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I. INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE

Background
In August, 1996, the Ward-Meade (formerly Central) Neighborhood Improvement Association (NIA) was one of 11 different neighborhoods to submit a request to the Topeka-Shawnee Metropolitan County Planning Commission for “down zoning” of their neighborhood to a primarily single-family residential classification. In September of 1997, Topeka City Council passed a resolution directing the Planning Commission and staff to prepare the necessary studies, reports, and recommendations in response to this request. In July of 2000, City Council adopted the Neighborhood Element of the Topeka-Shawnee County Metropolitan Comprehensive Plan 2025 identifying Ward-Meade as a high priority neighborhood for planning and funding assistance.

As a result, the Ward-Meade Neighborhood Plan was developed by community stakeholders in collaboration with the Metropolitan Planning Department and presented to the Planning Commission as an element of the region’s Comprehensive Plan. Planning staff began working directly with the NIA in December of 2000. The Plan was adopted as such in November, 2001, by the Shawnee County and Topeka governing bodies. Re-zoning of the neighborhood was approved concurrently to the Plan. The Plan is intended to be a comprehensive, cohesive and coordinated approach to neighborhood planning that is regularly reviewed as needed and formally updated every five to ten years.

In 2008, the Ward-Meade neighborhood applied for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds administered by the City of Topeka to use for revitalization activities in low-income, distressed areas of the city. In early 2009, the Topeka City Council approved the Ward-Meade neighborhood to be one of two designated target neighborhoods for planning assistance in 2009, and to receive significant funding to implement that plan in the years 2010 and 2011.

Purpose
The purpose of this document is two-fold: (1) to update existing conditions of the neighborhood and to analyze trends that occurred within the area since the previous plan in 2001, and (2) to provide long-range guidance and clear direction to the City, its agencies, residents, and private/public interests for the future revitalization of the Ward-Meade neighborhood. This document was prepared in collaboration with the Ward-Meade NIA and Topeka Planning Department. It establishes a 10-year vision with supportive goals, strategies and actions, and provides the policy basis from which to identify appropriate zoning, capital improvements and other initiatives for implementation.

It is impractical, however, to expect all recommendations of this plan to be implemented in a timely manner, if at all. Recommendations for infrastructure, housing and parks all involve major City expenditures that are constrained by the amount of tax revenues the City collects. Other NIA’s compete for such allocations as well. Reliance on non-City funding sources will also determine the pace of implementation. Thus, another purpose of this plan is to provide guidance for priorities in order to determine the most prudent expenditures with limited resources.
Process *(Refer to flow chart)*

This document has primarily been prepared in collaboration with the Ward-Meade NIA, with input from residents and other stakeholders in the neighborhood as well. The NIA has devoted many of their monthly meetings in 2009 in order to formulate the goals, guiding principles, strategies and actions recommended in this Plan. A working group from the NIA, furthermore, was also established to represent the NIA and to concentrate on the development of the Plan by meeting monthly with Planning Department staff.

Beginning in the spring of 2009, planning staff conducted a property-by-property land use/housing survey of the neighborhood and collected pertinent demographic data. The information was shared and presented during an NIA meeting held on August 27th, 2009. A summary of the final plan was also presented to the community at a confirmation/wrap-up meeting held on October 29th, 2009. A public hearing was held before the Planning Commission on December 21st, 2009.
The Ward-Meade Neighborhood under study is located just northwest of the State Capital building and Downtown Topeka. Ward-Meade is bounded by I-70 on the north, SW 6th Avenue on the south, SW Van Buren Street to the east and SW Garfield/Willow/Quinton to the west. The neighborhood comprises about 296 acres. The neighborhood’s western boundary was recently extended from SW Washburn to Garfield Avenue adjacent to Willow Park.

Ward-Meade is a higher density residential area extending from the downtown area on its eastern edge. The character of the abutting areas to the west include two stable neighborhoods (Kenwood, Potwin), while the area to the north is hemmed in by I-70. The residential portions of Ward-Meade are generally hidden behind the mixed-use commercial frontages along SW 6th Avenue and Topeka Boulevard.

As you walk through the Ward-Meade neighborhood, you see many of the properties that have made up the history of Topeka. In the neighborhood itself, the Hicks Block, Sargent House, St. Joseph’s Church, Sumner School, and Ward-Meade mansion are the most prominent and are all on the National Register of Historic Structures (see Map #6). The Hughes Conoco Station at 400 SW Taylor Street is listed on the Kansas State Register of Historic Places. Half of the neighborhood was part of Topeka’s Original Town Site in 1859, which came as far west as SW Western Avenue. The oldest subdivision in the neighborhood is Harvey’s Subdivision which was filed in 1847.

The neighborhood derives its name from the Ward-Meade mansion and park of the same name. In 1853, Government Blue Books listed Mr. Ward as a wagon maker with the Indian Agency here in Topeka. The 240 acres of prime land that overlooked the Kansas (Kaw) River was purchased by the Ward family from a Kaw Native American. The Ward family farm was where pioneers crossing the Oregon Trail at the Kansas River could seek lodging and food for the night. Mary Jane Ward kept a candlelight burning in her windows to guide weary travelers to their doors. In 1854, the river crossing and Ward home became the reason for the founding of Topeka at its present day site.

The Ward home began as three small log cabins perched neatly in a row on the brow of the hill. The exterior of the Victorian mansion, finished in the 1870s, was transformed to a gracious southern colonial-type reminiscent of the Meade ancestral home in Kentucky. The two six-inch square peepholes on either side of the chimney of the north wall are no longer needed as lookouts for possible intruders. Eventually, the ancestors of the Ward family sold off enough property for future development of the neighborhood surrounding it. Members of the Ward family lived in the mansion until 1961, when it was eventually purchased by the City of Topeka for use as a park. The Ward-Meade house was
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added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1975 and restoration began the next year as a bicentennial project.

Ward-Meade neighborhood is also home to Sumner School. Originally, Sumner School was constructed in 1878 for African-American students. It was named after Charles Sumner, the staunch advocate for little Sarah Roberts of Boston in 1849. After the first Sumner school was replaced in 1901, African-American children were relegated to lesser facilities and eventually the Monroe School across town. Sumner then became a school for white students. In 1951, the Supreme Court’s famous desegregation ruling involved both Monroe Elementary School and Sumner Elementary School. The lead plaintiff in the Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, Linda Brown, lived in the Ward-Meade neighborhood. The current school, constructed in 1936, was closed in 1995 as part of a consolidation to remedy the Brown v. Board of Education lawsuit. The new Meadows Elementary School is also in the neighborhood. In 1963, the Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) finished I-70 Highway along the northern fringe of Ward-Meade. Twenty-six (26) lots were taken between the Kansas River and Ward-Meade for its development. Most of the lots in the neighborhood are 25’x150’.

B. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Tables 1-5 do not reflect the conditions along SW Garfield Street & Horne Street due to boundary changes. Refer to the Appendix for a summary of these two additional blocks. Information for Existing Conditions was gathered by the Topeka Planning Department & Shawnee County Appraiser.

Health

The Neighborhood Element of the Comprehensive Plan establishes a neighborhood health rating system for all neighborhoods in Topeka to prioritize planning assistance and resource allocation. According to the 2007 Neighborhood Health Map, most of Ward-Meade is designated as “at-risk” - neighborhoods with the second most level of distressed conditions – and is considered a high priority for re-investment due to the revitalization potential of its historic character that is largely still intact. Much of the area surrounding the Sumner School building, as well as the southeast portion of the neighborhood is designated as intensive care – neighborhoods with the most seriously distressed conditions – and is considered a high priority for re-investment.

Land Use

The neighborhood is predominately residential with 82% of all parcels and nearly 70% of the land area devoted to residential uses (see Table #1 and Map #1). 69% of all parcels are Single-Family Residential. Most single-family uses occur between and around the Sumner and Meadow sub-areas. Residential Two/Multi-Family (c) uses, which represents single-family homes that have been converted to apartments, declined significantly within the neighborhood since 2001 (-21%). There are relatively few two or multi-family structures that were built intentionally for that use. Only a moderate number of parcels are Vacant (8%). Land intensive Commercial parcels (including Light Industrial and Office) comprise a larger proportionate share of land area (16%) than they do with the number of parcels (7%). These land uses are primarily located along SW 6th Avenue and Topeka Boulevard.
### Table 1
**Existing Land Use – Ward-Meade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Parcels 2009</th>
<th>Parcels 2001</th>
<th>% Change 2001-09</th>
<th>% Total 2009</th>
<th>Acres 2009</th>
<th>% Total 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Single-Family</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Two-Family</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multi-Family</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-20.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail/Service</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-45.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking / Utilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (Parks)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>997</strong></td>
<td><strong>1026</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2.8%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>177.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public ROW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>109.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>286.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several revisions were made to 2001 data.*

### Zoning
In 2001, many blocks within the core of the Ward-Meade neighborhood were re-zoned from the “M-1” or “M-2” two/multiple-family designations to the “R-1” and “R-2” single-family classifications. This is a major reversal in the neighborhood since zoning patterns had not changed appreciably since 1939. The variations in existing zoning patterns within blocks adjacent to SW 6th Avenue and SW Topeka Boulevard include residential, commercial, institutional, industrial and office, as illustrated in Map #2. Much of the interior of the neighborhood, however, remains zoned for low-density single-family residential uses.

### Housing Density
The overall density level of 3.8 dwelling units per acre in the neighborhood decreased slightly from 2001 (4.1) due to the decline of converted single-family homes. It could have been much higher if it were not for the presence of large non-residential users (refer to Table #2). While single-family dwellings comprise the majority of units in Ward-Meade (62%), a large number of the remaining units consist of two/multi-family converted structures (nearly 3 out of every 10 units).

### Table 2
**Housing Density – Ward-Meade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Units 2009</th>
<th>Units 2001</th>
<th>% Change 2001-09</th>
<th>% Total 2009</th>
<th>Total Acres 2009</th>
<th>Units/Acre 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>-20.9%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Density Residential</strong></td>
<td><strong>1102</strong></td>
<td><strong>1177</strong></td>
<td><strong>-6.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>114.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Density All</strong></td>
<td><strong>1102</strong></td>
<td><strong>1177</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>117.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Density (w/ROW)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1102</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>286.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several revisions were made to 2001 data.*
Housing Conditions

Comparing the Housing Conditions tables from 2001 and 2009, reveals that there has been a significant improvement in the overall quality of the housing stock in the neighborhood. In 2001, housing conditions in Ward-Meade featured a below average rating, as less than a fourth of all residential structures were showing only Minor Deficiencies (see Ward-Meade Plan of 2001). In 2009, over half (55%) of all residential structures were showing Minor Deficiencies. Map #3 shows that housing conditions are most sound in the Meadows sub-area and declines fairly rapidly east of SW Taylor Street in the Sumner and Downtown sub-areas. The most noticeable decline of housing conditions occurred within the 300-400 blocks of SW Fillmore Street and Western Ave. The most noticeable improvement in the neighborhood occurred between the 5th Street and 6th Avenue corridor (SW Clay, Fillmore & Tyler Street) where non-profit re-development (Cornerstone) has combined with private rehabilitation of several two/multi-family houses.

Despite the overall improvement of housing conditions within the neighborhood, the reduction in the number of units showing Major Deficiencies can be attributed in part to the demolition of sub-standard structures. For example, in the 400 block of SW Tyler in which housing conditions were particularly poor in 2001, several converted single-family structures were demolished and new units were not built in their place. While this may be addition by subtraction in some cases, it also shows that maintenance is being deferred in some areas of the neighborhood.

Table 3
Housing Conditions – Ward-Meade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Minor Deficiencies</th>
<th>Intermediate Deficiencies</th>
<th>Major Deficiencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>446</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>332</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure

Owner-occupancy in the Ward-Meade neighborhood has declined since 2001, from roughly 43% of all housing units to 36% in 2009 (Table #4). Single-family units are 51% are owner-occupied. Areas with the highest concentrations of homeownership also generally correspond to areas with high concentrations of single-family dwellings, as is illustrated by Map #4. The highest levels of owner-occupancy can be found in the Meadows sub-area, while the lowest owner-occupancy levels can be found in the Downtown sub-area as well as the 5th Street-6th Avenue Corridor. The ownership rate declined most notably within the 400 blocks of SW Fillmore and Western Avenue, as well as within the 100 blocks of SW Western Avenue and Taylor Street. Vacancy estimates are considered to be conservative because the survey was limited to the exterior of the structure.
Table 4
Housing Tenure – Ward-Meade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Types</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimate

Property Values
According to data gathered by the Shawnee County Appraiser, property values in the Ward-Meade neighborhood increased over the past several years. The median value for single-family properties increased by 40%, converted multiple-family properties increased by 44% from 2001, and multiple-family properties increased by a large amount. A lot of the increase in property values, however, can be attributed to new construction and changing land uses in the neighborhood, rather than an overall increase in demand for housing.

Table 5
Median Property Values – Ward-Meade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2000*</th>
<th>%Change 2000-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Single-Family</td>
<td>$41,200</td>
<td>$29,350</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>$66,600</td>
<td>$33,625</td>
<td>158%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multiple-Family (c)</td>
<td>$40,200</td>
<td>$27,915</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>$226,200</td>
<td>$99,080</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value/Acre</td>
<td>$22,639</td>
<td>$28,760</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2000 figures in 2008 dollars
Land Value/Acre for residential property only

Public Safety

Map #5 illustrates the number of reported major crimes committed by block according to crime statistics provided by the Topeka Police Department for 2007-2008. Criminal activity was dispersed throughout the neighborhood. The highest concentrations of reported major crimes occurred along SW Tyler Street between SW 2nd Street and 6th Avenue, as well as between SW 4th and 5th Street from SW Buchanan Street and Western Avenue. The lowest number of crimes reported occurred in the blocks generally north of 2nd Street. Major crimes are defined as Part 1 crimes – murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, and theft.
Development Activity

Development activity in the past several years has primarily been limited to demolitions, as demolition permits outnumber new construction by 3 to 1 from the year 2001. There were, however, several important building projects that have taken place, such as the Cornerstone duplexes in the 500 block of SW Clay Street, as well as two 4-unit apartment buildings in the 500 blocks of SW Clay and Fillmore Street. Building permits tracked are for new construction or whole demolitions and do not include rehabilitation or additions.

Circulation

The Ward-Meade neighborhood is bordered by two major arterials – SW 6th Avenue and Topeka Boulevard. Traffic along these thoroughfares does not normally disrupt residential blocks since it occurs on the perimeter of the area. The neighborhood does experience heavy interior traffic on two collector streets – SW 4th and 5th Streets – which are one-way pairs designed to move commuter traffic in and out of Downtown by-passing 6th Avenue. Table #6 summarizes the annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes for several intersections in the neighborhood. Ward-Meade is only serviced by one bus line running along SW 6th Avenue.

Table 6
Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) – Ward-Meade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>AADT</th>
<th>Accidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willow &amp; Lane</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th &amp; Lane</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th &amp; Topeka</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>5,190</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th &amp; Topeka</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Topeka City Engineer (AADT 2004, Accidents 2008)
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C. SOCIOECONOMIC TRENDS

Ward-Meade is located in Census Tract 6. Information from the 2000 & 1990 U.S. Census are summarized in the tables below. The total population of the neighborhood declined by nearly 11% from the years 1990 to 2000. The largest decrease was seen in the 25-34 year old cohort, accounting for 13% of the population in 2000 as opposed to 22% in 1990. The 45-54 year old cohort, accounting for 8% of the 1990 population as opposed to 12% of the 2000 population experienced the largest increase in population. The number of households also decreased, as did the average household size. The percentage of female headed households with a child under 18 years of age decreased, representing 16% of the households in 2000 as opposed to 22% of the households in 1990. Incomes in the neighborhood increased in real terms during the 1990’s. The number of persons below poverty increased significantly, representing 32% of the population in 2000 compared to 25% in 1990.

As of 1990, the population can therefore be described as a declining population with larger household sizes, residing in an aging housing stock. It is an aging population with lower incomes, who are generally long-term residents of the neighborhood (more than 5 years). All of these factors may contribute to instability in the neighborhood unless new homeowners are found. The combination of low incomes, larger household sizes, aging housing, and the large percentage of short-term/renter households can lead to diminished housing conditions and homeowner investment.

Table 7
Population & Age – Ward-Meade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Change %0-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,956</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>127%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>-40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>-30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>-45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64 years</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and Over</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>-36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Households – Ward-Meade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>% Change '90-'00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>-9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>-18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-Wife</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>-26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-Headed</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/child &lt; 18</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>-36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per HH</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Family</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Income and Work – Ward-Meade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$30,090</td>
<td>$27,810</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$36,800</td>
<td>$33,030</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$15,750</td>
<td>$14,870</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Persons</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Children &lt; 18</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work &amp; Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons (16+ yrs.)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College 4 yrs.+</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>-38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>-41.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All Income figures in 2008 dollars

* 2000 College 4 yrs. + for individuals 25+ yrs. of age

* 2000 Unemployment Rate for individuals 16+ yrs. of age in Labor Force
D. PROFILE SUMMARY

Conditions of the Ward-Meade Neighborhood tell a tale of two neighborhoods: (1) a stable western half primarily within the Meadows sub-area and (2) an unstable eastern half within most of the Sumner sub-area and all of the Downtown sub-area. Clearly, there are pockets of transition and decline within its 280 acres that are impediments to re-investment:

Needs/Constraints
- 46% of children in the neighborhood under 18 live in poverty
- Over half the blocks in the Sumner sub-area show intermediate to major housing deterioration.
- Intermediate housing deterioration between SW 4th and 5th Street presents a negative impression along two important commuter routes.
- The total population of the neighborhood has declined by a significant amount from 1990 to 2000 (-11%).
- There are more renter-occupied housing units than owner-occupied housing units.
- Residential demolition permits outnumber new construction permits by 3 to 1 since 2001.
- Prostitution and related crimes remain a nuisance within the neighborhood.
- No neighborhood park space is allocated within the interior of the neighborhood to serve the nearly 2,300 residents.
- Historic Sumner School building has been purchased by a private entity yet remains vacant.

On the other hand, there are many strengths and opportunities that can be seized upon to overcome these constraints and better address the neighborhood's needs:

Strengths/Opportunities
- Diversity of land uses, population, housing, and proximity to downtown businesses typifies strength of traditional neighborhood.
- The neighborhood is anchored by several major destinations –Old Prairie Town Historic Site, Meadows School, and Downtown – that can attract outsiders to the area. Historic Sumner School will also be attracting future visitors as part of the Monroe School National Park Service site.
- Meadows Elementary School has become a major reason for new families to locate into the area attracting a higher percentage of out-of-district students.
- Historic turn-of-the-century housing stock is relatively intact leaving many “rough diamonds” for investment by new owners.
- Not-for-profit development and private rehabilitation work has improved conditions within the 500 blocks of SW Clay, Fillmore and Tyler Streets.
- Homeownership is very high within the Meadows sub-area with all but two and-a-half blocks having more than 50% owner-occupancy.
- 62% of the housing units in the neighborhood are single-family structures.
- A concentration of churches and the YMCA provide community anchors and quality of life amenities for the neighborhood.
A VISION:

“In the year 2020, two visitors exit off of the I-70/Topeka Boulevard interchange prompted by the signs for the Ward-Meade neighborhood and historic Old Prairie Town. They pass by new mid-rise office buildings and apartment houses on Topeka Boulevard and turn down 4th Street at the color-coordinated wayfinding sign. They notice the tastefully planted landscaping and decorative pedestrian lighting along this “clean” parkway which tells them they are likely at the center of a proud neighborhood.

Further west, they notice children on their way home from the renowned Meadows School stopping at the Sumner Neighborhood Center for award-winning after-school arts and humanities programs while mingling with tourists who have just arrived from Monroe School on the Linda Brown Trail. In the park outside, they see two elder statesmen engaged in a game of chess under the shade, a father playing frisbee with his daughter, and several mothers watching their toddlers enjoy the new playground equipment. They overhear a couple making plans to go to “G’s” ice-cream shop down the street after work.

They pass by the brick neighborhood entry markers and now know they are at the center of the “Ward-Meade Neighborhood.” They turn north and drive slowly down the brick streets to gaze at the beautifully restored historic homes within the Clay Street Historic District taking note of all the people on their porches or in their front yards meeting with their neighbors.

Finally, they find the Old Prairie Town parking lot and walk past an old schoolhouse, pharmacy, church, and general store on their way to tour the mansion and botanical gardens. After their tour, they pick up a neighborhood welcoming package which highlights all the goings-on in Ward-Meade. Then they look at each other and say, “Tell me again why I work at the State Capital and pay twice as much to live in Lawrence?”
**A. GOALS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

**LAND USE**

**Goal** – Protect single-family residential land uses as the predominate and intended land use of the neighborhood, and accommodate commercial, office, and multiple-family residential within established high intensity areas.

**Guiding Principles**

- Allow “corner store” commercial businesses compatible with a residential neighborhood that meets the needs of its residents and visitors.
- Maintain and preserve existing usable park space within the neighborhood.
- Prohibit expansion of industrial uses into predominantly residential blocks.
- Adaptively re-use Sumner School as community space for youth, cultural, civic, and recreational activities.
- Preserve the viability of single-family residential blocks within a medium intensity environment.
- Discourage strip-style commercial development along the SW Topeka Boulevard and SW 6th Avenue corridors.

**HOUSING**

**Goal** – Preserve and rehabilitate existing housing stock to the greatest extent possible.

**Guiding Principles**

- Increase overall homeownership levels by placing a high priority on assisting blocks to achieve greater than 50% owner-occupancy.
- Encourage rehabilitation of existing housing or new infill housing for affordable housing programs closer to employment areas and bus route.
- Demolition of structures should only be supported where they have become a blighting influence, they lack viability for long-term success, they are part of a targeted infill or rehabilitation strategy on a particular block, or they are impediments to achieving other goals of the Plan.
- Strive to maintain mix of housing to attract diversity of households (e.g. young singles, families w/ children, empty nesters, elderly, etc.).
- Ensure that new in-fill housing and rehabilitation of existing housing compliments traditional design/architecture of neighborhood.
- Identify strategic target blocks for housing and infrastructure improvements.
- Support development of new market-rate and affordable housing units to support the work force in the Downtown sub-area.
- Work cooperatively with landlords to better maintain properties and responsibly address problems with tenants.
CIRCULATION

Goal - Make the neighborhood safer for pedestrians and bicyclists while allowing for movement of appropriate traffic through the neighborhood.

Guiding Principles

- Provide for safe pedestrian/bike circulation to school, park and downtown areas.
- Discourage “through” truck and car traffic from I-70 environs.
- Use signage to improve wayfinding to the neighborhood and its attractions as well as gateway signs.
- Preserve existing grid street network and access ways to regional transportation network.
- Upgrade deteriorated infrastructure (alleys, sidewalks, streets, curbs, etc.).

NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Goal - Establish Ward-Meade as one of Topeka’s premier traditional neighborhoods through the preservation, restoration, and promotion of its historical qualities.

Guiding Principles

- Ensure that new in-fill development and rehabilitation is consistent with traditional design/architecture of area.
- Work to maintain or re-build elements unique to Ward-Meade’s traditional neighborhood design and heritage.
- Enhance gateway streetscapes to improve upon the neighborhood’s “front door” corridors.
- Explore local/national historic district designations for a small contiguous area within the Sumner or Meadows sub-area that will help promote rehabilitation efforts.
- Market the neighborhood’s assets year-round to outside visitors, tourists, and potential residents.
- Preserve, repair or replicate brick sidewalks and stone curbing: within an existing or potential historic district where they are the predominate material, OR within the environs of an existing or potential historic district where they are maintained as the predominate material.
- Preserve all brick streets and repair only with brick.

NUISANCE/CRIME PREVENTION

Goal – Create a safe, clean, and livable environment for all those in Ward-Meade to live, learn, work, and play.

Guiding Principles

- Increase resident involvement in the NIA and mobilize volunteer resident resources to take a more proactive role in blight and crime prevention.
- Promote educational efforts so residents are fully aware of “what to look for” in detecting and preventing crime.
- Eliminate prostitution activity in Ward-Meade and the indirect crime it attracts.
- Improve pedestrian lighting for better feeling of safety.
IV. FUTURE LAND USE PLAN

The Ward-Meade Land Use Plan (Map #7) graphically illustrates a conceptual guide for future development of the neighborhood that embodies the vision and goals presented in Section III. The map depicts preferred land use concepts and is explained more fully in the following descriptions below. The following land uses, zoning districts, and densities are the “maximum recommended” and do not preclude lower-intensity land uses, zoning districts, or densities from being appropriate.

A. LAND USE CATEGORIES

Residential – Low Density (Urban): This category comprises the single-family preserve areas of Ward-Meade that front on “local” low volume streets – SW Lane, Lincoln, Buchanan, Clay, Fillmore, Western, and Taylor – where the highest concentrations of single-family uses exist without a significant mixing of two/multiple-family uses or major frontage along arterial streets. These are areas whose original development was single-family and where a realistic potential exists to sustain this as the predominant character. New development in this area should be compatible with the existing single-family character, which could include such uses as churches and small-scale daycares. Since Ward-Meade has one of the higher density levels of any single-family neighborhood, new uses should not exacerbate on-street parking congestion.

Primary Uses: single-family dwellings
Zoning Districts: R-2 (Single Family)
Density: 5-7 units/acre (net)

Residential – Medium Density: This category is applied to the blocks that have transitioned into a higher density residential area from a lower density single-family area. Within Ward-Meade, those streets would include SW Polk and Tyler Streets between 2nd and 5th Streets. These blocks may not meet the characteristics of a Residential-Low Density area, but still should retain a decisively residential character albeit at a more medium density (8-14 units/acre). This area acts as a buffer between the high intensity industrial/ Downtown uses to the east and the low density single-family uses to the west. SW Tyler Street, due to its topography and proximity to Downtown/Topeka Boulevard, may include appropriately-scaled higher density dwellings. The purpose of this category is to allow medium density residential uses while protecting against the spread of higher density development into the single-family preserve areas.

Primary Uses: Single-family dwellings to four-unit dwellings
Zoning Districts: M-1A (Limited Multiple-Family), M-2 (Multiple-Family)
Density/Intensity: 8-14 dwelling units/acre
Residential – Mixed-use: This category builds upon the Residential-Medium Density classification by allowing the introduction of neighborhood-scaled office, institutional, and commercial extensions from SW 6th Avenue within the same blocks as residential uses. Adaptive re-use of existing structures should be highly encouraged, but when not feasible, sensitivity to screening, landscaping, parking, lighting, etc. should be incorporated into any new construction design so as to minimize impact on existing residential properties. Residential land uses are preferred and should not be subjugated by non-residential uses. Non-residential uses are appropriate to serve expansions of frontage property along SW 6th Avenue.

Primary Uses: Single to four-unit dwellings, neighborhood-scale commercial, office, and institutional

Zoning Districts: M-1A (Limited Multiple-Family), M-2 (Multiple-Family), X-1 (Mixed-use), PUD (Planned Unit Development-commercial or multi-family usage), C-1 (Commercial), O&I-2 (Office and Institutional)

Density/Intensity: 10-16 dwelling units/acre

Commercial – Neighborhood: This designation allows for small-scale “mom and pop” businesses within the interior of the neighborhood that would serve the needs of local neighborhood residents. Compatible uses may include an antique shop, artist studio, delicatessen, coffee shop, professional offices, etc. All of the properties under this category contain existing commercial buildings. These uses are intended to be an asset to a traditional neighborhood that can serve pedestrian convenience or live-work needs of the people that live nearby. They are not intended to attract a large number of non-local visitors.

Primary Uses: small-scale neighborhood commercial stores

Zoning Districts: C-1 (Commercial)

Density/Intensity: Low to Medium

Commercial – Mixed-use: This category would mirror the Residential-Mixed-use classification except that commercial land uses would be the preferred land use instead of residential. Higher intensity residential uses would be permitted alongside commercial and office uses that all adhere to urban design standards. Since most of these blocks front SW 6th Avenue, a major image street, parking lots and open storage should be effectively screened from street frontages by possibly expanding into the Residential-Mixed-use areas or side streets (see above). Quality of design should be emphasized by orienting buildings close to the street, softening views where possible, restricting large pole signage, ensuring visual integrity along SW 6th Avenue, and buffering physical impacts from adjacent residential blocks (see Design Guidelines for Image Corridors). Adaptive re-use should be highly encouraged such as the converted office dwellings on SW Washburn Avenue. Current C-4 commercial zoning allows high-intensity uses that render SW 6th Avenue to a life of strip retail and visual clutter if left unchecked. The purpose of this classification is to provide for a healthy combination of
mixed-uses along an aesthetically pleasing regional corridor that avoids future “strip commercial” characteristics.

**Primary Uses:** Mixed  
**Zoning Districts:** X-1 (Mixed-use); C-2 or C-4 (Commercial); M-2 (Multi-Family)  
**Density/Intensity:** Medium to High

**Downtown:** This designation recognizes the mixed-use nature and higher intensity of the area east of SW Tyler Street and crossing over NSW Topeka Boulevard. As described in the Downtown Topeka Redevelopment Plan, Topeka Boulevard is envisioned to return as the classic urban “address” for office space and downtown dwellers alike. A potential interchange connection with I-70 will create a much greater attraction for a Topeka Boulevard “address.” In order to realize this vision, the “Downtown” classification allows taller office buildings, new apartment/condominium houses, pedestrian-oriented retail, etc. as part of a higher-density mixed-use corridor along Topeka Boulevard. Parking should be hidden from Topeka Boulevard and elegant streetscapes incorporated into this new gateway to Downtown. Design guidelines and performance standards should follow recommendations found with the Downtown Plan. Some properties are not currently ripe for this sort of treatment including 315 SW Topeka Boulevard (the last notable mansion found on the Boulevard) and the enclave of single-family homes within the environs of historic St. Joseph’s Church. These properties should be preserved and renovated without the threat of higher density piecemeal development at this time. However, a re-examination of these blocks should be closely monitored if the realignment of the I-70/Polk-Quincy Viaduct and/or a future interchange connection with I-70 and Topeka Boulevard occurs which could have a major impact on the area.

**Primary Uses:** mixed  
**Zoning Districts:** D-1 (Downtown)  
**Density/Intensity:** Moderate-High

**Industrial:** This designation recognizes both existing light and heavy industrial use types concentrated near the Interstate entrances/exits. Ideally, light industrial uses such as light manufacturing, assembly, distribution, processing, warehousing, etc. would be appropriate farther away from the neighborhood. Light industrial uses have long been established in the vicinity of I-70 and SW 1st Street on the periphery of the neighborhood. This designation does not support light industrial uses in the case of wholesale redevelopment or significant changes to the alignment of I-70 that alters the setting of this area.

**Primary Use:** light manufacturing, storage, assembly, processing, etc.  
**Zoning District:** I-1 (Light Industrial)  
**Intensity:** High

**Institutional:** This designation recognizes existing schools, churches, utilities, and off-site parking lots. Major expansion of existing churches or schools...
off-site is not anticipated nor recommended at this time. Limited expansion of institutional uses should be assessed accordingly. A potential community center within Sumner School is the only anticipated new institutional use (see * below for more details).

**Primary Uses**: Schools, churches, etc.

**Zoning Districts**: primarily R-2 (Single-Family)

**Intensity**: Medium (limited occurrences)

---

**Open Space/Parks**: This designation represents existing (Old Prairie Town Historic Site and Giles Park) and future park space (which could apply to accessible open space at the Sumner School location). It recognizes that the development of these sites is reserved for public open space and should not be developed for non-park or non-public uses. Expansion of Old Prairie Town Historic Site is envisioned to be limited to 1 or 2 single-family parcels on SW Fillmore as necessary for them to carry out their master plan. At this time, expansion beyond that is not seen as a benefit to the neighborhood because of the sound conditions of the historic homes that surround it.

**Primary Use**: Parks, Public Facilities

**Zoning District**: OS-1 (Open Space)

**Intensity**: Low

---

**Transition Areas**: Blocks marked with dashed lines indicate areas that could potentially re-develop at higher intensity levels for non-single family purposes due to existing underlying zoning, or because of the presence of vacant land, deteriorated/blighted structures or other nearby non-residential uses. It is recommended that if non-residential development (or higher intensity residential development) is pursued within these areas, that it be within a Planned Unit Development (PUD) or similar zoning designation. The PUD designation would provide a more flexible range of permitted land uses within these locations while applying appropriate standards upon higher intensity development that may impact the long-term viability of single-family homes in the neighborhood. Development within the Transition Areas should consider appropriate design standards in terms of materials, access, building orientation, scale, architecture, etc. for potentially incompatible uses such as parking lots/structures, public facilities, outside storage, and office uses, among others. Commercial or industrial development should only be considered if it incorporates buffering standards into its design.

---

The asterisk applies to Sumner School and recognizes the potential of this property to serve multiple land-use functions for the neighborhood in the future. Potential land uses will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and should be limited to the following: institutional uses including a neighborhood-scale community center, single-family dwellings, and park space open to the public. It is recommended that any change of zoning necessary to accommodate a new use be conditional in nature (e.g. PUD) in order to ensure compatibility with the neighborhood and the recommendations of this Plan.
V. REVITALIZATION STRATEGY

“The greatest asset a city or neighborhood can have is something different than every other place.”

Jane Jacobs

A. THEMES

✓ “Reveal Thyself!” – The Ward-Meade neighborhood is one of the best kept secrets in Topeka. It is home to some of the greatest concentration of historic resources and major anchors of any neighborhood – Old Prairie Town Historic Site, Meadows Elementary School, Sumner School, St. Joseph’s Church, West Side Baptist Church and Downtown. The neighborhood must find ways to “reveal” its unique and historic homes and streets in order to neutralize image problems generally associated along its perimeter.

✓ “Make an Impact” – Concentrate improvements in a 3-4 block area to create momentum and synergy by building off other major investments (e.g., Meadows, future Sumner School re-use). This will have the effect of restoring public confidence in the neighborhood and encourage private rehabilitation and investment within the surrounding blocks.

✓ “Take Ownership” – The NIA must champion the implementation of this Plan, take the lead in what happens in the neighborhood, knock on doors, re-energize its volunteer system, and provide clear direction/input to decision-makers on how to realize neighborhood goals. No greater impact will be felt than if the NIA can stay committed and organized to the Plan’s causes, as well as maintain grassroots revitalization efforts and strong connections with neighborhood residents.

✓ “Housing and Livability” – The most profound effect on the neighborhood’s health will be felt in its ability to address both the supply side (housing quality) and the demand side (neighborhood livability) of housing. Because of the historic character of so many of the homes and relative lack of vacant land, repair of the existing housing stock must be emphasized. Just as important, non-housing strategies (e.g., community facilities, crime/nuisance prevention) must be addressed to add value to the demand side of housing or the livability of the neighborhood.
B. TARGET AREA STRATEGIES

The Concept (Where to Start?)

Neighborhoods make up the fabric of a city, but blocks make up the fabric of a neighborhood. When the fabric is strong the city or the neighborhood is strong. If the fabric becomes frayed, wears down or forms a gap, the city or neighborhood becomes weak and susceptible to accelerated decay. The most successful strategies in neighborhood revitalization involve the repairing and re-weaving of this fabric. To do this, a neighborhood revitalization strategy must protect key assets or anchors, isolate weaknesses, and re-position them as strengths. **Map #8** depicts these current features of the Ward-Meade neighborhood as defined below:

**Anchor** – These are rigid points of support that give a neighborhood identity. They are long-term community investments that draw people to them as destination thereby lending stability to the area and making them desirable for residential investment (e.g., schools, churches, parks and shops).

**Strength/Potential** – These areas are the relatively strongest blocks of a neighborhood which exhibit staying power and/or recent investment. These are also underachieving areas that have the potential to become strengths or anchors given an appropriate stimulus.

**Weakness** – These have the highest concentrations of negative conditions such as low homeownership, vacant/boarded houses, poverty and high crime. The more concentrated these are, the greater social problems occur and the more entrenched they become. Diluting their concentration gives surrounding areas a greater chance to revitalize on their own.

Spatial relationships play a dynamic role in the overall concept. Spread too thin, anchors or areas of strength will fail to influence beyond their natural reach leaving poorly performing areas little hope of turning around on their own. Conversely, if anchors or areas of strength are spaced more evenly and linked to their surroundings they will begin to influence the poorly performing blocks around it by creating greater confidence in those areas. Much like a shopping mall where the stores between two anchors will benefit from greater pedestrian traffic, weaker blocks isolated between two closely placed areas of strength will be prone to more investment. The fabric of the neighborhood can be re-woven back together by protecting anchors and making the most of the existing areas of strength in order to squeeze out older markets that do not work.

Image also plays an important role in a neighborhood’s revitalization. A neighborhood’s strength is often based upon market perception. If the market only knows about a neighborhood based on negative images (e.g., crime reports, run down edges, etc.), improving these images can begin to change market attitudes and introduce new investment to the area.
If followed, this strategy will also ensure that public dollars are invested wisely. The City has currently committed to investing several million dollars into the Chesney Park and Ward-Meade neighborhoods in 2010 and 2011. The goal of any public investment is to leverage the greatest amount of private investment possible. These public dollars should be carefully targeted to blocks that will give the neighborhood the best chance to succeed for years to come (i.e., re-establish market forces). If done correctly, focusing resources in a portion of the neighborhood should not only transform the affected area, but also effectively stabilize the blocks around it and entice new investment from the private sector.

**Target Areas**

One of the major challenges to the revitalization of Ward-Meade is in revealing more of the “hidden treasures” in the neighborhood. Most of the best examples of renovated and well-maintained blocks of historic homes lie deepest in the neighborhood away from where most cars and outsiders travel. Likewise, there are several key destination points – Meadows School, Old Prairie Town Historic Site, Sumner School, and West Side Baptist Church – that attract people from within and outside of the neighborhood. Targeting blocks linked to these areas is vital. The idea is to concentrate a critical mass of improvements in a 3-4 block area so that it stimulates additional investment by adjacent property owners, increases property values, and leaves behind a visible transformation of the area. If the improvements are not visible enough, then the stabilization of that 3-4 block area is marginalized and future investments to the area are not leveraged.

The following “target areas” have been selected based upon the existing conditions of the neighborhood and are discussed in further detail. They represent areas with the most collective weaknesses and/or strategic importance, and are listed in order of priority. Each “target area” will require a different set of strategies for improvement, of which public funding will be limited.

- **SW 4th / 5th Street Corridor (SW Clay Street to Western Avenue)** – SW Clay, Fillmore and Western Avenue are several of the most strategic paths in the neighborhood as they lead into major destinations within the neighborhood (Meadows Elementary, West Side Baptist Church, Old Prairie Town Historic Site and Sumner School). The blocks between SW 4th and 5th Street, furthermore, are important image corridors as these two streets are highly-traveled commuter corridors for the downtown area. In their current state, these blocks, along with many of the homes that face SW 4th and 5th Street, do not present a positive image for the neighborhood. Overall housing conditions for these blocks are poor, and infrastructure such as the stone curbing along SW Clay Street is increasingly falling into disrepair. In fact, housing conditions within the 400 blocks of both SW Fillmore Street and Western Avenue have declined since a survey was conducted in 2001, which represents the greatest amount of deterioration to occur in the neighborhood since that time. Crime in this area is also particularly high and has become more concentrated in this area since 2001 (refer to Sec. 2 Neighborhood Profile).

The 400 blocks of SW Clay, Fillmore and Western Avenue are more primed for investment than any other area of the neighborhood because they are adjacent to existing areas of strength to the north and west that make up a large enclave of stable, owner-occupied blocks in the Ward-Meade and Kenwood neighborhoods. These blocks will be at risk of
long-term decline if the 400 blocks of SW Clay, Fillmore and Western Avenue cannot be strengthened. SW 4th / 5th Streets are highly visible corridors that can thread these blocks together making them a logical choice for targeted public investment. Other strategic factors include:

- This target area is a key transition for the neighborhood and bridges the gap between very stable blocks of housing and other areas of more severe deterioration. This provides the sort of environment where short-term results can be achieved with relatively modest intervention, and represents several key anchors upon which to build. It will also serve to prevent poor housing and neighborhood conditions from spreading to other stronger and healthier portions of the neighborhood.
- This target area has a concentration of single-family houses ideal for starter homes, relatively few vacant lots, and is not compromised by multiple-family uses.
- SW Clay Street, Fillmore Street and Western Avenue are important image corridors in the neighborhood and are key gateways to Meadows Elementary, West Side Baptist Church, Old Prairie Town Historic Site and Sumner School.
- There is potential for either a local or national historic district within this area.
- Since these three blocks are located between Meadows Elementary and the Sumner School building, revitalizing these blocks will repair the fabric that has been torn between these two important sites within the neighborhood. It will also reconnect an existing area of strength (Meadows Elementary) with a future potential strength in the neighborhood (i.e., the successful rehabilitation and reuse of the Sumner School building).

Strategies to revitalize this corridor within the neighborhood should include the following:

- Primary targeting efforts should take place in the 400 blocks of SW Clay Street, Fillmore Street and Western Avenue. Homes that front SW 4th and 5th Streets should also be included within the primary area for improvements.
- A secondary area should be established in the 300 & 500 blocks of SW Clay, Fillmore and Western Avenue, with priority moving west to east. If enough participation from property owners has still not occurred, the 400 & 500 blocks of SW Buchanan Street should also be considered as this is a key entryway into the neighborhood and Meadows Elementary, even though it is located away from the primary recommended area.
- Housing strategies should primarily include:
  - Interior/exterior rehabilitation of many existing owner-occupied homes.
  - Exterior rehab of some renter-occupied homes.
  - Conversion of some renter-occupied homes into owner-occupied homes.
  - Vacant lots with little potential to support new housing should be incorporated with adjacent properties to help alleviate blight amongst these areas. Additionally, unoccupied and deteriorated structures that lack viability for long-term owner-occupancy should be selectively demolished. New infill units should be built where the opportunity exists; otherwise, the adjoining property owner(s) should be given the opportunity to incorporate the empty lot after the unit is demolished.
- Part of the housing and infrastructure improvements need to address “curb appeal” aspects. Specifically, trees/vegetation need to be trimmed or removed and erosion of
yard areas need to be prevented through necessary retaining walls, sod planting, fencing, or other means.

- Infrastructure improvements should include construction of concrete alleys, repair of brick sidewalks as needed, repair of existing concrete sidewalks, curb/gutter repair, pedestrian bump-outs at the intersections of SW 4th/5th & SW Clay, Fillmore and Western Avenue, mill and overlay of streets that have existing asphalt, and potential installation of additional street lighting. Refer to Infrastructure & Circulation on page 56 for more details.

Exterior deterioration of a growing number of homes, unkempt lawns and crumbling curbs and sidewalks leave a poor impression along image streets in the Ward-Meade neighborhood such as SW Clay (left) and SW Western Ave (right).

- Sumner School Area – The Sumner School area is a very strategic and visible portion of the neighborhood, and is a key anchor and potential strength upon which to surround revitalization efforts. The fact that it is a National Historic Landmark and is part of the Brown vs. Board of Education story is reason enough to target housing improvements along blocks adjacent to the school. SW Western Avenue and Taylor Street should be its own recognized target area as the key improvement blocks along this street exhibit “Intermediate Deterioration” and “Major Deterioration” for housing conditions, and which have a homeownership rate that is less than 50% (refer to Maps #3 & #4).

Stable areas, however, generally do not surround the school and conditions severely deteriorate to the east. This provides the sort of environment where long-term results can only be achieved with major intervention, which should consist of voluntary acquisition and demolition of private property for development of housing for qualified owner-occupants. The key to inducing housing and homeowner investment in these blocks will ultimately rest with the successful re-use of the Sumner School site and a significant reduction in crime (real and perceived). At this point, it is assumed that the successful re-use of Sumner School will not be realized for the next few years, thus any major public intervention in this area is not advisable until these blocks are riper for investment.
Strategies to revitalize this corridor within the neighborhood should include the following:

- Primary targeting efforts should take place in the 300-400 blocks of SW Western Taylor Street. Homes that front SW 4th and 5th Streets should also be included within the primary area for improvements.
- A secondary area should be established in the 200 & 500 blocks of SW Western and Taylor.
- Housing strategies should primarily include:
  - Interior/exterior rehabilitation of many existing owner-occupied homes.
  - Exterior rehab of some renter-occupied homes.
  - Conversion of some renter-occupied homes into owner-occupied homes.
  - Vacant lots with little potential to support new housing should be incorporated with adjacent properties to help alleviate blight amongst these areas. Additionally, vacant and deteriorated structures that lack viability for long-term owner-occupancy should be selectively demolished. New infill units should be built where the opportunity exists; otherwise the adjoining property owner(s) should be given the opportunity to incorporate the empty lot after the unit is demolished.
- Infill housing for homeownership should be targeted first along the 300 & 400 blocks of SW Taylor Street. Infill units should be selectively located upon existing vacant lots and/or replace dilapidated units that do not have long-term viability for owner-occupancy. Therefore, voluntary demolition and acquisition of property for infill should be a priority in these blocks. The new single-family units should meet the Plan’s design guidelines including the Secretary of Interior Standards.
- Several blocks of housing may have the potential to be included within either a local or national historic district.
- Where needed, infrastructure improvements should include construction of concrete alleys and sidewalks, repair of brick sidewalks as needed, curb/gutter repair, mill and overlay of streets and installation of additional street lighting, and pedestrian bump-outs at the intersections of SW 4th/5th and Western Avenue/Taylor Street. Refer to Infrastructure & Circulation on page 56 for more details.
- Part of the housing and infrastructure improvements need to address “curb appeal” aspects. Specifically, trees/vegetation need to be trimmed or removed and erosion of yard areas need to be prevented through necessary retaining walls, sod planting, fencing, or other means.

Properties along the 400 block SW Taylor Street are showing increasing signs of deterioration.
The two images above show the deteriorating conditions along SW 4th and 5th Streets, which are major image corridors. Poorly-maintained homes, sheds and garages, as well as crumbling infrastructure leave a very poor impression in this area between SW Western and Taylor.

✓ **SW Polk-Tyler Streets (SW 2nd to 5th Street)** – The largely single-family character of this area has suffered the most and exhibits a large concentration of converted homes into apartments, vacant lots and parking lots for nearby office and commercial uses, deteriorated housing conditions and other hot-spots of crime. Light industrial uses to the north along SW Polk and Tyler have further reduced demand for homeownership in the eastern portion of the neighborhood. One advantage this area does have is an affordable housing stock that retains much of its traditional architectural character. The Hicks Block apartment building at SW 6th and Tyler, for example, is on the National Historic Register and has provided a small resurgence of old-home restoration in this part of the neighborhood.

The single-family character of this target area, however, has been severely compromised by vacant lots, converted apartment houses and other non-residential uses. Existing underlying zoning and land uses within these blocks suggest that housing at a slightly higher intensity level may be more appropriate. The lack of an existing strengths and the scale of deterioration in this part of the neighborhood would severely hamper the ability to leverage private investment with public assistance. Public investment in this area would need to be substantial and would not have as much spin-off effect as in other target areas.

Strategies to revitalize this corridor within the neighborhood should include the following:

- Primary targeting efforts should take place in the 300-400 blocks of SW Polk and Tyler Streets. Homes that front SW 4th and 5th Streets should also be included within the primary area for improvements.
- A secondary area should be established in the 200 blocks of SW Polk and Tyler.
- Housing strategies should primarily include:
  - Interior/exterior rehabilitation of many existing owner-occupied homes.
  - Exterior rehab of some renter-occupied buildings.
  - Conversion of some renter-occupied homes into owner-occupied homes.
Vacant lots with little potential to support new housing should be incorporated with adjacent properties to help alleviate blight amongst these areas. Additionally, vacant and deteriorated structures that lack viability for long-term owner-occupancy should be selectively demolished. New infill units should be built where the opportunity exists; otherwise the adjoining property owner(s) should be given the opportunity to incorporate the empty lot after the unit is demolished.

- Infill housing for homeownership should be targeted first along the 300-400 blocks of SW Tyler Street. Duplex, tri-plex and quad-plex housing options should also be considered for this area. Therefore, voluntary demolition and acquisition of property for infill should be a priority in these blocks. The new units should meet the Plan’s design guidelines.

- Infrastructure improvements should include construction of concrete alleys and sidewalks, curb/gutter repair, mill and overlay of streets, installation of additional street lighting, and pedestrian bump-outs at the intersection of SW 4th/5th Streets. Refer to Infrastructure & Circulation on page 56 for more details.

- Part of the housing and infrastructure improvements need to address “curb appeal” aspects. Specifically, trees/vegetation need to be trimmed or removed and erosion of yard areas need to be prevented through necessary retaining walls, sod planting, fencing, or other means.

Images previous page: Industrial, commercial and vacant properties reside adjacent to many single-family homes along SW Polk and Tyler Streets, thus reducing the overall demand for homeownership in this area of the neighborhood.
Summary of Target Area Findings

- The most important assets to protect or to build off of are Meadows Elementary and Meadows sub-area, Old Prairie Town Historic Site, Sumner School, and SW 4th and 5th Streets (in no particular order). Any strategy to invest public funds should go towards protecting one or more of these assets.

- The blocks along SW Clay, Fillmore Street and Western Avenue are a transitioning area within the neighborhood that bridges the gap between the Meadows sub-area and that of the much weaker blocks east of Sumner School. These streets are also important image corridors in the neighborhood and thus have a number of key anchors upon which to build.

- Strong homeownership levels exist in the blocks just north of the key improvement blocks of SW Clay Street, Fillmore Street and Western Avenue, thus making those blocks ideal to leverage homeowner re-investment as a spin-off effect.

- Repairing homes along the blocks of SW Clay, Fillmore Street and Western Avenue in a historically-sensitive manner will increase the possibility that they could be designated as contributing structures within a potential historic district and attracting new homeowners.

- Housing and infrastructure investment should also be targeted along property that fronts or abuts SW 4th and 5th Streets as these are important commuter routes in the neighborhood. This will also have the effect of producing very quick and noticeable improvements in the neighborhood.

- Sumner School is not surrounded by stable blocks of housing as conditions severely deteriorate to the east. The key to inducing housing and homeowner investment in these blocks will ultimately rest with the successful re-use of the Sumner School site and a significant reduction in crime (real and perceived).

- SW Polk and Tyler Streets are isolated from “residential” strengths and is further undermined by land use incompatibilities to the north and east boundaries of the neighborhood. It has suffered the most deterioration, and has a high number of vacant lots. Public investment should be conservative unless done as a large-scale investment.
C. NEIGHBORHOOD-WIDE STRATEGIES

The following recommendations will expand upon the Target Area Strategies previously discussed in the Plan to include the remainder of the neighborhood. Strategies related to citizen participation, neighborhood character and image, infrastructure, community facilities and safety are all critical to an environment of livability that emphasizes a traditional neighborhood quality of life. These strategies can add significant value to the “demand-side” of the neighborhood and are discussed in greater detail in the following pages.

1. COMMUNITY BUILDING

Community Building is a key part of a neighborhood revitalization strategy because its focus is on making the neighborhood a stronger advocate for itself. Empowering the residents and institutions of a neighborhood with the notion that they can foster change that impacts the neighborhood in a positive manner is one of the goals of community building. Two aspects of community building – organizing & public safety – are explored below to help create a better sense of community.

**Organizing** - Successful organizations have the wherewithal to succeed. A neighborhood’s ability to complete a competitive grant application, run successful meetings that are open to all residents of the neighborhood, and complete projects in a timely manner demonstrates to decision makers and funding organizations that the neighborhood is serious about getting things done. Ideally, the neighborhood should function like a business. Below are strategies to increase organizational capacity:

- **Neighborhood Improvement Association Meetings**: The City supports regularly scheduled meetings between neighborhood improvement association officers and citizens to increase awareness in the neighborhood.

- **Neighborhood Empowerment Initiative**: This grant program through the City of Topeka funds public facility and infrastructure projects. Grants will encourage a match by the neighborhood organization or a match generated in the form of volunteer labor. NIA’s that are currently receiving target area assistance (i.e., Chesney Park and Ward-Meade for the years 2010 & 2011) are not eligible for this program. The final allocations of these project funds are made by the City Council.

- **Education and Training**: NIA leaders should consider attending seminars and conferences that deal with community building, neighborhood revitalization and other community issues. As an example, Neighborhoods USA holds an annual conference and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Training Institute conducts a number of training conferences every year as well. It is recommended that the NIA and City explore ways to encourage neighborhood leaders to attend.

- **Strength in Numbers**: When opportunities present themselves for the neighborhood to appear before decision makers, the neighborhood must be able to demonstrate a
unified voice with a large number of people. The NIA’s monthly newsletter is currently used as a way to rally supporters and to notify residents of activities taking place in the neighborhood.

○ Social Activities: Fun activities that bring neighbors together are an important element of a strong neighborhood. Fourth of July block parties bring neighbors together, as well as other events such as pancake feeds, potlucks, and neighborhood socials with live music and games held at the Park. The neighborhood also participates in “National Night Out”, which is a block party designed to heighten drug and crime prevention awareness in the neighborhood.

○ Marketing: The keys to successfully marketing a neighborhood’s assets lie within implementing many of the above strategies already mentioned. However, once you have assets or potential assets to show off, you still have to let others know about it. The easiest way to get started is making sure that the neighborhood is helping in any way possible to support existing attractions of the neighborhood – Old Prairie Town Historic Site, Meadows School, Sumner School, St. Joseph’s Church, historic properties. These assets and the events associated with them draw people into and through Ward-Meade and are a natural marketing point. Some things the NIA could promote to help market the neighborhood include:

✓ Continued support of the Apple Festival and other events held at the Old Prairie Town Historic Site (a schedule of events can be found on the City of Topeka’s website).
✓ Developing a welcoming packages for realtors and new residents
✓ Having greater partnerships ventures between Meadows and Old Prairie Town at Ward-Meade Historic Site
✓ Hold historic walking tours/brochures
✓ Starting a holiday home/garden tour (also as a potential fund raiser) in conjunction with Old Prairie Town Historic Site mansion and botanical gardens.
✓ Having block parties or neighborhood socials
✓ Maintaining an effective and visible NIA
✓ Door-to-door promotion by the NIA of housing loan / grant programs available to targeted areas

Public Safety - A major goal of this Plan is to create a safe, clean and livable environment for all residents of Ward-Meade to live, learn, work and play. A crime problem is a multifaceted issue. There is no magic solution that is going to erase the occurrence or even the perception of crime within the community. Implementing the revitalization strategies described previously will go a long way towards making the neighborhood safer for residents of the area. In the short-term, however, here are a few programs and activities that citizens can do to reverse the negative cycle of crime and begin to reclaim their neighborhood.

○ Citizen Patrols: The neighborhood should continue public safety activities such as “Stroll Patrols” that put more “eyes” on the street and discourage crime from happening in the area. The Citizen Patrol Coalition of Topeka-Shawnee County is a program to assist law enforcement in their fight against neighborhood crime, and
residents can apply to become members. The desired effect of Citizen Patrol is to increase the cooperation of private citizens with law enforcement to watch, record, and report crime throughout the City.

- Weed and Seed: This is a collaborative, participatory community development program between the City of Topeka and the U.S. Department of Justice. The program seeks to “weed” out crime and “seed” neighborhood revitalization. The program focuses community and City resources to empower neighborhood residents and promote positive long term change. The Weed and Seed strategy combines four elements: law enforcement, community policing, prevention/intervention/treatment services and neighborhood restoration.

- Westar Energy Inc., will pay for the installation of standard street lights within low/moderate income neighborhoods for individual homeowners who are then required to pay the electricity costs (varies).

- Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED): Safe Streets and the Police Department can help the neighborhood determine which property configurations discourage criminal activity. For example, the “5 & 2” rule states that trees should be trimmed to at least five feet high and bushes should be trimmed so that they are no higher than two feet tall as well.

- Crime Free Multi-Housing Program: The Topeka Police Department, Safe Streets and the City’s Code Compliance department have teamed up to provide landlords with free education in keeping their tenants safe and preventing crimes against their properties. The program uses a three-step process to help landlords and property managers make their units secure, prevent and identify drug operators, screen tenants effectively and learn about liability laws. The three steps landlords must take to earn certification as a Crime Free Multi-Housing property are to complete the eight-hour class, have a property inspection by code compliance services and police, as well as conduct a “Safety Social” for residents of the rental property at least once a year.

- Neighbor to Neighbor Volunteers: The “broken windows” theory states that the presence of even the slightest traces of neglected property such as broken windows can cause a ripple effect in which other adjacent property owners lose confidence in the neighborhood or where criminals begin to prey upon areas that “don’t care.”

This can be prevented through volunteer “neighbor to neighbor” programs that address smaller housing maintenance issues — painting, porches, gutters, etc. — that prolong the life of the existing housing stock and prevent the “broken windows” cycle. The NIA could also utilize existing volunteer rehab programs such as Rebuilding Together in order to accomplish the same purpose. Local businesses, churches and individuals donate money for materials used to repair homes for elderly residents who cannot afford to make the repairs themselves.

- Code Enforcement: Enforcement of housing, zoning, and environmental codes is an ongoing city-wide program that is used to assure a minimum level of maintenance and compatible uses of properties occur. In light of the high number of conversions
and absentee landlords in the neighborhood, the enforcement of these codes can be an effective tool when combined with programs that encourage owners to participate in the rehabilitation process.

2. HISTORIC PRESERVATION & NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN GUIDELINES

**Economic Incentives** - In addition to taking greater pride in the neighborhood’s history, establishment of a state/national district adds various incentives for housing rehabilitation. Historic districts have been proven to increase property values through maintaining the architectural integrity of a significant grouping of historic structures. Economic incentives in the way of federal/state income tax credits help stimulate investment in restoration. A state income tax credit of 25% of the qualified costs (minimum $5,000) is available to improve an historic structure or contributing structure within an historic district. If it costs $20,000 to rehab consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (see Appendix), a $5,000 credit can be taken on your state income taxes. A federal tax credit program also works in a similar fashion for federal income taxes, except it can only be applied to income-producing properties.

**Historic Listings** – In 2003, the City of Topeka Planning Department implemented a recommendation of the original neighborhood plan by receiving a survey and planning grant from the Kansas State Historical Society (KSHS). This survey included all properties north of SW 5th Street to determine their potential for listing on a State / National Register either individually or as a district. This survey was updated by KSHS staff in October, 2009 and concluded the following properties had potential for listing:

- **Districts (see inset next page)**
  - SW Clay (SW 4th to I-70 minus the west side of the 200 block)
  - SW Western Avenue (SW 2nd to I-70)

- **Individual**
  - 323 SW Clay
  - 120 NW Western
  - 311 SW Fillmore

323 SW Clay St.
Many of the houses in the blocks mentioned above already fall under state historic review because they are within the environs of Sumner School, Sargent House, and the Ward-Meade House, which are National Register structures. All projects occurring upon a registered historic property or district, or within the environs of a registered property or district, must meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Those same homes within the environs, however, are not eligible for tax-credit financial incentives since they are not in an historic district. While the integrity of the homes is relatively intact, the use of secondary/synthetic siding materials that have been applied over original or clapboard siding is widespread throughout the Ward-Meade neighborhood. Historic buildings with secondary siding materials are typically classified as non-contributing resources in a historic district. Removing the secondary siding materials to reveal the homes’ historic siding could allow for a larger area to be included within historic district boundaries. Some of the homes in these areas, furthermore, are falling under more disrepair and the tax-credit could be an added incentive to help spur rehabilitation. In order to start the process for a district nomination, a majority of the property owners should agree to the designation.

There is also the Hughes Conoco Service Station, which is listed on the State Register of Historic Places but does not have any environs. The Hughes Service Station is significant because it was operated by Edwin Hughes, who was one of the first African Americans in Topeka to operate a business outside of Topeka’s established black neighborhoods and the first African American in the city to operate a station selling gas supplied by a major petroleum company. It is also significant as an early 20th Century Tudor Revival-style gas station.

Hughes Conoco Service Station, 400 SW Taylor Street.

A Local Landmarks designation could also be utilized as a viable alternative, either for a historic district or for properties listed individually. This is a program started by the Topeka Landmarks Commission that recognizes properties that have historic architectural or cultural significance. It is a voluntary designation and does not require any ‘environs’ that place limits on adjacent properties as do buildings listed in the State or National Register of Historic Places. This designation is simply a matter of pride for the homeowner and represents a demonstrated commitment to historic preservation. Local landmarks, however, must still maintain their architectural integrity and requires approval by the Landmarks Commission for exterior alterations. The designation is applied as an overlay zoning district and can only be approved or removed through the City’s zoning procedures.
Design Guidelines for Rehabilitation – The neighborhood has enough unique and diverse historic housing styles that give it a competitive advantage over other areas of the City if preserved appropriately. Given the traditional character of the housing stock in the neighborhood, it is recommended that city-funded rehabilitation projects be sensitive to character-defining features of the Ward-Meade neighborhood by following design guidelines to ensure that the size, scale, form and detail of the structure will fit well with its surroundings. Doing so will do several things: 1) it will give homes a competitive advantage when marketing, 2) it will ultimately increase re-sale or property values, including surrounding homes, 3) it will lead to more pride in the neighborhood and young homeowners, and 4) it will help the city comply with federal regulations when utilizing CDBG funding for rehabilitation.

Inherent historic features of the existing housing stock should dictate such guidelines and should not be based upon a false historical interpretation of the neighborhood. For example, the re-construction and rehabilitation of porches should not detract from the look and character of older homes. The two pictures in the next page show the finished re-construction of several porches in older neighborhoods in Topeka. Important elements to preserve/replace when re-constructing or rehabilitating a porch should include the existing base of the column, ornamented columns rather than simple wooden columns, horizontal railings with balustrade joints, and a paint job that compliments the color of the house.

Porch Preferred

Porch Not Preferred
In addition to this, the following is list of do’s and don’ts for restoration and repair of the historic housing stock with examples found in the neighborhood. However, it is not a comprehensive guide for rehabilitation. Please refer to the Kansas State Historical Society (www.kshs.org) or the National Park Service (www.nps.gov) for more information on historic rehabilitation examples and tips.

### Do’s

**Roof**
- Retain the original roofline
- Retain dormers and dormer windows

**Siding**
- Retain the original siding whenever possible
- If siding needs to be replaced, replace with siding that matches the previous size, shape and texture.
- On masonry structures, all mortar repairs should match the original mortar as much as possible.

**Windows and Doors**
- Retain original windows and doors when possible.
- If window or door needs replaced, then new one should match the size, shape and arrangement of the previous.

**Porches**
- Retain and repair original detailing such as trim or lattice.
- Porch steps should be replaced only with materials appropriate for the façade.

### Don’ts

**Roof**
- Don’t modify the roof profile

**Siding**
- Don’t replace thin clapboard siding with vertical or diagonal siding.
- Don’t cover clapboard or wood siding with vinyl siding.

**Windows and Doors**
- Don’t replace original vertical windows with modern horizontal windows.
- Don’t block-off portions of original windows to fit modern standard windows.
- Do not use metal or fiberglass awnings on the main façade.
- Don’t install shutters to windows if none existed before.

**Porches**
- Don’t enclose or remove original porches.

**General**
- Don’t build additions to the front façade of the structure.
## House Styles in the Ward-Meade Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Prairie/Craftsman (1900-20)** | High pitched roof  
Front porch  
Rear yard vehicle access  
Stone or brick column bases  
Raised stone or brick foundations  
Horizontal lap siding  
Extended eaves  
Flattened gable roof edges  
Proportionate window sizes |
| **Craftsman Bungalow (1910-1925)** | Extended roof covers porch  
Tapered columns on brick piers  
Simple square porch rails |
| **Folk Victorian (1870-1910)** | Front porch  
Wide base wood porch supports  
Raised foundation  
Multiple roof lines  
Trim detailing  
Bay windows |
| **Victorian Queen Anne (1880-1910)** | Front porch  
Textured shingle siding  
Raised foundation  
Multiple roof lines  
Trim detailing  
Detailed spindle work |
Design Guidelines for Infill Housing - New housing development should maintain high-quality standards that complement the traditional and historic characteristics of the neighborhood as outlined in the next page. Based upon these characteristics, it is recommended that new infill homes have the following characteristics:

- Primarily 2 stories.
- A functional front porch with sturdy columns and bases.
- Proportionate window to wall space.
- At least one front-gable roof pitch of 7/12 or more is ideal with multiple roof lines.
- Raised foundation.
- Consistent setbacks based upon the existing front yard setbacks of other homes within the block in order to retain a cohesive identity.
- Garages (attached or detached depending upon lot size) should be placed to the rear of the house and should be very clearly subordinate to the principal structure.
- Where alleys are present, it is recommended that garage access be taken from the rear of the lot or from a side street if it is a corner lot.
- Lap siding with similar spacing to traditional homes. Vinyl siding is acceptable; however, manufactured hardiplank siding is often used and matches better with older homes.
- Trim detailing.

Cornerstone duplex in the 500 block of SW Clay Street in the Ward-Meade neighborhood that embodies most of the appropriate design features for a low-density neighborhood despite not having a raised foundation.

Design Guidelines for Image Corridors - These guidelines particularly apply to areas along SW 6th Avenue and SW Topeka Boulevard where higher-intensity residential/office/commercial land uses front image corridors and back-up to established single-family areas of historic character. These guidelines will not only establish these areas as a transition between high and low-intensity land uses, but they will also prevent “strip” characteristics that are commonly found along arterial streets and areas of suburban development, which would not be appropriate adjacent to areas with traditional neighborhood development.
- Encourage mixed-use development instead of single use buildings if possible.
- All buildings should match the characteristics of traditional commercial and residential development that is evident in parts of the area (reference the images below for examples).
- Monolithic structures with long, unbroken wall planes, surfaces, and roof planes are discouraged. Pitched roofs are preferred for single buildings. Traditional materials are also encouraged such as stone, brick, and siding spaced similar to nearby homes.
- Multiple story buildings should step-down in height the closer they get to single-family homes and should not be higher than two to three stories at the front or rear setback line.
- Buildings should minimize front setbacks from the street based upon the existing setbacks of other buildings within the block in order to retain a cohesive street edge.
- Buildings should be placed as close to the street edge as possible while still allowing adequate space for sidewalks and pedestrian activity.
- Parking lots should not dominate street frontages and should be placed behind or to the side of the principle structure.

**Preferred**

![The Hicks Block building has a building setback close to the street, a parking lot that is not located in front of the building, brick architecture, and a facade that has traditional residential qualities such as porch columns and steps and window details.](image)

**Preferred**

![This commercial building along SW 6th Avenue is an example of traditional architecture that is original to the neighborhood and has features that should be replicated by new development. Parking is behind the building with several cut-back parking spaces along SW 6th Ave. that do not dominate the street frontage.](image)
Preferred: Consistent Setbacks

Consistent front setbacks are important in order to retain a coherent visual identity along the neighborhood’s border. Buildings set close to the street also provide visual interest with ground-floor uses such as shops with storefront display windows and provide an environment that is more suitable for pedestrian activities than automobile-oriented development.

Conservation Overlay/Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) Zoning District – The purpose of the conservation overlay district is to ensure that new development along the neighborhood’s perimeter (SW Topeka BLVD and 6th Ave.) maintains a traditional architectural appearance, which is critical to the overall image of the Ward-Meade neighborhood. Conservation overlay districts are an additional set of design regulations for new construction above and beyond the existing base zoning district that require the massing, orientation, setbacks, form, access, etc. to be consistent with the character of the neighborhood. A TND district could also permit other types of traditional development like an accessory dwelling unit that is subordinate in size and nature to the single-family house (e.g., garlow, granny flat, above garage, attic, basement, etc.) intended for extended families or to subsidize larger house improvements. New or rehabilitated homes for commercial uses should retain the look of a house so that the structure has flexible use depending on the tenants yet it still blends in with the surrounding character. Such an overlay district needs to be adopted by the City Council and should follow the Design Guidelines found in this Plan.

Technical Assistance for Repairs (Internet/Video) - Most insensitive rehabilitation jobs are done due to lack of knowledge of appropriate methods or materials on older homes. Good design does not necessarily equate to higher renovation costs. If done right, historically appropriate repairs will ultimately increase the value of their property and the neighborhood. For example, some old home renovations replace original sash cord windows with smaller vinyl windows never thinking that they could save money through replacement of sash cords, weather-stripping, glazing, and insulation around window frames (all do-it-yourself-type jobs). Original wood windows have longer life because of better wood and can be energy efficient with adequate storm windows. Many visual repair demonstrations are now documented on internet sites, including YouTube and the State Historic Preservation Office (www.kshs.org). Having neighbors share handouts, videos, or web-site links with each other at NIA meetings creates a trusted knowledge base so that questions can be answered from first-hand experience.
When City funds are used, priority investments into housing rehabilitation should be focused in the areas outlined in the Target Area Strategies section previously recommended in the Plan. Upgrading houses in a randomly dispersed pattern only dilutes the impact upon the neighborhood and will not lead to any spin-off effect in nearby blocks. The following programs are administered with federal funds through the Housing and Neighborhood Department (HND) of the City of Topeka on an income-eligible basis for low/moderate income households:

- **Major Rehabilitation** - This HND program is primarily intended for owner-occupied properties in need of interior and exterior repairs within selected target areas. However, up to thirty percent may be set aside for the rehabilitation of rental properties subject to selection by an RFP process. Funds may also be provided to assist with lead-paint controls and weatherproofing.

- **Exterior Rehabilitation** - This is primarily intended for owner and renter-occupied housing units that need significant exterior repairs of the existing structure. The assistance, however, may be available to properties that have documented historic significance and are in need of exterior repairs. Funds may be provided to assist with lead-paint controls as well.

- **Emergency Repairs** - Emergency home repair assistance (primarily repairs that are of an immediate health or safety nature) can be provided for low income owner-occupants throughout the neighborhood. This assistance is intended for higher cost, major emergency repairs. Minor maintenance and repairs remain the primary responsibility of the homeowner.

- **Accessibility Modifications** - This assistance is available to persons with disabilities throughout the City, whether they are owner-occupants or tenants. This assistance is intended to provide access into and out of the home. The priority is to build exterior ramps, widen doorways, and provide thresh-holds.

- **KDOC Affordable Housing** - This program is a cooperative venture with the Kansas Department of Corrections, in which KDOC provides women inmates, tools and equipment to form two crews for the rehabilitation of affordable housing units and sidewalk improvements.

- **Voluntary Demolition** – Assistance may be provided for the demolition of substantially deteriorated and vacant structures. The intent is to remove blighted structures that are beyond feasible repair (i.e. the cost to rehabilitate is more than 30% of the replacement value). For those structures that are privately owned, the City may institute a method of repayment for the demolition services provided, yet would not gain ownership of the property in question.

In areas of Ward-Meade that are not within the historical environs of any listed structure of the National Register of Historic Places, the use of federal funds for the purpose of demolition may not be available if the State Historic Preservation Officer...
(SHPO) determines that the structure could contribute to a potential historic district for listing on the National Register. The consulting parties will be required to agree upon ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential adverse effects if the project is to continue. A survey of the affected blocks could be performed by city Planning staff in cooperation with the SHPO to determine their potential of a district. If the area is deemed not worthy of a district nomination, then the demolitions could proceed.

If the survey shows that the area is district-worthy, then it is recommended that HND pursue steps with SHPO to sign a memorandum of agreement that will allow some selected demolitions to occur provided that other historical goals are advanced through mitigation. Some mitigation measures include surveying the historic character of the neighborhood, documentation of properties to be demolished, more sensitive rehabilitation methods for windows, porches, siding, etc. by the City and others as deemed appropriate by SHPO.

Infill Development - There are several infill development opportunities in the neighborhood, as previously discussed in the Target Area Strategies section. Funds can be used to facilitate and support housing development by providing infrastructure development, land acquisition, clearance, demolition, site development, housing construction, soft-second mortgages, closing cost assistance and construction-related associated costs.

Acquisition of larger infill opportunity areas should be explored through the City. The land could be held and marketed for development at a future date that adheres to the objectives of the Plan. Demolition and re-construction will need to be coordinated through HND in order to ensure expenditures follow federal regulations.

Additional Housing Considerations…

Lot Expansions – Opportunities for the City to acquire and demolish unoccupied and substandard homes, or vacant lots with little potential to support new housing should be offered to adjoining property owners who participate in the major rehabilitation program within the target areas. Lot expansions could also be useful within other infill opportunity areas. This would help to remove vacant and blighted homes that reside on small lots and have very little potential of being successfully inhabited for the long-term.

TOTO-II - Assistance is provided as a 2nd mortgage, deferred loan subsidizing the purchase and rehab costs of a home for families at or below 80% of median income. While the program is available Citywide, it is structured to encourage home purchases in at-risk and intensive care areas. Homeownership and debt counseling assistance are provided by Housing and Credit Counseling Inc. Lending institutions participate by managing the maintenance escrow.

Conversions to Single-Family Use - Where possible, a Rental Conversion Program should be used to acquire, rehabilitate and convert vacant rental properties into renovated homes, which will then be offered to homeowner occupants. In cases where large single-family structures have been divided into apartment units, the costs to re-convert and rehabilitate those structures may be higher than average. It is recommended that the City voluntarily acquire such properties as part of a major
rehab program, convert them to single-family units and then offer the home for purchase by a homeowner much like an infill development.

- **Neighborhood Revitalization Program** - The City offers a 10-year 95% property tax rebate for improvements that increase the value of the property by more than 10%. The rebate period can be extended up to 15 years for historic landmark properties. Improvements must be consistent with the adopted design guidelines for the neighborhood. The City’s Planning Department administers the program.

- **Design Guidelines** (see “Neighborhood Design Guidelines” on page 48).

## 4. INFRASTRUCTURE & CIRCULATION

**Basic Infrastructure** - Target areas for housing should be the first priority for upgrading the following basic infrastructure and restore public confidence in the Ward-Meade neighborhood:

- **Alleys** – Alley re-construction will improve circulation, drainage, and image. Alleys should be re-done in all affected target areas.

- **Curbing** - Stone curbing should be preserved wherever it is in good condition. Where replacement curbing is required because of deterioration, concrete that is formed in the rectangular shape of the existing stone curbing should be used to the extent possible. In all other where there is no stone curbing such as SW 4th/5th Streets, the shorter curb height is preferred and should remain a consistent height that is appropriate for modern uses.

Repair of curbing along SW 4th & 5th Streets, however, should be put on hold in order to study the potential for streetscape improvements that may include bike lanes (see SW 4th/5th Streets in the next few pages).

- **Additional Street / Pedestrian Lighting** – As previously mentioned, Westar Energy will pay for the installation of additional mid-block standard lights in low/moderate income neighborhoods, and the adjacent homeowner/s pay the additional electricity costs. As part of the further effort to improve the safety and image of the neighborhood and potential bikeways, decorative street lights should be installed along SW 4th & 5th Streets as an extension of the Washburn / Lane Parkway lighting project. Lighting glare along these roadways will need to be appropriate for a residential neighborhood instead of along a major thoroughfare. **Important note:** a funding source to operate and maintain the lights is currently not identified by the City.

- **Sidewalks** – Brick sidewalks should be preserved or repaired within an existing or potential historic district where brick is the predominate material, OR within the...
environs of an existing or potential district where it is maintained as the predominating material. The 300 and 400 blocks of SW Clay and Fillmore Streets should be a priority for brick sidewalk repair or replacement. Since brick sidewalks require more homeowner maintenance, concrete should be used to replace deteriorated brick sidewalks along SW 4th and 5th Street where lot sizes are small and homeownership is low. In all other areas, sidewalk repair should be taken on a case-by-case basis.

- **Streets** - Mill and overlay of asphalt streets that are in poor condition will be necessary. Brick streets are an important part of an historic neighborhood and should be preserved or repaired with brick since most of the brick streets appear to be in good condition.

- **Underground Utilities** - Utility lines should be placed underground in order to remove visual clutter in the neighborhood and reduce the risk of power outages. Placing utility lines underground, however, will require significant public and private investment and may be cost prohibitive.

**Circulation** - Ward-Meade is comprised of several east-west streets – SW 4th Street, 5th Street, 6th Avenue - that move sizeable volumes of commuter traffic at peak hours and do not necessarily detract from the livability of the neighborhood.

- **I-70 Polk-Quincy Viaduct Study** – The I-70 Polk-Quincy Viaduct study will analyze the conditions and alignment of I-70 from the MacVicar Avenue interchange through the 10th Street interchange. In addition to the I-70 mainline, the study will also consider other modes of transportation, such as public transit, bicycles and pedestrians. While most of the potential changes will have little effect upon the Ward-Meade neighborhood, there are several key issues that may affect traffic and circulation in certain areas. For example, the study will examine the possibility of repositioning the on- and off-ramps to provide better access to Topeka Boulevard and Kansas Avenue. This would have the benefit of eliminating “cut-through” traffic in the neighborhood resulting from drivers exiting the 1st Street exit from I-70. The study will also determine the future of the 3,800-foot long bridge that passes through a primarily mixed-use and industrial portion of the neighborhood near the downtown area.

- **Meadows Elementary** - Another important circulation issue concerns the 15-minute daily stampede of cars in and around Meadows Elementary School during the school year. The school, police and traffic engineers have collaborated to implement a “one-way” pick-up system along SW 2nd Street in the afternoons to alleviate vehicle conflicts and pedestrian safety concerns. There has been a positive response to maintain such a system. Street engineering can be part of the solution by preserving brick streets for slowing down cars, and improving pedestrian crossings by creating bump-outs at corners around the school and concrete in-lay crosswalks in the brick streets instead of painted crosswalks on brick that wash off.

- **SW 4th/5th Streets** – SW 4th & 5th Streets are important commuter corridors in the Ward-Meade neighborhood that connect the Downtown core of Topeka with vibrant urban neighborhoods nearby. As mentioned in the **Target Areas** section, however,
many portions of SW 4th/5th Streets do not leave a high-quality impression due to deteriorating homes, unmanicured lawns and broken infrastructure. In addition to the basic infrastructure and housing recommendations noted previously, several recommendations are discussed below that can transform these vital commuter and image corridors and turn them into assets for the Ward-Meade neighborhood.

The image to the left along SW 5th Street shows broken and eroded brick sidewalks and curbs that have become overgrown with grass, untrimmed trees, and homes on small lots that are mostly rental properties. Targeted housing and infrastructure improvements along SW 4th/5th Streets will transform the area and change Ward-Meade’s image along two highly-visible corridors.

- **Curb Bump-Outs** – Pictured below is an example of a “green street” corner bump-out that reduces the length in which pedestrians have to cross the street. This will have the advantage of slowing traffic and providing additional pedestrian safety at critical neighborhood intersections where a stop sign would not be beneficial. In particular, bump-outs should be constructed at SW Clay & Fillmore on 4th and 5th Streets as these are important school crossings for Meadows Elementary. Along SW 4th/5th Streets, which are one-way thoroughfares, bump-outs may extend from only one side if there is limited street width.

- **Bike Lanes** – SW Washburn Avenue, Lane Street, and 4th/5th Streets should all be reviewed on a system-wide basis to analyze their capacity to incorporate bike lanes. Each of these roadways is an important commuter route between Downtown Topeka and area neighborhoods that are not solely utilized by motor vehicles. Bike lanes would improve accessibility in the neighborhood and provide an important linkage between existing and potential trails in the city, as well as between other important sites such as the Medical District, the public library, and Washburn University.

Bike lanes should be considered as a part of a “complete streets” review for the neighborhood, the goal of which is to provide an attractive, safe and accessible roadway for all users, including pedestrians, cyclists and public...
transportation users. Bike lanes, furthermore, could increase the functionality of the SW 4th & 5th Street corridors, thereby adding value to the neighborhood and providing reasons to live in Ward-Meade.

Since SW 4th/5th Streets are each one-way thoroughfares, bike lanes could simply be marked along the left side of the street in order to avoid on-street parking. As shown in the images to the right and below, bike lanes could also be marked on the right side of the street 7' feet from the curb in order to retain parking spots, which would also remove the potential conflicts resulting from bike lanes and curb bump-outs as the bike lane would not have to turn to follow the narrowed curb line. Additionally, dedicated bike lanes or even shared-lane markings could be placed even further than 7' feet from the right curb line in order to avoid impacts with open car doors. It is not anticipated that any of these options will require additional right-of-way as this could all be accomplished within the existing widths of SW 4th/5th Streets.

This image shows a bike lane adjacent to on-street parallel parking, intersecting with a curb bulb-out for increased pedestrian safety.

- **SW Willow & Washburn Avenue Intersection Improvement** – This intersection is a very visible location at the conjunction of several busy commuter streets and is also a gateway into several different neighborhoods including Kenwood, Potwin and Ward-Meade. Its current form, however, is both confusing and visually unappealing due to criss-crossing streets and signage to prevent wrong-way driving. It is not recommended that any of these streets be blocked, or the directional flow of any streets be changed as this would prove to be both costly and unbeneificial to the access of these neighborhoods, and may create additional problems such as cut-through traffic along adjacent blocks. Instead, it is recommended that a raised island in the center of the intersection be built that could include either decorative pavement or landscaping, including improved pedestrian markings across SW Willow and Washburn Avenue. This would provide a visual and physical barrier for drivers to maneuver and help guide them along the correct path, thus reducing confusion. It would also prove a space for a potential gateway entry with decorative signs.
leading into several different neighborhoods and increase the aesthetic appeal of this location.

Stop signs and no entrance signs, crosswalks and one-way streets make the convergence of SW Willow and Washburn Ave a difficult place to maneuver for drivers not experienced with the area.

Road median with decorative pavement and landscaping that could be used as a model for a traffic island for the SW Willow & Washburn Avenue intersection.

5. PARKS, OPEN SPACE & RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Currently, the Ward-Meade neighborhood has serious deficiencies in their access to neighborhood parks/green space and a community center. The 0.75-acre Giles Park, located at the neighborhood’s northern fringe within a right-of-way of an I-70 off-ramp and the Meadows Elementary playground located at the neighborhood’s western edge serve as Ward-Meade’s only neighborhood park space. Both are ill-suited for the neighborhood because of their location, size, and function. Although Meadows School recently installed a running track around the outdoor play area, the larger neighborhood population is still devoid of any passive green open space in the middle of such a dense urban environment. Ironically, the name of the neighborhood is derived from the Ward-Meade Historic Site which serves as a regional historic park for cultural events but is not associated with recreation. It is also located on the northern edge of the neighborhood. The closest community center is the Central Park Community Center serving the southern portion of Central Topeka nearly a mile away.
The lack of any sufficient centralized green space or community center serving northern Central Topeka makes the transformation of the Sumner School block into a community center/neighborhood park a critical need for the livability of this area. Already a National Historic Landmark, Sumner School is a focus of the Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision and its continued preservation will help attract thousands of visitors each year who come to Topeka to visit the Monroe School National Park site.

While Sumner School was purchased by a private entity in 2009, plans to refurbish and re-use the property may take time to materialize. Beyond historic preservation and tourism, however, the value to the local community is as a place for cultural, civic, and recreational functions. The 32,000 square foot (+ basement) 3-story former elementary school built in 1936 houses an art deco auditorium that could potentially be used for community performing arts groups. A basketball/recreation gym could be added on at a later date. It appears that a high priority should be placed on the community center and park space for youth activities that compliment student needs of Meadows Elementary School. Most disadvantaged kids that attend Meadows will pass by Sumner School to and from Meadows. Having a place to go after-school as well as in the summer should minimize “hanging-out” and build constructive relationships for educational/recreational enrichment. The restored auditorium could be the basis to create an arts and humanities theme in the center.

The aforementioned Old Prairie Town Historic Site is a regional asset that attracts visitors from outside Topeka. Attractions at the City-owned 6-acre park include a 19th Century prairie town depicting the history of Topeka, the Ward-Meade Victorian mansion home, and a 2.5 acre botanical garden. Musical and cultural events are held year-round including the Park’s signature fall event, the Apple Festival. A key element of the neighborhood’s livability strategy is to market and enhance the Old Prairie Town Historic Site as a successful destination for people outside the immediate area. It is a free advertisement for the neighborhood and an on-going reciprocating relationship in which the park helps to sell the neighborhood and the neighborhood helps to sell the park. Future initiatives for the park should include:

- Completion of rod-iron fencing around the botanical garden and added lighting for security
- Addition of period buildings to the Prairie Crossings
- Transformation of on-site parking lot into Prairie Crossing or green space
- Renovation of adjacent house for security/caretaker presence
- Continuation of Pioneer Summer Program for kids and more shared curriculum with schools
- Improved space for the preservation of artifacts, including an on-site curator
- Upgrades to mansion and period buildings
- Removal of privacy fencing and/or addition of lighting for increased security in off-site parking lot
“Plans are only good intentions unless they immediately degenerate into hard work.”  

Peter Drucker

After all that is written of what should be done, the reality is that it means nothing unless something is done. The implementation of the goals and strategies in the plan becomes the measuring stick for the success of a plan. The purpose of this section is to provide a “framework for action” that outlines how the community’s vision for Ward-Meade can be realized over the next 5-10 years and the costs and responsibilities that may be incurred along the way. This section should be used by all stakeholders to guide their decision-making implementing the priorities of the Plan.

Priority “A” Activities (address these before all others)

- **Alley Construction.** These actions should be focused on those areas receiving housing rehabilitation assistance in order to concentrate revitalization efforts. Infrastructure costs such as this are included in the City’s CIP budget for target area assistance. Refer to the Infrastructure Priorities table for recommended locations.

- **Home Rehabilitation Program.** Begin targeting blocks for rehabilitation. Focusing on rehabilitation will improve the housing conditions in the neighborhood and make a big impact on overall revitalization. All rehabilitation projects should work to preserve the original size, scale, and architectural integrity of the housing stock and follow the Plan’s design guidelines.

- **Neighborhood Signs/Markers.** Install neighborhood signs/markers at gateways into neighborhood. Options include: SW Willow & Washburn Avenue, SW 4th / 5th Street & Clay within potential curb bump-outs, SW 1st Street & I-70, as well as SW 4th Street & Topeka Boulevard.

  The NIA should finalize the location and design concept with an appropriate sign/installation company and submit for the City’s review and approval. CDBG and Empowerment Grant funds can be used for neighborhood signs, as well as funds set aside from the NIA’s operating budget maintained through HND.

- **Sidewalk & Curb Repair.** These actions should be focused on those areas receiving housing rehabilitation assistance in order to concentrate revitalization efforts. Maps in the Appendix illustrate the repair needs within the neighborhood. SW 4th & 5th Streets within the target areas should be included. The Department of Correction’s women inmate crews are available for small brick repair projects in the neighborhood, while larger projects will need to be undertaken by a licensed contractor. Infrastructure costs such as this are
included in the CIP budget for target area assistance. Refer to the Infrastructure Priorities table for recommended locations.

✓ **Street Paving (local north-south streets).** Most of the streets north of SW 4th Street were milled and overlayed with new asphalt in 2008. Mill and overlay repairs for remaining streets in the Ward-Meade neighborhood should be part of the City’s CIP funds targeted for neighborhood infrastructure or as part of the half-cent sales tax initiative. Brick streets should be preserved and repaired where needed using labor from the women inmate crews. Refer to the Infrastructure Priorities table for recommended locations.

**Priority “B” Activities (secondary, but still should be worked on)**

✓ **SW 4th & 5th Street Improvements.** SW 4th/5th Streets are slated for improvements in 2011 due to funding from a half-cent sales tax to repair existing infrastructure along Topeka streets. Funds allocated for target area infrastructure assistance in the Ward-Meade neighborhood, therefore, should not be used for improvements along these streets. However, the NIA should work closely with Public Works and Planning staff to implement a “Complete Streets” concept along these minor arterial thoroughfares. This includes participation in the City’s new bikeways master plan.

Other enhancements such as bike lanes and curb bump-outs will require that funds are set aside from the target area assistance program to complete these projects once the improvements to SW 4th & 5th Street are finished utilizing the half-cent sales tax. Although CIP dollars can be spent on the purchase of lighting fixtures, ongoing power and maintenance costs will need to be included in the City’s operational budget.

✓ **“Gateway” Intersection at SW Willow & Washburn Ave.** An improvement to the intersection of SW Willow & Washburn Avenue should be placed in the City’s CIP budget or be included with the future repairs of SW 4th & 5th Streets as part of the half-cent sales tax initiative. Improvements may include, but are not limited to, a traffic circle or raised median with decorative pavement, landscaping, and/or signage to improve traffic and pedestrian safety in a “gateway” setting. It is not recommended that SW 4th and 5th Street be converted to two-way thoroughfares at this time to facilitate these changes.

**Priority “C” Activities (hold off until more of A and B get accomplished)**

✓ **Apply for State / National Historic Designation Status: SW Clay Street & Western Ave.** A Historic Preservation Fund grant is available through the Kansas State Historical Society (KSHS) to document the historic significance of the potential districts, which will then be submitted as part of the historic district nomination. The deadline for the grant, which is used to hire a consultant to prepare the nomination forms, generally occurs annually every February. Planning Staff can prepare the application for the grant, and there is no deadline to submit the materials necessary for historic district nomination. Ultimately, a majority of the property owners within these potential historic...
districts will need to consent to the historic designation status before an application can be made and the nomination finalized.

✓ **Apply for Local Landmark Status.** An alternate to a National Listing could be sought through a Local Historic District as recommended by the Topeka Landmarks Commission. Work done through the KSHS grant could be used to document the information necessary for a local nomination.

**Important Note:** The priorities and cost estimates on the following page for infrastructure projects in the neighborhood are provided for informational purposes only and should not be relied upon for future costs or as actual bids for future projects. Increases in materials, overhead and labor can change drastically in a short period of time. Funding is subject to availability, as provided by the governing body and allocations change annually.
## WARD MEADE INFRASTRUCTURE PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alley(s)</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Neighborhood Funds</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 Buchanan-Clay</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Clay-Fillmore</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Fillmore-Western</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Western Taylor</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete (12 of blocks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Buchanan-Clay</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Clay-Fillmore</td>
<td>Asphalt &amp; Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete (344 of blocks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Fillmore-Western</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Western Taylor</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Western Taylor E/W/N/S</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Quarters-Clay</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curb &amp; Gutters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th St. (1,950' Washburn-Topeka)</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th St. (1,650' Washburn-Topeka)</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Clay St. (540')</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Concrete to Match Existing Stone (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Western (540')</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Concrete to Match Existing Stone (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Clay St. (270')</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Concrete to Match Existing Stone (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,500</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Western (540')</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Concrete to Match Existing Stone (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mil &amp; Overlay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th St. (1,215' Washburn-Topeka)</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th St. (1,230' Washburn-Topeka)</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-500 Buchanan St.</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-500 Fillmore St.</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-500 Taylor St.</td>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>Mill &amp; Overlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalks (both sides 4th &amp; 5th Streets only)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th St (7,450' Washburn-Topeka)</td>
<td>Brick/Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$254,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th St (7,900' Washburn-Topeka)</td>
<td>Brick/Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$249,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Clay St. (450')</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Repairs (As Needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Fillmore St. (450')</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Repairs (As Needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,500</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 Western Ave. (450')</td>
<td>Brick/Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,400</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Clay St. (360')</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Repairs (As Needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,250</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Clay St. (360')</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Concrete (East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,520</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 SW 3rd South Side E/W 360'</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Repair (As Needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 SW 3rd North Side E/W 360'</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Repair (As Needed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Fillmore St. (450')</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete (East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,820</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Western Ave. (450')</td>
<td>Brick/Concrete</td>
<td>Concrete (East Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,400</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bike Lanes</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Curb bump-outs SW 4th &amp; 5th Clay &amp; Fillmore Intersections</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Traffic intersection improvement SW Willow/Washburn Ave</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 decorative lights at $1,400 installation fee per pole + monthly electricity costs (varies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,227,260.00</td>
<td>$1,473,390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, Engineering, Inspection, Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,601,561.25</td>
<td>$1,922,773.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions**
- Average block length = 460' in Ward-Meade
- Alleys w/ Sewer = $60,000 per block; w/o Sewer = $50,000
- Curb & Gutters (Concrete) = $29,170 per block, both sides of street where needed, or $22 per linear foot approx.
- Mill & Overlay = $115,000 per block
- Sidewalks (Concrete) = $12 per linear foot, one side of street unless otherwise indicated
- Sidewalks (Brick) = $10 per linear foot, one side of street unless otherwise indicated
- **Bike lanes, curb bump-outs & traffic median have never been bid, and thus remain preliminary estimates**
- Decorative street lights along SW 4th & 5th Streets, 4 lights per block, require general fund for utility costs

**Ward-Meade Neighborhood Plan**
**January, 2010**
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Criteria Used to Evaluate Structural Defects

**Minor Defects** – deficiencies corrected during the course of regular maintenance.

- Missing shrubbery or bare spots on lawn, trash and garbage accumulation
- Deteriorated or lacking window screens.
- Weathered paint, minor painting needed.
- Wear on or light damage to steps, window and door sills, frames and porches.
- Weathering of mortar and small amounts of loose, missing material between bricks.
- Cracked window panes, loose putty.
- Handrails deteriorated or missing.
- Missing splash blocks at foot of down spouts.
- Lacking porch lights.

**Intermediate Defects** – deficiencies serious enough to require more extensive repair than required by regular maintenance.

- Gutters or drain spouts rotten or parts missing.
- Sagging, cracked, rotted or missing roofing, overhang or lattice work.
- Foundation or bearing walls cracked or sagging or with loose, missing material.
- Erosion of landscape due to improper drainage, abandoned vehicle, cracked or uneven sidewalks.
- Deteriorated fencing with loose or missing material.
- Rotted, cracked or sagging porches, columns, door frames and stairways.
- Cracked or missing material from chimney.
- Broken or missing window panes and/or rotted window sills.
- Peeling or cracked paint, complete paint job needed.
- Damaged or missing air vents in foundation.

**Major Defects** – condition of structural components which can be corrected only by major repairs.

- Holes, open cracks, rotted or missing material in foundations, walls, roofing, porches, columns, etc.
- Sagging or leaning of any portion of house indicating insufficient load bearing capacity: foundation, walls, porches, chimneys.
- Defective conditions caused by storms, fires, floods or land settlements.
- Inadequate or poor quality material used in permanent construction.
- Inadequate conversion for use involved.
- Major deteriorated or dilapidated out building or garage.
- Evidence of a lack of, or inadequate indoor plumbing such as no roof vents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings/Properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Deficiencies (Sound)</strong></td>
<td>No major defects and no more than 1 intermediate defect and less than 5 minor defects. (3 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Deficiencies</strong></td>
<td>No major defects with 2 or more intermediate defects; no major defects with 1 intermediate defect and 5 or more minor defects. (2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Deficiencies</strong></td>
<td>1 to 4 (5+ is dilapidated) major defects in combination with intermediate or minor defects. (1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sound</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.7 – 3.0 points per block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minor Deterioration</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.4 – 2.69 points per block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Deterioration</strong></td>
<td>Average 2.1 – 2.39 points per block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Deterioration</strong></td>
<td>Average less than 2.09 points per block</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Condition Tables for 500 SW Garfield Street & Horne Street

**Sources: Topeka Planning Department & Shawnee County Appraiser**

#### Table 1a: Existing Land Uses (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Parcels 2009</th>
<th>% Total 2009</th>
<th>Acres 2009</th>
<th>% Total 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Single-Family</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Two-Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Multi-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Retail/Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking / Utilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space (Parks)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public ROW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2a: Housing Density (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Units 2009</th>
<th>% Total 2009</th>
<th>Total Acres 2009</th>
<th>Units/Acre 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Density Residential</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Density All</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Density (w/ROW)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3a: Housing Conditions (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Minor Deficiencies</th>
<th>Intermediate Deficiencies</th>
<th>Major Deficiencies</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4a: Housing Tenure (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Types</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 5a: Median Property Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential - Single-Family</td>
<td>$56,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two/Multi-Family (c)</td>
<td>$51,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value/Acre</td>
<td>$26,779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation

(from the U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service National Park Service’s website http://www.nps.gov/)

The Standards (Department of Interior regulations, 36 CFR 67) pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior, related landscape features and the building’s site and environment as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. The Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.

2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.

3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.

4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.