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Abstract

This study analyzes community support for, and feasibility of the establishment of a proposed historic district in Keene, New Hampshire. A New England town with impressive colonial history, Keene contains a historic district to preserve its vibrant downtown. Preservation efforts continue with emphasis on South Main Street, the area first settled in Keene, which is now considered as a site worthy of protection by means of a historic district. This study investigates the opinions of members of the Historic District Commission, Heritage Commission, and Keene Planning Board, as well as the public as to analyze relative levels of support for a South Main Street historic district. This study focuses on the economic implications, regulations, and relationship between Keene State College and the City of Keene in regards to preservation efforts. By means of a survey, it was found that 79 percent of professionals and 70 percent of the public support a plan to establish a South Main Street historic district. Furthermore, when statistically analyzing opinions further regarding the proposed district’s effect on property values, potential regulations, and the current regulations to control the external color of structures in the present historic district, the answers of the experts and public are well aligned. Moreover, there is strong community support for a South Main Street historic district. Keywords: Historic preservation, college towns, regulations
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Chapter 1

Introduction
During the mid-twentieth century a movement to protect historic sites and structures swept across the United States, igniting popularity in historic preservation. The motives behind this movement involve the protection of historically significant landmarks, structures, and urban areas in order to halt development that would otherwise lead to their destruction. Historic preservation therefore consists of enacting specific regulations to minimize what measures can be taken to renovate or alter the appearance of protected areas. Historic preservation takes form through planned protection of sites, neighborhoods, and landmarks in order to preserve cultural integrity for future generations. Sites worth protecting may be considered so due to their intricate architecture, aesthetic beauty, historical context, location, or previous inhabitants. Historic Preservation is particularly important in maintaining the character of a community’s past.

The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities (SPNEA), founded in 1910, was the first regional historic preservation organization in the United States. SPNEA was founded by Samuel Adams Drake due to his concerns for the preservation and upkeep of Paul Revere’s home in Boston, Massachusetts. The establishment of SPNEA has influenced the field of historic preservation, and Drake and his colleagues are referred to as the “trailblazers” of the discipline allowing historic preservation to burgeon throughout the United States (Lindgren 1995).

Preservation efforts continued with the establishment of the United States National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1949. Later preservation was seriously considered by policy makers after a time of urban development that led to the demolition of historically significant structures, sites, and landmarks (Ashworth and Tunbridge 1990). During the 1960’s the United
States was in “an era of extensive urban renewal that coupled demolition of older buildings and neighborhoods with construction of new center cities and highways to the suburbs” (Fisher 1998). As a result, a national policy for historic preservation was developed under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. With this act, the establishment of a nationally recognized preservation program in order to encourage the identification and protection of historic resources in various American locales was underway. In 1968, the Association for Preservation Technology (APT) was created. The APT was founded to create an official body dedicated to promoting the best technological resources in the preservation of historic sites and settings (apti.org 2009). In just two short years, the United States had taken a substantial step in historic preservation, with the development of a national historic preservation policy as well as a professional organization for the promotion of technology and training in the field of historic preservation (Fisher 1998).

The development and implementation of the National Historic Preservation Act authorized the establishment of the National Register of Historic Places:

The Register is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect historical and archaeological resources. Resources can be buildings, districts, sites, landscapes, structures or objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, or culture (NHPA 2006, 4).

The register provides a working list of culturally valuable sites protected throughout various communities in the United States. In specific instances, there are high volumes of historically significant structures or landmarks within a designated area. When historic resources all lie within the same site, a historic district is often established in order to protect all resources under a like set of guidelines. The New Hampshire Preservation Alliance (NHPA) identifies three
types of historic districts that can be adopted by a community or municipality: National Register historic districts; locally designated historic districts; and, neighborhood heritage districts.

A National Register historic district is one that is initiated locally but approved by the state or federal government. Districts of this kind do not impose regulations that prohibit property owners from altering their structures unless federal funding or licensing is involved. The second type of district, a neighborhood heritage district, operates on a local level with very lenient standards. According to the NHPA, a neighborhood heritage district is, “A group of buildings and their settings that are architecturally and/or culturally distinctive and worthy of protection based on their contribution to the architectural, cultural, political, economic or social history of the community” (2009, 6). The third district, locally designated historic districts, are created and administered by a commission of active local citizens who then become a board that oversees the “exterior alterations, new construction and demolition within the district, using regulations and guidelines set up by the community” (2009, 6). On the local board sit the decision makers that ultimately manage and either allow or reject propositions regarding properties within the district. Keene, New Hampshire, is a community which houses this type of district.

New Hampshire boasts an impressive 106 districts, with districts present in every county (National Register of Historic Places 2009). The rich history of this New England state has made abundant structures, landmarks, and entire neighborhoods worthy of preserving. Colonial architecture and historically significant events having taken place within these structures make them targets for preservationists to protect. The early history of New Hampshire lies within the
walls of these buildings, making the case that preservation in the state of New Hampshire is crucial in protecting the past to better educate citizens of the future.

Keene, New Hampshire, is the most prominent city in the southwest portion of the state. The locally designated historic district, encompassing Main Street and beyond, currently in place serves to preserve one of the community’s most vibrant neighborhoods. However, the portion of Main Street that comprises the current historic district is not the oldest part of Keene. In fact, South Main Street, between the Winchester Street rotary and the junction of Route 101, is the area in which individuals first resided and began constructing the city. With this, the benefits of preservation in this specific neighborhood involve protection of the oldest buildings still erect in Keene.

As a result, the Heritage Commission (HC) and Historic District Commission (HDC) of Keene have expressed a growing interest in establishing a historic district to stimulate preservation efforts for South Main Street. A complex analysis of this proposition must be prepared to accommodate the needs of residents and business owners of South Main Street, Keene State College (KSC), and preservationists alike. Moreover, a detailed investigation regarding this proposition must be completed in order to facilitate the decision as to the prospects and problems associated with the historic district along South Main Street.
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Literature Review
Previous literature regarding historical preservation and historic districts is extensive. The breadth of literature includes the history and importance of preservation, cost/benefit analyses of historic district designation, in-depth research of specific case study locations, and the impact of college or university presence on historic districts.

All relevant literature collected provides additional content to the field of historic preservation. First, necessary information was gathered regarding the history of preservation in the United States and specific governmental developments which endorse and allow for the protection of historic sites. The federal and local processes which foster progress in the field of historic preservation deserve particular attention as these bodies allow for the establishment of historic districts. The majority of these processes take form through the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Register of Historic Buildings, and New Hampshire’s State Register of Historic Places (Fisher 1998; NHPA 2006; Little 2007).

**Sustainability and Historic Preservation**

There are many advantages associated with designating an area as historic. In Donovan D. Rypkema’s presentation entitled *Sustainability, Smart Growth and Historic Preservation*, he touches upon the environmentally friendly aspect of historic preservation. Rypkema states that the preservation and rehabilitation of a historic building, not only reduces the creation of waste but also preserves new materials required to construct an entirely different structure in its place (2007). For example, if a particular historic building was not actively being preserved, it may be perceived as dated and thus demolished, generating excess waste. Next, a new structure would be constructed in the former building’s place. The construction would consume
a substantial amount of new materials during the building process, along with the previously generated waste resulting from the demolition. If said building had simply been restored, however, far fewer materials would be used and the levels of waste accumulation would be drastically lowered. Rypkema states, “In fact, historic preservation is the ultimate in recycling” (2007). Ashworth and Tunbridge (1990, 33) explore this notion through the lens of economics and state, “demolition and rebuilding may cost more than preservation, renovation, and subsequent maintenance.”

**Economics and Historic Preservation**

Another advantage of historic preservation is its potential to have a positive effect on property values. Not only does historic preservation serve as a type of warranty against future neighborhood decline, it also works as a positive factor for the improvement and restoration of surrounding neighborhoods (Leichenko et al. 2000). Residents of one neighborhood or community may observe the positive qualities being re-established or preserved in a bordering neighborhood and realize the same should be done in their own. This could act as a domino effect, preservation diffusing from one neighborhood to the next.

Conversely, however, Asabere et al. (1994), found through their study of historic and non-historic apartment buildings in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, that historically designated apartment buildings experience a 24% reduction in price compared to their non-historic counterparts. Moreover this study illustrates that public regulations do infringe on the rights of private property owners, and that, “some local regulations increase the capital cost in the [historic] structure and therefore reduce the return on equity” (1994, 227). It is concluded that
the highly regulated historic agenda in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, with few incentives for historic property owners, has led to adverse impacts on property values.

The presence of historic districts in cities and towns can act as an economic asset by potentially drawing tourists to the area. This is carefully investigated by Ashworth and Tunbridge who assert that historic cities and/or districts can be utilized as a resource for economic gain. “The promotion of cities to potential investors, residents, and visitors through such ‘amenity’ factors as historic heritage is a rapidly expanding preoccupation of many public urban authorities” (1990, 34). The popularity in using cultural heritage and a community’s history to benefit the locale economically is a concept emphasized throughout the literature. Prentice (1993), outlines the employment opportunities available by means of historic sites. For example house museums, historical societies, and notable landmarks within a historic area will all draw tourists as well as require employees. Though these employment opportunities are likely part-time, they are desirable for certain individuals, such as students or retired citizens.

**Regulations and Historic Preservation**

Included with the advantages of historic preservation, are several effects which some may consider unfavorable. Leichenko et al. (2000) mentions several negative effects which may be associated with historic preservation. These effects concern the overall expense to owners in the management of their historic properties. Implementing a historic district often puts in place regulations regarding what property owners can and cannot do to renovate or alter their property. This may inhibit the installation of an addition to a home, which could potentially increase its value. These regulations and restrictions may also require certain types of repair
and upkeep to exterior features of a home or building. Leichenko et al. states that these maintenance regulations are often much more strict than the general maintenance code of a jurisdiction. This maintenance work is typically much more costly to the owner, as it is being done to historic property and therefore required to follow much stricter guidelines than would be necessary to an owner of a non-historic property.

Another disadvantage of historic preservation is its restricting effect on artistic expression. Many regulations associated with historic preservation inhibit the ability to alter the exterior of a home or building. For example, the owner of a property may not be able to have an artistic mural painted on the side of their building. Binetti (2005) analyzes the often dissenting relationship between artistic freedom and historic preservation, believing that it can be used by the government as a way of censoring art and creativity. Furthermore, perhaps in terms of building modification, a homeowner may be prohibited from installing screens on porches outside of his or her residence. An additional point, discussed by Binetti, is that historic preservation needs to be further defined in terms of what can and cannot be done to properties. Binetti argues that local preservation commissions must elucidate the regulations a historic district creates in order to define what is permissible in altering historic properties. However, they must do this while protecting individuals’ First Amendment rights.

This lack of clarity within historic districts’ regulations is further discussed in a study regarding homeowners’ responses to a local historic district being established in their neighborhood, and thus, the application of certain legal restrictions regarding the maintenance of their homes (Heuer 2007). This study found that the majority of homeowners in a New Haven, Connecticut neighborhood were in favor of the designation of a local historic district
reasoning that its benefits far outweighed its disadvantages. After the district had been established, homeowners stated that they were pleased as it ensured quality of life, well maintained homes in their neighborhood, and an added ‘stability’ that could potentially encourage others to invest in properties located in said neighborhood. However, of all the homeowners interviewed stating that they were in favor of the local historic district, the majority did so solely for their own personal benefit gained from district designation. Few ever mentioned historic preservation as the reason for their support.

One of the largest discrepancies in the creation and establishment of this local historic district was the confusion owners of properties located within the district experienced. Perhaps the most important point stressed is the need for improved communication between historic preservationists or the local historic district commission and historic district property owners. Heuer suggests that a copy of the local historic district ordinance, stating everything in which the district mandates, be distributed to all homeowners located within said district to eliminate any confusion. Clear communication between committees and the public is a highly important factor in successful historic district designation.

**Urban Renewal vs. Adaptive Reuse**

Urban renewal is the process of replacing or restoring urban areas or structures for uses other than their original intent. Many works have been published regarding urban renewal (Greenstein and Sungu-Eryilmaz 2004; Roberts and Sykes 2000; Smith and Williams 1986). Such a program can certainly cause controversies, as there are often clashing views regarding the demolition of an urban area or a building. To some, such demolition is viewed positively, as it
may be more efficient and beneficial for the community to do so, yet others may see it in a negative light, as this can mean the loss of historically significant structures. Sometimes the most agreeable decision may be to restore the building and essentially transform it so that it is capable of whatever future use intended. This process is known as adaptive reuse and it simultaneously qualifies a building for more modern uses, and preserves said buildings history and architecture.

Margulis provides examples of adaptive reuse being implemented in both San Francisco, California, and Vancouver, British Columbia. Margulis (1992, 51) states that “through adaptive reuse, Ghirardelli Square and the Cannery have recycled old buildings into a complex of shops and restaurants. In a similar manner, Vancouver has converted derelict warehousing facilities on Grand Island into a thriving and popular festival marketplace.” The process of adaptive reuse has been implemented throughout the world to preserve the history and architecture of buildings which hold special value to the formation of the communities in which they are located. This process can be viewed as a much more sensible choice than simply demolishing old structures and rebuilding, which, as discussed by Salah el-Dien Ouf (2008, 403), adds a feeling of “placelessness” that is often associated with the modern city.

**Historic Preservation in College Towns**

In exploring the role of historic districts in college towns, Gumprecht (2008) examines different aspects and defining characteristics of college towns throughout the United States. The author analyzes the ‘Town and Gown’ relationship existing between a college and the town within which it is located. Gumprecht points out a common dividing factor between town and
gown - the fact that colleges and universities often tend to overshadow the town in which they are located. However they do not only dominate the town physically, as they often tend to be quite vast in area, but they do so economically and politically as well.

Another factor that may cause the town to view the ‘gown’ in a negative light is the influx of student housing into residential neighborhoods. Often, this ultimately forces previous residents out of their own neighborhoods as they no longer possess desire to reside there. Gumprecht describes these neighborhoods as being morphed into “student ghettos”, featuring uncut grass cluttered with garbage and empty beer bottles, rotten wood porches containing old, ratty couches and an overabundance of bicycles chained to nearly everything. Among the neighborhoods that have become infiltrated by student residents and transformed into student ghettos are those located in historic areas containing old Victorian homes.

An area which Gumprecht investigated outside of the University of Delaware campus had withstood the intrusion of student renters more successfully than the surrounding areas. This was likely due to its abundance of larger, expensive homes, as the neighborhood was more upper-class than those surrounding and was significantly older. However, once one of its homes was converted to student housing, the rest eventually followed. A former resident who was forced to leave due to neighborhood decline described the unstoppable influx of student rentals, resulting in a virtually unlivable neighborhood.

Numerous communities in New England have preservation efforts that involve university and college presence in places similar to Keene. For example, downtown Durham, New Hampshire, is preserved by means of a historic district while plans are currently in motion to expand the downtown center and simultaneously protect the city’s historical aspects.
Durham has been progressing through a phase of growth and future plans for the town take into account the existence of the University of New Hampshire (Howland 2008). This is quite similar to the situation regarding the city of Keene, its historic district, and Keene State College. Also, although larger in size and scope, Boston, Massachusetts, balances the needs of many colleges and universities with historic preservation of many sites and buildings. Boston has undergone various changes and has grown significantly over the years, but the Massachusetts Historical Society, implemented in 1791, has been dedicated to preserving the city’s history consistently throughout (Holleran 1998).

Knowledge of the history, benefits, and drawbacks of historic preservation are essential in gaining a fluid understanding of the subject. This understanding is especially important in assessing a historic district in Keene. Various resources have been utilized in order to outline a detailed chronology of Keene to acquire an appreciative understanding of why the preservation of this community may be necessary.
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History of

Keene, New Hampshire
**History of the City of Keene**

The City of Keene was established in 1873, though Keene existed as a populated settlement long before becoming an official city. The township began in 1732 when its inhabitants obtained a grant from the Massachusetts Bay Colony to establish a settlement in the area. In 1740, after a longstanding border dispute between Massachusetts and New Hampshire, Keene and its surrounding area was officially adopted by New Hampshire. The settlement was declared a town in 1753 by Governor Benning Wentworth and was named after Sir Benjamin Keene; a confidant of Wentworth and a minister of both England and Spain (Figure 1).

**Figure 1** Chronology of Early Keene, New Hampshire.

Soon after acquiring township, Keene was overrun by several Indian raids which forced many inhabitants to abandon their homes and retreat to Massachusetts for protection. During these raids numerous houses along Main Street including a fort, meetinghouse, and various residential houses were burned entirely. When the raids ceased in 1749, the settlers returned and again attempted to establish themselves in the area. As a result of their re-establishment, Main Street continued to be the focal point and most populated area of Keene (Access Genealogy 2009).
History of Main Street

Keene is known for its pronounced, Main Street, which continues to be one of the widest Main Streets in the United States today (Preserve America 2009). Many of the structures on Main Street have significant history as their construction predates the town’s official establishment. In particular, the buildings along South Main Street have housed many prominent residents over the last two centuries and are characterized by distinctive colonial architecture. Two buildings along South Main Street possess unique history that have prompted their establishment as museums in the present day.

The oldest building standing in Keene today is the Wyman Tavern, with history dating back to 1762 when it was constructed by Captain Isaac Wyman (Figure 2). The first meeting of the Dartmouth College trustees was held at Wyman Tavern in 1770. Additionally, the tavern was the meeting place for minutemen who organized a march to Lexington and Concord during the Revolutionary War in 1775, led by Captain Wyman himself (Historical Society of Cheshire County 2009). The building was used as a tavern for forty years and later became home to Reverend Zedekiah S. Barstow. Among Barstow’s pupils was Salmon P. Chase, the Secretary of the Treasury in President Abraham Lincoln’s administration.

Another historically significant structure located on Main Street is the Horatio Colony Museum (Figure 3). This structure was once home to Horatio Colony, an author and the first mayor of Keene. The Colony family is one of prominence in Keene, inhabiting the city from 1761 to 1977 as distinguished mill owners. Built in 1806 and remodeled in 1899, the home is characterized by brilliant oak floors, custom hand painted tiles, and masterfully patterned ceilings. The home is now a museum, enabling citizens to explore the many worldly decorations
acquired during Colony’s travels. When touring the museum, visitors become engulfed by the classic New England feel in which the home evinces (Horatio Colony Museum 2009).

![Figure 3 Horatio Colony Museum. Source: Authors](image)

![Figure 2 Wyman Tavern. Source: Authors](image)

Numerous buildings along South Main Street have transitioned from residential buildings to commercial buildings over time. For example, built in 1795 the Daniel Adams House is currently the second oldest building in the city. This home was constructed and occupied by Daniel Adams until 1830. While residing in the house, Adams became the founding member of the Cheshire County Medical Society. He also became the postmaster for Keene from 1799 to 1802, and the post office was located in the first room of his house. After the death of Daniel Adams, his son Charles inherited the house and remodeled it to its current condition (New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources 1997). Currently, the Daniel Adams House is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is now home to the Monadnock Appraisal Company.
Keene’s first fire society was constructed in 1808 and initially comprised of 42 citizens. The society has gone a variety of titles over the years, including Subscribers for an Engine, Proprietors for an Engine, and Keene Engine Company. In its early years, the organization bought most of its first equipment themselves, as they did not receive any funding from the town. The first fire house was built in 1808 and located on Main Street, slightly north of the old Sentinel Building (Keene History Committee 1968). Over an eighty year period, the location of the society building moved several times until eventually finding permanent residence on Vernon Street in 1884. The building was designed to house three sects of the fire society including the Keene Steam Fire Engine and Hose Company, Deulge Hose Company, and the Washington Hook and Ladder Company. The building was completed in 1885 and is still in use by the Keene Fire Department today.

**History of Keene State College**

One fundamental feature of Keene has been the presence of Keene State College (KSC) along Main Street for the past one hundred years. The college was founded in 1909 when the state of New Hampshire decided upon Keene as the site for a new teachers college. The school originated in the Dinsmoor-Hale House which housed both students and classrooms. This building, located on the corner of Main and Winchester Streets, is still a fixture being utilized for administrative purposes at KSC. The city later contributed the Fiske Seminary for additional student housing. In 1914, the construction of Parker Hall was completed in order to further expand the number of classrooms present at the college (New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources 1997). In the decades that followed, the school continued to annex property and
construct various buildings to establish classrooms and living spaces for students. Elliot Hall was among these buildings acquired in the early development of Keene State College.

Originally known as Elliot Mansion, Elliot Hall was constructed in 1810 and inhabited by Captain William Wyman, the son of Captain Isaac Wyman. The mansion was considered one of the finest homes located in Keene, situated at the time on a 20 acre estate (New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources 1997). After the death of William Wyman and his wife, the house was passed down through four generations and ultimately donated to the city for use as the Elliot Community Hospital in 1892. In the late 1960’s, Elliot Community Hospital was converted into an administrative facility owned and operated by Keene State College as it remains today.

**Keene as an Industrial Hub**

A significant contributor to the growth of the community and the industrial development of Keene was its locale as a center of railroad transportation. These railways consisted of both those established in and those passing through Keene. In 1848 the Cheshire railroads, which traveled through Keene, were constructed. Later the Manchester and Keene Railroad were established in 1878. Many railways connected Keene to cities such as Boston, Massachusetts and also became one of the primary stops for those traveling between Boston and Brattleboro, Vermont.

These railroads sparked the manufacturing industry in the city, allowing it to become the most developed city in Cheshire County as well as a hub of such industry in New Hampshire. In 1866, the Cheshire Railroad built the Keene Repair Shops which consisted of blacksmith,
mechanic, and carpenter shops. The Keene Repair Shops employed roughly 250 people by 1890 and repaired passenger coaches, postal cars, and built and rebuilt railcars and locomotives. Various industrial products were manufactured in Keene including shoe-horns, wooden pails, and assorted machinery. Chair manufacturing was one of the most productive industries in early Keene, employing hundreds of workers and producing up to a million chairs annually (Keene History Committee 1968).

In addition, Beaver Mills was a big contributor to the development of Keene as a supplier of power and furniture. Throughout its operation, Beaver Mills supplied power to apartments and other facilities to aid various manufacturers in the region. The mill cut thousands of feet of lumber annually, making it one of the top manufacturing facilities in Keene between 1850 and 1949. In 1997, as a model of adaptive re-use, the building was renovated to establish affordable housing and as commercial space. Currently, Beaver Mills is one of eight Keene properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (Appendix A).

Various other buildings, though not directly located within the present or proposed historic districts, play a role in the historical makeup of Keene. Such buildings are still in use today, albeit not for their original purpose. For instance, the Colony Mill was formerly utilized as a wool manufacturing plant. The plant was originally constructed in 1838 in a joint effort by the Colony family and the Faulkner family. During its period of operation, this mill produced clothing and processed wool, being known for supplying “the finest garments for the Union troops during the Civil War, and Allied forces during the World Wars I and II” (Colony Mill Marketplace 2009). The mill continued manufacturing these garments as well as housing other small businesses throughout its history until eventually closing in 1953. The mill remained in
disrepair and vacancy until 1983 when Emile J. Legere employed methods of adaptive re-use and restored and transformed the building into a shopping complex as it still stands today.

As demonstrated, the city of Keene has extensive history that has played an integral part in the construction and architecture of its earliest properties. Keene’s past as an industrial hub has characterized the city’s neighborhoods and downtown region. The presence of KSC over the past 100 years has aided in the city’s growth while contributing to the consistent development of Keene currently. In all, Keene’s history classifies it as a community that often attracts preservation efforts to protect historical aspects worth maintaining for future generations.
Chapter 4

Case Study City:
Keene, New Hampshire
Keene, a quintessential New England city nestled in the hills of Cheshire County, is characterized by its appealing Main Street, college town atmosphere, and beautiful autumn scenery. Keene is the largest city in Cheshire County and is located in southwest New Hampshire (Figure 4). Running through the city is a tributary of the Connecticut River, the Ashuelot River, providing a serene backdrop to this classic New England municipality.

![Figure 4 Cheshire County, New Hampshire.](image)

A major fixture in the city is Keene State College (KSC), a liberal arts college with a student body of just over 5,500. The college is a focal point in the city and downtown region,
bringing in individuals from around New England, around the country, and around the world. However, KSC is not the only facility of higher education in the city, as the graduate school Antioch University New England is also located within Keene’s city limits.

Many citizens of Keene, as well as citizens of surrounding cities and towns are employed within the city. Current employment, as found in the 2006-2008 Census Bureau estimates, are mainly sales and office jobs, a far cry from the industrial and manufacturing jobs that once dominated the city. Of the people aged 16 and over in Keene the most popular means of employment is sales and office jobs as well as the management and professional careers, accounting in total for over 60% of the working population. Currently, manufacturing jobs make up close to 11% of the work force.

Demographics

The present day population structure in Keene is greatly influenced by KSC, as the city is brimming with younger people between the ages 15 to 24. Young adults and college students in this age cohort comprise nearly 25% of Keene’s total population (Figure 5). The population of Keene is characterized by youth with an irregular shape to the pyramid due to the influx of college students. Although the college is a dominant presence effecting population, there are still sizable numbers of middle aged and senior citizens.

From ages 65 and up, a larger number of females can be seen in the population, whereas males make up a majority of the population in earlier cohorts. There are small numbers of young children under the age of five, as it is often the case that people come to Keene for educational purposes and then move away upon graduation. The sharp drop off
between the age cohorts 15 to 24 and 25 to 34 display this population trend. Apart from the irregularity brought about by the presence of college-aged students in the city, the population pyramid of Keene displays steadiness, which can lead to decline in later years (US Census Bureau).

![Population Pyramid of Keene, New Hampshire, 2005-2007.](image)

**Figure 5**  *Population Pyramid of Keene, New Hampshire, 2005-2007.*

Founded as a township in 1732, the population of Keene started small, with little increase from year to year. According to the first census held in 1790, Keene’s population was only 1,307. When Keene was established as a city in 1873, the population began to increase steadily. Even before then, mills were built drawing workers into the city of Keene for employment opportunities. As the demand for industrial jobs increased, more individuals migrated to the city, and between the years of 1850 and 1880, Keene’s population doubled. Keene State College was built in 1909, and from then until 2000, the population doubled once
more from just over 10,000 to 22,563. Since 2000 the population has begun to steady and decrease slightly, as the estimated population in 2008 was 22,407 people (Figure 6). This minimal decrease will have little effect on the systems in Keene as it is not substantial and is likely only a normal population fluctuation (US Census Bureau).

![Figure 6 Population Trends in Keene, New Hampshire from 1790-2000.](image)

**Ethnic Composition**

The ethnic structure of Keene is not one of great diversity. In fact, a vast majority of the population, 96%, is white (Figure 7). According to the United States Census Bureau 2006-2008 demographic estimates, 22,760 residents of Keene declared white as their race. Some races included in the data series, such as American Indians and Native Hawaiians or Pacific Islander only make up a fraction of a percentage of the population. The other races, African American,
Asian, ‘some other race’, and ‘two or more races’ make up the remaining four percent of Keene’s population (US Census Bureau). The diversity that is present in Keene is in part due to the college by means of both faculty and students. The lack of ethnic diversity shows that a majority of the people living in Keene were likely descended from European mill and factory workers that lived in Keene during the peak of the Industrial Revolution when the city was a manufacturing hub in New Hampshire.

**Figure 7 Ethnicities in Keene, New Hampshire.**

**Recreation and Leisure**

From the city, one prominent mountain can be seen rising above the landscape: Mount Monadnock. Although not located in Keene, 3,165 foot Mount Monadnock, situated in the nearby town of Jaffrey, is a popular outdoor recreational activity for citizens of Keene. Due to the presence of the mountain, Keene is a part of what is referred to as the Monadnock region.
Keene also has various biking and walking trails along its rivers and brooks which provide for alternate sources of recreation.

Every October, Keene hosts its annual Pumpkin Festival, an autumn celebration encompassing the downtown area featuring jack-o-lanterns, food vendors, and numerous forms of entertainment. The day before the festival, KSC students gather on Fiske Quad for Pumpkin Lobotomy, where pumpkins are provided for carving to be displayed at the festival the following day. Pumpkin Festival draws people from near and far as individuals gather and stroll down Main Street to see thousands upon thousands of uniquely carved pumpkins. At the festival in 2003, Keene earned a Guinness World Record for the most lit pumpkins in a single location, and each year the city attempts to reclaim the title by defeating Boston’s 2006 record. Pumpkin Festival is certainly a boost to the economy in Keene and is enjoyed by children, college students, and adults alike.

The dominant focal point of the city is its downtown. Main Street is the heart of Keene, with its many shops and restaurants located in the central region of downtown. Currently a historic district is established in the downtown area along Main Street, which was set up in 2004 to preserve the historically significant structures on Main Street. However, the oldest and most historic portion of the city is along South Main Street, which is why this area is now being considered a locale worthy of preserving by means of a historic district.
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Historic Preservation in Keene, New Hampshire
Keene’s Historic District and National Recognition

Keene, a city with abundant, dynamic history has attracted preservation efforts from concerned citizens and policy makers alike. These efforts fully developed in the late 1990’s due to the threat of “big box” stores infiltrating Keene’s much enjoyed “mom and pop” downtown. Frowned upon by various citizens of Keene, measures to prohibit stores of this nature from becoming part of Keene’s lively Main Street began to surface.

Actions were first taken in early 1998, when then Mayor Patricia Russell formed a committee of architects, developers, builders, the Keene planning director, downtown business and property owners, City Council members, and three citizens. This committee was created in response to heightened concerns regarding the upkeep and protection of downtown Main Street and the surrounding neighborhoods. By the end of 1998, this committee put forth a proposal to the Keene City Council recommending the formation of a Heritage Commission (HC) and a mandate to create a historic district and citywide design guidelines. After a successful proposition in October 2000, the Heritage Commission was established and first convened in 2001 by Mayor Michael Blastros. In October of 2004, the Historic District Commission (HDC) was subsequently established and a locally designated historic district (Figure 8) was officially put in place to preserve downtown Keene (Farrar, Personal Communication, 7 October 2009).

The eastern boundaries of the historic district are jagged, encompassing Eagle Court, Cyprus Street, and Railroad Street while following Ninety-Third Street to include Norway Avenue. The outcropping to the east preserves specific sites on Water Street that were places of industry in Keene’s early years. The historic district includes the southern portions of both Washington Street to the east and Court Street to the west, stretching as far north as to contain
Mechanic Street. The historic district’s western boundaries are linear, following Middle Street, School Street, and Wilson Street. The southern boundary follows Winchester Street but excludes the rotary.

Figure 8 Historic District, Keene, New Hampshire.
By establishing this locally designated historic district, Keene allowed the local residents most affected by the district to have a voice in the decision making process. Jeananne Farrar, one of the initial commissioners and former chair of the Heritage Commission states that a district of this kind was best suited for Keene since, “the regulations are written by members of this community [Keene], specifically for this community; they are not generic, rather meant to preserve the unique character of this place” (Personal Communication, 30 October 2009). Farrar acknowledges that in creating and establishing the present historic district there were setbacks, admitting that the greatest roadblock was the general fear of regulation among citizens. In tackling this issue, Farrar assures that the Historic District Commission is meant to be a helpful, advising body and that it exists not to impose hardship on people, but rather to assist.

In the years since the historic district has been in place, there has been controversy regarding the lack of regulations concerning the exterior color of structures within the district. This debate came to fruition in April 2009 when a Mexican Restaurant on Central Square named Pedraza’s was painted a sunny, bright yellow. The Keene Sentinel, Keene’s local newspaper, published a total of six articles during the month of April with various headlines reading “Color Code Gets Cold Reception”, “Unmellow Yellow?”, and “Paint Scheme Has Town Talking”. Many citizens were in an uproar, as they believed the bright yellow was not cohesive with the downtown aesthetic. In an article entitled, “Color Code Gets Cold Reception” published on April 14, 2009, City Councilor Nathaniel M. Stout was quoted stating, “I don’t like the color one bit. I really don’t like it. I think it’s incongruous. I think it throws off the whole experience in Central Square” (3). Others welcomed the cheer and vitality the yellow emitted. In an opinion piece entitled “A Little Color Never Hurts”, a citizen of Nelson, New Hampshire asserts “Any town or
city can do bland, mundane, muted etc. It takes creativity and boldness to step it up a notch with color, difference, frivolity. Let people be unique, sameness is overrated” (7).

Many citizens in Keene questioned how such a dramatic external change to the downtown aesthetic was within the regulations of the historic district. It was made clear in an article entitled “Unmellow Yellow?” which was published in The Keene Sentinel that, “People now need a certificate of appropriateness from the Historic District Commission to paint buildings made of brick, concrete, masonry and stone. But it’s within rules to paint buildings that have already been painted” (D2). Ultimately, after re-investigation of existing regulations, the Heritage Commission decided, in an 11-3 vote, not to alter the regulations that exist regarding paint color within the historic district. Despite small bouts of controversy, the presence of the historic district in Keene has been positively received by several prestigious national organizations. Jim Duffy of the Keene City Council states that, “Keene has got a lot of national recognition. A sense of place is important for a community, a sense of history” (Personal Communication 27 October 2009).

The City of Keene was first recognized in 2003 by the National Trust for Historic Preservation as being one of their Dozen Distinctive Destinations. The Dozen Distinctive Destinations program was established by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 2000 and “recognizes unique cities and towns that are working to preserve their historic character, promote heritage tourism, enhance their community and encourage others to enjoy what they have to offer” (preservationnation.org 2009). After submission by Jeananne Farrar, Keene was chosen as one of the twelve destinations from a pool of locales from across the United States. The National Trust for Historic Preservation elaborates on its reasoning regarding the selection
of Keene, “Because so many of the town’s earliest structures have remained unchanged for more than two centuries, it is easy to get lost in time” (preservationnation.org 2009). This accreditation not only legitimized the preservation efforts in Keene, but also encouraged efforts to continue to progress.

In 2005, Preserve America, an organization in accord with the national Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and nine other federal councils, committees, and departments deemed Keene an official Preserve America Community. The Preserve America Community program began in 2003 and nearly 800 municipalities have been awarded this distinction. Preserve America communities are those that openly “protect and celebrate their heritage” (Presereamerica.gov). The Preserve America website describes Keene as a model of heritage protection, “Keene enjoys one of the best-preserved and most architecturally rich downtowns in New England” (Preserveamerica.gov 2009).

Additionally, a specific site within Keene’s downtown and the present historic district has recently been praised by the American Planning Association (APA) for its “exemplary character, quality, and planning” (APA 2009). Central Square has been deemed one of the APA’s Great Public Spaces for 2009 (Figure 9). This accreditation is awarded to only ten spaces within the United States each year. Cited on the APA website as a “soapbox and cultural hub, Central Square has been a part of the fabric of life here [Keene] for more than two centuries” (APA 2009). In deeming this site a Great Space, the APA highlights Central Square due to Keene’s planning practices in preserving existing architecture while allowing the introduction of new development in the area consistent with the present style. The APA has successfully praised both preservation and planning efforts in Keene thus far with this highly acclaimed award.
Proposed South Main Street Historic District

Preservation efforts in Keene continue, with a focus specifically on South Main Street, the first area in the city constructed and settled in the early 18th century. The proposition of creating a historic district to protect South Main Street has been rationalized thus far as specific boundaries for the said district have been delineated (Figure 10). Ultimately, every structure that faces South Main Street has been included. This differs from the boundaries of the present historic district, which extend to also encompass various side streets. This is a necessary difference due to various zoning regulations in place that affect the boundaries of the present historic district. Jeananne Farrar explains:
Many of these [side] streets and ‘jagged areas’ are adjacent to and seen from the public way. As well, other areas such as surface parking lots, empty spaces, buildings that are designated "intrusive" need to be included because at some point they may be changed/developed and the infill should complement what exists in the district (Personal Communication 2 November 2009).

Figure 10 Proposed Historic District, Keene, New Hampshire.
The idea to create a South Main Street historic district to protect and preserve this site has been given much forethought, as the present downtown historic district was never intended to be the only district within Keene’s city limits (J. Farrar, Personal Communication 25 September 2009). Although historic preservationists in Keene have introduced the idea of creating a historic district to preserve South Main Street, the official establishment of the district may not take place until the distant future. First, A Preservation Consultant needs to be hired in order to inventory and review the architectural significance of each property to be submitted to the New Hampshire Division of Historic Resources to increase legitimacy of Keene’s plan. Later the proposal would be analyzed and approved by the Keene City Council and then by the Planning, Licenses and Development (PLD) Committee pending a public hearing. If changes are necessary regarding zoning, a joint meeting with the PLD and the Keene Planning board will take place to review such ordinances. Once the proposal is approved by committees, boards, and finally the Keene City Council (Figure 11), the district will officially be designated (Garceau 2009).

The structures on South Main Street have various purposes; residential, commercial, and institutional. The majority of structures are residences, housing permanent inhabitants of Keene followed by structures utilized for commercial purposes. Commercial buildings include those utilized for medical services as Harborside Healthcare Westwood, an optometrist office, and an oral and maxillofacial surgical office inhabit structures on South Main Street. Additionally, the Carriage Barn Bed and Breakfast is a source of lodging for those visiting Keene. Two prominent sites that promote historic education include the Wyman Tavern and the Cheshire County Historical Society; both are fixtures on South Main Street. Businesses also are
located on South Main Street including various real estate offices, consulting agencies, and the Monadnock Appraisal Company.

**Figure 11** *Historic District Designation Process.*

Institutional buildings owned by Keene State College (KSC) exist throughout the proposed South Main Street historic district. Various KSC residential buildings including Carroll House, Keddy House, Proctor House, 361 and 349 Main Street are located within the
boundaries of the proposed historic district. Administrative buildings are also present including Elliot Hall, Hale House, the President’s House, and the newly constructed Alumni Center, as well as Rhodes Hall and Joslin Building both containing classrooms. With the dominating presence of Keene State College-owned property within the proposed South Main Street historic district, the relationship involving the college and the city of Keene in terms of preservation efforts is critical. In understanding the measures and implications of officially establishing the South Main Street historic district, current and future development of the college must be thoroughly analyzed.

**Keene State College**

Keene State College has been a focal point in the City of Keene since its establishment in 1909. KSC maintains a steadfast reputation as an institution for teacher preparation but is also considered New Hampshire’s primary liberal arts college. KSC’s campus is located adjacent to South Main Street having great influence on the vibrancy of downtown Keene (Figure 12). The buildings in which Keene State was founded are located on South Main Street including Elliot Hall, Hale-Dinsmoor House, and Fiske Hall. Each are still utilized by the college today.

Critical to the success of Keene State College is the relationship the institution maintains with the City of Keene. College or university presence in a locale alters the dynamic of the area forcing both the city and college to communicate and put effort into their mutual success. Consistent university development that encroaches on what permanent residents see as exclusively the city’s land is often a source of conflict. Blake Gumprecht, author of *The American College Town* and geographer from the University of New Hampshire, states:
Most colleges and universities are also exempt from local zoning laws, so they enjoy much greater autonomy in building than private developers. Because colleges and universities are normally only subject to housing and safety codes, they can build what they want, where they want, and when they want no matter how vocal and widespread the opposition from city officials and residents (2008, 322).

Figure 12 Keene State College Campus, Keene, New Hampshire.
Recently, Keene State College expanded its campus further to the east side of Main Street with the construction of the Alumni Center. Although the plan to erect the structure was outlined in the Keene State College Master Plan prior to the initial construction, this did not deter some members of the community from being angered by the development. Citizens who showed opposition often did so due to the demolition of two historic structures required to accommodate the Alumni Center. To appease citizens who were irritated by this demolition, an agreement was drawn up between preservation activists and KSC to preserve and restore 232 Main Street, a historic property acquired and included as part of the Alumni Center.

A general dissatisfaction with the outcome of the agreement and restoration efforts regarding 232 Main Street has been vocalized by preservationists in Keene (figure 13). Dr. Jay Kahn, Vice President of Finance and Planning at Keene State College explains that measures had to be taken in the restoration of 232 Main Street for safety reasons:

In starting to take apart 232 Main Street, what looked like a normal two story house was not. Selective demolition was utilized to remove asbestos, dispose of lead paint, and to create a structure that could jointly support a mechanical system above. Additionally a new foundation was created in order to support the interior structure due to the inadequate structural support from the foundation to the roof of the house (Personal Communication, 5 October 2009).

Dr. Jay Kahn stresses the college’s dedication to maintaining a similar aesthetic to the surrounding buildings on Main Street in the development of the Alumni Center. In doing so, Dr. Kahn notes that the college analyzed surrounding structures to design the Alumni Center with comparable features, “A lot of effort has been put forth to adopt certain design principles to the modifications we’ve made. To create a look that would fit Main Street we’ve looked specifically at the height, set-back, materials, and profiles of neighboring buildings” (Personal
The recently published flyer, The Alumni Center at Keene State College, states that the features of the building include the, “Incorporation of an historic 1860 home, retaining various architectural features that echo the generations and legacy of the College’s many alumni while updating core components with contemporary usage” (November 2009). Despite the controversy regarding the state of 232 Main Street, it is clear that in developing the Alumni Center, KSC considered the way in which the building would aesthetically compliment Main Street.

Figure 13 232 Main Street, Keene, New Hampshire. Source: Authors

The consistent growth of the college’s study body is prompting further development to accommodate future alumni. Despite some fluctuation, the size of the freshmen class enrolled at KSC has steadily increased over the past ten years but, to some, with little regard for residential accommodations for students (Table 1). Between 1999 and 2003, the average size of
the freshmen class at KSC was 1,018 students. Between 2004-2008 this number was 1,165, an increase of 147 students or 14% (KSC Office of Institutional Research). With the increasing size of the student body, new residential opportunities must be devised to house students. Without proper forethought, surrounding neighborhoods may slowly be converted from single family homes into rental properties inhabited by college students.

Gumprecht (2008) addresses the encroachment of student rental properties on neighborhoods inhabited by permanent residences as an area of conflict between universities and the city’s in which they are located usually due to the degradation these properties experience. Gumprecht asserts “tensions will always be present whenever significant numbers of students live off campus in college towns” (321). During the 2008-2009 school year, 58% or 2,798 Keene State College students lived on campus while 2,055 lived off campus. However it is unknown how many of the 2,055 students living off campus may be commuter students that do not inhabit rental properties in Keene.

Table 1 Number of first-year students enrolled at KSC 1999-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of first-year students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the proximity of Keene State College to South Main Street, many of the side streets extending from South Main Street are becoming increasingly infiltrated by college students. Currently Elliot Street and Proctor Court are especially inundated with Keene State students. In establishing a historic district in this area, there has been much debate on the inclusion of Proctor Court within the district. Some assert there is nothing wrong with the presence of student housing in historic districts. However, the measures that should be taken when students inhabiting historic properties do not act responsibly are subjective. Whether students should be blamed for the degradation of their historic properties or blame should fall on landlords is an argument constantly up for discussion. Currently, the boundaries that have been delineated do not include the rental property neighborhood of Proctor Court.

In order to understand the community’s outlook regarding KSC and preservation efforts within the city, expert and public opinions are required. In moving forward with the plan to establish South Main Street as a historic district it is crucial to consider community support. Without doing so, all effects to efforts to designate South Main Street as a historic district could be to no avail.
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Original Research and Analysis
In designating South Main Street as an official historic district, much analysis within the City of Keene must take place. Investigating community support and professional opinion in regards to levels of awareness, attitudes toward historic preservation, outlook concerning relations between Keene State College and Keene’s historic preservation efforts, and possible implications of a South Main Street historic district are crucial. By doing so, those pursuing the creation of a South Main Street historic district can measure levels of support and any areas of opposition. This will aid in the official designation process as it is vital to have the support of Keene’s preservation experts and citizens alike.

In order to analyze and determine overall awareness levels and attitudes towards the present and the proposed historic districts in Keene, survey instruments intended for both professionals and the general public were carefully designed and distributed (Appendix B). The target audience among the public included Main Street goers within the present historic district of varying ages, genders, and places of residence. These individuals were randomly selected and asked if they were willing to participate in a survey regarding their awareness and attitudes toward historic preservation in Keene. The sampling frame among professionals included members of the City of Keene Planning Board, Heritage Commission, and the Historic District Commission.

The Heritage Commission and Historic District Commission were both selected as survey recipients in order to gain the opinions of those who are actively involved in historical preservation in Keene. The importance in gathering the opinions of both groups concerns their collective goal aimed at the preservation of Keene’s historic landmarks. In further detail, according to the City of Keene website:
The Keene Heritage Commission is an advisory and review commission of the City of Keene which is responsible to inventory, promote and actively seek protection and preservation of all Keene resources which are valued for their historic, cultural, aesthetic, archeological and community significance (2009).

The City of Keene states that the role of the Historic District Commission is to:

Preserve the heritage and visual character of the City of Keene by regulating the compatibility of new construction and alterations to existing buildings and structures, and sites within the Historic District in collaboration with City Departments and other agencies (2009).

In collaboration with the Historic District Commission is the City of Keene Planning Board, whose role in historic preservation is to review the overlay zoning regulations resulting from historic district proposals put forth by the Planning, License, and Development Committee (PLD). The PLD would then recommend the new regulations to the City Council for final approval, so long as no strong political opposition exists.

**Survey Distribution**

Surveys were distributed these three professional groups each on a separate occasion and to Main Street goers on five separate dates, on various days of the week and at varying times (Table 2). Surveying of the public was conducted on various occasions in attempt to make the selection as random as possible. Identical surveys were distributed to all parties involved in order to accurately compare results. The survey format includes closed response questions such as yes or no, agree or disagree, and Likert scale ratings in order to obtain data which could then be statistically tested and analyzed. A Likert scale rating gives survey takers a set number of rankings from which to choose. In this case, the Likert ratings were used to determine survey takers’ opinions regarding the relationship between Keene State College and the preservation
of Keene. The question was comprised of numbers one through five, with each numerical value representing one of the following: Positive Relationship, Somewhat Positive Relationship, Neutral, Somewhat Negative Relationship, and Negative Relationship.

**Table 2 Survey Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Surveyed</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Surveys Obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Commission</td>
<td>Keene Public Library</td>
<td>Wednesday October 14, 2009</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic District Comm</td>
<td>Keene Public Library</td>
<td>Wednesday October 21, 2009</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>Keene City Hall</td>
<td>Monday October 26, 2009</td>
<td>6:30 PM</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Tuesday October 20, 2009</td>
<td>4:30 - 5:30 PM</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Wednesday October 21, 2009</td>
<td>2:00 - 3:00 PM</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Friday October 23, 2009</td>
<td>3:00 - 4:00 PM</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Thursday October 29, 2009</td>
<td>4:00 – 5:00 PM</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Saturday October 31, 2009</td>
<td>1:00 – 3:00 PM</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic questions inquired about survey takers’ sex, age, years as a resident of Keene (if any), involvement in historic preservation efforts in Keene, and whether they were aware of Keene’s present historic district. Other questions queried survey takers as to their levels of agreement with certain effects, both beneficial and consequential, of the present historic district, as well as potential effects of the proposed historic district. Survey takers were also asked whether or not they would support a plan to create a historic district encompassing
South Main Street and how they felt the relationship between Keene State College and historic preservation in Keene stood with the construction of the Alumni Center.

These questions enabled comparisons to be made primarily between professionals and the public, as well as between Keene residents and non-residents. The reasoning behind the inclusion of non-residents is their fundamental significance to the community. Keene, being the hub of Cheshire County, is where many individuals from surrounding towns commute daily for work and/or leisure such as shopping. During this time, the population downtown increases dramatically and much revenue is brought in to the local businesses located within the historic district. Therefore, these visitors are essential to the economy of Keene, hence their inclusion in the survey data. The comparisons made included differences in attitudes in support of a historic district containing South Main Street, whether Keene State College’s relationship with the city of Keene’s historic preservation efforts is being altered by the construction of the Alumni Center, and if regulations should be placed on the external color of structures within the present historic district. These comparisons were conducted through a variety of statistical tests using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. SPSS is a program which enables users to efficiently and accurately obtain descriptive and bivariate statistics and contains an array of other features as well.

In particular, two-sample independent difference of means tests were utilized in comparing the opinions of professionals to that of the public. Such a test determines whether there is a statistically significant difference between the average results of two separate samples. In order to test this, a null hypothesis is formed stating that there is no statistical significance between the two samples being compared. If the test results in a significance level
of less than .05, then the null hypothesis is rejected and there is, in fact, a statistically significant difference between the two averages. In the present study the two samples are Keene’s preservation professionals and Keene’s public. Additional two sample independent difference of means tests were run utilizing Keene residents as one sample and non-residents as the other sample.

**Expected Results**

There are a variety of predicted and expected results in conducting said statistical tests. Residents of Keene will have a greater awareness of the present historic district than those who do not reside in Keene. Naturally, one would know more about a community if they lived there permanently, rather than those visiting or commuting to the city for work or school. Another expected result is that experts will be more in agreement that the present historic district should contain regulations to control the external color of structures within it than will the public. The public may feel threatened by this and thus state that they disagree with such a regulation. Experts, on the other hand, might feel that this is a necessary action toward properly preserving the structures’ architecture and historical character. It is also hypothesized that experts of the Planning Board, the Heritage Commission and the Historic District Commission will be more aware of the present historic district, and certainly more supportive of the proposed historic district than the general public. Clearly, those who are actively involved in historic preservation efforts in Keene will likely be more enthusiastic and knowledgeable about the present historic district, and their attitudes will be more favorable towards the official implementation of the proposed historic district than those who are not involved.
In addition, it is expected that the public will believe that the creation of a South Main Street historic district will impose more prohibiting regulations than would the experts. Experts will be more aware of the regulations that will be created, and may not view them as prohibiting, instead beneficial, as they are in place to preserve the historical integrity of the structures. A separate prediction is that there will be no significant difference between levels of agreement between experts and the public regarding whether or not they believe that the creation of the South Main Street historic district will increase the property values of South Main Street. Both the public and experts will agree that the creation of this district would increase the value of properties due to the historical significance of the buildings located within the historic district. The experts, however, may be slightly more in agreement of this effect due to the fact that they are more knowledgeable of the history present in this area, though it is not predicted to be statistically significant.

Finally, it is hypothesized that experts will find Keene State College’s relationship with historic preservation in the City of Keene to be more negative than do the general public. KSC’s construction of the Alumni Center resulted in the demolition of two historic buildings and the major renovation of a third. Such actions are more likely to affect historic preservationists’ attitudes on this relationship than that of the public. This is mainly because they would generally be more aware of these buildings’ histories, and more unsettled regarding KSC’s encroachment upon them. The public, on the other hand, would cherish such structures to a lesser extent, and thus see the relationship and Keene State College’s actions in a more positive light.
Descriptive Statistics

A total number of 91 surveys were distributed and collected. This included 72 surveys collected from the public and 19 collected from individuals involved in the field of historic preservation. Both groups had an even gender distribution, with 34 males and 38 females comprising the public surveys and ten males and nine females making up the expert surveys (Figure 15). A total of 39 participants in the public surveys were residents of Keene and 33 were non-residents, whereas 100 percent of the experts were residents (Figure 14). Fittingly, 100 percent of the experts were aware of the present historic district, where 66.7 percent of the public were aware while 33.3 percent were unaware of its existence.

Figure 14 Gender Distribution Among Survey Recipients.

Figure 15 Residents and Non-Residents Among Public Survey Recipients.
In testing awareness levels of Keene’s present historic district between Keene residents and non-residents, surveys were divided into these two groups and results were calculated to determine the average levels of awareness for each. It was indicated that, of the 39 resident respondents, 71.8 percent were aware of Keene’s historic district, while only 60.6 percent of non-residents were aware. A smaller percentage of non-residents were expected to be knowledgeable about the historic district, and, as hypothesized, residents were more aware of its presence. As stated, one who lives in Keene would generally be more aware of the features of the community than those who do not. Those residing in the community, especially those residing within the historic district, would be more involved in the community and certainly more aware of the specific codes and regulations which result from the district.

Another reason why this would be expected is that the only public advertisements declaring the existence of the present historic district do so quite inconspicuously. Therefore, those who are simply visiting the community would be likely to overlook these signs and be completely uninformed of such a district here. The installation of more noticeable signs located along Main Street or on Central Square, undoubtedly the most highly traveled portion of the historic district, may be a worthwhile endeavor for increased public recognition of Keene’s history. The inclusion of maps delineating the boundaries of the district may also increase public knowledge and awareness.

A two-sample independent difference of means test comparing levels of agreement between experts and the public regarding whether the present historic district should contain regulations controlling the external colors of structures within it was conducted. The results
indicated a significance level of 0.537. Being greater than .05, this result fails to reject the null hypothesis, stating that the levels of agreement between experts and the general public would be identical (Table 3). An output of 0.537 reveals a 53.7 percent chance of being wrong if the null hypothesis is rejected, which is why one would fail to do so.

**Table 3 SPSS results regarding the external color of structures within the present historic district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average level of agreement among experts was a 2.42, falling in between the ‘agree’ category and ‘no opinion/don’t know’. The average level of agreement among the general public was similar, at 2.59. However the public response is closer to the ‘no opinion/don’t know’ category than that of the experts. These results are expected, though not statistically significant. Experts in the field of historic preservation are generally more in favor of capturing the historic integrity of a building, including regulating its color. It is important to note, however, that despite all the media attention from the public regarding the external color of Pedraza’s restaurant on Central Square, the public if generally neutral as to whether external colors of structures within the district’s boundaries should be regulated.

**Proposed South Main Street Historic District**

Regarding whether the public would support a plan for a historic district encompassing South Main Street, 51 individuals stated that they would, while four would not, and seventeen
were unsure. As for the experts, a total of fifteen individuals stated that they would support a plan, whereas two would not, and another two said they were unsure. As displayed in Figure 16, almost three quarters of the public who were surveyed were in support of the proposed South Main Street historic district and a mere 6.2 percent were not in favor of such a district. In addition, the majority of experts surveyed were also in favor of a South Main Street historic district. This determination is vital, as community support and agreement is a key factor in any feature added to a city.

![Figure 16](image)

**Figure 16** Public and Expert Responses to Supporting a South Main Street Historic District.

Attitudes regarding potential effects of the proposed South Main Street historic district were gathered using a two-sample independent difference of means test. Experts and the public were questioned about whether or not they believe it would impose prohibiting regulations on property owners within the historic district. The null hypothesis stated that there is no statistical significance between agreement levels of experts and the public on whether or not they believe the proposed South Main Street historic district would impose prohibiting regulations on property owners located within the district’s boundaries. This
difference of means test found a statistical significance of .111, which is greater than .05 and thus, fails to reject the null hypothesis proving that no significant difference exists (Table 4).

**Table 4 SPSS results regarding prohibiting regulations in the proposed historic district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>6.610</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A noteworthy factor of the results of this test lies within the means of the two groups compared. The average agreement level among the experts was a 3.05 while among the public, the average agreement level resulted in an average of 2.63. As was hypothesized, the experts’ mean agreement level fell closer to the ‘Disagree’ category than did the public’s, however, contrary to what was predicted, it was not a significantly higher difference. This slightly higher mean may be a result of some experts being well aware of the regulations which may be created, but not viewing them as prohibiting because they are in place for the sake of historic preservation, hence the reasoning behind disagreeing with such a statement.

A two-sample difference of means test comparing the public and experts’ average levels of agreement regarding the proposed historic districts potential to have a positive effect on property values was conducted. It was found that the predicted results were accurate. With a significance level of .790, the null hypothesis is not rejected; therefore no statistically significant difference exists between the means of the two groups (Table 5).
Along with the initial results of this test, it was also accurately predicted that the experts would have a slightly higher level of agreement than would the public, though it would not be a significant difference. In this test, category two represented ‘agree’ and category three represented ‘no opinion/don’t know’. The experts’ average agreement level resulted as 2.05 and the public’s 2.11, showing that the experts were slightly more in agreement with this than the public, though only by a mere, non statistically significant difference of .06. This is likely due to their more extensive knowledge of the historical significance of the properties along South Main Street. This test may be seen as extremely relevant as it demonstrates that both experts and the general public see the creation of a South Main Street historic district as being beneficial to the community, especially so for those who own properties located within.

**Future Prospects**

When assessing the feasibility of a South Main Street historic district, research was undertaken to address additional possible sites and neighborhoods that both experts and the public would believe to be of importance from a preservation standpoint. To attend to this notion, the public and experts, as part of the survey, were asked to rank various sites and neighborhoods from the least important to preserve to the most. The sites and neighborhoods
in question were; the Center at Keene, Colony Mill, Keene Public Library, South Main Street, the Victorian Homes on Court Street, and an ‘other’ category that allowed survey recipients to write-in a site they believed to be worthy of preserving. The results of said question are both alike and different among the experts and the public (figure 17).

First, results are similar in that the highest percentage of the experts and public deemed the Victorian Homes on Court Street as the number one site to preserve in Keene; 38 percent of experts and 28 percent of the public believed so. This outcome could likely influence the direction of preservation efforts in Keene. In order to successfully designate a new historic district, the support of both preservation experts and the public is crucial. The bulk of support relating to the protection of the Victorian Homes on Court Street could suggest that these homes could potentially be incorporated into the present historic district or possibly be a new district. However, the support that is being put forth in regards to South Main Street is immense. A full 21 percent of experts and 15 percent of the public ranked this neighborhood the most important to preserve. Both groups ranked Colony Mill highly, as 23 percent of experts and 16 percent of the public believed it to be the most important site to preserve. This is noteworthy, as the Colony Mill depicts the industrial hub Keene once was, as well as being a model of adaptive re-use. By indicating that Colony Mill is an important site to protect, the community is indirectly showing support for these processes. Since many individuals ranked Colony Mill first, its potential should be considered by preservationists in Keene regarding future preservation projects.
Although these results illustrate similarities between the beliefs of the public and experts, there are substantial differences. No experts recorded the Center at Keene as their first choice. Also, no experts ever indicated an ‘other’ site as their first choice. This is a measurable difference to the beliefs of the public in which a staggering 24 percent ranked the Center at Keene as the most important site to preserve. This site was only a mere four percent behind the top ranked site among the public, the Victorian Homes on Court Street. A nominal four percent of the public listed ‘other’ sites as the most important to preserve, writing-in both “Southeast Neighborhoods” and “Stone Arch Bridges”. These findings are the biggest discrepancies between the attitudes of the experts and the public. Although alike in many ways, the difference between these two bodies lies in their overall support of preserving various sites throughout Keene. With this, it will be imperative for those pursuing preservation projects in
the future to take into account the community’s preference regarding which sites deserve protection most. Future prospects must carefully analyze the sites and neighborhoods in which the public and experts believe to be most worthy of preservation efforts.

**Keene State College and Historic Preservation in Keene**

In respect to attitudes regarding whether Keene State College’s construction of the Alumni Center and renovation of 232 Main Street is altering KSC’s relationship with the city, the attitudes between experts and the public varied. Among the public, results were relatively even as 31.9 percent felt that it was negatively altering the relationship between KSC and the City of Keene, where 29.2 percent did not think it was altering the relationship and the remaining respondents were unsure. On the other hand, 52.6 percent of the experts believed that the college’s construction and renovation was altering its relationship with the city while 31.6 percent did not think it had an impact and 15.8 percent were unsure (Figure 18).

![Figure 18 Responses to Whether KSC's Construction is Altering its Relationship with Keene.](image)

As predicted, a much larger majority of experts believed that this construction was altering the college’s relationship with the city than did the public. This 20.7 percent difference
in attitudes between the two groups is most likely due to the fact that the experts are much more invested in preservation. However, it is important to note that experts also had a higher percentage of those who did not believe that such construction was altering KSC and the City of Keene’s relationship. The public had more than double the amount of survey takers stating that they were unsure if it was altering the relationship than did the experts. This can be explained because, as experts in the field, historic preservationists and planning board members are more apt to have an attachment or opinion on a subject they see firsthand.

A final test comparing expert and public agreement levels regarding Keene State College’s current relationship with historic preservation in the City of Keene also resulted in a significance level above .05. Again, one fails to reject the null hypothesis, which states that there is no statistically significant difference between agreement levels of experts and the public pertaining to the relationship between Keene State College and historic preservation in the City of Keene (Table 6). In this case, the average agreement levels were 2.33 among the experts and 2.11 among the public. Therefore, both groups believe that there is a somewhat positive relationship between Keene State College and historic preservation in Keene.

Table 6 SPSS results regarding the relationship between KSC and historic preservation in Keene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This result contradicts the hypothesized results of this test which stated that experts hold that a more negative relationship exists between Keene State College and historic
preservation in Keene. In fact, the opposite was found and the majority of experts believe that a somewhat positive relationship exists. This is slightly surprising, as one might assume that the experts view Keene State College’s construction of the Alumni Center negatively. There are various reasons why this may be; one possible factor is the college’s effort to make the Alumni Center blend in with the historic architecture of the area (Figure 19). In aiming to maintain a certain architectural aesthetic, Dr. Jay Kahn states that “we [KSC] should want to maintain a historic character to Keene” (Personal Communication 5 October 2009). This notion is consistent with the inference that experts recognize the effort put forth by Keene State College to compliment Main Street’s existing ambiance in the development of new structures.

Figure 19 Alumni Center, Keene State College. Source: Authors.

This compliance of maintaining certain architectural aesthetics may enable the success, in terms of community reception, of new developments which are being implemented in historic areas. Typically, opposition results from what some consider to be eyesores established
in the community, such as Pedraza’s restaurant or Cool Jewels in Keene, which was unfavorably mentioned by a survey taker regarding its bright external appearance. In regards to future expansion, conforming to the existing appearance and atmosphere of Main Street may be a fundamental aspect to a prosperous future for Keene State College and the existence of a potential historic district along South Main Street.
Chapter 7

Conclusion
In a globalizing world, it is crucial to recollect the history regarding how individual communities have reached where they currently stand. Preservation allows this notion to become a reality by enabling culturally enriching buildings to be present through the generations. Without such action, citizens of today may be unaware of the roots in which their communities were derived. Furthermore, preservation is an effort in which concerned citizens should be invested. This study compiles the views, attitudes, and levels of awareness of Keene’s preservation experts and public in order to aid in the decision-making process regarding the creation of a South Main Street historic district.

This study comprehensively reviews related literature within the field of historic preservation in order to provide additional, original research to the material which currently exists. A detailed chronology of the City of Keene is outlined to provide adequate context as to the reasons for preservation within the city. Historical content regarding Main Street and South Main Street, the areas in which the present and proposed district are located, are highlighted as they are the areal focus of the study. An analysis of the City of Keene is outlined to provide a framework of the case study city, including demographic trends, ethnic makeup, primary employers, and popular recreational activities.

The aim of research conducted was to gather the perspectives of Keene’s preservation experts and the public in order to gauge support of the establishment of a South Main Street historic district. In order to understand the standpoints of Keene’s citizens a survey instrument was devised to probe preservation professionals and the public of their attitudes and awareness of the present historic district as well as relative levels of support or opposition to the proposed South Main Street historic district. Findings reveal that an overwhelming 79
percent of professionals and 70 percent of the public surveyed agree to support a plan to designate South Main Street as a historic district. Ultimately, this level of public support may propel preservation efforts to officially establish a South Main Street historic district.

South Main Street was not the only site indicated by the public and experts as worthy of preservation. When inquiring about alternate areas and neighborhoods within Keene that are most important to protect, 28 percent of the public chose the Victorian Homes on Court Street as the number one site in Keene worthy of preservation efforts, compared to fifteen percent that chose South Main Street. Among experts, 38 percent chose the Victorian Homes on Court Street as the most important neighborhood to preserve compared to 21 percent deciding South Main Street. It can be concluded that in addition to support for a South Main Street historic district, there are sites and neighborhoods that would also receive support if pursued for preservation purposes.

Regarding the historic district already present in Keene, the public and experts were questioned about their opinions as to whether the external color of structures within the district should be controlled. Results determine that there is no statistically significant difference between the beliefs of the public and the experts. Ultimately, both parties answered between the ‘agree’ and the ‘no opinion/don’t know’ category when asked if the present historic district “should contain regulations that control the external color of structures within it”. Expert responses did average slightly closer to the ‘agree’ category, with a mean of 2.42, compared to the public responses which were nearer to the ‘no opinion/don’t know’ category, with a mean of 2.59. Despite this, the responses between both groups were extremely similar to one another.
The public and experts were also asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement, “The creation of a South Main Street historic district would impose prohibiting regulations on property owners”. Again, results reveal that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Although not statistically different from one another, results do show that the public agrees more with this statement than do the experts. An additional statistical test was run to determine how the experts and public perceive how the proposed South Main Street historic district may affect property values. Again, no statistically significant difference exists between the responses of the public compared to preservation professionals. Likewise, there is no statistically significant difference in the opinions of these two bodies, as to the relationship between KSC and historic preservation in Keene. Responses of the experts did include more ratings of the relationship to be ‘somewhat negative’ or ‘negative’ in regards to the demolition and renovation of historic properties in the construction of the Alumni Center.

Limitations of this study are minimal. In the survey, in answering the final question regarding ranking sites and neighborhoods within Keene in order of which are most important to preserve, recipients instead of ranking the sites in numerical order would give a single numerical value to more than one site. For example, recipients often recorded that numerous sites and neighborhoods are the most important to preserve by indicating each with a number one. Other limitations regard the cartographic components of the study. In depicting the present and proposed historic districts, the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data layer portraying all buildings located in the City of Keene is not true to date, as certain institutional
buildings featured are no longer in existence, with new structures having been constructed in their place since the time the data was compiled.

The results of this study depict widespread community support for the preservation of South Main Street. This support will allow preservationists in Keene to go forward with plans to preserve South Main Street without reservations. With the possible upcoming progress, decisions will be made regarding which type of historic district South Main Street will become and what specific regulations the district will put forth. When such decisions have been made, possible future plans should include the reassessment of community support regarding the specific district and regulations that will be in place. This will make completely clear the community’s desire to protect South Main Street. Community support is a crucial component to any citywide endeavor and Keene residents indicate that they are in agreement.

In concert, gathering community response is a critical element in the creation of a new historic district which may generate and impose additional regulations upon individuals. However it is important not just to gather, but to assess and acknowledge such concerns, desires, and recommendations. Being an essential procedure for success, the opinions of the community, both expert and public, are imperative components when analyzing the proposed South Main Street historic district. Given the results of this study, a South Main Street historic district is a feasible endeavor for preservationists in Keene to pursue. Initial findings encourage the process of designating South Main Street as a historic district to continue, although this process should not limit alternate preservation pursuits. To conclude, capturing Keene’s character is a community wide goal in which the preservation of South Main Street could help to accomplish.
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### Table 7 Sites in Keene on the National Register of Historic Places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Year Added</th>
<th>Historic Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel Adams House</td>
<td>324 Main St.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Architecture/Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Mills</td>
<td>93-115 Railroad St.</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire County Courthouse</td>
<td>12 Court St.</td>
<td>Local Gov</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colony's Block</td>
<td>4-7 Central Square</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Cooke House</td>
<td>Daniels Hill Road</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinsmoor-Hale House</td>
<td>Main &amp; Winchester St.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19760</td>
<td>Person, Event, Architecture/Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot Mansion</td>
<td>305 Main St.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Fiske Seminary</td>
<td>251 Main St.</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Domestic/Education</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A
Hello! We are from the Department of Geography at Keene State College and are students in Seminar II. This survey is designed to gain an understanding of the awareness and attitudes toward the present historic district and the possible creation of a new district in the city of Keene. Results of this survey will be part of our senior capstone research project which will be presented at various community events and at the Keene State College Academic Excellence Conference. Your participation in this survey would be greatly appreciated!

Gender: (please circle)  Male    Female

Please indicate which age bracket you fall into.

☐ 18-24  ☐ 25-44  ☐ 45-64  ☐ 65+

Are you a permanent resident of Keene, New Hampshire?

Yes  ☐  If yes, how many years have you resided in Keene?  ________

No  ☐

Are you (or have you) been actively involved in Historic Preservation efforts in Keene?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Are you aware that there is a Historic District in Keene?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding the Historic District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion/ Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Keene economically</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracts tourists to the downtown area</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should contain regulations to control the external color of structures within it</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you support a plan to create an historic district for South Main Street (from the Winchester Street rotary to Route 101)?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ No Opinion/ Don’t Know
Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

The creation of a South Main Street Historic District would:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion/Don’t Know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase tourism to Keene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the property values of South Main Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help preserve the historical integrity of Keene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impose prohibiting regulations on the property owners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your outlook regarding the relationship between Keene State College (KSC) and the preservation of Keene, New Hampshire (please circle)?

1 2 3 4 5
Positive Relationship Somewhat Positive Neutral Somewhat Negative Negative Relationship

Do you believe that KSC’s construction of the Alumni Center and the renovation of 232 Main Street is altering the college’s relationship with the City of Keene?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Unsure

Please rank the following neighborhoods and sites regarding which you believe are the most important to preserve (1 being most important and 6 being least important)

________ Center at Keene
________ Colony Mill
________ Keene Public Library
________ South Main Street
________ Victorian Homes on Court Street
________ Other (please identify _________________________________)

Thank you very much for completing our survey. Please feel free to add any additional comments below.
Address: 226 and 232 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $231,200 and $304,600

Current Use: Institutional; Alumni Center

Year Built: 2009; currently under construction

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 229 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $547,000

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: 1860

Architectural Detail:

- Granite Posts or Bollards (Granite gate posts mark the entrance),
- Italianate style,
- Deep bracketed eaves,
- Arched window and door openings with molded caps,
- Gable roof over the primary entrance bays,
- Full third story,
- Full-height bowed bay on the façade,
- Grape arbors
Address: 229 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: N/A

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: 1959

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 229 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: N/A

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: 1913

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 238 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $546,300

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: 1860

Architectural Detail:

- Granite Posts or Bollards
- Side-gabled Italianate house
Address: 246 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $958,100

Current Use: Historical Society of Cheshire County

Year Built: 1870

Architectural Detail:

- Granite Posts or Bollards

- Italianate style

- Deep bracketed eaves

- Arched window and door openings with molded caps

- Gable roof over the primary entrance bays

- Belvidere

- Brick building

- Ball House
Address: 251 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $419,300

Current Use: Institutional; President’s House

Year Built: 1868

Architectural Detail:

- Low hip-roof house
- End chimneys
- Center entrance featuring an elliptical fanlight and sidelights
- Peaked window caps
- Deep bracketed eaves
- Entry portico
- Side porch
Address: 260 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: N/A

Current Use: Institutional; Proctor House

Year Built: 1890

Architectural Detail:

- Queen Anne Style
Address: 266 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $319,700

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1900

Architectural Detail:

- Colonial Revival
- Wood frame
- Single bay
- Gambrel-roof dormer on the façade
Address: 272 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $382,000

Current Use: Commercial; MEI Search Consultants, Dentist

Year Built: 1868

Architectural Detail:

- Granite Posts or Bollards
- Side-gabled Italianate house
Address: 283 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $8,959,000

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: No information available

Architectural Detail: No information available
Address: 284 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $244,100

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1865

Architectural Detail:

- Gable front
- Side-hall plan Italianate
Address: 290 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $327,700

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1906

Architectural Detail:
  - Queen Anne Style
Address: 298 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: N/A

Current Use: Commercial; Care and Rehabilitation Center

Year Built: 1970

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 305 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $4,946,500

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: 1810-1815

Architectural Detail:

- 5-bay wide
- Fanlit center entrance
- Partial sidelights
- Slender portico
- Splayed granite lintels with keystones and decorative tooling
Address: 324 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $392,700

Current Use: Commercial; Realtor; Daniel Adams House listed on the National Register of Historic Places

Year Built: 1795

Architectural Detail:

- Wooden picket fence encloses the lot
- 5-bay wide
- Hip-roof Federal house
- Gable roof in 1830’s as well as Greek Revival detailing
- Pedimented from gable
- Barn is attached to the rear ell
Address: 329 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: N/A

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: 1902

Architectural Detail:

- “L”-shaped
- Mansard roof
- Two gambled dormers at each bay
Address: 331 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $630,200

Current Use: Institutional

Year Built: 1902

Architectural Detail:

- Foursquare form
- Façade roof dormers
- Colonial Revival details
Address: 338 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $431,600

Current Use: Commercial; Optometrist

Year Built: 1873

Architectural Detail:

- Italianate style
- Deep bracketed eaves
- Arched window and door openings with molded caps
- Gable roof over the primary entrance bays
Address: 339 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $317,400

Current Use: Wyman Tavern Museum, (Oldest Building

Year Built: 1762

Architectural Detail:

- Wooden and cast iron fences
- “Deep lot” that historically defined the street layout
- Bay wide, side-gable, center chimney, entrance Georgian house
- Pedimented window caps
- Entry portico
- Wagon shed with seven arched openings behind the Tavern
Address: 346 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $494,300

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1842

Architectural Detail:

- “Deep lot” that historically defined the street layout
- 5-bay wide
- Side-gable roof building perpendicularly situated to the street
- Pedimented gable end
Address: 349 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $280,500

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1835

Architectural Detail:

- Gable front
- Brick structure
- Recessed entrance with three-quarter length sides and ornamented reveals
- Flared brick lintels
Address: 358 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $310,500

Current Use: Commercial; Carriage Barn Bed and Breakfast

Year Built: 1870

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 361 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $271,500

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1926

Architectural Detail:

- Brick
- Full width shed-roof dormers
- Entry portico
Address: 365 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $302,600

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1865

Architectural Detail:

- Side-gable
- Gabled façade pavilion
- Detached barn
Address: 370 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $228,000

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1958

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 375 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $243,200

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1906

Architectural Detail:

- Queen Anne Style
Address: 380 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $243,200

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1845

Architectural Detail:

- “Deep lot” that historically defined the street layout
- Greek Revival building
- Brick building
- Gable front
- Side hall building
- Granite lintels and sills
- Marble walkway
Address: 383 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $321,100

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1896

Architectural Detail:

- Queen Anne Style
Address: 389 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $267,900

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1873

Architectural Detail:

- Second empire style
- Arched roof dormers
Address: 390 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $383,800

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1918

Architectural Detail:

- Brick
- Full width shed-roof dormers
- Entry portico
Address: 399 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $300,100

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1870

Architectural Detail:

- Granite Posts or Bollards
- Gable-front
Address: 400 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $376,500

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1855

Architectural Detail:

- Flat roof house
- Stepped parapet end walls linked by a roof balustrade
- Gable front
- Side-hall plan Italianate
Address: 409 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $247,100

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1865

Architectural Detail:

- Gable front
- Side-hall plan Italianate
Address: 410 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $373,100

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1900

Architectural Detail:

- “Deep lot” that historically defined the street layout
- Queen Anne Style
Address: 419 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $261,500

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1835

Architectural Detail:

- Federal style

- Gable front

- Fan lit entrance flanked by slender pilasters
Address: 420 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $284,700

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1904

Architectural Detail:

- “Deep lot” that historically defined the street layout
- Foursquare form
- Façade roof dormers
- Colonial Revival details
Address: 425 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $253,900

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1890

Architectural Detail:

- Full width shed-roof dormers
- Entry portico
Address: 428 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $523,900

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1905

Architectural Detail:

- Foursquare form
- Façade roof dormers
- Colonial Revival details
Address: 431 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $270,600

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1925

Architectural Detail:

- Brick
- Gable-front
Address: 440 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $241,700

Current Use: Residential

Year Built: 1850

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 441 Main Street

2009 Assessed Property Value: $384,200

Current Use: Commercial; Realtors

Year Built: 1883

Architectural Detail:

- Granite block retaining walls separate lawn from sidewalk
- Corner entrance is set off by fieldstone wall and gate posts
- All capped with concrete; Italianate style
- Deep bracketed eaves
- Arched window and door openings with molded caps
- Gable roof over the primary entrance bays
Address: 11 King Court

2009 Assessed Property Value: $661,700

Current Use: Commercial; Clough Harbour & Associates, WV Engineering Associates

Year Built: 1912

Architectural Detail: No significant detail
Address: 15 King Court

2009 Assessed Property Value: $331,900

Current Use: Commercial; Indian King Framery

Year Built: 1912

Architectural Detail: No significant detail