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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“Citizen participation is not new to the politics of the United States. In fact, perhaps no other theme has so persistently dominated debate concerning American government.”

The community design charrette has rapidly become a planning tool of choice, as contemporary city planners, and urban designers seek ways to involve the public in proactive, rather than reactionary roles. The goal of a design charrette is to distill community goals and aspirations into a feasible plan of action for community redevelopment and growth (National Charrette Institute, [NCI], n.d.). The University of Georgia (UGA), the Center for Community Design and Preservation (CCDP) has conducted forty-nine charrettes throughout the state of Georgia between 1998 and 2006. This thesis examines the efficacy of the charrette process at the University of Georgia as a tool for positive community change.

Chapter 1 provides an introduction and a statement of objectives. Chapter 2 develops the conceptual framework for understanding historical and contemporary views of citizen participation in the planning process, including the role of federal government initiatives and the impacts of federal programs. Chapter 3 defines the concept of social capacity in community building efforts and describes the community design charrette process using the UGA Charrette Connection program as a model. Chapter 4 describes the research methodology, charrette survey and findings. Chapters 5 - 8 are case studies of Georgia communities, which have participated in
the Charrette Connection process. Chapter 9, the final section, is a summary and synthesis of lessons learned from successful communities.

Objectives:

1. Analysis of the historical and contemporary role of citizen participation in community planning and design.
2. Examination of the charrette as a tool for addressing contemporary city planning challenges.
3. Inventory of charrettes completed by the UGA Center for Community Design & Preservation.
4. Progress evaluation of communities, which have participated in the UGA Charrette Connection program.
CHAPTER 2

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN HISTORY

“Citizen participation is most often stimulated by existing social problems coupled with a lack of confidence in the official solutions.”

Citizen participation has been a key concept in American government since its inception. The American tradition of town assembly was an early platform for organized citizen participation (Jackson 1986; Billington 1974). Assemblies were convened for the purpose of community decision making. While early participation in these meetings was often limited by race, sex and economic status, broad-based citizen participation has been an objective of our government from the early days of the republic (Billington 1974). The establishment of a decentralized government and separation of powers are further measures intended to enhance the role of the citizenry (Strange, 1972).

Thomas Heberlein, author of Principles of Public Involvement, (1976) notes that public involvement in civic affairs generally results in better decisions. Widespread involvement in community affairs is also more likely to result in decisions which will be accepted by locals. He argues that better community decisions should, by definition, be beneficial to the average citizen (Herberlein, 1976).

Participation allows greater access to the benefits of a democratic society (Herberlein, 1976). Hans Spiegel, author of Citizen Participation in Urban Development (1968) suggests there are
three rationales for citizen participation: first, knowing that one can participate promotes dignity and self-sufficiency for the individual; second, participation utilizes the energy and resources of individual citizens within the community; third, citizen participation provides a source of information, knowledge, and experience, which contributes to the soundness of community solutions. The result is an emphasis on thorough problem solving and a reduction of deficiencies within a community (Christenson & Robinson, 1980).

Figure 2.1 Norman Rockwell Painting “Freedom of Speech.” Rockwell painted this image from the personal experience of watching a man voicing an unpopular opinion at an Arlington, Virginia Town Meeting. Image: (Norman Rockwell Pictures for the American People, n.d.)

Citizen participation can legitimize a program, its plans, actions, and leadership (Cook, 1975). The stamp of public approval and legitimacy can often tip the balance between success and failure of community efforts.
Citizen Participation and Civil Rights

The inability of urban government to meet the needs of neighborhoods was a key issue in the 1960s. The influx of the poor into urban areas exposed governmental deficiencies, exacerbated those deficiencies and revealed the inability of many local governments to meet citizen needs. Poverty, unemployment, racial unrest and lack of adequate city services bred contempt and mistrust of local government (Bailey, 1974).

In some cases, more affluent residents could pay for services typically provided by the government, such as garbage collection, schools, and security. Many affluent white citizens relocated to the suburbs during the 1950s and 1960s in a phenomenon known as white flight. While many factors combined to create the social climate of the 1960s, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and Veterans Administration (VA) loan programs played a pivotal role in urban dispersal following World War II (Duany, Plater-Zyberk, & Speck, 2000; Jacobs, 1961). These programs provided insured mortgages, typically costing less per month than paying rent, which were directed at new single-family suburban construction. Loans for new housing were only for a single owner, effectively pricing out of the market those who could only afford to live in multifamily buildings. The FHA and VA programs discouraged the renovation of existing housing stock, construction of row houses, mixed-use buildings, and other urban housing types on the basis of economic soundness (Duany, et. al, 2000; Jacobs, 1961).

Appraisal manuals from the FHA instructed loan underwriters to avoid neighborhoods with "inharmonious racial groups"—recommending that cities and towns enact zoning ordinances that restricted areas to whites, and enact covenants prohibiting African-American owners. Homes, neighborhoods, and entire towns were legally restricted to individuals of the Caucasian race.
Discrimination in the housing market was the norm in most parts of the country—and housing values declined rapidly in minority neighborhoods (Anderson, 1964). See Appendix A for a timeline of events impacting community planning in the United States.

Public Response

The citizen participation movement of the 1960’s and 1970’s was born out of a sense of urgency to address basic needs rather than from a philosophical belief in democracy or a belief in the duty of the citizen to participate (Arnold, 1979). People were angry and getting angrier—riots, violence, and property destruction ensued. While some of the most widely publicized incidents occurred in large cities, such as the Los Angeles Riots of 1965 and the Detroit and Newark Riots of 1967, there were proportionally devastating effects in smaller towns (Cohen, De la Vega & Watson, 2001).

Reacting to the climate of civil unrest, citizen participation became an increasingly emphasized component of federally funded programs throughout the 1960s. The three federal programs most influential in organizing citizen participation in the field of city planning were the Community Action program, (CAP) the Model Cities program, and Urban Renewal (Halpern, 1995; Tigan, 2005).

CAP began under President Lyndon Johnson in 1964. The urban revitalization program required citizen participation and emphasized the inclusion of the poor in advisory roles as a necessary component of the War on Poverty. CAP community action boards were required to include at least one-third representation by low income members of the community (Arnold, 1979). This
measure was intended to guarantee broader-based local involvement. In some cases an added benefit was that it gave participants skills and opportunities that could be used to advance their careers (Keating, 2001). In Atlanta, former Model Cities participants were subsequently elected to the City Council, school boards, and the state legislature, and congress (Keating, 2001; Tigan, 2005).

Cities wishing to participate in the Model Cities program were only awarded funding if they proved that they were successfully coordinating with local community groups. This requirement was influential because it made neighborhood residents and their leaders familiar with the concepts and processes of city planning, opened a dialogue for bargaining, and directed the emphasis away from comprehensive city-wide planning, toward smaller scale, locally-oriented, incremental planning (Arnold, 1979). In Atlanta, this later gave rise to Neighborhood Planning Units (NPU), which are written into the city charter, ensuring that historically disenfranchised groups are able to review and vote on issues affecting their communities (Keating, 2001).

The Model Cities program was cancelled and replaced by the Gerald Ford Administration in 1974 with the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, following congressional pressure to give local governments more control of the process. The CDBG program evolved into a narrower, specific function-focused planning practice. CDBG projects are largely directed by nonprofit Community Based Organizations (CBO) (Tigan, 2005).

By most measures, the Model Cities and CAP programs did not achieve their goals of abolition of poverty and radical improvement in the quality of urban life. The most lasting legacy of the programs is that they can be credited with an increased focus nationally on neighborhood planning with increased emphasis on residents driving the process.
Community Design Movement

The Community Design Movement, gained momentum in the 1960s from the realization that the mismanagement of the physical environment is a major contributing factor to social and economic ills (Sanoff, 2000). While many schools of architecture taught the mantra: design does not affect behavior, and respected sociologist Nathan Glazer proclaimed in 1965, “We must root out of our thinking the assumption that the physical form of our communities has social consequences” there were ample examples to the contrary (Duany, et. al., 2000; Fowler, 1992).

One prominent example was the Pruitt-Igoe housing project of St. Louis, completed in 1956. The buildings, constructed in the international style, were demolished 17 years after completion due to rampant crime, vandalism, and gang related violence. This example is emblematic of the era’s misguided approach to solving urban problems. Shortly after the building’s initial design phase was completed in 1951, architect Minoru Yamasaki attempted to patent the building so that it could be replicated in other locations throughout the country (Mogilevlich, 2003). As the buildings of the Pruitt-Igoe project neared completion, its flaws became increasingly apparent. When the first residents moved in, things became worse: exposed steam pipes scalded children; outdoor corridors, and isolated laundry rooms became havens for muggers, rapists, vandals, and drug dealers. Instead of playgrounds and parks, the fields between buildings became places of fear, planted with garbage and broken glass (Mogilevlich, 2003). The architect blamed budget cuts for many of the buildings’ shortcomings. However, historians view the project as an indication of a significant disconnection between architects, planners and the low-income people for whom the buildings were designed (Duany, et. al, 2000; Mogilevlich, 2003).
Figure 2.2 Pruitt-Igoe circa 1957. Note the difference in scale between Pruitt-Igoe and the surrounding neighborhood, as well as the departure from the city grid. Image: (MacDonald, 1996).

Fig. 2.3 Pruitt-Igoe lobby rendering. Architect, Minoru Yamasaki said “when people go into good buildings, there should be serenity and delight.” (Mogilevlich, 2003). Image: (Newman, 1972).

Fig. 2.4 Pruitt Igoe lobby photograph. Yamasaki blamed the Housing Administration for their frugality as well as the residents, stating “I never thought people could be that destructive” (Mogilevlich, 2003). Image: (Newman, 1972).
Figure 2.5 Pruitt Igoe demolition 1972. As Pruitt-Igoe’s failure became apparent, the building’s architect Minoru Yamasaki referred to it as “a job I wish I hadn’t done.” (Roberts, 2005). Image: (Gottdiener & Hutchison, 2000).

Figure 2.6 Cabrini Green in Chicago. Similarly, this housing project became a bastion of crime in the 1960s. Image: (Affordable Housing Institute, 2007).
In the 1960s and 1970s, contemporary best management practices (BMPs) supported replacing buildings in sections of blighted neighborhoods with new construction as one of the most effective means to alleviate urban congestion, pollution, crime, and lack of public open space (Kaitz & Hyman, 1970). Federal money from the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Department supported these initiatives. Architecture and planning professionals rose to the call, creating what they saw as architecture for the people. The results were housing projects such as Pruitt-Igoe and Cabrini Green, which featured too much undefined public space, shopping and mega-block convention centers, which struggled economically and were vacant at night (Duany et. al., 2000; Jacobs, 1961).

![Image](image-url)

**Figure 2.7** Poor definition of outdoor space in public housing projects creates a sense of isolation and overexposure. Image: (Suchman & Urban Land Institute., 1994).

In downtown Detroit, like many other US cities, a large number of older buildings were removed in an effort to clear the slums (Pluntz, 1985). In cases in which new buildings were built in their place, they were typically large footprint, single use, widely spaced buildings separated by expanses of greenspace. The empty spaces between buildings tended to isolate people even further and reduced accountability and sense of pride in ownership of space (Duany et al., 2000; Jacobs, 1961; Newman, 1972).
Figure 2.8 Detroit, Michigan, Figure Ground Study 1916-1994. Today, the 1950s and 1960s renewal efforts of downtown Detroit are studied as infamous examples of bad city planning. Image: (Plunz, 1985).
Community Design Centers

Paul Davidoff, an influential planner and attorney active in the mid-1960s, advocated for the planning profession to undertake a greater social justice mission—encouraging planners to think more holistically and to challenge the urban redevelopment practices of the day (Davidoff, 1965; Manzo & Perkins, 2006). Community Design Centers (CDCs), influenced by Davidoff, sought to represent the interests of disenfranchised community groups (Comerio, 1984; Dreier, 1996).

The energy and momentum surrounding the Civil Rights Movement and the federal programs formed as a result of the Equal Opportunity Act of 1964 created a fertile climate for grass roots efforts (Comerio, 1984; Conway, 2000). The HUD Office of Neighborhood Development provided economic development assistance to communities, enhancing the effectiveness of neighborhood advocacy groups (Filner, 2002; Tigan, 2005).

An early example of a successful CDC buoyed by HUD funding is the Mid-Bronx Desperados (Filner, 2002). The desperados began in 1964 as a coalition of volunteers motivated to revive their community, which was struggling from increasing disinvestment, arson, abandonment and population loss. The group partnered with local police and fire departments to establish a community self-help program. Increasingly, they took on more ambitious projects, including renovating buildings and developing new housing to repopulate the neighborhood. The service area for the organization is a 52 square block area with a population of approximately 28,000 (Mid-Bronx Desperados Housing Corp. Inc., 2002). They have been supported by a variety of funding sources throughout the years, including HUD Community Development Funds.
New Town Macon is another example of a successful CDC. The group began in 1998 as a public-private partnership dedicated to implementing the community’s vision of a comprehensive, coordinated, and continuous revitalization of downtown Macon, Georgia (New Town Macon, 2006). Currently, the organization is implementing a downtown retail and parking improvement plan, which includes marketing efforts for ideal tenant mixes, physical infrastructure improvements for better circulation, façade rehabilitation, as well as signage and visual merchandising guidelines (New Town Macon, 2006).

Gordon Bennett, Business Development Director for New Town Macon, reported that private investment has been a significant force sustaining the group’s efforts (G. Bennett, personal communication, January 2006). However, as a nonprofit organization, New Town Macon is also able to compete for a wide range of governmental funding sources. Since 1998, this CDC has established a regional as well as national reputation for effective community organizing and downtown revitalization (Anderson, 2005).

In southeast Atlanta, the SouthStar CDC serves a function similar to New Town Macon. SouthStar’s mission is to foster neighborhood projects and partnerships that focus on sustainable community development in Southeast Atlanta (SouthStar Community Development Corporation, n.d.). The organization’s initiatives are improvement of workforce housing, economic development, community building and revitalization. The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) recently awarded SouthStar funding to further study the feasibility of enhancing South Moreland Avenue (“ARC Initiative Funds South Moreland Avenue Study,” 2007). The South Moreland Avenue Corridor study will formulate strategies to develop activity nodes along the corridor that
will create urban scale, mixed-use developments that are pedestrian-friendly and support transportation choices (“ARC Initiative Funds South Moreland Avenue Study,” 2007).

Since beginning in 1998, SouthStar CDC has focused on revitalization of Moreland Avenue south of Memorial Drive in Atlanta. "We recognize the regional importance of Moreland Avenue," said SouthStar CDC board chair Kevin Lynch. The ARC funding, Lynch said “will help us plan for the future of the corridor to serve the region, and be a livable and sustainable part of the fabric of southeast Atlanta” (“ARC Initiative Funds South Moreland Avenue Study,” 2007).

Over the last 40 years, CDCs have provided planning and development services to hundreds of communities (Filner, 2002; Silverman, 2004). They have been said to serve as the planning profession’s equivalent of health clinics to the medical field, or what legal aid is to the law community, “often providing services after the injury has already occurred” (Sanoff, 2000). The injury, in the cases of urban neighborhoods and downtowns is commonly in the form of demolition of historic buildings, highways bisecting neighborhoods, and general disinvestment in property.

There are more than 3,600 CDCs throughout the country (National Congress for Economic Development, n.d.). Although more numerous in large cities in the Northeast and Midwest where the groups first began, there are CDCs in most states (Filner, 2002). Additional examples located in Georgia include the Community Design Center of Atlanta, the Center in Newton County and the UGA CCDP. Ninety-five percent of the 133 largest cities in the United States have at least one active CDC (Filner, 2002).
The Will to Participate

When citizens feel their government is making good decisions, similar to those that they would make themselves, they are unlikely to actively participate in government (Arnold, 1979). However, if those conditions are not being met, the public loses confidence in government and the demand for active participation increases.

Economic stability and social class largely determine who will participate. For the poor, participation in the planning process can be seen as long range and irrelevant to day-to-day needs (Arnold, 1979). Residents of economically depressed neighborhoods commonly express suspicion of design professionals. The fundamental fear is that officials do not actually intend to solve problems, but are only there to pacify the residents and stifle their complaints (Arnold, 1979; Arnstein, 1969). In a much-cited article “A Ladder of Citizen Participation,” 1969, Sherry Arnstein explains that there are several significant gradations of citizen participation:

“The idea of citizen participation is a little like eating spinach,” Arnstein says, “no one is against it in principle because it is good for you. Participation of the governed in government is, in theory, the cornerstone of democracy – a revered idea that is vigorously applauded by virtually everyone. The applause is reduced to polite handclaps, however, when this principle is advocated by the have-nots” (Arnstein, 1969).

Arnstein reflects the frustration with the participatory processes common during the 1960s and 1970s, by stating, “without actual redistribution of power, citizen participation is an empty ritual and is basically a frustrating process” (Arnstein, 1969).
In 1972, James Riedel, sociology professor at the State University of New York at Albany, outlined what he saw as the realistic view of the process in “Citizen Participation: Myths and Realities.”

1. Even under the best conditions, most people tend to avoid participation and involvement.
2. The American political system favors group over individual action, coalitions of groups even more so. However, most individuals are motivated only by single issues and are turned off by coalitions.
3. Localizing control does not necessarily increase participation.
4. Citizen groups working outside the system tend to handicap themselves.
5. Official and citizen views of participation are often inherently contradictory.
6. Direct citizen action, though seemingly hostile to the system, has strong historic support (Riedel, 1972).

Contemporary planning theory recognizes the shortcomings of the participatory process, and acknowledges that citizen participation occurs when there is a confluence of several factors, including existing social problems, dissatisfaction with solutions of local authorities, a minimum level of affluence, leisure time, and at least a cursory level of knowledge of government and planning (Sanoff, 2000; Dreier, 1996; Silverman 2004).
CHAPTER 3
SOCIAL CAPACITY: THE ROLE OF THE DESIGN CHARRETTE

“Social capacity is the attitudinal, behavioral, and communal glue that holds society together through relationships among individuals, families, and organizations. Without social capital . . . efforts to address specific problems will make little progress.”


Community building is a holistic approach rooted in the idea of residents taking control of the future of their communities. Communities in which residents feel empowered, and feel that they have influence in the decision making process tend to report higher quality of life satisfaction levels (Forester, 1999; Sanoff, 2000). Naparstek, Dooley and Smith, 1997, explain that successful community building efforts include the following elements:

- Involvement of residents in goal setting and strategy generation
- Identification of community strengths and challenges
- Development of unique strategies for each community
- Reinforcement of community values while building social capacity
- Development of creative partnerships with institutions in the community

Paul Mattessich and Barbara Monsey, authors of Community Building: What Makes It Work, (1997) argue that task and goal accomplishment are not the best evaluative measures of a community building process. Rather, the outcome of a successful community building effort is something called increased social capacity – that is, the ability of a group to accomplish tasks
and goals and a heightened sense of community (Mattessich & Monsey, 1997). This may also be thought of as a strengthening of social and psychological ties to a place and to other residents (Dreier, 1996).

Community building efforts seek to integrate top-down and bottom-up initiatives to form networks of partnerships between residents, businesses, and city management. Through participation in goal setting and implementation strategies, parties who wish to participate have an opportunity to share ownership of the process. Collaborative involvement in the decision-making process strengthens social bonds and allows participants to develop relationships based on mutual trust and common values—therefore building social capacity (Dreier, 1996; Manzo & Perkins, 2006). A community with high level of social capacity has increased potential to achieve its goals (Mattessich & Monsey, 1997).

**Community Design Charrettes**

The community design charrette is a tool for building community social capacity. Charrettes have become a popular means of problem-solving for American cities, and are based on citizen participation and community input (National Charrette Institute, [NCI], n.d.).

Charrettes have been utilized throughout the country for a wide variety of applications, including new development plans, community-wide visions, downtown revitalization, new annexations and comprehensive planning initiatives (NCI, n.d.). Charrette is the French word for “chariot” or “little cart.” The origin of the English usage of the word dates back to the 19th century at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts School of Art and Architecture in Paris. It is said that the charrette was pushed between drafting tables to collect student work assigned on tight deadlines. At times,
eager students would jump onto the cart with their work to put finishing touches on their
drawings (NCI, n.d.). The National Charrette Institute (NCI), is a national nonprofit
organization, devoted to publicity of, advocacy for, and education about the charrette process.
NCI helps people build community social capacity through the creation of healthy community
planning. The mission of the organization is to advance the fields of community planning and
public involvement through research, publications and facilitation.

![Figure 3.1 Illustration of the charrette cart. Image source: (NCI, n.d.).](image)

Ruth Ann Bramson, author of “Cultivating Productive Public Conversations,” advocates that
citizen involvement in the naming and framing of community issues is crucial for real
improvements to be seen (Bramson, 2001). Too often, she states, citizens feel decisions have
already been made before they are even invited to weigh in on the issues. “Pubic deliberation,”
Bramson says, “involves postponing solution generation and engaging community members at
the beginning of the process, by asking them to define an issue in terms of what is meaningful to
them” (Bramson, 2001).
A well-facilitated charrette begins with the charrette leader asking a series of questions, aiming to guide the conversation from the surface of a topic to a deeper understanding of its implications for a community’s quality of life and economic livelihood.

Research by Henry Sanoff, author of *Community Participation Methods in Planning and Design* (2000) has shown that satisfaction in a community building process is based not on the degree to which a person’s needs have been met, but rather the feeling of having influenced the decisions (Sanoff, 2000).

![Figure 3.2 Charrette Cartoon. Drawn for The Washington Post by Roger K. Lewis, Professor University of Maryland School of Architecture (1988).](image)

Henry Sanoff (2000) summarizes the theories and practices of contemporary public participation as follows:

1. The professional’s job is no longer to produced finalized, unchangeable solutions, but to develop a range of solutions from a continuous dialog with the expected users.
2. Solutions should arise from exchanges between professionals and citizens.

3. The professional should provide opinions and technical advice, discussing consequences of various alternatives and citizens should state their opinions and contribute expertise.

4. The process should remain transparent with the design process and decision making process visible in order for the final decisions to be understood by the people who will be affected by them.

5. The greatest possible participation of the community should be encouraged. Public comments and representation should be accepted continuously throughout the process.

The United States citizen experience is built upon a tradition of public participation. The New England Town Meeting, illustrated by Norman Rockewll (Fig 2.1), depicted people voicing opinions and working together to solve problems. At early New England Town Meetings participants debated issues and voted on the spot. They were able to see results as the direct result of their input. The essence of this experience is one of the reasons the charrette process is so compelling.

As people get involved in planning processes, many have come to expect an inadequate, inefficient public participation process that leaves them feeling frustrated and suspicious. NCI notes that many people are frustrated with the public involvement process and states that charrettes can provide the missing elements to facilitate productive community decision making (NCI, n.d.).
Table 3.1 The NCI recommends that charrettes comply with general guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A CHARRETTE IS</th>
<th>A CHARRETTE IS NOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An open, collaborative process including all interested parties.</td>
<td>A one-day workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves compressed work schedules and multiple disciplines in a series of short feedback loops.</td>
<td>A multi-day marathon involving everyone all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes place on location or as close as possible to the site.</td>
<td>A plan authored by a select few that will affect many.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produces a buildable plan, developed from a generalist, holistic approach.</td>
<td>A “visioning session” that produces non-specific results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates public trust through meaningful public involvement and education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Georgia Charrette Connection

“Successful communities don’t just happen; they must be continually shaped and guided.”
– Author unknown

The University of Georgia Center for Community Design & Preservation (CCDP) has conducted charrettes throughout the state of Georgia since 1998. Initially working only in concert with the Georgia Department of Community Affairs (DCA) Better Hometown and Main Street programs, the CCDP began conducting its own charrettes, in addition to DCA projects in 2001.

From 1998 – 2006, a total of forty-nine charrettes were completed. Figure 3.3 illustrates the geographic distribution of the communities with which the CCDP has worked. Charrette projects vary from corridor and downtown planning to watershed and green infrastructure initiatives. A complete inventory of CCDP projects is located in Appendix B.
Figure 3.3 Charrettes completed in Georgia by the UGA Center for Community Design & Preservation between 1998 and 2006.
Charrette Connection Process

University of Georgia charrette teams usually range in size from 10 - 15 participants. Participants include members of the charrette course HIPR 4680/6680, as well as additional students and faculty. Pre-charrette preparations include securing a large scale base map of the study area, and ensuring that the host community has publicized the event and invited all stakeholders to attend a charrette kick-off meeting. Some communities post fliers, mail postcards, issue public notices, or encourage local newspapers to announce charrette schedules.

Typically, the first day of a UGA charrette focuses on information sharing. The day begins with a charrette kick-off meeting, led by Pratt Cassity, Director of the UGA CCDP. During this session, residents are usually asked to identify the community’s primary strengths, weaknesses and future challenges.

Writing on flip charts, Cassity records community comments during a charrette kick-off meeting. Often, Cassity applies meeting facilitation practices, which can be summarized by the following techniques described in Henry Sanoff’s 1978 text, Designing with Community Participation. These techniques have proven to be an effective means of directing meaningful public discussions.

- Restating what has been said in the same words
- Paraphrasing what has been said in different words
- Dividing ideas into smaller parts
- Summarizing messages
- Organizing ideas into a sequence
• Generalizing the points of a message
• Asking probing questions for elaboration
• Asking questions for clarification

Following the kick-off meeting, the team of UGA students and faculty usually begins a site tour and photograph the study area. The site tour also includes a process known as ground-truthing, which is on-site verification of information gathered from public input and documented on the team base maps.

Following a site visit, the team usually assembles in the workspace and shares what they have learned in the field. Cassity begins to categorize the work products into broad categories; the team divides into interest subgroups and begins developing alternatives and solutions.

Typically, the team continues to work through the second day of a charrette. Frequently, additional visits to the study area are necessary. The remainder of second day of a charrette is usually spent refining ideas and eliminating ineffective options. Often, residents stop by throughout the day to provide design ideas and additional information. The studio remains open to the public throughout the entire process.

On the third day of a typical charrette, the team finishes and prepares for the presentation of solutions to the public. The presentation of charrette results usually takes place in the middle of the afternoon of the third day, and the format varies depending on local needs and conditions.

Later CCDP staff write a final report; Eleonora Machado, CCDP Graphics manages report design and layout. Final reports are delivered to communities within a few months following a charrette.
Figure 3.4 Example of final report for Tybee Island charrette. Charrette reports serve as community tool kits, documenting existing conditions and illustrating recommended improvements.

Figure 3.5 The Tybee Island Charrette Report was awarded a Water First award for excellence by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs in 2006.
The solutions generated through the UGA charrette process reflect student abilities and limitations. The format of individual charrettes remains flexible in order to satisfy the client community and to respond to the locally specific issues.

Charrettes result in a wide array of final products, such as:

- Community master plans
- Design guidelines
- Building typology and facade recommendations
- Roadway, corridor planning, and parking recommendations
- Open space & recreation master plans
- Downtown revitalizations strategies
- Environmental management plans ("What can a charrette do for my community?" n.d.)
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY & FINDINGS

Paul Mattessich and Barbara Monsey, authors of *Community Building: What Makes it Work*, (1997) developed criteria for program evaluation of community building efforts. Their criteria answer the following questions: What makes a community building process successful? What distinguishes efforts that succeed from those that fail? The questions used in the charrette follow-up survey (Appendix C) were based on Mattessich and Monsey’s research. These questions were designed to evaluate two fundamental issues, critical to community success:

1. **What was the community’s existing social capacity at the time of the charrette?**
   What existing factors predispose communities to success or failure? Were communities motivated, flexible and adaptable? Was there strong, identifiable leadership?

2. **How successful was the charrette as a community building process?** Were the charrette products useful and appropriate to the community’s needs? Was the public aware that a charrette was taking place? Was there adequate community participation in the design process? Were there competing organizational groups vying for attention and resources? Were the charrette recommendations implemented?

The sample survey group for this research consisted of liaisons from communities, usually city staff or volunteer board members. For nearly every charrette, there were one or two contacts, which were closely involved in the process, and able to respond to questions relating to implementation of charrette recommendations. The survey was web-based and distributed via
email to city staff and volunteer board members. Survey participants were asked to rank their community on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high) the degree to which it fulfilled a list of statements (see Appendix C). Questions were designed to identify the degree to which communities complied with the criteria outlined in Table 4.1 and 4.2. A total of 43 communities were surveyed, and 19 completed surveys were returned. Narrative responses from the 19 cities are located in Appendix D.

Interpreting the Results

Completed charrette follow-up surveys for each community were scored based on responses to the survey questions. The graph in figure 4.1 conveys the pre-existing level of community social capacity at the time of the charrette. Indicators of a high level of community social capacity include: community awareness, motivation, flexibility, social cohesion, ability to cooperate, leadership quality and general preparedness for the charrette process. Based on social capacity theory, cities scoring higher on this index, would have a greater likelihood of successfully reaching community goals (i.e. implementing charrette recommendations). Scores ranged from a high of 28 (Greensboro, Hawkinsville and Woodbine) to a low of 16 (Newton County). The average score was 23. The graph in figure 4.2 illustrates the perceived success of the charrette as a community building process. Indicators of the success of a charrette included: widespread participation, community control over decision making process, minimal competition for community attention by other initiatives, a good system of communication, and the development of self-understanding through the charrette process. Scores ranged from a high of 24 (Greensboro) to a low of 14 (Newton County). The average score was 18.5.
Table 4.1 Characteristics of successful communities (Mattessich & Monsey, 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SURVEY QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation from within the community</td>
<td>Successful efforts are more likely to occur in communities where the motivation to begin a community building process is self-driven rather than encouraged from the outside. When ideas come from a community itself, the ability to accomplish tasks tends to increase.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of community motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good system of communication</td>
<td>Successful efforts tend to have well-developed systems of communication. Good communication ensures that residents know the rationale for an initiative, and know what has already been accomplished. Communication sustains the momentum of a community building process.</td>
<td>Please rate the strength of the community communication system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility and adaptability</td>
<td>Flexible community groups, which remain open to a variety of ways of dealing with issues, are more likely to be successful in community building efforts. Progress is more likely when residents have an inclination to do whatever is best, not simply whatever has been done in the past.</td>
<td>Please rate the community level of flexibility and adaptability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preexisting social cohesion</td>
<td>The stronger the interrelationships among community members, the more likely the community building effort is to succeed. Communities with stable populations, tend to have greater success with building community.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of general strength of relationships among community members involved in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to discuss, reach consensus &amp; cooperate</td>
<td>Successful efforts tend to occur more easily in communities that have a spirit of cooperation, as well as the ability to openly discuss problems.</td>
<td>Please rate the ability of community members to discuss, reach consensus, and cooperate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing, identifiable leadership</td>
<td>Successful efforts are more likely to occur in communities with existing, identifiable leadership. A local leader, or set of local leaders can serve as the catalyst for an initiative.</td>
<td>Please rate the strength of existing, identifiable leadership within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARACTERISTIC</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>SURVEY QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widespread Participation</td>
<td>Successful efforts are more likely to occur when the process includes developing a group identity, clarifying priorities, and agreeing on how to achieve goals.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of community participation in the charrette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Awareness of Issues Leading to the Charrette</td>
<td>Efforts are more likely to be successful in communities where residents and leadership recognize the need for community building initiatives. The community building effort must address an issue which is perceived as important enough to warrant attention.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of knowledge of the issues leading to the charrette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Competition in Pursuit of Goals</td>
<td>Community building efforts tend to be more successful in communities where existing organizations do not perceive other groups as competitors. Communities with duplication of activities by many organizations tend to deplete leadership and other resources.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of competition between community initiatives (i.e charrette recommendations vs. other community projects).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Control Over Decision Making</td>
<td>Successful community building efforts are more likely to occur when residents have control over decisions, particularly with regard to how funds are used.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of community control over decision making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Success of Community Building Process</td>
<td>Successful communities tend to utilize technical assistance to help residents gain competence in a particular area; successful communities also tend to perceive themselves as successes.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of success of the charrette.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Preparedness</td>
<td>Community building efforts are more likely to be successful if the community has spent adequate time educating the community, notifying stakeholders, and gathering accurate maps and demographic information.</td>
<td>Please rate the level of community preparedness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of community comments from the surveys revealed several notable trends among communities. A total of 84% of responding communities reported having made progress towards implementation of charrette goals. Only Forsyth, Jonesboro and Newton County reported no progress. City officials in Forsyth have chosen to withhold the charrette report from the public in order to release it in conjunction with the Downtown Development Authority’s Jackson Street Block project (J. Bramson, personal communication, January 6, 2007).

Survey responses from Jonesboro and Newton County both cited difficulties with local leadership and local politics as impediments to progress. A total of 63% of communities reported that they had implemented some of the charrette recommendations. The same percentage (63%) of responding communities also indicated that they had been awarded or had allocated funds following the charrette process. A total of 100% of responding communities indicated that they would recommend the UGA charrette process to other communities.

Table 4.3  Charrette follow up survey results.

| Communities reporting progress toward charrette recommendations. | 84% |
| Communities which have implemented charrette recommendations. | 63% |
| Communities awarded or allocated funds to implement charrette recommendations. | 63%  
(of those, 66% reported receiving funds from state sources, 58% from nonprofit/foundation/private sources, 33% from local sources, 33% from federal sources). |
Figure 4.1 Pre-existing level of community social capacity at time of charrette.

Figure 4.2 Success of charrette as a community building process.
Case Study Methodology

Case studies for this thesis were chosen based on demonstrated progress toward at least some of the charrette recommendations and willingness of city staff to participate in the evaluation process. The four case studies represent a cross section of successful communities with a range of demographic characteristics. The evaluation process included site visits, photodocumentation, comparison of before and after photos, interviews with city staff, and gathering of demographic information. Successful cities were selected in order to provide a platform for analyzing implementation strategies. Cities which did not report significant progress toward charrette goals, or did not respond to the charrette follow up survey were not included in the case study section of this thesis. This is an area for further study and future research.
The City of Suwanee, Georgia is located in northeast Gwinnett County. In the 1990s Suwanee was one of the fastest growing small cities in Georgia, experiencing an over 260% population growth increase between 1990 and 2000 (U.S. Census, 2000; Visser, 2006). The city grew from 2,500 people in 1990 to almost 8,000 by the year 2000, and the population is continuing to increase (U.S. Census, 2000). The area known as Old Town Suwanee is the geographic center of the city. It consists of fewer than a dozen historic buildings, most of which are one story tall. Physical constraints, including topography, zoning, adjacent historic neighborhoods and an abutting rail line, made it difficult for the city to direct new growth into the city’s historic center.

Figure 5.1 Suwanee is located in Gwinnett County, Georgia.
Urban Design Challenge

The sprawl growth pattern characteristic of Gwinnett County is well known throughout north Georgia (Duffy, 2006; Freeman, 2005; Green, 2006). The pattern of growth is characterized by big box stores located behind expansive surface parking lots, large, rapidly constructed houses on lots of one acre or more, and wide, congested roadways. The city of Suwanee wanted to be different from the other municipalities in Gwinnett County. They wanted to retain what was left of their community character and grow in a more sustainable way, reported Denise Brinson, Suwanee Economic Development Director (D. Brinson, personal communication, Feb 6, 2007).

The city was accepted into the DCA Better Hometown program in 2000. A few months later the UGA charrette for Suwanee took place; the project focused on improving the city’s historic downtown as well as the recommendation of the development of a New Town Center. The mixed-use Town Center was recommended as a focal point for the community’s new growth. Mixed residential and commercial uses in a compact urban form would place less of a burden on the city’s infrastructure and create a walkable, pedestrian friendly, and more sustainable city (Suwanee Charrette Report, 2000).

The city of Suwanee implemented the charrette recommendations within a few years (Fig 5.9). In order to move from concept to implementation, additional studies and design work were needed (D. Brinson, personal communication, February 6, 2007). A total of six firms, specializing in planning, market analysis, architecture, and engineering, studied, designed and redesigned Suwanee’s New Town Center following the UGA design charrette. These studies validated the city’s interest in the New Town Center concept by demonstrating that the local economy could support it. Studies also determined that the New Town Center could be very
popular and valuable because of the scarcity of comparable options in the area. Construction of the New Town Center began in 2003. As of February, 2007, the first of several construction phases had been completed, and all available residential and commercial space was fully occupied (D. Brinson, personal communication, February 6, 2007).

Figure 5.2 Suwanee New Town Center. View of mixed use residential and commercial buildings from across New Town Center Park.

Figure 5.3 New neighborhood adjoining the mixed use area of Suwanee New Town Center.
Population and Demographics

The average Suwanee resident earns a comfortable income compared to their counterparts throughout the state and country (United States Census, 2000). Suwanee is considered a good starter community for young homebuyers (Kanell, 2005). The city has 9 elementary schools, 2 middle schools and 3 high schools. A total of 25% of the population is 15 years old or younger, and nearly 60% of the population is within the workforce age of 25-65 years (United States Census, 2000).

Suwanee compared to Georgia State Averages:

- Median household income above state average.
- Unemployed percentage significantly below state average.
- Black race population percentage below state average.
- Hispanic race population percentage significantly below state average.
- Renting percentage below state average.
- Percentage of population with a bachelor's degree or higher above state average.
- Population density below state average for cities.
- Gwinnett County is ranked 4th in the state for its carbon monoxide emissions ("City Data, Suwanee Georgia," 2007).
Table 5.1 Suwanee, Georgia at a glance (U.S. Census, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Suwanee</th>
<th>State of Georgia</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$84,000 / yr</td>
<td>$42,000 / yr</td>
<td>$41,000 / yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Travel Time to Work</td>
<td>31 minutes</td>
<td>28 minutes</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Residents with Bachelors Degrees</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation

After experiencing a more than two-fold population increase, with predictions that population would more than double again by 2020, the city of Suwanee acted decisively. Several influential factors contributed to Suwanee’s successful implementation of the New Town Center Project. Chief among these was the strong leadership the community has had, both from the mayor and the city council for over 10 years (D. Brinson, personal communication, February 6, 2007).

Suwanee Planning Director Marty Allen, noted that the leadership in place when the key decisions were being made regarding the New Town Center, from 1999 – 2002, was very young and inexperienced in politics (M. Allen, personal communication, February 6, 2007). Looking
back at the time period when Suwanee’s local government approved the Town Center concept, Allen attributes a large portion of the support for the project to the local leadership’s inexperience and the council’s lack of fear regarding controversial decision-making (M. Allen, personal communication, February 6, 2007). “They didn’t know to be scared of repercussions, and they were bold,” said Allen. “The Mayor and council made courageous decisions, which turned out to be the right ones, and the city has benefited from of it” (M. Allen, personal communication, February 6, 2007).

The city proposed a 17.7 million dollar tax referendum for open space and parkland acquisition, which was voter approved in 2001, and resulted in a 140% tax increase for the community (“Open Spaces,” 2005). A voter approved tax increase of this magnitude represented an impressive amount of faith in local government on the part of Suwanee residents (“Open Spaces,” 2005). Denise Brinson noted that resident trust in the city has been built over time as the city has maintained a reputation of fiscal responsibility and follow-through on promises (D. Brinson, personal communication, February 6, 2007).

“Gwinnett County is not a place that tends to vote for higher taxes and government intervention,” said Suwanee City Manager Hardin Watkins. “We have progressive-thinking citizens, though, and they understood that sometimes you have to buy the land in order to preserve it” (Grillo, 2003). Another decision which was key in the implementation of Suwanee’s New Town Center was the city’s establishment of an Urban Redevelopment Agency (URA). Under Georgia law O.C.G.A. 36-61, cities and counties have the authority to establish urban redevelopment agencies to undertake redevelopment projects. After creating a URA and adopting the Urban Collage Inc. designed plan for the Suwanee New Town Center, the land was declared as blighted as defined

A partial list of benefits for local government which employ the Georgia Urban Redevelopment Act (O.C.G.A. 36-61) follows:

- Gives cites the ability to buy, sell, and assemble property for redevelopment purposes.
- Expands public financing options available to local governments (revenue bonds, fees, and taxes).
- Promotes public-private partnerships by permitting long term intergovernmental contracts.
- Allows cities to develop enforceable master plans because URAs give municipalities the ability to waive local development regulations, allowing for otherwise illegal features such as cottage development, narrow streets, and mother-in-law suites.
- Provides flexibility; sale of property under the act need not be to the highest bidder. Competitive Requests for Proposals (RFPs) may be solicited and evaluated; bidder’s qualification and the desirability of their concept plans may be considered.
- Conditions related to the Urban Redevelopment Plans must be attached to deeds and will continue to apply to the land regardless of future ownership (“Introduction to the Georgia Urban Redevelopment Act,” 2005).

The redevelopment entity may issue tax-exempt bonds to be repaid with profits from the urban redevelopment project. Bonds may be secured by mortgages on property within the redevelopment district (“Introduction to the Georgia Urban Redevelopment Act,” 2005).
In 2002, at the same time that the city of Suwanee purchased the land which would later become Suwanee New Town Center, the city purchased several other parcels of land for parks and recreation. Using a combination of funds from the URA and Gwinnett County Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST), the city has become one of the most recreation oriented cities in the county. Parks and recreation also include the Suwanee Creek Greenway and Park, which is an 82-acre, minimally disturbed passive recreation space. The New Town Center Park was built prior to construction of the residential and retail space. The 10-acre, urban style park quickly became a source of pride for the community. Numerous concerts and public events have been held in the park since 2003.

Figure 5.4 Site plan for Suwanee Town Center Park. Design by Jon Benson and Associates.
After the New Town Center park opened in December 2003, Suwanee sold the parcels surrounding the park to developers who were willing to build the planned mixed-use neighborhood and commercial area. One of the benefits of the URA was that it allowed the city to put restrictive covenants on the property, requiring new owners to follow the design plans of the New Town Center master plan.
Figure 5.7 Suwanee New Town Center and adjoining neighborhood.
Each of the four parcels, illustrated in blue, purple, orange and yellow below, have been purchased, resulting in sufficient funds for the city of Suwanee to pay off the urban redevelopment loans eight years early. The red portion of the plan in Figure 5.8 has been retained as the location for the new City Hall scheduled to open in early 2009.

Figure 5.8  Phased development plan for Suwanee New Town Center. Each colored section surrounding the Suwanee Town Center Park has been purchased for development. Construction in the blue, purple, gray, and green areas has been completed.
Figure 5.9 City of Suwanee Timeline. This timeline illustrates the progression of events and additional studies conducted between the UGA charrette and the construction of the Suwanee New Town Center.
CHAPTER 6
CASE STUDY: TOCCOA, GEORGIA

In the 1960s and 1970s many mid-sized cities in the United States created pedestrian malls in their downtowns (Steinhauer, 1996). Pedestrian malls were seen as a way for downtown districts to compete with the covered, climate controlled environments provided by self-contained shopping malls. Downtown retailers wanted to save their businesses, and cities wanted to defend their tax base, so pedestrian malls were an appealing option, and an easy initiative for which to gather public support (Steinhauer, 1996).

At the peak of their popularity there were 200 pedestrian malls in the United States (Dirk, 1996). Most pedestrian malls enjoyed only brief popularity. Yet there are several notable successes, such as the Pearl District in Boulder, Colorado, Lincoln Road in Miami Beach, Florida, and State Street in Madison, Wisconsin. After the initial novelty, shoppers in most cities returned to the convenience of self contained shopping malls, abandoning downtown. By 1997, all but 30 of the original pedestrian malls had been removed, and their streets were reopened to automotive traffic (Shaffer, 2006). In most cases, this was in response to general neglect, declining sales, vandalism, and crime (Steinhauer, 1996; Dirk, 1996).

Toccoa, Georgia has a population 9,323, and in 1971 created a pedestrian mall by closing three city blocks of downtown Doyle Street to automotive traffic (Grillo, 2001). In addition to closing the street, the city erected a series of concrete canopies covering the sidewalks, and shading shoppers from the elements.
Like many cities of its size, businesses in downtown Toccoa have struggled over the last several decades. Strip shopping centers with new buildings and broader inventories opened on the edge of town, and it became increasingly difficult for downtown businesses to compete. The pedestrian mall resulted in a temporary increase in visitors, but downtown business sales continued to lag; they could not compete directly with the shopping centers.

By the time Toccoa was accepted into the Georgia DCA Main Street program in 1991, downtown businesses were at a low point, reported Connie Tabor, Director of Economic Development for downtown Toccoa (C. Tabor, personal communication March 6, 2007). Belk, the primary anchor store in the downtown closed its doors in 1991, along with a local candy store and a Cato clothing store. The city invested in the beautification of the downtown throughout the 1990s, trying to work with the existing street configuration, but downtown continued to struggle (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007).
The city of Toccoa requested that UGA conduct a design charrette for the reopening of downtown to automotive traffic in March of 2005. By 2005, there was general agreement that the street should be reopened to automotive traffic, however a few business owners resisted, citing potential property damage that might result from canopy removal, business interruption, and additional expenses (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007).

Population and Demographics

Toccoa compared to Georgia state average:

- Median household income below state average.
- Median house value below state average.
- Hispanic race population percentage significantly below state average.
- Median age above state average.
- Foreign-born population percentage significantly below state average.
- Percentage of population with a bachelor's degree or higher below state average.
- Population density below state average for cities. ("City Data, Toccoa Georgia," 2007).

On average, residents of Toccoa make less money annually than their counterparts throughout the state (U.S. Census, 2000). Employment is largely concentrated in the manufacturing and service industries. A table of businesses with more than 100 employees is listed below.
Table 6.1  Major employers in Toccoa/Stephens County, Georgia
("Georgia Department of Labor, Georgia Labor Market Information," 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephens County Hospital</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens County School System</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart Supercenter</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruitt Corporation</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Pump</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milliken</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITR</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Register</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Aeroequipment</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habersham Plantation</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Woodmark</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Toccoa, Georgia at a glance (U.S. Census, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Toccoa</th>
<th>State of Georgia</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>25,345 / yr</td>
<td>$42,000 / yr</td>
<td>$41,000 / yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>51 %</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Travel Time to Work</td>
<td>16 minutes</td>
<td>28 minutes</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Residents with Bachelors Degrees</td>
<td>16 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.2 Historic photograph of Doyle Street in downtown Toccoa, Georgia before pedestrian mall. Date unknown.

Figure 6.3 Historic photograph of downtown Toccoa, Georgia at night before the pedestrian mall. Date unknown.
Figure 6.4  Doyle Street in downtown Toccoa, Georgia, 2005. The street is closed to automobile traffic and covered with concrete canopied walkways. Many storefronts are empty; a waterless fountain is shown in the foreground.

Figure 6.5  Canopies covering the sidewalks on Doyle St. in downtown Toccoa, 2005.
Implementation

Toccoa has demonstrated the power of perseverance perhaps more than any other Main Street City in the state. The city’s largest hurdle hampering reopening of Doyle Street has been the lack of funding (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007). Tabor attributes at least part of the time delay to a handful of business owners and local decision makers who were not in favor of the canopy removal. She credits the UGA charrette in 2005 with swaying the opinion of the remaining reluctant business owners (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007).

After the UGA charrette for Toccoa in 2005, the team’s final presentation was broadcast on public access television in Toccoa/Stephens County for several months. “We used the charrette drawings as the kick off for the whole process,” Tabor said, “it was a great marketing and education tool” (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007). Tabor said that the public broadcast of the charrette presentation allowed many people who had not participated to familiarize themselves with the issues. “People watched the presentation on T.V., and we included drawings from the charrette in every grant application we submitted. It was a huge selling tool. The process helped build [additional] support for the canopy removal,” (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007). Tabor sent copies of the charrette renderings to all of the property owners in and adjoining the pedestrian mall. Property owners were asked to vote on parking and street configuration options. “Without the renderings, I don’t know how we would have done it,” Tabor said. “The renderings along with the historic photographs used in the charrette presentation, really helped people visualize what the downtown used to look like and what it could look like again. It brought back a lot of nostalgia and memories” (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007).
Figure 6.6  Option A: Parallel parking with two-way traffic garnered the most support.

Figure 6.7  Option B: Traffic divided by tree-lined median. Property owners voted against this option citing access and space concerns.
After years of small changes in the downtown – a few new businesses opening, a few others moving or going out of business – the city began to gain significant financial support for the canopy removal project. In 2005, the city hired a grant writer who submitted an application to the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) for the amount of $200,000. “We knew we wouldn’t be able to get all of the money we needed from one source, so we had to try and piece different sources of funding together,” said Tabor. The ARC has a reputation as a risk taker, and a group which likes to provide seed money to encourage other funders to follow suit (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 7, 2007). The city’s application to the ARC was met with a $300,000 award for their $200,000 request. Next, the Georgia Department of Community Affairs granted the city $500,000, followed by $399,000 from the One Georgia Authority, $75,000 from a United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Business Enterprise Grant and $100,000 in local funds.
Figure 6.9  Toccoa celebrated the demolition of the concrete canopies with the Toccoa Rocks Street Festival, February 13, 2007.

Figure 6.10  Mayor David Austin takes a symbolic swing at the concrete canopy which covered downtown Toccoa for 36 years.
Figure 6.11  Canopies removed from Doyle Street in downtown Toccoa, February 13, 2007.

Figure 6.12  Residents celebrating the canopy removal sit underneath the only remaining cross-street canopy structure during Toccoa Rocks Street Festival, February 13, 2007.
Figure 6.13  Local contractors remove concrete canopy in downtown Toccoa, Georgia. The crew worked from 6 pm to 6 am to prevent disturbances during business hours.

Figure 6.14  The canopy removal process was less time consuming than expected; the crew finished several weeks ahead of schedule.
**City of Toccoa, Georgia**

**Timeline Since 1971**

- **1971** - Canopy and Pedestrian Mall Completed in Toccoa, Georgia; US news and world report praise the project, calling Toccoa an “All American City.”
- **1991** - Major retailers continue to move out of downtown area; Belk, Cato and local candy store, all close.
- **1999** - City purchases former Belk building, converting it into Cornerstone Antique Market with multiple vendors.
- **Sept. 2005** - City of Toccoa applies for $200,000 in funds from Appalachian Regional Commission for Canopy Removal, City is awarded $300,000.
- **2006** - One Georgia Authority awards Toccoa $339,000 for downtown improvements.
- **2006** - $100,000 in Local Funds appropriated for Canopy Removal and Street Reconstruction.
- **2006** - USDA Rural Business Enterprise Grant for Canopy Removal and Street Reconstruction $75,000.
- **March 2005** - Downtown Charrette, conducted by University of Georgia
- **February 2006** - DCA Redevelopment Fund awarded for Canopy Removal $500,000.

Figure 6.15 City of Toccoa Timeline Since 1971. The timeline illustrates a selection of significant events in the history of Downtown Toccoa Georgia since the Pedestrian Mall was completed in 1971.
Next steps for the City of Toccoa include submitting applications for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. While the canopies were in place, the city had not been eligible for National Register listing. The City is utilizing staff from the Georgia Mountain Regional Development Center (GMRDC) to assist property owners with rehabilitation of their building facades. The GMRDC is using work completed by the UGA charrette team and DCA resource teams as a guide (C. Tabor, personal communication, March 6, 2007).
CHAPTER 7

CASE STUDY: HAWKINSVILLE, GEORGIA

The City of Hawkinsville, Georgia, population 3,280, is similar in many ways to other towns in south Georgia. The city is slowly growing; between 2000 and 2003, the population increased only 1.4% (City Data, Hawkinsville Georgia 2007). In the preceding decade, from 1990 to 2000, the city experienced a population decrease of 10.7% (U.S. Census, 2000). Compared to the state growth rate of 26.4% during this period, Hawkinsville is a city with a recent history of significant population retention challenges. Hawkinsville is the Pulaski County seat and the county ranks 101st out of 159 Georgia counties for rate of population growth.

Figure 7.1 Hawkinsville is located in Pulaski County, Georgia. While ten highways intersect in Hawkinsville, the city is 18 miles from the nearest interstate, I-75.

In 2000, the median house value was in Hawkinsville was $67,500, which is significantly less than the $100,600 median house value for the state of Georgia (U.S. Census, 2000). Housing in the city is approximately 63% owner occupied, indicating a relatively stable population. Today,
one of the small city’s biggest assets is its equestrian training facility. The Lawrence L. Bennett harness horse training facility is one of the largest in the southeast and draws business from across the country during training season.

**Urban Design Challenge**

Hawkinsville’s slowly growing population, lack of industry, and limited employment opportunities merge to create several challenges for downtown. Downtown Hawkinsville was at its lowest point during the 1980s and 1990s prior to its acceptance into the Better Hometown program, reported Karen Bailey, Better Hometown program manager for the city of Hawkinsville (K. Bailey, personal communication, March 1, 2007). The UGA charrette for Hawkinsville took place in 1999, just a few months after the city’s acceptance into the Better Hometown program. Despite economic challenges, notable improvements in downtown Hawkinsville indicate a level of investment by the local community and a commitment to preserving and marketing the city’s history.

**Population and Demographics**

*Hawkinsville compared to Georgia state averages:*

- Median household income **below** state average.
- Median house value **below** state average.
- Black race population percentage **above** state average.
- Hispanic race population percentage **significantly below** state average.
- Foreign-born population percentage **significantly below** state average.
- Number of college students **below** state average.
• Population density **below** state average for cities. ("City Data, Hawkinsville Georgia," 2007)

There is one elementary school, one middle school and one high school serving all of Hawkinsville and Pulaski County. The schools consistently score below average or average on state assessment tests. ACT and SAT scores for Hawkinsville High School students are slightly lower than the state ("City Data, Hawkinsville Georgia," 2007).

Table 7.1 Hawkinsville, Georgia at a glance (U.S. Census, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Hawkinsville</th>
<th>State of Georgia</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$29,000/yr</td>
<td>$42,000 / yr</td>
<td>$41,000 / yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Travel Time to Work</td>
<td>17 minutes</td>
<td>28 minutes</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Residents with Bachelors Degrees</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation

The implementation of charrette recommendations in Hawkinsville has been steady and incremental. The Downtown Development Authority (DDA) and Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) boards have been revived. The DDA began issuing small façade grants on a competitive basis to assist property owners with physical improvements in 2000 (K. Bailey, personal communication, March 1, 2007).

Several architectural gems provided fundable focal points for historic preservation efforts. The city’s 1904 Opera House was recently rehabilitated to award winning standards (Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation, 2002). Restoration of the historic courthouse was also recently completed, and listing in the National Register of Historic Places has been approved for several individual properties. The city is currently pursuing National Register Listing for the entire downtown.

Hawkinsville was awarded Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds from the Georgia Department of Transportation (DOT) in 2002 and the first phase of streetscape improvements has been completed.

Karen Bailey, Better Hometown program manager for the City of Hawkinsville credits the enduring support of the local government with the city’s success. The city has maintained a sustained commitment to the Better Hometown program. There is also a significant network of local organizations working toward the goals of improving downtown. The city has been able to set goals and achieve these goals. This record of goal accomplishment has enhanced their fundability.
The UGA charrette in Hawkinsville focused heavily on the rehabilitation of the Opera House and historic building facades in the downtown. Many buildings have significantly improved since 1999.

Figure 7.2 Downtown Hawkinsville streetscape improvements were funded by DOT Transportation Enhancement funds.

Figure 7.3 Rehabilitated Hawkinsville Opera House, 2007.

Figure 7.4 Auditorium of rehabilitated Hawkinsville Opera House, 2007.
Figure 7.5 Photograph of the Hawkinsville Hotel building with only one operating business, 1999.

Figure 7.6 Charrette rendering of Hawkinsville Hotel building, illustrating repaired windows and occupied storefronts, 1999.
Figure 7.7 Photograph of the rehabilitated Hawkinsville Hotel building, 2007. Building is fully occupied with four retail tenants.

Figure 7.8 H&R Block, retail tenant in historic Hawkinsville Hotel building, 2007. Rehabilitated Courthouse building pictured in background.
Figure 7.9  Image of downtown building 1999.

Figure 7.10 Charrette rendering illustrating repaired windows and entryways, 1999.

Figure 7.11  Photograph of rehabilitated downtown building, 2007
Figure 7.12 Photograph of downtown Hawkinsville building facades, 1999.

Figure 7.13 Charrette rendering of buildings illustrating façade recommendations, 1999.

Figure 7.14 Photograph of building façade, illustrating the impact made by small improvements, 2007.
Figure 7.15 Photograph of Brown’s Bargain Store with non-functioning second floor, 1999.

Figure 7.16 Photograph of building with new (although not historically accurate) windows and entrance, 2007. Both floors are occupied with a new business, Iron Rose Café.
Figure 7.17 Photograph of downtown building façade, 1999.

Figure 7.18 Rehabilitated façade, 2007. A office supply store and the Hawkinsville Dispatch & News currently occupy the building.
City of Hawkinsville, Georgia

Timeline Since 1999

1999-Hawkinsville Charrette conducted by UGA

2000-DDA/501c3 funded 12 facade grants for downtown building improvements

2002-Hawkinsville awarded $600,000 in D.O.T. Transportation Enhancement funds for downtown streetscape improvements

2005-Liquor by the Drink referendum approved

2006-DDA initiated a two year option on the historic cotton mill. Renovation will include apartments, retail space and venue for year-round community market

2006-New businesses: M2 and Iron Rose Cafe open; Kid Stuff moves into larger downtown location

2006-Restoration begins for Old Hawkinsville High School, SPLOST funded

2006-New businesses: M2 and Iron Rose Cafe open; Kid Stuff moves into larger downtown location

1999-Hawkinsville was accepted into the Better Hometown Program

1999-DDA & Historic Pres. Commission were revived and began to meet regularly

2000-Beginning of restoration of Historic Hawkinsville Opera House, funded by county SPLOST

2004-Downtown District listed on the National Register of Historic Places

2005-Restoration completed for Pulaski County Courthouse, funded by SPLOST

2006-DDA hosted a golf tournament to raise funds for downtown projects

2006-City awarded $3,000 in Georgia Heritage Preservation Division funds, plus local match to cover consulting services for nomination of Local Historic District

2006-Redesign of County Park began, including river walk connecting county & city recreation areas

Figure 7.19 City of Hawkinsville Georgia Timeline Since 1999. The timeline illustrates the progression of investment by the community between the UGA charrette, designation as a Better Hometown program community and the present.
CHAPTER 8

CASE STUDY: HARLEM, GEORGIA

Harlem, Georgia is located five miles south of interstate 20, and 19 miles west of Augusta, but it has a remote and insular quality, which makes it seem much more removed. This has proven to be both one of Harlem’s greatest strengths and one of its most difficult challenges.

Formerly named Sawdust, the City of Harlem began as a rail line dependent town, founded in 1870; the community has remained small with a population of just under 2,000 residents (“City Data, Harlem Georgia,” 2007). The City’s website and the Augusta Chronicle trace the origins of the city’s name to a traveler from New York who visited relatives in the area and noted that the town resembled the “elite and artistic neighborhood in New York” by the same name (Wiechman, 1996; "City of Harlem Georgia Homepage," 2007).

Figure 8.1 Harlem is located in Columbia County, Georgia.
Urban Design Challenge

Harlem’s downtown spans a single stretch of highway 221, and is only a few blocks long. The city has successfully promoted itself and based its tourism initiatives on the city’s status as the birthplace of comedian Oliver Hardy. The Laurel and Hardy Museum in Harlem is the only one of its kind, dedicated specifically to the comedic duo. While Oliver Hardy spent less than one full year of his life in Harlem, before moving to Milledgeville, Georgia, and later Hollywood, the city of Harlem was the only one to claim him as their own. This decision has resulted in a modest tourism industry for the city, drawing hundreds of visitors annually to the museum.

After several years without an organized approach to preservation in the downtown, the city’s newly elected mayor approached UGA to conduct a design charrette. Prior to 2003, the city had submitted applications for DCA’s Better Hometown program seven times and had been rejected each time.

Population and Demographics

The population of Harlem, Georgia as of the 2000 census was 1,824. Census data reveals that the city experienced a population decrease of nearly 19% between 1990 and 2000 (US Census, 2000). The city’s population loss has corrected itself and the city is growing again. Harlem’s population is predicted to continue to increase, in response to recent annexations, rezoning activity, sewage capacity expansion, and anticipated subdivision approval of at least 311 new residential dwelling units ("City of Harlem Comprehensive Plan," 2006).
Between 2005 and 2025, the city’s population is expected to more than double. Following this immediate boom, however, population growth rate is expected to slow ("City of Harlem Comprehensive Plan," 2006).

![Harlem, Georgia Population Estimates Graph](image)

Figure 8.2 Harlem, Georgia Population Estimates 2010 – 2025 ("City of Harlem Comprehensive Plan," 2006).

Harlem compared to Georgia state averages:

- Median household income **below** state average.
- Median house value **below** state average.
- Hispanic race population percentage **significantly below** state average.
- Foreign-born population percentage **significantly below** state average.
- Number of college students **below** state average.
- Percentage of population with a bachelor's degree or higher **below** state average.
- Population density **below** state average for cities (“City Data, Harlem Georgia,” 2007).
Table 8.1 Harlem, Georgia at a glance (US Census, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City of Harlem</th>
<th>State of Georgia</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>30,500 / yr</td>
<td>$42,000 / yr</td>
<td>$41,000 / yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Owner Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>58 %</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Travel Time to Work</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
<td>28 minutes</td>
<td>26 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Residents with Bachelors Degrees</td>
<td>13 %</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation

Historic Preservation Commission Chairperson, Ann Blaylock credits the charrette with “giving the city its roadmap” (A. Blaylock, personal communication, March 2, 2007). Before the charrette, the Historic Preservation Commission and the city were uncertain which buildings could be successfully rehabilitated, and which period of time should be interpreted. “The charrette provided city with technical advise on the downtown buildings and created excitement for what was possible,” said Blaylock.

Harlem has successfully implemented several of the charrette recommendations. The visual improvement in the downtown is significant only four years following the completion of the
charrette. Façade improvements to the Laurel and Hardy Museum were the first recommendations to be implemented. While the improvement in the building is significant, the changes mostly involved paint (Figures 8.2-8.4). A young, local artist inexpensively completed the exterior painting of the building façade (A. Blaylock, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

Harlem Economic Development and Industry Foundation Inc., founded in 2002, has been a significant positive influence for downtown Harlem. Several private donors founded the organization, and the foundation is still pursuing a primary benefactor to fully sustain the organization. Currently, volunteers from the foundation are applying for grants while administering the Harlem façade grant program (A. Blaylock, personal communication, March 2, 2007).

The city began a façade program shortly after the charrette. The impetus of the program was to encourage Dr. Owens, the owner of five storefronts in downtown, to restore the buildings in a historically sensitive way. The owner’s initial plans were to modernize the facade with arches and reflective glass. The Harlem Foundation awarded Dr. Owens funding to make the historically appropriate improvements illustrated in Figure 8.9 and 8.11. Choosing the historically sensitive approach resulted in a savings of almost $70,000. (A. Blaylock, personal communication, March 2, 2007). To assist the foundation in the administration of the façade grant program, the city of Harlem donated $25,000. An additional $40,000 was provided from the state budget for restoration of the theater. The HPC estimates that the total cost for rehabilitation of the theater will be approximately $750,000. The city plans to use the theater as a community center and event venue.
Since the charrette, a historic building survey has been completed and the historic district boundaries have been identified. This information will be used to apply for creation of a National Register Historic District (NRHD). Blaylock credits the city’s progress to “good government” which is supportive of historic preservation initiatives (A. Blaylock, personal communication, March 2, 2007). “The key,” Blaylock says, “is getting city council to agree to it [preservation mission, downtown revitalization], or just to not get in the way and let it happen. You have to have the local government bought into it.” Blaylock noted that many long time residents say Harlem looks better than it has in 30 years.

The Harlem city council is very proactive in pursuing partnerships with other organizations which help the city on a wide variety of issues ranging from improvements in the downtown to Americorps volunteers in the schools and affordable housing initiatives. Blaylock also noted that in many cases, the building preservation approach proved to be more affordable than alternatives. Getting local crafts people involved has been a key part of the city’s success strategy. In addition to the painting of the museum mural, a local craftsperson constructed the windows for the restoration of the Masonic lodge, and another craftsperson is designing the street signs for the city’s new streetscape project. The Harlem HPC works in concert with the building owners throughout the process. Blaylock indicated that when owners have difficulty finding a cost effective way to replace the windows or doors, the group has been effective at finding local craftspeople who could do the job affordably (A. Blaylock, personal communication, March 2, 2007).
Figure 8.3  Photograph, existing conditions of Harlem’s Laurel & Hardy Museum, 2003.

Figure 8.4  Photoshop rendered illustration of recommended museum improvements (Eleonora Machado).

Figure 8.5  Photograph of Laurel & Hardy Museum demonstrating implementation of façade recommendations, 2007.
Figure 8.6 Photograph of Harlem’s Masonic Lodge, 2003.

Figure 8.7 Charrette rendering of Masonic Lodge building, 2003 (Jennifer Lewis).

Figure 8.8 Photograph demonstrating implementation of recommendations, 2007.
Figure 8.9  Photograph of existing conditions, Dr. Owens Dental Office block of five storefronts, 2003.

Figure 8.10  Photograph of restored building façades, accomplished with the assistance of the Harlem façade grant program, 2007.
Figure 8.11  Conditions of building facades, 2003.

Figure 8.12  Photograph of rehabilitated building façade, 2007.
City of Harlem, Georgia
Timeline Since 2002


2003 - Facade improvements completed for Laurel & Hardy Museum, funded by $1800 grant from the State Arts Council.

2003 - City indicates facade grant program to assist property owners with building rehabilitation.

2005 - City of Harlem purchased the historic theater building and is beginning restoration initiatives.

2006 - Survey of historic properties completed.

2007 - DOT funded streetscape enhancement project begins.

2007 - Harlem Economic Development and Industry Corporation continues to apply for grants and seek funding sources for improvements in the downtown area.

2007 - Harlem city council votes to approve historic preservation design guidelines.

Figure 8.12 The timeline illustrates a selection of significant events in the history of Downtown Harlem, Georgia since 2002.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION

Charrettes have been utilized throughout the country by local governments and private developers as a planning and design tool (Lennertz, 2003). UGA’s Charrette Connection program, which conducted forty-nine charrettes throughout the state of Georgia between 1998 and 2006 was previously unstudied and its impacts undocumented.

The charrette follow-up survey (Appendixes C & D) revealed several notable trends. Communities which have taken steps toward implementing charrette recommendations outnumber those which have not by a ratio of approximately four to one (84%). This thesis examined four successful communities in an effort to determine the factors that set them apart. The pervasive characteristic of successful communities is the presence of consistently supportive local government. In each of the four case studies, interviewees stated the importance of local governmental commitment. These communities were successful in implementing their preservation and urban design goals, in part because their local governments identified those goals as priorities, and assembled funds for implementation.

The four case studies represent different methods of success. The city of Suwanee achieved large scale planning objectives faster than the other cities. Suwanee assembled parcels and began construction only three years after the charrette solidified public support for the New Town Center concept. In contrast, the city of Toccoa pursued funds for reopening Doyle street for 14 years before construction began. Toccoa reached a tipping point in 2004 and over a two-
year period from 2004-2006, the city was awarded 1.3 million dollars for the project from five different funding sources (Gladwell, 2000). As of March 30, 2007 all of the pedestrian mall canopies have been removed and the city is moving forward with the reopening of Doyle Street. Hawkinsville’s progress has been slow and incremental. In the eight years since the charrette, at least 11 building facades have been rehabilitated through a combination of locally driven initiatives and a façade grant program (K. Bailey, personal communication, March 1, 2007). One phase of their streetscape enhancement plan has been completed and construction will begin on phase II soon.

After repeated rejection from Georgia DCA to participate in the Better Hometown program, residents of the city of Harlem began their own funding and revitalization initiative. They leveraged private funds for the rehabilitation of downtown buildings. The city of Harlem and the local HPC began work on the most feasible improvements first and have been successful in enhancing nearly half of the storefronts in the small downtown since 2003 (Ann Blaylock, personal communication, March 10, 2007).

The case studies in this thesis provide information about the steps successful communities took to implement charrette recommendations. This thesis does not focus on communities which have not made significant progress. While further research is needed to study the factors which hamper progress, the following broad conclusions may be drawn from the survey responses. Communities which have not made progress toward charrette recommendations have struggled with changes in local leadership, unsupportive local leadership, lack of funds, lack of local organization/social capacity, competing community goals and designs that were deemed too costly to implement.
Several of the completed charrette surveys mentioned the increased level of energy and enthusiasm generated by the charrette process. This enthusiasm and focused attention on specific urban design challenges provided communities with motivation and inspiration to pursue their goals. The charrette surveys revealed a broad range of methods and funding sources that were utilized to achieve community goals.

This thesis further supports the published findings that successful community improvement programs require a comprehensive approach, focusing on quality design, and capacity building (Mattessich, 1997; Propst, 1989; Rypkema, 2003). Successful communities studied in this thesis possess a self-help attitude, and active citizen boards and committees. These communities focus on incremental change, public/private partnerships, and capitalized on their existing assets. Findings from this thesis support the assertion that charrettes are an effective tool for community planning. The rate of implementation of charrette recommendations is dependent primarily on the degree to which local leadership supports community revitalization, as well as the creative packaging of funds, and the ability to build and maintain high levels of community social capacity.
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APPENDIX A

TIMELINE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS & EVENTS
Timeline of Federal Programs & Events Impacting Community Planning in the United States

1927 - Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty court decision upheld the constitutionality of single-use zoning. The ruling became the basis for all comprehensive zoning and planning in the United States. Single use zoning became the norm and mixed-use zoning became illegal in most areas.

1934 - Housing Act established the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) to improve housing conditions and standards. FHA introduced insurance for long-term mortgages, and extended repayment periods to an unprecedented 30 years. FHA insurance brokers preferred new construction to homes in existing urban areas on the basis of economic soundness. After the war, cities lost more of their upper and middle class population to the suburbs.

1937 - Federal Highway Administration was established and strengthened in 1956. Federally subsidized road building initiatives frequently dissected neighborhoods, especially those housing the poor. These deep rifts fed community tensions and dissatisfaction with lack of community involvement in the planning process.

1944 - Serviceman's Readjustment Act or GI Bill guaranteed Veterans Administration (VA) mortgages to veterans under favorable terms, which fueled urban dispersal after World War II.

1949 - National Housing Act marked the beginning of the Federal Urban Renewal Program; it mandated the elimination of “substandard housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas.”

1956 - Federal Highway Act funded the national highway system, which increased efficiency of the national economy, but also had several significant negative effects, including several notable example of bisecting neighborhoods populated by the poor.

1964 - Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) is passed, creating the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), which created the Community Action Program (CAP) calling for “maximum feasible participation” of the poor in community planning efforts.

1965 - Los Angeles, California riots result in thirty-four dead and over $200 million in property damage.

1965 - Department of Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 created HUD as cabinet-level agency from the Housing and Home Finance Agency.


1967 - Riots in Newark, NJ and Detroit, MI resulted in sixty-six dead and 3,500 injured.


1974 - Housing and Community Development Act consolidated several programs into Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Gerald R. Ford becomes president following Nixon's resignation.
1977 - The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) is a federal law requiring banks to use affirmative action in lending to "help meet the credit needs of their entire community, including low-and moderate-income neighborhoods."
APPENDIX B

CHARRETTE INVENTORY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Charrette Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>Downtown alleys and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Conasauga Watershed</td>
<td>Watershed conservation/landuse planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Transect zoning, infill and downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Forsyth</td>
<td>Gateways, accommodating big box development while maintaining community character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Walnut Grove</td>
<td>Masterplanning for new downtown area for a town without a center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hapeville</td>
<td>Accommodating rapid growth, industry-town relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Toccoa</td>
<td>Streetscape, reopening downtown to automotive traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tybee Island</td>
<td>Water resource planning, parking, sustainable development principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Western Newton County</td>
<td>Mixed use neighborhood planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Jonesboro</td>
<td>Heritage tourism, site planning for commercial/residential area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Tifton</td>
<td>Brownfield redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>Reuse plan for Old Monticello High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>Brownfield redevelopment, heritage tourism, transportation planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Locust Grove</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment, building facades, infill, municipal campus planning, parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Warner Robins</td>
<td>Corridor planning, military &amp; agricultural tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Historic preservation, downtown development, recreation, municipal planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Eastwyck Community, Atlanta</td>
<td>Developing community identity, signage, planting design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Riverwood Community, Atlanta</td>
<td>Recreation planning, developing neighborhood identity, erosion control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Sandersville</td>
<td>Rear entrances to downtown buildings, streetscape design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>McRae-Helena</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment, building facades, heritage tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Prince Avenue, Athens</td>
<td>Corridor planning, infill, parking, multimodal transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment, building facades, transportation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Riverbank stabilization, connecting downtown to new conference center, building infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
<td>Adaptive reuse, historic preservation, pedestrian access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Harlem</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment, building facades, heritage tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Varnell</td>
<td>Conservation of historic school site, recreation planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Carrolton</td>
<td>Greenway planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Unadilla</td>
<td>Downtown historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Sapelo Island</td>
<td>Conservation planning, preservation of community character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>West Point</td>
<td>Downtown development, heritage tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Millen</td>
<td>Historic preservation, adaptive reuse, environmental graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment, historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ty Ty</td>
<td>Park and memorial design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Richmond Hill</td>
<td>Corridor planning, residential infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>Streetscape, ecotourism, design guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Woodbine</td>
<td>Urban infill, recreation planning, ecotourism, housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>New neighborhood planning, greenway and streetscape design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Royston</td>
<td>Downtown development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Oglethorpe</td>
<td>Streetscape design, urban infill, maintaining community character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Flowery Branch</td>
<td>Context sensitive highway design, downtown development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Suwanee</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment, historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>Historic preservation, adaptive reuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Guyton</td>
<td>Corridor and recreation planning, historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Darien</td>
<td>Environmental conservation, economic development, heritage tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Metter</td>
<td>Recreation planning, entryways, historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hawkinsville</td>
<td>Downtown redevelopment, historic preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Plains</td>
<td>Preservation of community character, heritage tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Dawson</td>
<td>Downtown and industrial character, corridor planning, tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

CHARRETTE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
Charrette Follow-up Survey

Thank you for participating in the Charrette Follow-up Survey. Your input is valuable for program evaluation and improvement.

City/Town for which the charrette was conducted:

Last Name:
First Name:
Email:

Did you participate in the UGA Design Charrette?
(i.e. attend at least one of the following: community kick-off meeting, final presentation, team working time in studio)
Yes ☐ No ☐

Please think back to the time of the charrette and answer the following questions regarding your community’s characteristics and satisfaction with the charrette process.

Level of local officials knowledge of the issues leading to the charrette
Low. . . . . . . High
1 2 3 4 5

Level of community motivation
Low. . . . . . High
1 2 3 4 5

Level of community participation in the charrette
Low. . . . . . High
1 2 3 4 5

Community level of flexibility and adaptability
Low. . . . . . High
1 2 3 4 5

Level of general strength of relationships among community members involved in the process
Low. . . . . . High
1 2 3 4 5

Ability of community members to discuss, reach consensus, and cooperate
Low. . . . . . High
1 2 3 4 5

Strength of community communication system
Low. . . . . . High
1 2 3 4 5
Existence of identifiable leadership within the community
Low. .......... High
1 2 3 4 5

Level of community preparedness
Low. .......... High
1 2 3 4 5

Competition between community initiatives (i.e. charrette recommendations vs. other community projects).
Low. .......... High
1 2 3 4 5

Community control over decision making process
Low. .......... High
1 2 3 4 5

Level of success of the charrette
Low. .......... High
1 2 3 4 5

Your community’s charrette report included recommendations. Have these recommendations been implemented or moved toward implementation? Which ones? If not, why?

Did your community apply for funds to implement charrette recommendations? If so, what types of programs?

- Federal
- State
- Local
- Nonprofit
- Private
- Other. Please Explain:

Was your community granted funding? If so, from where? What was the approximate amount?
Would you recommend the UGA Center for Community Design & Preservation to other communities?

☐ Yes
☐ No

We are interested in using community comments and testimonials in future marketing efforts. Would you be willing to provide comments for our use?

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

Click here to SEND your form
Click here to RESET the form and start over
APPENDIX D

COMMUNITY COMMENTS FROM CHARRETTE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY
City of Athens, Prince Avenue  
Charrette Conducted in 2004

“We’re working on several of the long-term goals identified; in the short term, the process itself has been extremely beneficial in defining a vocabulary for discussing design and development within the community.

Pratt Cassity and the students and staff from the UGA Center for Community Design and Preservation were professional, engaging and extremely talented. Our community will benefit for years from one project. We have specific goals to work towards for the Prince Avenue corridor and more importantly we have seen how community design projects can be done effectively. They set a high standard and exceeded it.”

City of Carrollton  
Charrette Conducted in 2003

“Some of the items are being implemented. The county has acquired a land and water grant and they are working on implementing some of the trails on the plan.

The county received a $100,000 Land and Water Grant.

The team that worked with us was very professional and extremely energetic! They brought fresh ideas to the table, but, more importantly, they listened to the community.”

City of Dawson  
Charrette Conducted in 1998

“Beautification along Hwy 520, new sidewalks downtown, courthouse renovation has begun, and several buildings in the downtown have been rehabbed.

We received ISTEA grant for hwy beautification and some grant funds were used for new sidewalks. Can’t remember exact amounts.

The team that visited Dawson, was a fun energetic group who listened to our ideas and suggestions. They used our ideas and incorporated their knowledge and experience and came up with some beautiful drawings. Although, many of the buildings owned by individuals, still have not been rehabbed, quite a bit of work has taken place in our downtown.”
City of Forsyth  
Charrette Conducted in 2006

“We have chosen to hold back the report until 2007; it will be presented and used with the DDA’s "Johnston Street Block" project. The goal of this project is to address the needs of the entire block --- front and rear entrances, bldg repairs, parking, and landscaping needs will be addressed. The charrette will be one of the tools we use to show the building/property owners what can be done (in some cases minimal work) to improve their properties. We're looking at funding opportunities that team city/public partnerships to make this project economically feasible.

If you consider yourself a community that "thinks outside the box" and has a progressive plan of action, then you are describing the UGA Center for Community Design & Preservation. They see, feel, and interpret conditions in your community that you may never see or think of.”

City of Greensboro  
Charrette Conducted in 2005

“The designs are still on the walls at the BHTP office and are being used as "food for thought" to any willing or unwilling prospect. The new BHTP manager is using them now and is proceeding with some of the ideas but I am not privy to them except from a business owner side! Contact her too: Cail Hammonds at Greensboro Better Hometown. She was very excited about the charrette. The cultural center is moving forward but the drawings for it have not been finalized and the city is working with the mill project to do the enhancements from the city’s side. So, great job folks!

The design charrette was one of the best projects the Greensboro BHTP has ever done because it gave tools to move forward to all the citizens from "professionals". They loved the interaction with the students and Pratt - it still has them talking about what needs to be done. It also pulled the town together toward common goals like no other project! They are superb - the job was professional, motivational, thought provoking and FUN!!!!!! They are the BEST!”

City of Harlem  
Charrette Conducted in 2003

“Since the Charrette, the following has occurred to the building on the Mainstreet:

1) The City had the Laurel & Hardy Museum painted as recommended and shown in the drawings.
2) The Old Masonic Building has repaired and rebuilt the windows in upstairs section. The three store fronts have been painted and will have new awnings installed.
3) The City purchased the old Theatre Building and now seeking funding to restore the building.
4) Dr. Ron Owens owns a building with five store fronts. He recently renovated the facade according to Historic Guidelines.
5) Another property owner completely remodeled two storefronts that were in dilapidated state. Renovations were done in keeping with historic guidelines.
6) Many mainstreet businesses updated their signage in accordance with the Historic Guidelines.
7) A survey has been made of historic properties. Harlem has over 228 properties that are pretty much in tact.
8) The Historic Preservation has identified the Historic Districts.
9) The Harlem Foundation issued facade grants to assist with the facade renovations done in the downtown.

The Charrette drawings have been a very useful tool in assisting downtown property owners and what Harlem was trying to achieve in preserving the downtown buildings.

State Funding for Arts Council - $1800 was used towards implementing the recommendation for the Museum as well as Grassroots Arts Grant funding.”

City of Hawkinsville
Charrette Conducted in 1999

“Some of the charrette recommendations have been completed - others we are still working towards. others are not feasible due to the ownership of some of the buildings- the problem is with the owners, not the desires of the community to pursue the project. other constraints are financially imposing due to city, BHT or county budget constraints. Below are some of the accomplishments of the Hawkinsville BHT since our Charette was done in 1999.

We have revived our DDA - this board also serves as our Economic Restructuring Committee for our BHT. We have revived our Historic Preservation Commission - this board also serves as our Design Committee for our BHT.

We have completed restoration of our 1907 Opera House. *funded by a local SPLOST. ** listed on the National Register & a Georgia Trust award recipient.

We have 2 representatives to represent Hawkinsville/Pulaski Co. and to serve on the Middle Georgia Historic Preservation Advisory Committee formed by the Middle Ga. RDC in Macon. We attend meetings & educational trainings. ** from this a website has been created that features prominent historic sites in each county that is served by the Middle Ga. RDC.

The local VFW got the City’s permission to build a veterans memorial, along with flags and engraved brick walkways to the downtown park on the riverbank. The street was also renamed by the city as - Veteran’s Parkway.
We have completed restoration & renovation of our court house - *funded by SPLOST - also listed on the National Register. We have another addition to our NR listings - St. Thomas AME Church - and this was also a Georgia Heritage award recipient for funding to do much needed work on the roof & brick stabilization for this church.

Our DDA/501c3 has funded 12 facade grants for downtown building improvements. ( * $500.00 ea. for the facade grants - total of $6,000.00 given by local business & individuals for this purpose)

DDA hosted a golf tournament to raise funding for downtown projects.

We received a $3,000 HPD grant for funding consulting work contributing to our National Register Downtown Historic District. this was accompanied with a local match for the grant. We have been successful with getting a National Register Downtown Historic District nomination in 2004

We have received $3,000 ( 2006) in state HPD funding to hire a consultant to assist our HPC with creating & nominating a Local Historic District. this was accompanied by a local match for the grant.

We were successful in getting $600,000 in T. E. funding for streetscape improvements. We have completed one round of streetscape improvements through DOT - T. E. funding & a local match.

We are into a project currently trying to address a - behind the stores parking lot.... with new rear facades & improved parking area.

Our DDA has a 2 year option on the old cotton mill downtown - (it is privately owned) to get a renovation project off the ground. We are currently into our 2nd year of working with a developer - The Landmark Group - Mr. Dewayne Anderson of Winston-Salem, NC - to renovate & restore our old cotton mill located on the Ocmulgee river bank at the edge of our downtown. This project will feature apartments, retail space, a year round community market space & river walk. We are currently in our 2nd year of a project involving renovation of our old county park. We are working to establish & build a river walk also that will connect the "county" park & boat ramp to the "city" boat ramp and Veterans Park. We are also working on a Nature Walk currently. The National Park Service's Rivers, Trails & Conservation program is providing us with technical assistance along with the Ga. DNR & the Middle Georgia RDC partnering with our local River Park Advisory Committee for this project.

We are in our 2nd year of a project aimed at renovating & restoring our historic old high school.

We were successful in getting the old high school on the "2006 Georgia Places in Peril" list. We have applied to get it listed on the National Register. We were successful in 2006 to pass a local school SPLOST to fund the restoration.
Along with the old high school project is a secondary project of having a museum in one of the old high school's separate buildings. The Pulaski Co. BOE is working with our HPC & BHT to achieve this.

We have hosted a successful Georgia Trust Ramble- fall 2005.

We are currently engaged in re-vamping our downtown "walking-driving tour" of historic homes & buildings. Our BHT was selected as a Georgia Main Street Program in 2005.

We have created a successful, although small - downtown community market that meets every Saturday in our downtown. The market features home grown, & home made items as well as some flea market items. we are currently involved in a project to have a year-round covered space for a more improved market area in the old cotton mill.

We have lost a couple of downtown businesses; but have 3 very successful downtown businesses including one new restaurant in a downtown building (in 2006) that is open for lunch & dinner - Kid Stuff; M squared ; and the Iron Rose Cafe.

Hawkinsville was successful in 2005 with voting in a "liquor by the drink" referendum in order to help sustain our restaurants who choose to serve. The new restaurant downtown - the Iron Rose Cafe' - has taken advantage of this and hosts a full service bar as well.

Our HPC has hosted our 2nd annual downtown tour of historic buildings and surrounds historic homes (Jan 2007) for our middle school's Georgia History students. They write essays from this tour about a particular home or building of their choice. Some are entered into the Georgia Voyager's (educational publication) essay contest - "History in my Backyard". One of our middle school students was the states first place winner last year.... she wrote her essay on the Opera House. we do a mini tour of what we offered on our 2005 Georgia Trust Ramble tour sites for the students. It has been so popular that the Pulaski Co. Middle School has asked for this to be an annual event. This was our 2nd year.

BHT created an "intern" position in 2005-2006. This internship was fulfilled by an HHS high school senior student who was in the high school's Youth Apprentice Program. This was a volunteer position.

BHT purchased new Christmas banners for downtown in 2004.

BHT, HPC & DDA & the Arts Council - will launch this year -a campaign to fund new year-round banners to mark the NR historic district downtown.

DOT - T.E. $600K HPD -$3K & another $3K some grants for "Technical Assistance" only- NPS; RTC program Private donations from local individuals & businesses for Facade grants Golf Tournament Fund Raiser- for DDA to use for downtown improvements."
City of Jonesboro  
Charrette Conducted in 2005

“There is a current lack of political will and interest/education on the issue of the public at-large.

The community design charrette hosted in the City of Jonesboro was a ray of hope in a what has been a very divisive period in the City's history. It was the one time in recent memory where the community came together and discussed big ideas in a rational and respectful manner—proving to the many who thought that it could not be done, that it really could. I truly believe that this could not have been accomplished without the infinite patience and expertise of the UGA Charrette team. I am most grateful for the help and guidance provided to our community. Although the goals developed from the charrette have yet to be achieved, the sense of community and teamwork demonstrated within the community as a result of the process was very valuable. Thank you!”

City of Locust Grove  
Charrette Conducted in 2004

“Moved toward implementation on the building facades.”

City of Macon  
Charrette Conducted in 2006

“We are in the process of working to execute some of the design concepts which were presented during the charrette. We are going back to try and receive some state funding. We were trumped by funding for tennis court rehab during the last round of DCA funding.”

City of McRae-Helena  
Charrette Conducted in 2004

“Yes and no! We have implemented a Facade Grant Program that has been received/utilized so-so. We have had 6 businesses to renovate and improve storefront looks, but only two of the ones identified by the charrette participated. The others were new ideas, but still an improvement. The community seems to have lost interest. Crossroads Cities, Inc. is pursuing a Planter Sponsorship for the downtowns this spring. Hopefully with a little nudge we can get more players and make a difference this year. This has been mostly frustrating to those of us who want to see good things happen to the community. A few of the older homes have undergone renovations and that helps
the spirit a bit. But, we have a long way to go. McRae downtown still looks like a "ghostly has been".

I would be most willing to support the charette concept. My direct involvement with McRae-Helena, however, is not one of the more successful events at this time.”

---

**Newton County**
Charrette Conducted in 2005

“Nothing has been done. Leadership is changing in this area. We will have to bring new leaders up to speed and try to move forward.

The UGA Design Charrette program has been a major catalyst in changing the way our citizens and leaders look at growth and growth management. We greatly appreciate their help in our efforts to build a more pleasant place to live.”

---

**City of Plains**
Charrette Conducted in 1998

“The team addressed such issues as downtown cohesion. Future building development, and recreation. The use of vacant building was suggested. Change outside of the Fire and Police Station to be more compatible with City Hall. All of the recommendations have been implemented.

Every town needs a charrette!!! Especially a small rural town in Southwest Georgia, that has a Population of 653. We were clueless when our very on Jimmy Carter announced he was running for President. At that time, little did we know what that meant to our community or what was going to happen to our community? Thanks to Pratt Cassity and the design team, we’ve still held on to our character. The Plains Cerreatt helped the local officials and the community to better understand the importance of planning and preserving.”

---

**City of Sandersville**
Charrette Conducted in 2004

“The Lang’s Pond project has been used to apply for several grants for the pond. We have not been awarded any grants but the project is still top of mind for the DDA.”
City of Suwanee
Charrette Conducted in 2000

“The following have been implemented: Creating (about 80-90% complete) a mixed-use development (called "Town Center") on major corner in City and in the downtown district; basically creating a downtown core; compliments historic district.

Increased civic space (in Town Center) - creation of a 10 acre urban style park; located on the corner of 2 major roadways. Total cost of park = $5,000,000+; major gather spot for community.

Other undisturbed open space purchased in downtown district; 23 acres.

Design guidelines created; basically 3 sets - 1 for the downtown district in general, 1 for the historic district to preserve those design elements, and 1 for Town Center area. Design guidelines are in line with the UGA recommendations.

Worked with Gwinnett County in the design of the new County library built on Main Street.

City continues to encourage development along Bufor Hwy. as described in the Charrette document.

Lots and lots of cool stuff happening in Suwanee - much of it was spurred by the ideas that came out of the charrette.

Funding was through a combination of SPLOST dollars - recreation and transportation. Issued URA bonds for commercial land acquisition in Town Center and general obligation bonds for park property acquisitions. Private developers funded commercial development. Old Town Master Plan (completed shortly after the Charrette) was grand-fathered into LCI (Livable Centers Initiative) program through the Atlanta Regional Commission - received $1 Million for railroad pedestrian underpass connecting Main Street (at the library) with Town Center area.”

City of Toccoa
Charrette Conducted in 2005

“Yes, they have been implemented and the project is under construction currently.

ARC $300,000, DCA RDF $500,000
OneGA Authority $339,000
USDA RBEG $75,000
Local: $100,000”
City of Tybee Island
Charrette Conducted in 2005

“Here's at least a partial list of what we've done:

- Written a text amendment encouraging swales and rain gardens, rather than curbs and gutters for new construction.
- Replaced existing troughs in public restrooms with waterless urinals.
- Written an ordinance requiring all driveways to be permeable.
- Received a grant for signs to go on beach crossovers explaining ecosystems, the water cycle, etc.
- Increased enforcement for litter on the beach, and improved Signage.
- Put city irrigation systems on shallow wells.
- Begun a master plan for Memorial Park that will include a demonstration xeriscape garden.
- Begun an overhaul of our tree ordinance to give it more teeth.
- Improved public outreach to increase water conservation.
- Implemented seasonal tiered water rates to encourage conservation.
- Replaced an aging water line down Butler Avenue.
- Slip-lined all sewer pipes to eliminate intrusion.
- Budgeted automatic meter reading equipment to enable quick location and repair of leaks in water lines.
- By the way, we did get WaterFirst certification, and your teams' suggestions definitely helped. Thanks very much for all your good work.
- We passed a Green Building Resolution requiring all municipal buildings and renovations to strive for LEED Silver certification.
- We're working with the River Basin Center and DNR to develop a model buffer ordinance for the coast.
- We've begun a rain barrel program.
- The first condos with a green roof are under construction in the beach business district.

We received a $2,000,000 GEFA loan for water line replacement.”

City of West Point
Charrette Conducted in: 2002

“Freight depot has been restored and is being used. It's being rented out for wedding receptions, banquets, school reunions, etc. It has a caterer's kitchen and a big room with restrooms plus a smaller room which will eventually be a museum. The local foundry donated lots of molds which were used for making textile machinery and these are mounted on the walls like art work.

The 2-story part has several offices which are rented out, one to our Better Hometown and Downtown Development Authority director.”
River development committee is meeting, has hired consultant to obtain grants to develop riverfront as a park. Downtown business district has been listed on National Register. Design Committee is still functioning and discussing projects.

We received a State Heritage grant for $18,000 for the Depot restoration, but the Depot committee asked the City Council to decline it, over my protest.

The Depot committee has restored the depot using entirely private funds from local donors and foundations.

Our Historic Commission received a State HPD grant for $12,000 to hire a consultant to write our Design Guidelines.”

City of Woodbine
Charrette Conducted in 2001

“The Charette was an integral part of our Master Plan proposal process. Each bidder was given a copy of the Charette documents to review prior to making a proposal. The Master Plan is not completed yet, but I believe it will make good use of the recommendations from the Charette.”