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1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this Housing Study is to provide the City of New Castle a city-wide planning document that establishes priorities and strategies for future decision making. This study approached the planning process with a concentration on livability, by exploring in detail how housing can impact the quality of life for the City’s residents.

The findings outlined within this study (and cited in the 2011 “Northside livability Study” prepared by Sturtz Public Management, LLC) respect the Livability Principles created through the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2009). These principles present a core set of principles that can assist in the decision-making process for community and economic development throughout the City.

*Provide more transportation choice:* Develop safe, reliable and affordable transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce energy consumption and dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.

*Promote equitable, affordable housing:* Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower combined cost of housing and transportation.

*Enhance economic competitiveness:* Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services and other basic needs by workers, as well as expanded business access to markets.

*Support existing communities:* Target Federal funding toward existing communities to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.

*Coordinate policies and leverage investment:* Align Federal policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration, leverage funding, and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth, including making smart energy choices such as locally generated renewable energy.

*Value communities and neighborhoods:* Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods – rural, urban, or suburban.
1. INTRODUCTION

STUDY BOUNDARIES
The focus of the analysis is to assess the socio-economic conditions of the City and to determine what housing strategies should be considered in an effort to develop a thriving and sustainable community. The study area was limited to the formal City limits. In an effort to segment the collected data and proposed strategies, the study area was also subdivided into four districts:

Northside District
This area, with Broad Street as its southernmost boundary, mimics the boundaries of the “Northside Livability Study – A Community Revitalization Planning Documents” by Sturtz Public Management Group, LLC in 2011.

Southeast District
Anchored by 14th Street and Highway 38, the district is largely industrial.

Southwest District
Bounded by Highway 3 and Parkside Street, this area consists of large commercial districts with primarily suburban detached housing.

Central District
Located between Highway 3 (west), Broad Street (north), 14th Street (east), and Parkside Street (south) this district is the centralized neighborhood within the City.

The map to the right delineates these boundaries. Through the study process, each of these districts were studied in detail, with specific strategies and concerns highlighted for each.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study was intended to focus on the role housing can play in increasing the quality of life of residents throughout the city. By analyzing the current housing stock in the community, the strategies presented in the report outline specific tactics that can increase the livability of New Castle, Indiana. In reviewing the current condition, the projected population trends of the community must be addressed. Between 2010-2050 Henry County’s population is projected to grow by 15.4%. During that same time, the City of New Castle’s population is assumed to decrease by 16.3%. While there might not currently be a long-term need for additional housing within the community, as the housing stock within the City evolves, it should be done in a way that can better support the changing needs of these shifting demographics.

In looking at the existing housing stock within the community, key findings from this study were as follows:

- Median Household Value is 45% less than State average.
- Median Household Income is 35% less than the State average.
- Occupancy Rates are comparable to State average.
- Owner-Occupancy is 10% lower than the State average.
- Housing stock offers almost twice as many homes with values less than $100,000 and rents below $300/month when compared to the State average.
- Housing stock offers almost twice as many homes with 2-bedrooms or less when compared to the State average.

Livability is important to the long-term sustainability of a community by providing transportation choices, affordable housing, increasing economic competitiveness, supporting existing communities, leveraging investments, and valuing communities and neighborhoods. The strategies outlined within this study are inline with the Livability Principles created through the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2009) and focus on:

- Providing more transportation choice
- Promoting equitable, affordable housing
- Enhancing economic competitiveness
- Supporting existing communities
- Coordinating policies and leverage investment
- Valuing communities and neighborhoods

This study explores how the City of New Castle can develop strategies for housing that supports a thriving and sustainable community in the years to come.
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Based on the findings outlined within this report, a variety of residential development strategies could be supported within the City. The following is a prioritized list of key recommendations for the City to consider in the immediate future.

STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. **DEFINE AND ADOPT A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND VISION FOR THE CITY**
   In analyzing the rapidly shifting demographics within the community, the City should leverage the growing appreciation for walkable, medium-sized communities and develop a detailed Comprehensive Plan that can address the issues outlined within this report to provide an economic development strategy that can systematically incentive Lifetime Community initiatives in the years to come. In doing so, this plan should integrate previous studies and efforts by the City (e.g., Northside Livability Study, Bicycle + Pedestrian Master Plan).

2. **STRENGTHEN THE BRAND OF THE CITY**
   The survey and stakeholder input throughout this study indicated that there is currently a low level of community “promoters.” While this is often the case for rural communities, the City should explore specific strategies to improve the internal and external perception of the community and engage in a marketing campaign to better define the brand of the community and the quality of life it offers (e.g., downtown, schools, code enforcement). This could be performed in concert with the creation of a Comprehensive Plan.

3. **FOCUS RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON SPECIFIC AREAS**
   Various neighborhoods within the City have a large amount of vacant and/or under-maintained properties, particularly single-family platted lots in contiguous clusters. Therefore, new residential development should be focused and concentrated on a specific area such as a street block or neighborhood sector where possible. Scattered or sporadic residential development will likely slow efforts to revitalize residential areas. While long-term housing needs may not be apparent, these developments provide an opportunity to increase the overall quality of the community’s housing stock.

4. **SUPPORT EFFORTS TO IMPROVE INDEPENDENCE FOR HOMEOWNERS**
   Engagement of residents is a key indicator of economic growth. As the demographics within the community change in the coming years, specific attention should be given to how housing and public space can engage citizens of all ages and abilities, especially those that have been marginalized by suburban development (e.g., older adults, developmentally disabled, etc.). Specific strategies should be outlined to coordinate existing services for these populations and formally consider how they can work together to serve the City’s residents collectively.

5. **SUPPORT EFFORTS TO RENOVATE, REPAIR, AND MAINTAIN EXISTING HOUSING**
   As this report indicates, the City has a considerable amount of large older homes serving families of moderate to low income levels. Given the difficulties associated with the development of new housing on a large-scale, strategic efforts should be made to improve and preserve existing housing stock. Such efforts should include programs that enable owners of lower-priced, and often lower-quality, housing to receive financial assistance (loans or grants) to property improvements. Programs can also be pursued to increase homeownership for marginalized population within walking distance to daily goods and services. In addition to this, code enforcement regarding maintenance and upkeep of residential properties should be regularly enforced.

6. **ENCourage AND SUPPORT ADAPTIVE REUSE OF VACANT STRUCTURES**
   There are currently several vacant and/or underutilized structures located in downtown and along primary vehicular corridors that could offer viable candidates for residential redevelopment. The adaptive reuse of these structures, especially historic structures, into supportable residential product types mentioned in this report would benefit the community by providing needed housing and reversing the negative impact vacant structures have on neighborhoods.

7. **REMOVE FUNCTIONALLY OBSOLETE AND UNUSABLE STRUCTURES**
   There are several structures that are vacant and unusable within the City limits. These properties should be identified, demolished, and the properties rezoned as needed. Through various programs (e.g., Blight Elimination Program or “BEP”), funding for such efforts may be available at the State and local levels. Historic buildings and neighborhood density should be preserved wherever possible.

8. **ENCourage PRIVATE-SECTOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**
   While the public sector plays a large role in any redevelopment strategy, successful improvement of the overall housing stock will rely on participation from the private sector. The City should engage in a strategic effort to promote key redevelopment projects and/or sites in order to educate qualified developers on the opportunities the community has to offer. In order to do so, the City should explore the ability to land bank strategic properties for future redevelopment. These key projects should be encouraged to improve the cohesion and livability within the neighborhoods they serve as outlined within this report.

9. **INCREASE HOMEOWNERSHIP**
   The majority of the City’s households primarily consist of lower-income households and lower-priced/lower quality housing. Efforts should be made to develop or expand programs and incentives to assist potential homebuyers of all ages and abilities. Emphasis should be placed on programs and incentives that assist renter households in becoming homeowners. Increased home ownership offers the ability to increase community attachment and social cohesion within neighborhoods, a primary driver to economic growth in rural communities.

10. **SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERATE-PRICED RESIDENCES**
    The City has a large base of lower-income households and lower-priced housing, but lacks moderately priced housing. This is generally defined as rental housing priced between $400 and $800 a month and for-sale housing priced between $100,000 and $150,000. The lack of such housing limit’s the City’s ability to retain residents whose incomes and family dynamics may change over time. It also limits the area’s ability to attract new moderate-income households.
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POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS
This section outlines the key demographic information and projected trends for the City. Through this analysis, unfolding trends and unique conditions are revealed regarding populations and households residing in the different districts. Demographic data comparisons between census tracts also provided insights into the often dramatic differences between the respective demographics between each neighborhood and area. Critical questions, such as the following, can be answered with this information.

- Who lives in what areas and what do these residents like?
- In what types of household types or residents live?
- What share of households rent or own their residences?
- Is the number of people within the community expected to increase or decrease over time and what other ways are populations and household dynamics expected to change in the near future?

COMPARATIVE CITY ANALYSIS
If you look at rural communities within the state of Indiana, one will find an extremely different economic condition than that of the state average. By segmenting the cities within the state with populations between 10,000-25,000, you find these “target cities” are faced with unique challenges. The City of New Castle should not only acknowledge these conditions, but strive to be an economic leader within this cohort.

3. DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS
Between 2010-2050 Henry County’s population is projected to grow by 15.4%. During that same time, the City of New Castle’s population is assumed to decrease by 16.3%. While their might not currently be a long-term future need for additional housing within the community, as the housing stock within the City evolves, it should be done in a way that can better support the needs of its shifting demographics.

AGING POPULATIONS
Between 2010 and 2030 the number of individuals age 65 and older in the United States is expected to double. More meaningful to cities is the fact that currently less than 5 percent of age-qualified households reside in intentional senior-care communities (e.g., Continued Care Retirement Communities, Nursing Homes, Assisted Living Apartments), leaving the balance to age-in-place in America’s cities and towns. With that, Baby Boomers are projected to make over 200 million residential moves between 2010 and 2020. With their preference for non-metro areas, rural and small town populations of 55-75 year olds are projected to grow from 8.6 million to 14.2 million. Additionally, a recent study demonstrated that 32 per cent of boomers indicated they plan to or are intrigued by retiring in an ‘urban, walkable environment,’ ideally regionally located near their existing home. More so, the study highlighted that while 60 percent expect to move and make a lifestyle adjustment while in their 60’s, 86 percent wished to live in a diverse community among people across the age spectrum. These projections illustrate the changing identity of these communities, ones whose future will undoubtedly be impacted by their ability to successfully react to this aging citizenry.

DEMOGRAPHIC SUBGROUPS
While the City’s economic data presents averages that present one condition, if this information is further subdivided by census tract a even more nuanced set of conditions becomes obvious. Each area has drastically distinct realities that should be considered when exploring housing needs. The following summaries outline the distinguishing factors for each subgroup.

CITY/COUNTY POPULATION CHANGE (2010-2050)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>Henry County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>-12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>-16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: STATS Indiana
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CENSUS TRACT COMPARISON


City Avg.
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AREA DIFFERENTIATORS INCLUDE:
- Historic District
- Downtown/Urbam Core
- Higher Education Attainment
- Higher Median Household Income
- Young Demographic
- Topography
- Amenities Include: Courthouse; South Mound Cemetery; Highway 3 Commercial Corridor

TRACT BREAKDOWN (976000)

- Persons 65+ (2010)
- Bachelor’s Degree or Higher (2008-2012)
- Renter Occupied (2008-2012)
- Median Household Value
- Median Household Income (2008-2012)

CITY AVG.
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AREA DIFFERENTIATORS INCLUDE:
- Older Demographics
- Lower Educational Attainment
- Lower Median Household
- Amenities Include: Henry County Hospital; Medical Park; Osbourne Park

TRACT BREAKDOWN (976100)

- Persons 65+ (2010)
- Bachelor’s Degree or Higher (2008-2012)
- Renter Occupied (2008-2012)
- Median Household Value
- Median Household Income (2008-2012)

CITY AVG.
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AREA DIFFERENTIATORS INCLUDE:

- Younger Demographic
- Lower Educational Attainment
- Higher Renter Mix
- Lower Median Household Income
- East Downtown
- Amenities Include: Eastwood Elementary School

TRACT BREAKDOWN (976300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 65+ (2010)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree or Higher (2008-2012)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied (2008-2012)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Value</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income (2008-2012)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

AREA DIFFERENTIATORS INCLUDE:
- Older Demographic
- Higher Household Value
- Higher Median Household Income
- Higher Educational Attainment
- Amenities Include: Babe Ruth Park; Baker Park and Aquatic Center

TRACT BREAKDOWN (976400)
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AREA DIFFERENTIATORS INCLUDE:
- Younger Demographic
- Extremely Low Educational Attainment
- Lower Median Household Value
- Lower Median Household Income
- Proposed Belmont Redevelopment Project
- Amenities Include: Lowe Park, Crede New Castle Foundry

TRACT BREAKDOWN (976500)

- Persons 65+ (2010)
- Bachelor’s Degree or Higher (2008-2012)
- Renter Occupied (2008-2012)
- Median Household Value
- Median Household Income (2008-2012)
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AREA DIFFERENTIATORS INCLUDE:
- Older Demographic
- Lower Educational Attainment
- Amenities include: Crown Equipment USA (TIF District)

TRACT BREAKDOWN (976600)

- Persons 65+ (2010)
- Bachelor’s Degree or Higher (2008-2012)
- Renter Occupied (2008-2012)
- Median Household Value
- Median Household Income (2008-2012)

CITY AVG.
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WORKFORCE
Henry County has a diversified economy that has identified the following target industries that best fit within the current business climate, infrastructure, workforce and development goals:
• Advanced Manufacturing
• Agriculture-Food Processing
• Alternative Energy
• Transportation/Distribution/Logistics

CUSTOMER PREFERENCES
Tapestry segments helps communities understand their customers’ lifestyle choices, what they buy, and how they spend their free time. Tapestry classifies US residential neighborhoods into 67 unique segments based on demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, providing the ability to identify preferred customers and underserved markets.

With more than a century of combined experience, this proven Tapestry Segmentation methodology classifies US neighborhoods into 67 unique market segments. For a broader view, the segments are consolidated into 14 LifeMode summary groups and 6 Urbanization summary groups.

Tapestry can help you answer four customer analytics questions:
• WHO are your best customers and prospects?
• WHAT do they buy?
• WHERE can you find more like them?
• HOW can you reach them?

The following page summarizes the primary tapestry behavior for the City of New Castle.

For more see www.esri.com.
HOUSING TAPESTRY

Housing can be looked at in various ways. Beyond the physical structure, it is important to understand HOW people live in their homes and explore how this quality of life can be enhanced. For example, New Castle tends to be:

**Hometown (29%)**

Wealth – Lower Middle; Household Type – Mixed

We’re a mix of singles and families of different ages in settled, low-density communities. We’re content to stay close to home; although we may move from one house to another, we seldom cross county lines. Most of us who work have jobs in manufacturing, retail, and service. We like to go fishing, and play baseball, bingo, backgammon, and video games. We watch shows on CMT, Nick at Nite, Game Show Network (GSN), and TV Land. We shop at Belk and Wal-Mart, and also buy Avon products.

**Salt of the Earth (23%)**

Wealth – Middle; Household Type – Families

Settled, hard-working, and self-reliant, we’re married couples with or without kids. We own and live in single-family houses in small towns or rural areas. Even though we’re somewhat older, many of us still have professional or managerial jobs in mining, manufacturing, construction, and agriculture. Others are skilled laborers. We love and work on our vehicles; some of us own three. Most of us drive a truck; many ride a motorcycle. Two pets, most often dogs or cats, are part of the family. We’ll tackle small home improvement projects, hunt, fish, and go target shooting, to country music concerts and car races.

**Simple Living (11%)**

Wealth – Lower Middle; Household Type – Singles

We are older singles who live alone or share housing; others are married couple families. We’re in urban outskirts or suburbs across the US. Nearly half of us receive Social Security. We live in older single-family houses, assisted living facilities, and multi-unit buildings. More than half of us rent. Our activities vary by age; the younger ones go dancing, and play softball and volleyball. Seniors go to Bingo Nights. Many seniors don’t own a PC cell phone, or DVD player; however, we watch a lot of daytime TV, so cable is a must.
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HOUSING STOCK SUMMARY
The current state of housing with the City of New Castle has several key indicators. While the occupancy rate of residential structures is comparable to the County and State, other metrics vary dramatically. In performing a detailed analysis, the following descriptions summarize the state of the City’s existing housing stock.

Housing Occupancy
The vacancy rate of the homes is high at 16% when compared to the County (12%) and the State (11.4%). In discussion with local residents and stakeholders, in addition to this condition is a problematic “absentee landlord” phenomenon that provided occupied residences, but within under-maintained structures.

Housing Tenure
The renter-occupied rate within the City is high at 39.2% when compared to the County (24.8%) and the State (29.4%). With frequent turnover of residents, strategies focused on place attachment and community cohesion become unsuccessful.

Housing Value
The home value within the community is disproportionate when compared to the County and State. While the City has almost 75% of its housing stock under $100,000, the same price range only accommodates 55% of the State and 37% of the State.

Gross Rent
Gross rent is also disproportional. While the City has almost 14% of its rents under $300/month, the same price range only accommodates 10.8% of the State and 5.8% of the State.
HOUSING SUPPLY AND ANALYSIS

**BEDROOMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Castle</th>
<th>Henry County</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or more Bedrooms</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bedroom</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>New Castle</th>
<th>Henry County</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939 or earlier</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 or later</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: American Community Survey 2011, U.S. Census Bureau*
RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT + LIVABILITY

Addresses Basic Needs
- Appropriate and affordable housing
- Safety in the home and neighborhood
- No one goes hungry
- Useful information on available services

Promotes Social and Civic Engagement
- Meaningful relationships
- Active engagement in community life
- Meaningful paid and voluntary work
- Community priority for aging issues

Optimizes Physical and Mental Health and Well Being
- Healthy behaviors
- Community activities to enhance well being
- Access to preventative health services
- Access to medical, social, palliative services

Maximizes Independence for Frail and Disabled
- Resources for "living at home"
- Accessible transportation
- Support for caregivers
PLACE ATTACHMENT

How we qualify communities surprisingly doesn’t vary from city to city. While one might think these would differ between San Francisco, CA and Des Moines, IA, in fact they don’t. In 2008, the Knight Foundation and Gallup teamed up to launch the Soul of the Community project, which examined citizen attachment in 26 communities across the country. They sought to tease out factors that impact why certain communities have residents who are enthusiastic about where they live and have a deep sense of pride, while others are fairly indifferent. Their research indicated that successful cities consistently prioritize communal attachment through three categories:

- **Social Offerings**: Places for people to meet each other and the feeling that people in the community care about each other.
- **Openness**: How welcoming the community is to different types of people, including families with young children, minorities, and talent.
- **Aesthetics**: The physical beauty of the community including the availability of parks and green spaces.

Despite traditional variables such as jobs, economics, and safety also being analyzed, these specific factors appear to always have more impact on one’s attachment to place and community. More importantly, research indicated that the communities with the highest levels of attachment had the highest rates of gross domestic product (GDP) growth (Gallup 2008).

Furthermore, citizens that are engaged and give something back to their communities (be it time, money, or goodwill) have higher rates of personal wellbeing (Gallup 2011). Improving attachment positively impacts the well-being of the community and its residents. It’s a reciprocal relationship that, in a time of growing interest in community health and wellness strategies, offers towns another marketable economic differentiator.

Therefore, while the measurement of social offerings, openness, and aesthetics can be made, there must also be specific consideration to the individual perception of these elements, especially through the lens of marginalized populations such as older adults and the developmentally disabled. This distinction is critical for the future economic growth of small towns.
6. RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT + LIVABILITY

HUMAN CAPITALIZATION
As illustrated in Richard Florida’s book, *Who’s Your City*, “despite all of the hype over globalization and the ‘flat world,’ place is actually more important to the global economy than ever before.” As our understanding of the value of engaging and walkable neighborhoods increases, so does the market’s appreciation for their functionality.

When studying the rate in which a community benefits from its citizens’ success, sometimes referred to as “human capitalization”, the key factors are often directly related to place (e.g. poverty, education, and culture). For example, in an inner-city neighborhood where young boys must cross gang lines to go to school, absenteeism skyrockets. The ‘cap rate’ for that neighborhood is ultimately zero because if you cannot acquire a high school diploma the likelihood of you obtaining meaningful employment is dramatically reduced. No matter the quality of the education being provided, the potential of the students is directly hindered by the limitations of the place itself.

Social capital, at its fundamental level, is what most differentiates safe and organized cities from unsafe and disorganized ones. Where neighborhoods prioritize a sense of place through their ability to maximize informal contact among neighborhoods, the streets are safer, citizens are healthier, and people are happier with their surroundings. This historically was the structural identity of many historic Midwestern cities.

Despite the instinct to pursue increased engagement with migrating emerging professionals, a workforce development strategy that can have an undeniable impact, there may be a stronger case for towns to pursue the captive demand within the isolated populations currently residing in their communities (e.g., teenagers, older adults).

Additionally, for the first time in modern America, the consumer behavior of multiple generations are aligning. Baby Boomers, Gen Xer’s and Millennials are buying the same music, watching the same movies, and migrating to the same neighborhoods. More importantly, they are prioritizing communities in very similar ways, and no other region is better suited to capitalize on this growing demand for an authentic urban village experience than the small towns littered throughout the Midwest.
**6. RESIDENT ENGAGEMENT + LIVABILITY**

**TRANSIT AND WAYFINDING**
A multi-modal transit system is critical to the independence and engagement of citizens. Understanding how people move through the community highlights their ability to interact with the local economy and each other.

- **Bicycle Lane Network**: An outline of various existing and proposed bicycle routes per the May 2014 “Bicycle + Pedestrian Master Plan” by Butler Fairman & Seufert.

- **10-Minute Walkshed**: A typical resident can walk ¾ mile in 10 minutes. This “walk-shed” begins to segment the various walkability of the area(s).

- **10-Minute Walkshed**: A frailer resident (e.g., older adults, disabled, etc.) can normally travel 1,500 feet in 10 minutes. This narrowed “walk-shed” begins to further segment the various walkability of the area(s) and should be considered when considering neighborhood revitalization.

- **Public Transit**: While current public transit services are offered, no repeatable or predictable line exists to provide residents flexibility and impromptu service.

**Walkscore**
Walk Score.com measures the walkability of any address using a patented system. For each address, Walk Score analyzes hundreds of walking routes to nearby amenities. Points are awarded based on the distance to amenities in each category. Amenities within a 5 minute walk (.25 miles) are given maximum points. A decay function is used to give points to more distant amenities, with no points given after a 30 minute walk. The scoring system is outlined as follows:

- **90-100: Walker’s Paradise** (daily errands do not require a car)
- **70-89: Very Walkable** (most errands do not require a car)
- **50-69: Somewhat Walkable** (some errands do not require a car)
- **24-49: Car-Dependant** (most errands require a car)
- **0-24: Car-Dependant** (almost all errands require a car)

While the average walkscore for the 31 “target cities” is 60, New Castle’s walkscore is currently 37.
1. SHADE TREES
2. SIDEWALKS WIDE ENOUGH TO ACCOMMODATE CROSS-TRAFFIC
3. PUBLIC TRANSIT
4. SAFE PATHS FOR BICYCLES
5. INTEGRATED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
6. PEDESTRIAN “BUMP-OUTS” TO REDUCE CROSSTRADE DISTANCES
7. ON-STREET PARKING
8. RESIDENTIAL UNITS OVERLOOKING PUBLIC SPACE
9. STREET LIGHTING
10. FREQUENT SEATING AREAS

**COMPLETE STREETS**
As redevelopment occurs within the City, a “complete streets initiative” can focus infrastructure to be designed in a way that better accommodates people of all ages and abilities by offering multiple modes of transportation. Additionally, it can encourage development to concentrate near vehicular corridors and define neighborhood edges.
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HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOODS
While historic districts (similar to that in downtown New Castle) have a certain level of charm, the value they add to a sustainable community is much more objective. Historic districts consistently perform better than the whole of the cities they inhabit (see adjacent chart). From higher level of occupancy rates to more active and involved residents, these neighborhoods tend to attract and retain an appealing demographic—those that are attached to their neighborhoods.

One reason is because beyond having historic structures, they have a historic density—offering more compact and livable neighborhoods that are attractive to residents of all generations, occupations, and income levels. Historic neighborhoods should be the cornerstones of smaller, more resilient, more livable cities. As diverse, walkable, existing environments with unique character, historic neighborhoods and traditional neighborhood business districts can be sustainable at environmental, economic, and social levels. These qualities help retain existing populations and attract new residents and businesses.

COMMUNITY PERCEPTION
As small and medium-sized cities across the Midwest continue to battle population decline and shifting demographics, resident attraction (and retention) are becoming increasingly important to community sustainability. With that, they way in which communities are perceived must be understood with care.

Something as simple as maintaining decorative landscapes can have a dramatic impact on how visitors to a community will perceive residences, neighborhoods, schools, and the local economy. These perceptions should be understood and addressed.

From code enforcement regarding residential property maintenance to beautification projects, outsider perception and civic pride are critical in increasing community attachment.
Individual definitions of what constitutes a 'livable' or 'lifetime' community varies. AARP defines it as 'one that has affordable and appropriate housing, supportive community features and services, and adequate mobility options, which together facilitate personal independence and the engagement of residents in civic and social life'.

In specifically defining the priorities for elder-friendly communities, the Center for Home Care Policy & Research (2011) outlines four key domains that should be considered: (1) Addressing Basic Needs, (2) Promoting Social and Civic Engagement, (3) Optimizing Physical and Mental Health and Well Being, and (4) Maximize Independence for Frail and Disabled. Although several communities and organizations throughout the country address these issues individually, few have formally adopted a comprehensively strategy that embraces them collectively.

The sustainability of existing small towns is dependent on embracing these strategies to attract and accommodate the growing senior market. Inversely, the communities that fail to do so will continually suffer from a stagnated economic climate and disengaged senior population, especially when coupled with the persistent growth of brain drain within rural communities.

Coined as a 'Lifetime Community District' ('LCD'), this new planning model incentivizes development that promotes physical, social, mental, and economic wellbeing for persons of all abilities, across the entire lifespan. Through this planning typology, existing rural downtowns can be transformed into intergenerational neighborhoods that understand and systematically prioritize all facets of wellness, utilizing these elements not as healthcare strategies, but as planning principles.

Existing as a basic overlay zoning district, the LCD can be adopted by any local land-use regulating authority to allow certain types of development to occur within a defined geographic area. Overlay zoning may generally stipulate conditions under which specific functions or uses may be developed by right without further conditions, or they may be 'plan contingent' - requiring review and approval of the specific plan and adherence to such requirements once entitlements are provided. The zoning can be enacted in an area before a specific project is identified and can be an enormous asset in attracting the targeted kinds of projects desired by the community. Pattern books and other means of stipulating specific uses or building forms are encouraged to help proactively recruit the kinds of functions that would be most beneficial to the district (see following table).
### 7. HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Common Issues</th>
<th>District Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>• Lack of diverse housing options.</td>
<td>• Prioritize diversifying housing stock through new living models (e.g., multi-family, co-housing, accessory dwelling units, supportive housing, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rigid separation between residential, commercial, and recreational areas makes it difficult to reach daily necessities and community amenities.</td>
<td>• Incentivize rehabilitation of owner-occupied homes to improve accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Markets fail to provide affordable and accessible units for all incomes and abilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Homes lack design features to serve residents across the life span.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Mobility</td>
<td>• The automobile is the main, and often, exclusive mode for transportation.</td>
<td>• Develop a multi-modal network and/or complete streets intuitive with access to daily goods and services (e.g., sidewalks, trails, transit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other transportation options, such as public transit, are limited or nonexistent.</td>
<td>• Prioritize availability of daily goods and services within 10-minute walking distance (1/3 mile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Road design separates neighborhoods and impeded mobility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Walking is neither facilitated nor encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>• Expansion into less dense areas favored over existing urban areas.</td>
<td>• Explore Form Based Code and/or a pattern book for the district to define development patterns and preferred urban form to encourage independence and accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development is scattered and separated by function and design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open spaces are inaccessible and unconnected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Communication</td>
<td>• Cooperation among adjacent communities is limited.</td>
<td>• Create supportive living network to allow local agencies and institutions to collaborate and define synergies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communication among agencies that could help advance livable community projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education and Community Input</td>
<td>• Planning takes place without sufficient knowledge about the community and its residents.</td>
<td>• Provide transparent planning process to educate residents and agencies on shifting demographics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The public does not fully understand the aging boom on a community level.</td>
<td>• Involve residents and local agencies in defining district guidelines and priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIFETIME COMMUNITIES (cont.)**

For example, specific attention must be given to the accessibility of the defined area. Beyond the basic sensitivity to requirements outlined by the American Disability Act (ADA), issues of proximity and wayfinding must also be taken into account. Conventional urban planning defines 'walkable' environments by calculating a 10-minute walk shed at a distance of 0.5 miles (or 2,640). This is unrealistic when considering the physical ability of older adults. Research supports that individuals 65 and older with an average life expectancy would average approximately 0.3 miles (or 1,574 feet) in that same ten minutes. Therefore, when an effort to provide urban conditions that can provide everyday goods and services (e.g., milk, produce, post office) within walking distance, the LCD can not only consider the walkability of an able-bodied teenager, but the physical limitations of older adults.

While many organizations and services are provided within existing communities to assist people of all ages and abilities, the LCD should consider rethinking how the success of these services are measured. If the goal of each of these services was to empower local residents to be more active members of their surrounding community (e.g., shopping, working) aging populations can begin to serve as a critical mass for a vibrant and intergenerational neighborhood. The captive demand of marginalized populations in smaller cities and towns can serve as a catalyst for local economies and public life. This 'reciprocal revitalization' strategy is the fundamental goal of a LCD. (see following diagram)
The concept behind this idea of “reciprocal revitalization” is to prioritize the engagement of marginalized populations throughout social services and housing in an effort to entourage these populations to be active and independent users of the community’s assets and services.

**SENIOR POPULATION**: Seniors retained within existing community or migrating from outside the community.

**SENIOR SERVICE NETWORK**: (e.g., in-home care, transportation, etc.)

**LOCAL ECONOMY**: Private sector institutions benefiting from growing senior population (e.g., medical retail, restaurants, wellness facilities, etc.)

**INITIAL NETWORK**: Services aimed at accommodating the supportive needs of seniors.

**RESULTANT NETWORK**: Socio-economic activity offered by concentrated populations of engaged senior populations.
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DISABILITY AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING
With almost 20% of all Americans are disabled, few realize the condition of the many of these residents. Few are utilizing wheelchairs. The majority of individuals experience some form of cognitive disability, and condition that should be considered when considering housing. The breakdown* of disabled residents within the country is as follows:

- 5% Wheelchairs (people that utilize a wheelchair for daily use)
- 18% Mobility (people who use ambulatory aid such as a cane, crutches, or a walker for daily use)
- 21% Daily Activities (people who need personal assistance with one or more activities of daily living)
- 30% Cognitive (people who have limitations in cognitive functioning or mental/emotional illness that interfere with the activities of daily living)

While these conditions can be mitigated, the housing that supports these individuals does not have to be aesthetically different than the existing building stock within the neighborhood. See the following page for examples of various supportive housing projects within Indiana.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU's)
Accessory dwelling units are additional residential units on a property that would normally accommodate only one dwelling unit. A secondary suite is considered "secondary" or "accessory" to the primary residence on the parcel. And can be implemented to help families with different support or care needs (see adjacent diagram). It normally has its own entrance, kitchen, bathroom and living area. Such a suite often is one of the following types:

- backyard cottages
- accessory apartments
- backyard dwellings
- secondary dwelling unit
- supportive living
- granny flats
- in-law apartments
- mother-in-law flat
- backyard apartments
- garage apartments
- basement apartments
- carriage house
- garden suite
- laneway house
- alley apartment
- multi-generational living

*Source: 2002 U.S. Census Bureau Disability Statistics

Life Cycle Diagram: for family and housing needs

owner  renter

young professionals
students
newly weds

grandparents

young family

teenager

mother-in-law flat
The Courtyard (transitional housing for post-foster care teenagers)  
Fort Wayne, IN (2014)

Woodview Memory Care (assisted living for older adults)  
Fort Wayne, IN (2008)

Heritage of Fort Wayne (assisted living and nurse care for older adults)  
Fort Wayne, IN (2014)
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SOCIAL NETWORKS
Beyond the possibilities of built construction, social programming and networks can be established to encourage neighborhood vitality and well-being.

Block Clubs – A Way to Build Community
An emerging practice called “Block Clubs” has been proven in many communities to be an effective strategy for building community, block by block. When Block Clubs made up of one to ten residential blocks drive the planning, it results in more ownership, better engagement and buy in, and closer relationships as a consequence of the groups shared concern for one another and the immediate environment.

Discussion for the groups should center around the neighborhood’s assets and any work that needs to occur to improve it. The groups will also identify residents who may qualify for the local programs and services within the LCD and community at large. As relationships in the group develop and grow, residents and continue to meet regularly to address these issues as a community and partner with local institutions (i.e., churches).

NeighborLink – A Virtual Volunteer Database
NeighborLink is an internet-based connection tool for volunteers that invites local residents and organizations to seek free assistance from their neighbors, and invites residents to join Volunteer project teams to provide free assistance.

The NeighborLink web page has three primary functions-Project Posting, Project Selection, and Volunteer Sign-Up. The Project Posting Site is where individuals can post a project with which you or someone you know needs help. Once a project has been posted to the site, the NeighborLink Fort Wayne Coaches will evaluate, construct (e.g., how many volunteers, and what tools and materials are needed, etc.) and select projects.

Once a project is selected, the Coach posts the project to the NeighborLink web page. Persons accessing the site can review the posted projects, and volunteer by signing up for a specific project, date and time, and if they so desire, may also donate tools or materials to the effort.
FORM-BASED CODES

Form-based codes address the relationship between building facades and the public realm, the form and mass of buildings in relation to one another, and the scale and types of streets and blocks. The regulations and standards in form-based codes are presented in both words and clearly drawn diagrams and other visuals. They are keyed to a regulating plan that designates the appropriate form and scale (and therefore, character) of development, rather than only distinctions in land-use types.

This approach contrasts with conventional zoning’s focus on the micromanagement and segregation of land uses, and the control of development intensity through abstract and uncoordinated parameters (e.g., FAR, dwellings per acre, setbacks, parking ratios, traffic LOS), to the neglect of an integrated built form. Not to be confused with design guidelines or general statements of policy, form-based codes are regulatory, not advisory. They are drafted to implement a community plan. They try to achieve a community vision based on time-tested forms of urbanism. Ultimately, a form-based code is a tool; the quality of development outcomes depends on the quality and objectives of the community plan that a code implements. Five elements of form-based codes include:

1. **Regulating Plan**: A plan or map of the regulated area designating the locations where different building form standards apply.
2. **Public Standards**: Specifies elements in the public realm: sidewalk, travel lanes, on-street parking, street trees and furniture, etc.
3. **Building Standards**: Regulations controlling the features, configurations, and functions of buildings that define and shape the public realm.
4. **Administration**: A clearly defined and streamlined application and project review process.
5. **Definitions**: A glossary to ensure the precise use of technical terms.

Additional option elements can include:

7. **Landscape Standards**: Regulations controlling landscape design and plant materials on private property as they impact public spaces.
8. **Signage Standards**: Regulations controlling allowable signage sizes, materials, illumination, and placement.
SMALL SCALE REDEVELOPMENT
There are several structures that are vacant and unusable within the City limits. These properties should be identified, demolished, and the properties rezoned as needed. Through various programs (i.e. Blight Elimination Program or “BEP”), funding for such efforts may be available at the State and local levels. As these properties become available, two groupings of strategies exist:

Single Property Strategies
Strategies that can be pursued through single-property interventions.
1. **Collective Ramps**: Where grading is difficult, groupings of homes can construct collaborative ramps to allow accessible entries without relying on large switch-back ramps.
2. **Accessory Dwelling Units**: Accessory dwelling units can be reintroduced to the alley to diversify housing and offer ability for in-home care.
3. **Additions**: Additions can be installed to allow multiple residents to live within one residence (e.g., "Golden Girl Living").
4. **New Construction**: In vacant lots, new accessible home can be provided.

Multiple Properties Strategies
Strategies that can be pursued by occurring multiple properties for collaborative interventions.
1. **Row Housing**: Mixed-density housing can be provided to fit within the scale of the existing neighborhood.
2. **Community Gardens**: Selective vacant lots can be transformed into community gardens to allow surrounding neighborhoods to grow fresh local produce.
3. **Bungalow Courts**: Multiple structures can be built on one or more combined properties to create a "family estate" allowing multiple residents to occupy a single property.
7 HOUSING STRATEGIES
**OVERALL STRATEGIES**

Livability is important to the long-term sustainability of a community by providing transportation choices, affordable housing, increasing economic competitiveness, supporting existing communities, leveraging investments, and valuing communities and neighborhoods. Below is an analysis of livability strengths and needs of the north side of New Castle based on background research and public input. This analysis is followed by livability goals and recommended activities for the community to pursue to achieve these goals.

1. **Provide more transportation choice**

   Develop safe, reliable and affordable transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce energy consumption and dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health. Goals would include:
   
   a) Implement transit program enhancements as deemed necessary and as funding allows to encourage predictable and consistent transportation access for residents.
   
   b) Strengthen safer, more walkable sidewalks throughout neighborhoods to promote pedestrian activity.

2. **Promote equitable, affordable housing**

   Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower combined cost of housing and transportation.
   
   a) Pursue owner-occupied and rental-occupied rehabilitation of housing funding opportunities for low- to moderate- income residents.
   
   b) Conduct inventory of vacant and/or abandoned structures and pursue funding for their removal.
   
   c) Investigate the land-banking of blighted properties to address the ongoing issue of vacant, boarded properties that are devaluing neighborhoods and neighboring properties (especially within designated “redevelopment” zones.
   
   d) Encourage the rehabilitation or production of affordable rental housing with qualified developers that can provide flexible housing stock as population demands change in coming years (i.e., low-income housing that may become senior living facility).
   
   e) Explore strategies for increasing homeownership for mentally and physically disabled residents (e.g., Pathfinders).
7. HOUSING STRATEGIES

OVERALL STRATEGIES (continued)

3. Enhance economic competitiveness
Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services and other basic needs by workers, as well as expanded business access to markets.
   a) Develop economic development strategy with predefined metrics aimed at competing with 31 target cities.
   b) Create an “identity” for each defined district through signage and streetscape improvements.
   c) Preserve and maintain commercial buildings in the downtown historic district.
   d) Review existing zoning ordinances and amend as needed (e.g., Overlay Districts, Form-Based Code).

4. Support existing communities
Target Federal funding toward existing communities to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.
   a) Update the city’s grant strategy (capital improvement plan)
   b) Explore the Strategic Investment Process through the Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority (IHCDA) and work with qualified developers to pursue meaningful housing projects within redevelopment sites.
   c) Develop marketing plan and branding effort to promote community amenities (e.g., downtown, schools)
   d) Implement planned bike and walkway improvements as funding allows.
   e) Develop comprehensive “Quality of Life Consortium” designed to leverage existing support and resident services to encourage neighborhood development and resident independence.

5. Coordinate policies and leverage investment
Align Federal policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration, leverage funding, and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth, including making smart energy choices such as locally generated renewable energy.
   a) Update the City’s Comprehensive Plan in line with the priorities outlined within this report.
   b) Implement Lifetime Community Districts as funding allows (e.g., IHCDA’s Lifetime Community Pilot City Program).

6. Value communities and neighborhoods
Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods — rural, urban, or suburban.
   a) Improve sidewalks and install where absent.
   b) Improve street crossings for frailer and less independent populations (e.g., young children, older adults).
   c) Proactively enforce existing neighborhood code infractions.
   d) Review existing codes and amend as necessary.
   e) Engage volunteers to contribute services and materials for clean-ups through virtual database network (i.e. NeighborLink).
   f) Conduct an internal street lighting analysis to determine deficiencies.
   g) Housing within the community should focus on investment in neighborhoods that are not exposed to threats from brownfields but that are walkable to urban manufacturing employers.
   h) Conduct an internal street tree assessment within the right-of-way and create a program to remove dead trees and cut or remove obstructive trees that affect the safety of residents.
   i) Within each defined district, incentivize the availability of daily goods and services within 10-minute walk of majority of residents.
NORTHSIDE DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS
The Northside District offers a unique collection of housing stock and community amenities (i.e., Osborne Park). Key existing features are:
- Older Demographics
- Lower Educational Attainment
- Lower Median Household
- Historic District
- Natural Resources

District Identity: “Sports Health and Wellness District”
With a variety of wellness-based facilities and institutions within the district (e.g., hospital, YMCA, medical office buildings, etc.) as well as access to natural resources (e.g., parks, river, trails, etc.), the northside district has the opportunity to identify itself as a “wellness district” focused of resident health and ecotourism.

District Strategies:
In addition to the general strategies outlined for the City, the district could pursue the following:
1. Historic Home Stabilization Programs/Incentives for Homeowners
2. Protect character and density of historic districts
3. Supportive Living /Housing (e.g., ADU’s)
4. Incentivize daily goods and services within defined walkshed.
5. Redevelop and/or concentrate housing along district boundaries (shown in highlighted yellow)
6. See Northside Livability Study by Strutz Public Management, LLC (October 2011) for additional strategies.

Redevelopment Opportunities
A. Downtown Living: Explore redevelopment of upper-level housing within central downtown area.

B. Mobile Home Community: While several underused and vacant structures existing within the district, the existing motor home community offers a substantial amount of land that could be targeted for redevelopment. With its proximity to the existing park and medical facilities, it provided a unique opportunity for senior and/or supportive care housing as well as market rate.
CENTRAL DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS
The Central District offers a rich collection of historic homes and rolling hills and
Topography. Key existing features are:
• Older Demographics
• Higher Household Value
• Higher Median Household Income
• Higher Educational Attainment
• Parks/Cemeteries

District Identity: “Town Center”
The “Town Center” district offers a unique and specialized experience for the City.
With a variety of housing types located in a centralized, walkable set of
neighborhoods, this hilly and picturesque district provides the ability to attract
new resident types to the City. With its proximity to commercial districts, historic
downtown, and natural amenities it is a suitable environment for emerging
professionals and young families as well as empty nesters and retirees.

District Strategies:
In addition to the general strategies outlined for the City, the district could pursue
the following:
1. Residential Infill
2. Marketability as age diversity
3. Increase stock of median-priced housing.
4. Improve pedestrian connections to Urban Core
5. Developed vacant second-level unit in downtown area
6. Adaptive Reuse of underused commercial buildings
7. Diversified Housing Options (e.g., work/live, ADU’s, etc.)
8. Incentivize daily goods and services within defined walkshed.
9. Redevelop and/or concentrate housing along district boundaries (shown
   in highlighted yellow)

Redevelopment Opportunities
A. Walnut St./S. 14th St.: Redevelopment of existing commercial buildings
   along the southwest corner of intersection.
B. G Avenue/S. 14th St.: Redevelopment of existing vacant land adjacent to
   existing apartment buildings. See enlarged aerial for more information.
PROPERTY SUMMARY
This set of properties adjacent to the existing Autumn Oaks apartments offers a unique opportunity to increase housing and concentrate mixed-use development along this intersection as a defined boundary along 14th Street. A more detailed plan for this area should be considered in the future Comprehensive Plan.
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SOUTHEAST DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS
The Southeast District consists of a large collection of industrial sites. With existing rail lines dissecting the neighborhoods, the area offers a variety of traditional tract housing and small-scale commercial districts (that are currently mostly underused or vacant). Key existing features are:
- Concentrations of Old and Young
- Low Educational Attainment
- Higher Renter Mix
- Lower Median Household Value
- Lower Median Household Income
- Large Areas of Industrial Development

District Identity: “Cottage District”
With an abundance of small, low-income housing within the area, this district has the opportunity to leverage the dense urban neighborhood as a “livable village” for supportive and age-qualified housing. While many communities are currently struggling with an inability to provide small, 1-bedroom homes, this district is filled with them.

District Strategies:
In addition to the general strategies outlined for the City, the district could pursue the following:
1. Development of Cottage Living Units (with potential of ADU’s)
2. Code Enforcement + Accessibility Upgrades
3. Support Living Networks with local agencies and organizations
4. Developed vacant second-level unit in downtown area
5. Trail and Sidewalk Development
6. Incentivize daily goods and services within defined walkshed.
7. Redevelop and/or concentrate housing along district boundaries (shown in highlighted yellow)

Redevelopment Opportunities
A. 18th/Grand Intersection: Redevelopment of existing commercial buildings. See enlarged aerial for more information.
B. Belmont Neighborhood: With its proximity to adjacent brownfields, this area should be explored as a redevelopment area for light-industrial and/or commercial properties through future planning efforts.
PROPERTY SUMMARY
This set of properties surrounding the Elk’s Bingo Facility offers an opportunity to redevelop this 3-street intersection, improve pedestrian conditions, and insert mixed-use development within the heart of the neighborhood – providing daily goods and services within walking distance to the surrounding residents. A more detailed plan for this area should be considered in the future Comprehensive Plan.
**SOUTHWEST DISTRICT RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Southwest District consists primarily of commercial development and suburban housing. Key existing features are:

- Older Demographic
- Higher Household Value
- Higher Median Household Income
- Higher Educational Attainment
- Large Commercial Areas

**District Identity: “Suburban District”**

Encompassing the majority of the city’s suburban housing, this district offers a specialized housing option for older residents and growing families.

**District Strategies:**

In addition to the general strategies outlined for the City, the district could pursue the following:

1. Increase stock of median-priced housing.
2. Diversify Housing Options
3. Explore Public Transit/Trolley/Sidewalks
4. Incentivize daily goods and services within defined walkshed.
STAKEHOLDER INPUT
**NEW CASTLE SURVEY RESULTS (n=83)**

Net Promoter Score for the City of New Castle = -59%

Net Promoter Score for the housing priorities = -62%

**Overall Findings**

- On a scale of 1 to 5, 90% of individuals would rate the health of the City of New Castle as Fair (3) to Poor (1). (1 at 30%; 2 at 30%; 3 at 30%; 4 at 8%; and 5 at 2%)
- Of those that reviewed the preliminary housing analysis report, the majority of respondents felt more knowledgeable about the existing conditions and future challenges for housing within the City of New Castle. (5 at 15%; 4 at 8%; 10 at 3%; 2 at 6%; and 1 at 12%. 50% of respondents did not review report.)
- A large majority of respondents have lived in the City of New Castle for over 10 years (less than 1 year at 8%; 1-5 years at 8%; 5-10 years at 9%; 10+ years at 72%; and 4% said not applicable.)
- 36% of respondents indicated they have lived elsewhere in the last 10 years including Henry County, other Indiana locations, Greenfield, Chicago, Shelby County, Kentucky, Virginia, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Muncie, Warsaw, and Russia.
- Respondents identified their neighborhood as:
  - Central 28%
  - Henry County 19%
  - Southeast 19%
  - Northside 15%
  - Southwest 8%
  - Other 6%
  - Unsure 6%
- 55% of respondents were between the ages of 25 and 44 years old. (15-24 yrs at 6%; 25-34 yrs at 23%; 35-44 yrs at 32%; 45-54 yrs at 19%; 55-64 yrs at 15%; and 65+ at 6%)
- 65% of respondents were female (33% were male and 2% indicated other).
- 70% of respondents had some college, associates or bachelors degree.

**SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

The Net Promoter Score, or NPS®, is based on the fundamental perspective that all community members can be divided into three categories: Promoters, Passives, and Detractors. By asking one simple question — How likely is it that you would recommend your community to a friend or colleague? — you can track these groups and get a clear measure of your community’s performance through your customers’ eyes. Survey respondents are given a 0-to-10 point rating scale and are categorized as follows (from a retail perspective):

- **Promoters** (score 9-10) are loyal enthusiasts who will keep buying and refer others, fueling growth.
- **Passives** (score 7-8) are satisfied but unenthusiastic customers who are vulnerable to competitive offerings.
- **Detractors** (score 0-6) are unhappy customers who can damage your brand and impede growth through negative word-of-mouth.

To calculate your community’s NPS, take the percentage of customers who are Promoters and subtract the percentage who are Detractors (see chart below).

![Net Promoter Score Diagram]
NEW CASTLE SURVEY RESULTS (continued)

Promoter Information

- 78% of Promoters said they would be likely to champion the priorities outlined.
- Promoters identified the health of the City of New Castle as either a Fair (33%) or Good (67%).
- 67% of Promoters have lived in the City of New Castle for 10+ years. The remaining 33% answered “Not Applicable” and they indicated they live in Henry County.
- 100% of Promoters were ages 45-54 years old.
- They are mostly female.
- They have at least some college education.
- Number one priorities include:
  - Jobs, Desirable culture for business
  - Housing
- Community Asset of Pride:
  - Parks
  - Sports, Fieldhouse, Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame
  - EMS
- Community Asset needing development:
  - Strategic Plan for City and County
  - Community Pride
  - Trails
- Major challenge affecting housing in City of New Castle:
  - Lack of housing for older individuals who do not need care facilities
  - Lack of appropriately desirable housing for young professionals
  - Vacant housing

Detractor Information

- Only 5% of Detractors said they would be likely to champion the priorities outlined.
- Detractors identified the health of the City of New Castle as Poor to Fair (1 at 34%; 2 at 36%; and 3 at 26%).
- Of Detractors who viewed the report, 31% said it increased their knowledge. 50% of Detractors did not view the report.
- 73% of Detractors have lived in the City of New Castle for 10+ years. (Less than 1 year at 7%; 1-5 years at 10%; and 5-10 years at 10%)
- The majority of Detractors live in the neighborhoods identified as Central (32%) and Southeast (22%). (Southside at 17%; Henry County at 15%; Unsure or other at 10%; and Southwest at 5%)
- 63% of Detractors were ages 25-44 years old. (15-24 yrs at 2%; 25-34 yrs at 29%; 25-44 yrs at 34%; 45-54 yrs at 12%; 55-64 yrs at 15%; and 65+ yrs at 7%)
- They are mostly female (68%) as compared to male (29%). (3% identified as Other)
- Number one priorities include:
  - Jobs (Good paying; long term; increased wages; sustainable)
  - Redirect focus from attracting businesses to attracting people. Being a bedroom community is not a bad thing!
  - Health factors like drugs (repeated topic), fast food
  - Crime (see also drugs) and curfews
  - Small Business opportunities
  - Downtown revitalization
  - Quality of Life attractions
  - Housing
    - Conversion of abandoned houses to housing for homeless
    - Affordable options
    - Home Maintenance training
    - Clean up
    - Code enforcement
    - Sidewalk repair
    - Historic preservation

10. STAKEHOLDER INPUT
STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS
On August 5, 2014 MKM interviewed a series of community stakeholders to better understand how they understood the current and future housing issues within the community. The two largest topics that were brought up by the vast majority of stakeholders was (a) lack of community pride and (b) lack of code enforcement for residential property maintenance. The following summarizes their concerns and comments:

- Highway 3 is a pedestrian barrier
- Community is too reliant on manufacturing as a “silver bullet.” The community needs to prioritize quality of life issue within the city
- The community lacks civic pride
- Some residential areas needs to be razed and redeveloped. There are several homes that are sitting vacant that could never be lived in again.
- Community struggles to attract and retain emerging professionals.
- We could become a bedroom community for Fishers and Carmel.
- Maintaining individual properties with residential neighborhoods seems to be a growing concern. How can the City better enforce codes to eliminate this problem?
- Very little housing stock has been built within the City in the last few decades.
- How could neighborhoods camaraderie be improved?
- Enrollment seems to be constantly declining within schools. How can schools become a critical component in how we promote the community?
- The community’s sidewalk must be improved.
- How can residential developers become interested in developing projects within the City?
- The community may not have shortage of housing, but it definitely has a shortage of quality affordable housing.

Stakeholders: Carrie Barrett, Mayor Greg York, Dr. Wylie McGlothlin, Judge Joel Lansinger, Bill Atchison, Corey Murphy, Liz Whitmer, Susna Falck-Neal, Jerry Cash, Chris Heyward, and Cathy Hamilton.
RESOURCES
ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Previous Studies
The City of New Castle has commissioned a series of studies in the recent years that have been reviewed in detail as part of this initial analysis. Those studies included:

- **New Castle Bicycle + Pedestrian Master Plan** by Butler Fairman & Seufert (May 2014)
- **Report to New Castle Mayor and City Council** by Hope Intitive (October 2013)
- **Downtown New Castle Redevelopment Report** by Raintree Development (Spring 2013)
- **Historic Jennings Apartments Market Analysis** by Mitchell Appraisal Analysts, Inc. (October 2012)
- **Northside Livability Study** by Strutz Public Management, LLC (October 2011)
- **Creekside at Fosters Landing Market Analysis** by Mitchell Appraisal Analysts, Inc., (March 2007)
- **Housing Needs Assessment for New Castle/Henry County** by Bonar Group (January 2000)