routes and load limits to manage the traffic issues that are created.

Undeveloped Land

The Far Eastside contains 2,030 acres of land that is either vacant or used for agriculture. (See Graphic 6.15) This undeveloped property represents 35 percent of the total in the community. The presence of this abundance of undeveloped land locally is both an asset and a liability. The presence of these large, undeveloped parcels of property, completely served by utilities, provide a significant incentive for continued investment in the area. However, increased development locally would also translate into increased demands for services which are already in short supply. Road congestion would increase, as would the need for parks and recreation, consumer goods, educational facilities, and health care.

Approximately 23 percent (1,334 acres) of the Far Eastside is farmland. These agricultural properties are concentrated primarily at the easternmost edge of the community and mark the frontier between the City of Indianapolis and the rural countryside. The easternmost mile of the community is characterized by a dramatic contrast of high density apartment complexes, mobile home parks, and rolling corn fields and farmsteads. Included in this block of farmland are several significant natural features, including Indian Creek which links the Far Eastside with the proposed Indianapolis greenway system. Two significant blocks of agricultural land are also present in the interior of the community. One of those blocks is located between 52nd and 46th Streets west of Mitthoeffer Road. The other is located adjacent to Franklin Road.
between 42nd and 38th Streets

Over 12 percent (696 acres) of the land of the Far Eastside is vacant - meaning that it has not been developed, but is also not used for agricultural production. Significant plots of vacant land are scattered throughout the community. The most prominent of these vacant lands are located along Pendleton Pike east of Post Road, and in the otherwise industrial area along 30th Street between Franklin and Mitthoeffer Roads. Other noteworthy pieces of vacant land are located at the intersection of Post Road and 46th Street and Mitthoeffer Road and 46th Street.

The presence of this undeveloped land represents a significant asset for the Far Eastside. This abundance of inexpensive, undeveloped land grouped in large plots in close proximity to an interstate highway provides considerable incentive for private investment. At the same time, this land provides the opportunity to correct some of the shortcomings of the local physical conditions. It provides the basis for the creation of neighborhood parks, recreation centers, medical centers, and community gathering spaces. It further makes available the option of creating the elements of community character - public spaces, places with unique identity, and landmarks. Several of the vacant and agricultural properties form a network that could become the basis for a local pedestrian and bicycle transportation system. Also, Indian Creek provides the opportunity to link the community with the remainder of the city through an expanded greenway system.

This land becomes a liability only if the development patterns that originally dominated the area are allowed to continue. Some portions of this land have been developed as standard residential subdivisions in the last five years. This trend must stop for the community to build sense of place and character, and take
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advantage of the resources that are available. Both the Lawrance and Warren Township Land Use Plans portray this undeveloped land as becoming residential and park space. If and when this development occurs, it must follow a set of design standards and community principles opposite to those that guided the original growth in the area. Emphasis must be given to the management of transit systems, natural features, and park space, and creation of physical and social linkages between each of the new developments and the existing community. Several of the plots of vacant land provide the opportunity to provide the consumer opportunity that is currently absent from the area. The abundance of vacant land in the portion of the community currently being developed for light industrial use provides the opportunity to continue the introduction of private sector funds and jobs into the community. In this location, significant industrial development can occur without resulting in land use conflict or the need for public infrastructures expenditures.

Zoning

The Far Eastside contains 31 different zoning classifications from all land use categories. Included in the community are five industrial classifications, eight commercial classifications, ten residential classifications, and seven different special uses. Despite the variety of classifications in the area, the current zoning map has dictated the creation of strictly segregated land use patterns. This diversity also represents the changing status of the community. Suburban classifications are mixed with urban zones in terms of residences, commerce, and industry. Also included in the area are zones established for encouraging urban residential revitalization.

The area contains few nonconforming uses, but an abundance of spot zones which has resulted in some land use incompatibility. Vacant land in the industrial section of the community is zoned appropriate for the continued expansion of this use. Agricultural land in the eastern portion of the area is zoned either for agricultural farmsteads or future planned unit developments. It is very likely that the current zoning in the community is the result of rapid and relatively uncontrolled development that occurred locally in the 1960's. Rather than guiding development, zoning was more reactionary and actually served to reinforce the characteristics of the development patterns that occurred.

In order to prevent sprawl and the inefficient use of the abundant community open space, local zoning practices must be more pro-active than reactionary. It is important for the zones established to provide a template for development rather than a justification. It is also very likely that traditional zoning may not provide the answers needed to stabilize the community and ensure future quality of life. Current zones need to be complemented by a set of design guidelines and overlay zones that both manage growth and encourage revitalization. Also of importance is the role that zoning can play in ensuring the preservation of land for parks and natural systems.

Summary

The primary land use and housing issues in the Far Eastside focus on the age and condition of the housing stock, the poor physical relationship between uses, and the potential threats and opportunities of the undeveloped land. Land use patterns and structural characteristics throughout the community are a reflection of the driving forces that guided local development. Land use types are separated from each other, natural features have been neglected or destroyed, and little accommodations are available for pedestrian movement. The access to the interstate highway system and presence of inexpensive undeveloped land remain significant local driving forces.
While the majority of the housing stock remains in excellent condition, the presence of decline signals a significant threat to the community. As the services offered locally have declined, the shelter value of the housing stock becomes of increasing importance. In the Far Eastside, that shelter value is limited by the efficient design of the units and lack of expansion and upgrading options. However, the local housing stock remains very affordable, and housing options are available locally for the accommodation of the demands of a diversity of income groups.

The primary land use issue for the Far Eastside is the need to manage growth in a way that directs reinvestment to the established portions of the community while limiting new development on the agricultural land. Any new growth needs to occur in a manner which builds community linkages, allows for the establishment of park space, and does not contribute to stress on local infrastructure. This growth management may also aid in the relief of land use conflicts that are occurring in the community. While the lack of linkage between commerce and residences is the primary land use issue for most of the developed areas, isolated instances of conflict are present. The most significant point of land use conflict is in the southern portion of the community, where residences abut unbuffered light industrial and warehouse facilities.

Local zoning regulations have traditional not played a significant role in dictating the design of the community. In the Far Eastside zoning regulations would appear to have taken a reactionary rather than pro-active role in the development of the area. Redevelopment plans for the community must include increased code enforcement and the creation of zoning regulations that serve as a guide for development. The development of an overlay zone based on design criteria, rather than land use could be beneficial in resolving current land use issues.
Economic Development Profile

Introduction

The overall economic prosperity of the Far Eastside has declined in the last decade. Decreased incomes, private sector investment, and community financial resources are generally attributed to the exodus of the area’s large manufacturing firms and the downsizing of Ft. Benjamin Harrison. Economic development, which occurs primarily in the form of business openings and expansions, contributes to the area in two ways. First, the business openings and expansions provide job opportunities for the local labor force. The community as a whole benefits as some of this increased personal income is spent at area stores; those stores in turn expand, creating additional job opportunities. Second, the expansion of businesses leads to improvement in the bundle of neighborhood services. New neighborhood grocery stores, restaurants, and clothing stores provide jobs, but also improve the overall quality of life in the community.

The Far Eastside is characterized by several factors which may be capitalized on to attract economic development. One of the original area driving forces that remains significant locally is the access to interstate transportation routes. When considered with the abundance of inexpensive land available locally, this access provides a locational advantage for Far Eastside distributors, manufacturers, and wholesalers. The Pendleton Pike access to Interstate 465 provides a further advantage in that it exposes numerous travelers to the businesses of the community. The significance of this feature is displayed by the abundance of regionally focused convenience retailers operating along Pendleton Pike. Other local characteristics providing potential incentives for economic development are the availability of utilities and an abundant labor force. The primary economic development issues in the community focus on the quality of the labor force and the implications of the deteriorating social conditions.

Market Analysis

In October of 1995, the School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) at Indiana University conducted a retail market analysis for the Far Eastside. The report analyzes the gaps between household expenditures and retail sales of goods and services for the purpose of identifying shortcomings and surpluses in the community. The report reinforces the profile of neighborhood consumer opportunity through the identification of several potential areas for local economic growth. The report estimated annual household expenditures at approximately $118,400,000, and annual sales at $87,400,000. Local sales and expenditures were divided into nine categories. In the food away from home and health care categories, sales exceeded expenditures. Sales were approximately equal to expenditures for food at home. In the
gasoline, vehicle expenditures, entertainment, personal care products, household furnishings, and apparel categories, estimated sales were less than estimated expenditures. The potential for growth was the most significant in the personal care, household furnishings, and apparel categories where sales were observed to be less than one-half of the estimated expenditures.

The SPEA report omitted expenditures for reading materials, tobacco products, and alcoholic beverages as the sales and expenditures for these items were considered negligible. Vehicle purchases were excluded due to the willingness of consumers to travel long distances to purchase this type of high order good. Also excluded were expenditures for housing, insurance, pensions, and social security as they are not linked to the retail market. The expenditures by local residents were calculated based on a set of pro-rated national averages for income groups. Estimated expenditures by Far Eastside residents are based on the percent of median household incomes spent nationally on the subsets of goods and services. The estimates did not include purchases made with credit and can therefore judged as low-end approximations. Annual sales by businesses were calculated by identifying the number of Far Eastside business being represented by each Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Code. Total sales for each SIC group were estimated by multiplying the average sales by such business within the local zip code boundaries by the number of local business represented by each code. As was the case with annual expenditures, the sales figures are likely underestimates due to the numerous rounding and averaging steps in the calculating process.

Despite the possibility for error, SPEA judged the report to offer a reliable "first-cut" comparison of area consumer spending and estimated sales. Graphics 7.01 and 7.02 provide a summary of estimated expenditures and sales in the Far Eastside. The largest expenditures by local households were made for food at home, food away from home, entertainment, and apparel. The $27,600,000 spent on food at home represented 23 percent of the total expenditures by local households. This category also lead the estimates of area retail sales, accounting for 31 percent. Other leading sales categories locally included food...
away from home, health care, entertainment, and vehicle expenses.

Based on the results of the SPEA analysis, the expenditures of the residents of the Far Eastside may be able to support additional business that supply goods and services. (See Graphic 7.03) For example, area residents spent only 9 percent of their apparel expenditures at local businesses. Likewise, residents spent only 20 percent of household furnishing, 37 percent of personal care, and 59 percent of entertainment expenditure totals at local businesses. Also, the large surplus in the food away from home and health care categories does not indicate that the Far Eastside can not support additional businesses of these types. The surplus may indicate that consumers living outside of the area are drawn to these local establishments, bringing positive income into the community. Generally, the SPEA market report identifies the apparel, household furnishings, and personal care products and services categories as offering the greatest potential for growth. Estimated expenditures in each of these categories were more than twice reported sales. The excesses in the food away from home category may be due to the nonresidents frequenting of local fast food restaurants.
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Based on the SPEA results and the findings of the services profile, the best opportunities for economic development locally would be the introduction of businesses that provide high order goods such as home furnishings and apparel. Other potential areas for retail growth are personal services, entertainment, and food away from home. In each of these categories Far Eastside residents are leaving the community to purchase retail goods and services that they could purchase within the area if a sufficient supply (of sufficient quality) were available. In particular, demand is present locally for establishments of fine dining and entertainment, a movie theater, clothing stores, and furniture stores. The presence locally of the interstate highway and its intersection with Pendleton Pike provides incentives for the development of auto service and fast food restaurants. While the food away from home category displays income generation from beyond the community, the quality of dining options this provides for area residents is low. The Far Eastside does benefit from these types of businesses through the incomes that they bring into the community. Economic growth based on the food and gasoline needs of persons traveling through the community is a possibility.

**Location and Operation Issues**

In January of 1996, Purdue University completed a draft version of a locational and operational issues report for the Far Eastside based on a survey of existing businesses. The survey took the form of personal interviews with a number of Far Eastside business owners and managers. Of the 94 firms that were interviewed, 39 percent were service, 30 percent were retail, 15 percent were wholesale, and 16 percent