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ABSTRACT

History and its interpretation are important to establishing individual and community identity as well as tools for economic growth through heritage marketing and tourism. Even with the public increasingly recognizing the value of history, developers continue to omit the history of the local landscape in the design and marketing of new residential communities. This thesis examines the benefits of incorporating historic site interpretation into new residential development. It also examines how the local government, community and developers are involved in the problem of the lack of history in new residential development and its solution. By looking at the site and history of Altama-Hopeton Plantation in Glynn County, Georgia, this thesis makes recommendations that can be applied to similar landscapes.
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PREFACE

I became interested in exploring the need for historic site interpretation in new residential development when a piece of land once owned by my family in Glynn County, Georgia, was sold as a result of the recession of 2009. Altama and Hopeton plantations were sold to a development/holding company that did not indicate a commitment to preserving the history of the landscape in their plans or investments.

Altama Plantation is a good place to explore the possibilities of using site interpretation in new residential development. It consists of about 6,000 acres of land in the Northwest corner of Glynn County, Georgia, about 16 miles from the coast, on the southern bank of the Altamaha River. The area is comprised of both hardwood and planted pine forests, with several artificial ponds, dirt roads, buildings, structures, and other various landscape features. The property was developed as a cotton, sugar and rice plantation in the nineteenth century and used as a private retreat and hunting land since 1900.

I chose this as my site and inspiration because of my personal connection to the land. My family owned Altama from 1945 until 2010, and I spent a large portion of my life there wandering around the woods and plantation ruins. I first became familiar with the basic history of the place through landscape features such as the canals and dikes of abandoned rice fields, tabby remains of a sugar mill, a formal garden built during the 1930s, and various “old” buildings that I explored again and again. My time there
developed in me more of a sense of home than the neighborhood on nearby St. Simons Island where I actually lived.

When Altama was sold, I contemplated the potential it and similar sites have to influence people and communities. I imagined a neighborhood full of people drawn to the mystery of the tabby ruins or old rice fields, who learn through interpretation of the site’s history. I also wondered if Altama would retain its significance if development left little of the existing historic remnants. I thought that if invisible or intangible history could be made available to residents through interpretation they would have more respect for their home and community, much as my respect and sense of belonging has grown with my research of the landscape. Because I no longer have access to the site, the existing conditions are from my memory and do not extend past the winter of 2010.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

The problem of characterless suburban sprawl has been a worry of many planners and preservationists in recent years.¹ The developed land area in the United States increased by 14.2 million hectares between 1982 and 2003.² Construction and growth are an important part of any community’s economy and cannot be expected to halt. Residential and resort development is a very important source of growth and revenue for a community like Glynn County, Georgia, which has abundant natural and historical resources that attract residents and tourists. The value of construction in Glynn County, Georgia, in 2011 was $78,178,406.³ Much of development and construction is residential with some developments better planned and higher quality than others. The total area for rural residential land in America is 73 million acres, 44 million of which are lots of ten

---


The Southeast region is the most developed in the U.S., with 15% of non-
federal land developed and a 73.3% projected increase in developed land in Georgia by
2030. This increase could be affected by many things including the changing preferences
of consumers who value conservation of open space and high-quality development. This
could trigger more planning and regulatory efforts to maintain the character of historic or
rural lands. Many local governments and developers do not realize the monetary and
intangible value of history in a landscape and often fail to incorporate or encourage the
incorporation of history and its interpretation in new residential development.

Historic site interpretation can affect citizen’s quality of life, stewardship of the
area and the economic prosperity of the community. Using traditional and current
historical interpretation theory, mitigation tactics and an examination of similar sites, this
thesis argues that using site interpretation to add character and meaning to new residential
development can benefit all involved parties. Recommendations suggest interpretation
methods that best fit the needs of a residential area within a Southern rural historic
landscape. Zoning regulations, limited design guidelines and methods of keeping
interpretation relevant to area residents are included.

Research Questions

The sources listed in the literature review provide a base from which to begin
formulating and answering the main question of this thesis. This thesis explores the

---

4 George Wuerthner, “The Truth About Land Use in the United States,” Watersheds Messenger 9, no.3
article6.htm

5 E.M. White, et al., “Past and Projected Rural Land Conversion in the US at State, Regional, and National

motivations and methods of applying historic site interpretation to new residential developments in rural areas, using Altama Plantation in Glynn County, Georgia as an application site. To do this, several issues are examined: (1) various arguments about why historical interpretation is beneficial; (2) the groups most affected by, and in control of, the use of site interpretation; (3) the history and existing conditions of the application site. Issues inherent in site interpretation and development affect all the people who have a stake in the process and outcome. Along with historical research, this thesis analyzes current information about interpretation and mitigation tactics, as well as various historical interpretation methods to determine the most compelling reasons and methods of interpreting history in new residential developments in the rural South.

The main thesis question is: How and why should historic interpretation be used by the local government, community, and developers in new residential development in the rural South in order to preserve and profit from a site’s historic character? To better answer the main question, several sub-questions also will be answered. These include: Why is there a need to interpret the history of a landscape after the physical elements of that history are gone or altered? How can local governments, communities, and developers all be encouraged to provide some level of historical interpretation in their rural/suburban edge projects? Using various case studies and the application site of Altama Plantation, what is the best way to interpret that history to future residents as well as visitors?
Research Methods

Various sources were consulted to address the research questions stated above: (1) a review of literature, (2) historical research of primary sources, and (3) field work was completed to understand all the aspects of the problem and possible solutions.

A survey of literature was done of the topics of identity, sense of place, site interpretation, heritage marketing, mitigation in historic preservation, the development process and players, and the history of Altama Plantation. Archival research was conducted online at the University of North Carolina’s Southern Historical Collection, at the Hargrett Rare Books Library at The University of Georgia, and other online archives. Primary source material found in these archives provided a full picture of the site’s history, and guided the recommendations for interpretation. Correspondences, plantation records and maps helped make clear the most significant aspects of the site’s history and what needs to be used in interpretation.

Limited field work was done to assess the state of the surrounding land at Altama, and access to the site was restricted. However, knowledge of the landscape features, buildings and structures was gained through a significant amount of time spent on the site when it was owned by the author’s family during the years of 1945-2010.

Although thorough research was done to address issues related to the main question of this thesis, some information remains unknown. Further research is needed to assess the current conditions of the site as well as more detailed assessment regarding the dates of construction of built features. More analysis is needed to determine the site’s full potential of heritage marketing in the area. Using relevant texts, historical research, and a
realistic assessment of the known and unknown factors of the application site, recommendations for appropriate interpretation were developed.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature pertaining to this thesis can be grouped into two broad categories: (1) material related to why and how history and site interpretation is beneficial, and (2) the history of the application site, Altama Plantation. Within the first category, relevant subjects include site interpretation, history, identity/sense of place, heritage marketing, the development process and players and mitigation. The literature about the history of Altama includes both primary and secondary sources related to the site, and contextual information about the area and similar sites. The following literature review summarizes the relevant sources to establish a context for this thesis.

Identity and Sense of Place

To begin to understand why historic site interpretation should be used in new residential development, the connection between history, identity and interpretation should be explored.

The links between history, landscape and identity have been explored by writers in many different fields. In *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, David E. Sopher discusses sense of place and home in an essay called, “The Landscape of Home: Myth, Experience, Social Meaning.” Sopher makes the case that a sense of belonging and a sense of home come from social connections, both to people one knows now and to
ancestors. This link to one’s community can be the first step to further preservation of a community’s history. In 1989, Ary J. Lamme used four national historic sites to illustrate the power a community has to protect or change a landscape. He argues that landscape is more than the visible environment; it is a feeling that can be brought out by interpretation. If a group of people all share the same feeling from a landscape because of a shared knowledge of history, they are more likely to protect that connection. The following year Michael Hough published *Out of Place: Restoring Identity to the Regional Landscape*. This book discusses place identity in terms of both physical and social connections. Hough also emphasized how to preserve a historic landscape without arresting its natural evolution or erasing its character.

In the *Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity* published in 2008, Sara McDowell reaffirms the social nature of place identity and elucidates the need for memory—and therefore heritage—in a place to facilitate the formation of both personal and community identity. An essay by Groot and Haartsen also included in this collection, discusses how effectively communicated heritage can facilitate identity

---


Derek H. Alderman’s essay, “Place, Naming and the Interpretation of Cultural Landscapes” addresses the specific interpretation technique of naming and how it can powerfully connect people to places. Place names act as sign posts that can inform observers of a place’s past, which could encourage a sense of belonging through understanding that leads to the formation of identity. A thesis written by Jeremy C. Wells in 2009 about a new residential community in Charleston, South Carolina, called I’On, discusses the role of identity and sense of place in new development as well as the effect of historic material on residents’ and visitors’ attitudes. The main conclusion of Wells, and these other authors, is that history is directly linked to identity. They also conclude that people have consistently chosen materials, places and names that relate to history when developing or interpreting historic landscapes. This is even true in I’on where the materials only appear to be historic.

The author could find no sources that directly examined the relationship of historic site interpretation to forging identity and links to the landscape in newly developed areas. Most authors—such as Tilden; Alderson and Low; and Knudson, Cable and Beck—discuss historic site interpretation at preserved sites. Others—such as Groot and Haartsen; Aldrman and Wells—describe the connections between history, sense of place and identity. Few suggest the potential benefits of incorporating historic site

---


interpretation into new residential development. Hough talks about the importance of place naming to identity and Meinig and Lowenthal talk about the importance of awareness of the past, but no one discusses site interpretation in new development.\textsuperscript{14} This incorporation of interpretation would not only benefit resident’s quality of life, but bring monetary benefits to owners and the community.\textsuperscript{15}

The research supporting the connection between history and identity is abundant but discussion of providing a connection to the past through historic site interpretation in new residential development is scarce. Works discussed in this thesis relate to the main question by identifying and supporting the link between knowing the history of a place and feeling a sense of belonging. The ideas most relevant include Lamme’s discussion of the power a community has to protect or change a landscape, Hough’s writing about how to preserve a historic landscape without changing its natural evolution character, and Alderman’s essay, “Place, Naming and the Interpretation of Cultural Landscapes” about how names can powerfully connect people to places. These ideas could be combined to argue for the need for historic site interpretation in new development to provide a sense of belonging and community to residents. This intangible feeling raises the quality of development and, therefore raises the value.

\textsuperscript{14} Hough, \textit{Out of Place}, 18; David Lowenthal, “Age and Artifact,” 104.

Interpretation

To understand historic interpretation theory and the methods used today, one must first look at the history of site interpretation. Examining evolving ideas about how individual and community identities are shaped by an area’s history can also help to answer this thesis’ main question of why historical interpretation is essential.

In 1957, Tilden Freeman became the first person to write extensively about interpretation theory. His book, *Interpreting Our Heritage*, outlines six elements to consider when planning the interpretation of a site.\textsuperscript{16} *Interpreting Our Heritage* has gone through several editions since it was first published and continues to inform interpretation theory today. During the beginning of the synthesis of interpretation theory Tilden and others developed themes of interpretation that subsequent authors also have maintained, such as using site interpretation to provoke visitors and the importance of establishing a connection with the past.

Most later works discuss the same methods that Freeman outlined.\textsuperscript{17} Other sources offer some variation of Freeman’s interpretation theory, with updates that account for advances in technology or current trends.\textsuperscript{18} Few authors have addressed the interpretation of historic sites in residential areas, or interpretation that caters to

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
permanent residents or long term/repeat visitors.\textsuperscript{19} Despite this weakness in interpretation literature, many authors have written about the importance of interpreting the history of every landscape, not only ones with a well-known story.

*The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes*, published in 1979 and edited by D. W. Meinig, contains essays that deal with the topic of interpretation for sites that have historic significance but are not associated with a particular event or person in history.\textsuperscript{20} David Lowenthal writes in his essay, “Age and Artifact: Dilemmas of Appreciation,” about the need for establishing a relationship with the past. He also explains that while interpretation is necessary in establishing this relationship, it can never represent the complete past. Site interpretation should not detract from the setting or contribute to freezing a historic place in time rather than allowing it to evolve naturally.\textsuperscript{21}

In 1995 Knudson, Cable and Beck produced a textbook titled, *Interpretation of Cultural and Natural Resources*, that outlines the history of interpretation and describes different interpretation methods for common situations like historic sites or museums. They also discuss interpretation theory, and touch on marketing and the role of heritage and identity. The authors discuss “long-term visitors,” as well as standard visitors, and how to interpret for them.\textsuperscript{22} Long-term visitors have different priorities when visiting a

\textsuperscript{19} Knudson, Cable and Beck, *Interpretation of Cultural and Natural Resources*, 61.


\textsuperscript{22} Knudson, Cable and Beck, *Interpretation of Cultural and Natural Resources* (State College: Venture Pub., 1995), 61.
significant site than one-time visitors. The interpretation can be more in depth because of the amount of time long-term visitors have to experience the site.  

During the same time Alderson and Low’s 1996 book, *Interpretation of Historic Sites*, further builds on Freeman’s theories and discusses traditional interpretation methods. They outline a categorization of historic sites that extends beyond the National Register of Historic Places by dividing sites into “documentary,” “representative” or “aesthetic” to determine how best to interpret them.  

These categories divide sites according to what should be prioritized in interpretation. Documentary sites relate to a person or event, representative sites relate to a period of time, and aesthetic sites relate to design and form.  

Newer sources give insight into new ideas and technology in site interpretation. James Carter writes about breaking through boundaries of interpretation methods and rethinking how a site is represented. He also talks about the media and smart phones as vehicles for interpretation through the ability for instant information such as with Quick Response (QR) codes. Wren Smith discusses the power of poetic language rather than straight facts to convey emotions and scenes in interpretation.  

---


25 Ibid.

26 Carter. "Don’t Fence Me In," 14-16.

27 Ibid. 16.

28 Smith, "The Poetics of Interpretation" 36-38.
evolution of interpretation techniques to fit into a modern world and keep people interested.

Principles of site interpretation have changed little since Freeman Tilden, except for expanding interpretive methods to include modern technology and lifestyle. Tilden’s principles remain the most important ideas about site interpretation both for the public and this thesis. Also important for this thesis is the argument to not let site interpretation detract from the setting or freeze a place in time rather than allowing it to evolve naturally. Since new residential development is not a tourist location, the interpretation will need to be planned for an audience that is more long term. Tilden’s principles are essential and should be consulted when planning interpretation in new residential development. New technology should also be used to best appeal to modern day residents, especially young people, to get them involved and interested in the history of the landscape. Smart phones, social media, QR codes and augmented reality apps could all be used in interpretation. According to Tilden, interpretation should do more than inform, it should intrigue observers and make them seek out more information which will lead to an investment in the place. Examples of using interpreting history in new residential development can be seen in two communities in the South. I’On in Mt. Pleasant, SC and Palmetto Bluff in Bluffton, SC. They have used various techniques and

---

29 Lowenthal, “Age and Artifact: Dilemmas of Appreciation.”

30 Knudson, Cable and Beck, *Interpretation of Cultural and Natural Resources.*

31 Carter, "Don’t Fence Me In."
methods to create very different new developments that both take into account the landscape’s history.

Case Studies of Historical Interpretation Methods Used in Two Recent Residential Developments in the Southeast

I’On

I’On is a New Urbanist and Traditional Neighborhood Development in Mount Pleasant, South Carolina, just north of Charleston. It was founded in 1995 by Vince Graham and designed, in part, by Duany Plater-Zyberk & Company. The community consists of more than 550 single family homes, numerous trails and walking paths, lakes, a rookery and a central square. The collective architecture is based on a traditional Charleston and South Carolina Lowcountry style that includes deep double porches, side gardens and close proximity to the sidewalk (see Appendix D). The designers and planners felt that recreating the aesthetics of the Lowcountry’s built environment would “facilitate the development of an endearing and enduring place.”32 A sense of a living community is very important in I’On and the design guidelines are in place to ensure a sense of cohesiveness. A short document about I’On’s design says, “In order to work together to create a community, the design of each house should respond to the character of the street, park or square it faces.”33 Further integration of the site into the design can be seen in some early structures using lumber from onsite trees. Although I’On reflects a


33 Ibid.
specific aspect of lowcountry design, there is little to be learned of the history of the landscape just by walking around the community.

Short History

The history of the I’On landscape is similar to much of the Southern coast. The main themes being American Indian settlement, European settlement, agriculture, fishing and now development. Archeologists found remains of a plantation site prior to construction of the first homes. The community takes its name from the plantation owners, the I’Ons, who lived and worked on the land from the 1700s until the Civil War. After the plantation era, the land was divided and farmed. Fishing and oysters were a large part of the economy due to the proximity to tidal rivers and the coast. Some elements of the site’s history remain and have been restored by the developers. The cemetery and its monuments were brought back from near ruin and remain accessible to visitors and residents. There is little else in the community that indicates or educates visitors and residents to what was on the land that their community now occupies.

Evaluation of Historical Interpretation at I’On

I’On is a new residential community that did many things right. The developers took responsibility for the long term wellbeing of the community they created. There is a focus on creating a sense of place through specific design guidelines that evoke the history of coastal South Carolina. Special care was taken to integrate nature into the

34 Ibid.
development through trails and public green space. The development is mixed use allowing for less dependency on cars and better pedestrian mobility. Many people feel I’On is a good solution to the problem of sprawl and what could have been done with the land. One former resident wrote an essay about his memories of the site before I’On was constructed and how those memories compare with the new community. He writes, “Thanks to the care with which I’On was laid out and constructed, streets run along the paths of the old roads, the great trees familiar to me from childhood endure, a lawn and boat landing stand at Shelmore point which now accommodates somewhat more formal parties. I can walk along the marsh as I once did through a landscape transformed, but not obliterated.”

Though many street names are based on characters from literature or values held by the creators, some names give hints at the history of the landscape. The community’s name comes from a former resident. Another example is “Shelmore” which comes from “a former seafood company of that name, which, long ago, operated a docking facility where the Creek Club now stands.”

Overall, I’On achieves a sense of vague history without creating real ties with the landscape’s actual history. Anyone who has visited Charleston will see the similarities while never knowing without thorough research that the site used to be home to a plantation and a seafood company. While clearly preferable to characterless sprawl, there is a missed opportunity to integrate the past into the present.


Palmetto Bluff

Description

Palmetto Bluff located on the May River near Bluffton, South Carolina, is a resort and community founded in 2000 whose goal is conservation, sustainability and “responsible luxury.”\(^{37}\) The property consists of about 20,000 acres that include conservation areas, a community square, inn, church and several residential areas. The retention of elements such as trees and historic ruins help the recent development feel as if it has been in place for much longer than the 2000s construction dates (see Appendix D).

Short History

The history of the land at Palmetto Bluff is similar to many areas of the coastal south. The Native Americans inhabited the area until just before European occupation. Plantations were established here in the 1700s until the Civil War. The main historic era was during the early 20th century when Richard T. Wilson, a wealthy banker, bought the property and built a mansion for hosting extravagant parties. The mansion stood from 1910 to 1926 when it was destroyed by fire.\(^ {38}\) Wilson died soon after and the property was later purchased by the Union Bag Company (later Union Camp Corporation) because of its rich timber reserves.\(^ {39}\) Union Camp Corp. bought a significant amount of land on


the Southeastern coast during the 1930s and 40s. When the beauty and abundance of wildlife of the land came to the attention of Union Camp corporate officers, the property was preserved and used as a hunting retreat. These years of use and appreciation known as the “Union Camp Years” are an important part of the history of Palmetto Bluff and led to the conservation and development ethic still seen today.

Evaluation of Historical Interpretation at Palmetto Bluff

Palmetto Bluff manages to provide a sense of place despite very recent development. The conservation of green space, design guidelines and use of the landscape’s history in design all make Palmetto Bluff a model of new residential development. Throughout the developed area of Palmetto Bluff large trees remain and cast shade on roads and sidewalks that were built around them. The village center provides an example for the rest of the small community. “The compositional architectural and constructional quality of the village center is felicitous and entirely free of the misapplied, ill fitting, poor detail which impoverishes the quality of so many otherwise well intentioned New Urbanist developments.”  

Near the village center the development is dense but still allows for a park by the river. Further away from the village center the lot sizes increase, thereby providing extra space for people who would like more solitude. Although these lots are low density, they do not define the entire

development and there are at least 734 acres under a conservation easement to help ensure there will always be undeveloped land.41

Integrated into this development, both at the village center and further out, are elements of the landscape’s history. In the central square the developers chose to keep the ruins of the Wilson mansion as well as interpretive signage that explains them. There are other interpretive signs in the main village area that talk about the history, planning and development of Palmetto Bluff. These allow visitors and guests a chance to feel more connection with the area through education. Beyond signs telling the story of Palmetto Bluff there is also a small museum that houses a collection of artifacts found onsite as well as a more thorough telling of the sites history. This is located in the main village and open every day for free. Along the entry road there remains part of an old manual water pump. This element is notable because it is located outside the main pedestrian area and surrounded by mown grass on the side of the road. This water pump attests to the commitment of the developers to preserve historic character even when it is not in the direct line of sight. The website says, “By connecting with the island's colorful history, we can continue its centuries-old legacy of living well. This link to the past also requires that we connect to the present. The Lowcountry's land, its rivers, its people, its ideals, its spirit – they are all integral parts of Palmetto Bluff.”42


There are lessons from these two cases that can be applied to new residential development along the coast and specifically to Altama Plantation. I’On’s attempt to recreate history without giving enough attention to the landscape’s actual history makes the development seem not genuine. Palmetto Bluff’s respect of the natural resources as well as abundant information about the history of the site built into the development make it seem like the visitor is part of the story and belongs there. New residential development should take lessons and style from history but not attempt to make new places be old.

**Mitigation**

Most sources devoted to the subject of the mitigation of adverse effects to historic properties deal with archeology or disaster. The most common of these strategies is documentation of historic resources with a few suggestions for some kind of separate site interpretation. Without published works about how to mitigate the destruction of historic properties due to development, both the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Park Service (NPS) website were consulted to determine the current policy and practices for mitigation of the loss of historic resources due to disaster.\(^{43}\) Both organizations are agencies of the federal government, and both have similar ideas regarding appropriate mitigation strategies.

No sources were found that suggested strategies for mitigating the loss of historic resources during a nonfederal government project. There were a limited number of

---

examples of creative mitigation solutions. The Grand Canyon National Park website described some creative mitigation solutions for the Grand Canyon National Park that include resource education and outreach for visitors.\textsuperscript{44} The Georgia Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site also used education and outreach to mitigate adverse effects to archeological sites due to their projects.\textsuperscript{45} The DOT in Washington State used creative mitigation measures to offset negative effects of a road construction project. Here they built an interpretive center that told the history of the neighborhood and educated visitors about the necessity of the project.\textsuperscript{46}

The use of site interpretation to educate visitors about current projects as well as the history of a site could be useful in historic areas that attract new residential development. Even though development is not a disaster situation, it can still destroy historic resources. Educational mitigation tactics could make people more aware of a place’s history and more eager to protect what is left.

**Heritage Marketing**

Heritage marketing is an emerging field that so far has been focused on tourism and policy. Very little has been written about heritage marketing prior to the 1990s. In 1997, Michael Hutter and Ilde Rizzo edited a collection of essays called *Economic Perspectives on Cultural Heritage* in which many noted economists discuss the logistics


and potential of heritage marketing. Determining the worth of cultural heritage, policy and incentives for protection are common themes in many of the essays. These ideas are all important because they could persuade governments and developers to prioritize history in development projects and policy by showing the worth of historic resources. Arjo Klamer, Bruno S. Frey and Christian Koboldt discuss the evaluation of cultural heritage and optimizing its use. Arjo Klamer, Daniel Bluestone and David Throsby also discuss marketing heritage in a newsletter for the Getty Conservation Institute. Klamer writes about the need to expand traditional economic thinking to include less finite values, such as the value of culture and history. Bluestone states that the economic incentives to preserve history will never be as powerful as heritage’s intangible values. Throsby discusses the value historic resources have because of their long life. These ideas prove the long-term worth of history outweighs the short-term gain of development that leaves out history.

In 2006, Shashi Misiura wrote a textbook for students and professionals that provides an overview of heritage marketing as well as examples and fundamental policies. This lengthy book breaks down the fundamentals of heritage marketing
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beginning with basic marketing principles such as identifying a target audience and analyzing demographics.\textsuperscript{53} Misiura goes on to describe how history raises the value of a product by appealing to consumers who are looking for something to remain constant in an ever-changing world.\textsuperscript{54} Branding based on heritage is also discussed in this book. Misiura talks about using a company’s long history to market to buyers or investors.\textsuperscript{55} Developers could cultivate a reputation for respecting the historic and natural resources of a site in the same way.

David Throsby published a book in 2010 called \textit{The Economics of Cultural Policy}, in which he examines the potential of smart policy to help protect cultural resources by providing economic incentives for their preservation.\textsuperscript{56} This and other sources describe economic reasons for preserving history. They conclude that people like history because it is a constant in a changing world.\textsuperscript{57} Because of this they are willing to pay more for history.\textsuperscript{58} This could apply to historic interpretation in new residential development by proving that even though the value of history is more difficult to define, the value is still there. If developers and local governments were convinced of this, they might be more inclined to prioritize the preservation and interpretation of history in projects.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{53} Ibid. 79.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Ibid. 10.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Ibid. 96
\item \textsuperscript{56} David Throsby, \textit{The Economics of Cultural Policy} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
\item \textsuperscript{57} Misiura, \textit{Heritage Marketing}, 10.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Ibid.
\end{itemize}
Development Process and Players

The development process and the major players within it can be an extensive subject with many different facets. This thesis focuses on residential development in a rural landscape as opposed to commercial development or residential areas in an urban setting. There were many websites that provided flowcharts of the basic process as well as journal articles and PDFs that summarize what is involved.  

Ben Bullock and John Sullivan, in an article for *Cornell Real Estate Review*, defines the real estate development process as, “The process of creating value by making tangible improvements to real property.” This process is broken down into steps by several sources, the goal always being to make a profit. This thesis argues that historic elements and interpretation add intangible value to developments so sources on intangible value were consulted. Sources give procedures for determining and accounting for intangible value in industrial and franchise development, but not in residential development. Intangible value is also discussed in *Harvard Business Review* as  


60 Bullock and Sullivan, "Information - The Key to the Real Estate Development Process." 78.  


increasing a company’s value, which could apply to developers who market themselves as responsible and preservation minded.63

The developer, community and local government all play a part in new residential development.64 While the developer has most of the control, the local government can develop policy and incentives that influence growth within its jurisdiction.65 The community also influences development by influencing the market and by participating in the political process by which government policies are created and administered.66

These sources explain the development process and players which are essential to the implementation of site interpretation in new residential development. The idea of intangible value is especially relevant because much of the value of historic elements is considered intangible.67 The main player in this process is the developer but the government and community have influence as well.68


65 Dowall, "Public Real Estate Development Process."


67 Klamer, Bluestone, Throsby, “The Economics of Heritage Conservation.”

History of the Coast and Altama

Altama and Hopeton Plantations have been subjects of interest since their settlement in 1816. Early primary source materials include James Hamilton Couper’s papers which are held at the Hargrett Rare Books Library at the University of Georgia and available online in The Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina (UNC). The Hargrett library has genealogical records, photographs and maps. UNC has plantation records, correspondences and other records of information from Couper’s time at Altama. Many first-hand written accounts by visitors such as Fanny Kemble, J.D. Legare of the *Southern Agriculturist*, and Amelia M. Murray, describe the plantation. The *Southern Agriculturist* can be found in the College of Charleston Library. The fascination with the history of Altama continued after the plantation’s demise after the Civil War. J. H. Couper’s son-in-law wrote and published an early history of the plantation in 1897.\(^69\) This account was short and mostly a romantic pondering on the extinct way of life Altama embodied.

From 1898 through 1945 Altama went through several owners. The first and most brief owner was a Shaker Colony from Ohio. The Shakers sold to William Du Pont in 1914. The Hagley Digital Archives at the Hagley Museum and Library in Wilmington Delaware hold a William Du Pont Collection that contains correspondence and records from when Du Pont owned Altama during the years 1914-1933. Since the 1930’s *The Georgia Historical Quarterly* published many essays written about the history of Altama.

\(^{69}\) Charles Spalding Wylly, *Memories and Annals* (Brunswick: Glover Brothers, 1897).
including a collection of letters from Couper to his wife about his time establishing cottonseed oil mills.\textsuperscript{70}

During the early part of the twentieth century there was growing local interest in the history of Glynn County. Margaret Davis Cate researched, wrote, and published several books and pamphlets that include the history of Altama and Hopeton. In 1966, Russell Anderson published an essay in \textit{The Georgia Historical Quarterly} about the presence of Shakers in southeastern Georgia at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{71} He discussed the brief Shaker occupancy of the Altama plantation house and land. In 1982, James Clifton wrote an essay entitled “Hopeton, Model Plantation of the Antebellum South” that was published in \textit{The Georgia Historical Quarterly}, which explained many of the reasons why Hopeton stood out among other plantations of the region and Antebellum era, including its size, innovative agriculture, and management of enslaved workers.\textsuperscript{72}

The main work that deals with the antebellum history of Altama is James Bagwell's book, \textit{Rice Gold: James Hamilton Couper and Plantation Life on the Georgia Coast}, published in 2000.\textsuperscript{73} This is an extension of Bagwell’s doctoral thesis published in 1978. It gives details about Couper’s many innovations, which left their mark on the land.\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Rice Gold} and most of the other sources dealing with the history of Altama focus


\textsuperscript{72} James M. Clifton, “Hopeton, Model Plantation of the Antebellum South,” \textit{The Georgia Historical Quarterly} 66, no. 4 (1982).

\textsuperscript{73} James E. Bagwell, \textit{Rice Gold: James Hamilton Couper and Plantation Life on the Georgia Coast} (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2000) 200.

\textsuperscript{74} James E. Bagwell, \textit{James Hamilton Couper, Georgia Rice Planter} (Hattiesburg: The University of Southern Mississippi, 1978).
on the white history and tend to leave out details or analysis of the African American or Native American history of the landscape.

Other historical sources provide a context for Altama’s history. A booklet entitled, “Altama Then and Now,” gives a brief history of Altama from its settlement to its purchase by A. W. Jones in 1945. This booklet has no publication date within the text, but it was privately published during the 1950s for the Jones family and guests. *Georgia’s Disputed Ruins*, published in 1937, gives an early perspective on how people viewed the tabby ruins of the antebellum period. The persistent myth that tabby ruins were Spanish mission remnants instead of remains from plantations was being slowly debunked. Also published in 1937 is an essay about antebellum sugar culture in the southern Atlantic states by J. Carlyle Sitterson, who wrote many essays about antebellum sugar culture that were published in the *Journal of Southern History*. Essays dealing with other aspects of the antebellum and postwar South were published during the years between 1954 and 1964. Merle Prunty, Jr., wrote two essays on the fate of the antebellum plantation after the Civil War. The first, published in 1955, is about the new incarnation of the southern plantation after its post war demise, and the second (1963) is about woodland plantations in the South.

---


In the 1990s the focus of research and publication turned from the success, demise and renaissance of white landowners to the effect of the African American population on the landscape of antebellum plantations. In 1998, Diana L. Ramey’s essay, “She Do a Heap of Work: Female Slave Labor on Glynn County Rice and Cotton Plantations” addressed this aspect of plantation history, as did *What Nature Suffers To Groe: Life, Labor and Landscape on the Georgia Coast*, by Mart A. Stewart.79

The history of Altama and the southeast coast is one dominated by agriculture and tourism. These themes have connected people to the landscape from the first settlers until residents and visitors today. Historic site interpretation is a tool that can be used to continue to forge that connection between residents and the land. This connection fosters a desired sense of place that developers and local government can use to their advantage to bring in profit and economic growth.

**Conclusion**

Many arguments relate to this thesis’ main question of how and why historic interpretation could be used in new residential development. Alderman, Lamme, Hough, McDowell and others identify and support the link between knowing the history of a

---

place and feeling a sense of belonging. Tilden’s principles are still the most important ideas about site interpretation. The argument to not let site interpretation inhibit a site’s evolution is important when applying interpretation to newly built development.

New technology should also be used to get residents and visitors involved and interested in the history of the landscape. Smart phones, social media, QR codes and augmented reality apps are all examples of new technology that could be used at Altama or any other new rural residential development. I’On in Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina and Palmetto Bluff in Bluffton, South Carolina, have used new ideas and techniques in an attempt to make a place feel old. New residential development should take lessons and style from history but not attempt to make new places be old.

Economically, sources conclude that people’s desire for history, because it is a constant in a changing world, can translate to monetary value. This could apply to historic interpretation in new residential development by proving that even though the value of history is more difficult to define, the value is still there. If developers and local governments were convinced of this, they might be more inclined to prioritize the preservation and interpretation of history in projects. Altama’s colorful history, as well as

---
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its extensive remaining historic elements, make it a prime place for historic interpretation
to be used to increase the connection of residents to the land and make a profit for
developers
CHAPTER 3
ALTAMA: A HISTORY

Coastal History

The history of the Georgia coast goes back to the first Native American presence on the coast possibly as early as 10,000 B.C.E. The geography and climate has dictated how and where people settled in the area from the native populations through the present day. The Native Americans lived on the mainland coast and the barrier islands, and used the abundant resources of the ocean and coastal habitat to live comfortably until just before the arrival of Europeans. The Spanish, and later the British and the Germans, were drawn to Georgia’s coast for many of the same reasons that attracted the Indians who had lived there for thousands of years. The rivers provided transportation and sustenance and the climate was mild. The European settlers brought with them knowledge of war and agriculture, both of which were essential to scraping out a living in the sometimes hostile territory of southern Georgia.

Agriculture, and the slavery that enabled it, defined the Georgia coast until the Civil War, which left the area mostly deserted. During the early twentieth century wealthy industrialists from the North saw this largely deserted coastal landscape as their own playground and bought large amounts of land on which they built extravagant mansions for vacation homes. Naval stores, fishing and oysters have all been the main business of
the coast since Reconstruction. Tourism is now the main business of the coast bringing in money and development.

Native Americans occupied coastal Georgia as early as 10,000 B.C.E. until after European settlement. They made use of the abundant natural resources of the area, such as seafood from the ocean and rivers, and game animals from the maritime forests. They also found the tidal rivers and creeks ideal for transportation. The coastal occupants enjoyed relatively good health until corn became a more widespread food source. When the first Europeans arrived, the civilization was in a decline that would be highly accelerated with the introduction of disease.

The Europeans who first claimed the Georgia coast as their own were assisted by native people who were intimately familiar with the terrain and waterways. Many places on the coast still maintain some form of their original Native American names. Different native tribes often aligned themselves with Europeans in wars for territory on the coast. Soon, a combination of disease, war and unfair legislation pushed the original inhabitants of the land away from the coast.

The first Europeans to occupy the coast were the Spanish, followed closely by British. The Spanish established missions along the coast in the early to middle 1500s. In 1733, General James Oglethorpe established Savannah, and Frederica on St. Simons Island. Many different nationalities immigrated to the new colony, but the Scottish made up a significant proportion of new residents. They were preferred by Oglethorpe for their

---

knowledge of battle and defense rather than agricultural skill.\textsuperscript{85} After the Battle of Bloody Marsh on St. Simons Island, the Spanish left Georgia and concentrated their efforts in Florida. Oglethorpe was against slavery in the colony and most of the labor was done by colonists or their indentured servants. These indentured servants were mostly young men who paid for their passage to America by promising a certain number of years work. Many would later become land owners and planters once their servitude was complete.

Large plantations began to be established along the Georgia coast by the middle 1700s. Royal land grants given to friends of the crown were often bought by former indentured servants who quickly became the aristocracy of the South. Planters also moved from South Carolina to escape the tired soil exhausted by continuous cultivation with no rotation of crops.\textsuperscript{86} The amount of labor required to establish and sustain plantations of this size soon led to the repeal of the anti-slavery laws in 1750.\textsuperscript{87} The change of land ownership laws after the American Revolution and the use of slavery helped lead to the establishment of large plantations during the first half of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{88}

There were many advantages of settling on the largely untouched Georgia coast. The fertile barrier islands and tidewater rivers supported the lucrative crops of sea island cotton, rice and sugar. The temperate climate, cash crops, wealth and free labor led to a

\textsuperscript{85} James C. Bonner, \textit{A History of Georgia Agriculture 1732-1860} (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1964), 3

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Ibid.}, 17.

\textsuperscript{87} \textit{Ibid.}, 2.

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Ibid.}, 8.
tradition of agricultural experimentation that often led to failure.\textsuperscript{89} The navigable waterways surrounding these coastal plantations provided easy transport of crops to nearby ports of Savannah and Charleston. The cypress swamps, connected to major rivers, provided lumber for use and export.\textsuperscript{90}

Other influences on the Georgia coast at this time include culture brought from Africa with enslaved people, sugar plantations in Louisiana and the Caribbean and a growing sectionalism separating the South from the North. Slaves from Africa brought with them language, knowledge and customs that are still seen on the coast of Georgia today. Many had experience cultivating rice and food crops. Georgia plantation owners looked to Louisiana for examples of profitable sugar plantations when the price of sugar led to its experimental cultivation on the coast. The Southern society based on agriculture made possible by slave labor led to dissonance between the North and the South.

The Civil War brought an abrupt end to plantation life on the Georgia coast. Occupying Union forces led to an abandonment of plantations by their owners. After Sherman’s march to the sea he issued Field Order 15, which briefly turned over ownership of all coastal lands to the formerly enslaved workers who remained.\textsuperscript{91} This order was short lived and some plantation owners returned to attempt their old way of life under very different rules. The labor-intensive rice and cotton cultivation never found the footing it had when slave labor was available; consequently, many plantations fell further into ruin.

\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Ibid.}, 1.

\textsuperscript{90} \textit{Ibid.}, 2.

\textsuperscript{91} Special Field Orders, No. 15, Headquarters Military Division of the Mississippi, 16 Jan. 1865, Orders & Circulars, ser. 44, Adjutant General's Office, Record Group 94, National Archives.
The inexpensive and available land in the south began to interest wealthy northern industrialists around the turn of the century. Jekyll Island was bought and developed into a private summer retreat by a group that included J.P. Morgan, Joseph Pulitzer and William H. Vanderbilt.\(^\text{92}\) Cumberland Island to the south was bought by Carnegies for a winter home. Howard Earl Coffin, an automobile industrialist attracted to the coast because of its long flat beaches ideal for racing cars, at one point owned or partially owned Sapelo, St. Catherines and Sea island. These wealthy owners viewed the area’s history with a romantic fondness and often kept the ruins of past estates while also building new mansions and resorts. These large tracts of land were used as winter homes, hunting retreats and party islands through the stock market crash of 1929.\(^\text{93}\)

During the second half of the twentieth century the Georgia coast began to see increased development and tourism. Much of the land once privately owned by a few wealthy families was either sold to the government or taken over by foundations both with the intention of conservation. Other areas were developed into resorts, industry or residential areas. Paper companies, drawn to the Southeast by large areas of pine forest, built factories that employed many of the new residents of the area. Liberty ships were built in Brunswick during World War II and the city developed into an important port. The natural resources and history of the coast drew increasing numbers of tourists. Development and conservation are still active themes in the land use of coastal Georgia today.

---


\(^{93}\) Ibid., 262.
The Role of Altama in the History of Coastal Georgia

Altama plantation and its owners feature prominently into the historical narrative of the coast. Altama’s history is similar to Howfyl-Broadfield Plantation in Brunswick, Cannon’s Point Plantation on St. Simons Island, and other historic properties in the county. The very name “Altama,” meaning “the way to Tama,” is of Native American origin and shows the dependence on the waterways for transportation. Tama was a village on the Ogeechee River.94 This river combines with the Oconee to form the Altamaha River where Altama is located. The Guale Indians lived in this area and were known to settle in the coastal region especially along rivers.95 More archeological research is needed to determine if there were native settlements on Altama

Originally a land grant from the king, Altama and Hopeton plantations were bought and run by former indentured servants and Scotsmen James Hamilton and John Couper. These men and Couper’s son, James Hamilton Couper, made many important decisions that shaped the state of Georgia. Altama and Hopeton produced rice and sugar and were home to many innovations in agriculture. Like most other plantations in the area, Altama was largely abandoned after the Civil War, with only a couple unsuccessful efforts at making a living from agriculture such as a Shaker community that briefly established itself at Altama in an attempt to broaden the group’s membership in the South.

94 Florence Nisbet Marye, Garden History of Georgia, 1733-1933, ed. Hattie C. Rainwater (Atlanta: The Peachtree Garden Club, 1933), 47.

95 David Hurst Thomas, “Historic Period Indian Archaeology of the Georgia Coastal Zone” (Athens: The University of Georgia, 1993) 10.
During the early twentieth century a series of wealthy businessmen owned Altama and used the estate as a hunting retreat. These included William DuPont, Cater Woolford and finally Bill Jones of the Sea Island Company, a cousin of Howard E. Coffin. Sea Island Company owned many former plantations on St. Simons Island and developed much of the land into golf courses and a resort. Altama is now for sale with the potential for conservation and development.

Since the early 1900s, Altama has passed through many owners who used the land primarily as a hunting retreat. After the Shaker’s short occupation in 1898, Altama settled into its role as a hunting retreat and second home to various owners, including Alfred W. Jones and his Sea Island Company. The Jones family was the last owner before the land was sold to Stratford Land in 2010 for development. The company describes itself as “a well-capitalized private equity land group that has the philosophy of good stewardship and holding onto valuable land until the right time to earn money for its investors.” Although some of the property is protected from development as wetlands, and part of the Altamaha River Wildlife Management Area, most of the land is zoned for low-density residential development, which allows for up to three houses per acre.

The 6,000 acres, known as “Altama,” was and still is privately-owned. A cultural resource survey conducted by the county in 2006-2007 did not mention Altama
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Plantation, and a 2009 survey listed and described a house on the property that has been demolished for more than fifty years.99

**History of Altama**

Because Georgia was one of the original thirteenth colonies, it has an extensive colonial era history. With the establishment of Savannah and Fort Frederica by James Edward Oglethorpe in the 1730s, the coastal area of Georgia became a more enticing place to European settlers. In 1763, 2,000 acres south of the Altamaha River were granted to William Hopeton of South Carolina. His son, John Hopeton, inherited the land and eventually sold it to John Couper and James Hamilton, who continued to be associated with the land through the Civil War.

In 1816, John Couper and James Hamilton bought the 2,000-acre tract from John Hopeton.100 They called the land “Hopeton” after the original owners.101 Between 1816 and 1840 additional acreage was added to the plantation from time to time. Both Couper and Hamilton were already prominent landowners in the area and integral to the development and management of Hopeton. Although Hamilton and his family remained at least partial owners of Hopeton until after the Civil War, it was James Hamilton Couper who managed and worked the land. He was born on neighboring St. Simons Island to John Couper, also a planter.

---


101 Ibid.
John Couper owned Cannon’s Point Plantation on St. Simons Island. He came to America from Scotland in 1775 when he was fourteen years old as an indentured servant to a Savannah merchant.\textsuperscript{102} After paying off his indenture, Couper bought a plantation on the northern end of St. Simons Island and established his home there. It was there that Couper brought enslaved workers who grew mainly sea island cotton as a cash crop.

Couper was an avid agriculturalist and he grew many experimental crops at Cannon’s point, including olives, citrus, date palms, and mulberry for silk.\textsuperscript{103} He built what many considered to be one of the finest plantation houses in the region.\textsuperscript{104} Today tabby foundation ruins, as well as the brick kitchen and other structure ruins, still remain at Cannon’s Point. All of these remains have recently been purchased by the St. Simons Island Land Trust for protection and management in perpetuity.

John Couper entertained many visitors, some who stayed for months. He was known for his genial nature and hospitality.\textsuperscript{105} He hosted many visitors from all over the world including some famous guests such as Aaron Burr.\textsuperscript{106}

His carefree attitude was put to the test many times, as his finances were often in flux. In 1804 and 1825 entire crops of cotton were lost two years in a row to a hurricane and caterpillars.\textsuperscript{107} Bad weather also destroyed his citrus orchard and other cold-sensitive

\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
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crops. Because of unpredictable weather and Couper’s costly agricultural experimentation, many of his ventures failed. By 1827, Couper’s debt had increased so much that he sold his half of his investment in Hopeton to his partner and friend, James Hamilton.

By this time Couper’s eldest son, James Hamilton Couper (named for his partner and friend) was fully grown and managing Hopeton Plantation. Couper managed Hopeton and Altama Plantations from 1818 until shortly before the Civil War, and he contributed significantly to the history of the landscape. Altama still contains evidence of Couper’s agricultural practice and two homes.

Unlike his father, who was known for his jovial and gregarious nature, James Hamilton Couper was a serious, hardworking manager. He was born at Cannon’s Point in 1794, the first of six children. He was sent to Yale University to be educated and he returned to help manage his father’s properties in 1818. James Hamilton Couper proved to be a much better businessman than his father, and he successfully managed Altama-Hopeton, in addition to other properties throughout his life.

Altama and Hopeton first were cultivated for sea island cotton. The difference between sea island and short staple cotton is in the length of the fibers and the different growing conditions that are required for each species. Short staple cotton was used to
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make work shirts and could be grown throughout the state. Sea island cotton was used to make fine lace and could only flourish on the coast.

Couper decided in the 1820s that sugar had serious potential in the Southeast and began to experiment with sugar cane in 1825. When he determined that sugar could be a serious cash crop for Hopeton, Couper researched sugar plantations in Louisiana and the Caribbean and designed a mill to be built at Hopeton.  

The sugar mill was designed by Couper and built by his slaves in 1829. It was one of the largest sugar mills on the East Coast in terms of physical size, and it contained steam power equipment shipped from England.  

Sugar cane never produced like Couper expected, and by 1831 rice became the main crop of Hopeton. Luckily, the sugar mill also could be used a rice mill.

The coastal area of the Southeast, from South Carolina to northern Florida, was perfectly suited for rice cultivation because the tides could be used to aid in the flooding and draining of fields. Because of the concave shape of the Southeastern coast, the tidal variance is much greater than on other parts of the eastern seaboard. It is common for tides to rise and fall 6 to 8 feet. This rise and fall affects the water level on the Altamaha River that borders the rice fields at Hopeton. Because the plantation is located several miles upriver from the ocean, the water has lost its salinity, allowing natural flooding and draining of fresh water for crops.

Couper used the natural aid of the tides to flood and drain fields by dividing the fields into smaller segments using levees and canals. He also had his slaves construct a
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main canal that connected the river to the fields, mill and house to facilitate the transportation of goods. In preparation for making rice his main crop, Couper spent time in Holland in 1825 learning the best ways to control water with canals, dykes, and locks.\textsuperscript{116} He designed locks for his canals that allow him to control flooding and draining.

In addition to using canals, Couper developed a unique portable rail system for transporting goods within the plantation. Wooden rails could be moved to enable carts to move goods from field to mill, within the mill, or from the mill to canal to be taken down the river.\textsuperscript{117} This was much more efficient than relying on enslaved workers to carry goods on their backs.

Because planters in South Carolina had exhausted their land, more settlers began to move south to Georgia.\textsuperscript{118} Couper saw the effects of depleted soil and developed planting plans that ensured the soil stayed replenished and still produced enough profit. Although rice was the main crop at Hopeton by 1831, there were always other types of crops being grown for sale and consumption.\textsuperscript{119} Corn, peas, pumpkins and other plants were rotated to keep his land fertile. Crop rotation later became standard practice, but Couper was an early practitioner of the technique.\textsuperscript{120}

Besides agricultural practices, Couper made significant contributions to other areas of history while he lived at Altama. In 1831 he was asked to help lead a survey expedition to draw the final border between Georgia and Florida from the Alabama line
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to the origin of the St. Mary’s River.\textsuperscript{121} He had a passion for paleontology and gave lectures on fossils he found in Glynn County. He amassed a great collection of fossils that he gave to the College of Charleston Museum of Natural History.\textsuperscript{122} Couper is partly responsible for the development of railroads in Georgia. He was part of a committee that advised the state legislature about the possibility of an elaborate system of canals within the state of Georgia that would extend to the Mississippi River.\textsuperscript{123} Because of his canal experience, Couper advised the legislature to instead invest in railroads as the soil in Georgia was not ideal for large-scale canal systems. This was a bold move considering there were only twenty-two miles of railroad in the entire world at the time.\textsuperscript{124} Later Couper lent his expertise (and slave labor) to the construction of the local Brunswick-Altamaha canal, which was never successfully operated.

In 1833, Couper left Altama to oversee development of two mills for producing cotton seed oil, in which he saw a potential market before anyone else. He built mills in Mississippi and Alabama, but had trouble with both management and convincing farmers to save their seed for oil.\textsuperscript{125} Although he eventually abandoned the mills with a loss of profit, cotton seed oil later became an important commodity used in a diverse array of products.
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Another of Couper’s hobbies was architecture. He designed the mansion at Hopeton and the sugar mill, both built in 1828, and the later and smaller Altama Plantation house built in 1857 (fig. 2). Neither house still exists, and the sugar mill is in a state of crumbling ruins (fig. 5). The one lasting testament to Couper’s design skills is Christ Church in downtown Savannah, Georgia. He designed this Greek Revival building in 1840 and it is still in use.  

Couper was only able to succeed because of the enslavement of hundreds of workers who built and worked the rice fields, and constructed the houses and outbuildings according to Couper’s design. Couper owned or managed 1,500 enslaved workers at the height of his success. Although many visitors to the plantation wrote about his benevolence as a slave owner, including an account of Couper rising from the dinner table to shake an old servant’s hand, this benevolence only extended so far. Whipping was still the standard punishment for disobedient slaves. The reputation for benevolence came from the maximum number of lashes being 24 at Hopeton versus 50 on a neighboring plantation. Couper also sold slaves if they refused to obey rules or if they attempted to run away.

Like most Southern planters at the time, Couper saw slavery as a necessary evil and a kind of education and protection for the “less developed race.” There are few
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firsthand accounts of slave life at Hopeton, but some information can be found in visitors’ accounts of plantation life. Most of the time the slaves at Hopeton were required to work from 6:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., unless they finished their tasks early. They could use their free time to cultivate their own crops or engage in other money-making endeavors, and they could sell their products back to Couper or at any other market.\textsuperscript{132} Couper built a hospital to treat his sick slaves and brought in preachers to tend to their religious needs. Some were taught to read and write at Hopeton, despite this being against the law in Georgia at the time.\textsuperscript{133}

Although Couper opposed secession, he never considered emancipation of his slaves to be an option, and when Georgia left the Union he became an ardent Confederate. His five sons joined the Confederate army and two died of disease before the war was over.\textsuperscript{134} By 1862 the Union Army occupied the Georgia coast except for Savannah, and Couper and his family left Altama for good. They spent the remainder of the war at their house in Ware County, Georgia. With his flawed but comfortable way of life over and two sons dead, Couper slipped into a depression that characterized the end of his life. James Hamilton Couper died in 1866, just a few years after suffering an incapacitating stroke.\textsuperscript{135}

After the war, Hopeton and Altama were in a state of ruin, as were most plantations in the area. Couper’s sons briefly attempted to restore the plantation after their
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father’s death in 1866, but they did not succeed.\textsuperscript{136} Most resident slaves left the plantation and dispersed into the surrounding communities. More research is needed to determine where the slaves and their descendants settled. The Coupers remained absentee owners and the plantation, and house sat empty and deteriorating for several decades after the Civil War.

In 1898 began an unexpected phase of Altama’s history. In this year the entire property was bought by the United Society of Believers in Christ’s Second Appearing, also known as Shakers, of the Union Village community in Ohio. The Shakers are a Christian sect that began in England in 1747. They escaped religious persecution by coming to America in 1774 and enjoyed many decades of success and growth. The group’s guiding principles include celibacy, equality of the sexes, and simple hard work. Although marriage and having children were prohibited, the Shaker’s numbers rose steadily through conversion and adoptions of children who were then raised by the group. Most of the group’s success was limited to communities in New England and Kentucky.\textsuperscript{137} By 1850 their numbers began to taper; expanding southward was seen by many Shakers as a last attempt to broaden their membership. The Union Village community sent some of its elders southward to establish communities in Glynn and Camden Counties in Georgia.

In late January of 1896 the Shakers bought Altama and Hopeton Plantations, as well as additional acreage, for around 26,000 dollars.\textsuperscript{138} The \textit{Brunswick News} reported the
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sale as well as the property’s neglected state in February 1898. Because the house and the land were in poor condition, the Shakers planned to restore the 1857 plantation house and reclaim the land for livestock and crops.\textsuperscript{139} This was not an unrealistic goal for this group who valued hard and honest work above most else. Their maxim of “hands to work and hearts to God” would have been necessary when dealing with the overgrown rice fields and decrepit house.\textsuperscript{140} An abundance of livestock and goods were sent down to the outpost by the Union Village as soon as the group was established on the property.\textsuperscript{141} The group’s claim that a $10,000 dollar crop of rice was being harvested in 1898 seems suspiciously optimistic, considering the state of the landscape and the duration of their stay.\textsuperscript{142}

Perhaps the burden of restoring Altama was too much for the small band of followers; they remained on the property only from January 1898 until July of the same year. One pair of followers even left Altama, and the sect, to get married in Charleston, South Carolina.\textsuperscript{143} There were never more than twenty members living at Altama, and most had left by April. Some departed for Ohio and some moved one county south to the more established Shaker community of White Oak, Georgia.\textsuperscript{144} Altama was always considered a branch of White Oak, which continued with limited success for several more
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 years. Altama was eventually sold in 1902 to John W. Crow of Ohio. Although the Shakers only occupied Altama plantation for a matter of months, their presence is an interesting twist in the already important history of this particular landscape.

Because the Brunswick News reported on the sale of Altama and Hopeton, we know some specific details about the condition of the property at that time. Apparently the Hopeton Plantation house had burned but its ruins still were standing. The article described the Hopeton house as being positioned in an alley of trees which had fifty yards between rows. It also described the location of other buildings: “A quarter mile from the house was the hospital and to the right above a group of cedars was the sugar mill.”

The location of this hospital is not currently known, but the sugar mill ruins remain on the property today. The Altama Plantation house is described as a “brick, two story manse.” The house also was described to have been built on the “one hill in Glynn County,” which is still evident even though the house no longer stands. Further examination of the site is needed to determine if there are any physical remains on the landscape from this brief period of Shaker ownership.

After the Shakers sold the property to John W. Crow the land went through a series of owners who mostly used the property as a hunting retreat and vacation home. Crow sold the property to Frank Caldwell in 1904, who in turn sold it to William Du Pont ten years later. Du Pont sold Altama to Cator Woolford in 1933.
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William Du Pont was a member of the prominent Du Pont family who became known for horse racing and politics. Along with Altama, Du Pont at one time owned Montpelier, the home of President James Madison. Du Pont is responsible for giving the entire Hopeton-Altama property the name “Altama” and making improvements to the property such as adding a third story to the Altama Plantation house (fig. 1). A field thought to be cleared by Du Pont for use as a horse racing track was later turned into an airstrip for small aircraft and remains cleared today. William du Pont died at Altama January 22, 1928, and his children later sold to Cator Woolford.

During Woolford’s ownership from 1933 to 1945, the property underwent some important changes. Woolford built a pool, play house and formal garden next to the 1857 plantation house (figs. 3 and 4; Appendix A). More research is needed to determine how many out buildings and other landscape features were added during this period, such as multiple barns and caretakers houses. After Woolford’s death in 1944 the property is sold to Alfred W. Jones of the Sea Island Company.

Sea Island Company owned several other antebellum plantation sites on nearby St. Simons Island. Sea Island Company developed one of these, Retreat Plantation, into a golf course and resort area while retaining elements of the plantation such as tabby ruins and some structures. The other former plantation owned by Sea Island Company was Cannon’s Point Plantation, which was John Couper’s land before the Civil War. This property was left undeveloped.

Jones bought Altama for his family’s use as a retreat and hunting land. During his ownership the 1857 plantation house was razed and an addition to the playhouse was built to accommodate more guests. Other elements were maintained such as the gardens, pool and barns. Since 1945 several cabins have been built on the property, as well as oat patches and permanent hunting stands.

After Jones’ death in 1982 the property passed to his four children who sold the land to their own company (Sea Island Co.) for management purposes. This transfer of ownership did nothing to change the use of the land until the recession hit in 2009. Sea Island Company went bankrupt and was forced to sell most of its property, including Altama. Fortunately, the Cannon’s Point property remained undeveloped and it was bought and permanently preserved by the St. Simons Island Land Trust.

Altama Plantation, like much of Glynn County and the South, has undergone significant change since European settlers and African slaves first began to work the land during the mid-1700s. The virgin forest was cut for fields; the fields have since grown over and, in some cases, been cut again for lumber. The marsh and swamp have been cleared, drained, and then abandoned to become swamp again. Houses have been built, burned and completely razed. Nonetheless, there remains physical and intangible history on Altama Plantation that is invaluable to understanding its history.

**Remaining Historic Elements**

Little remains of the period of Native American settlement before Europeans arrived. There may be archaeological remnants on the property, but few if any have been
specifically documented on Altama. The Altamaha River is in the same general place and was probably as important to natives as it was to later settlers. The name “Altama” and “Altamaha” are both derivations of Native American words that are thought to mean “the way to Tama,” a village on the Ocmulgee.¹⁵⁰

The Spanish came to the area during the late 1500s, long before British settlers arrived, although very little remains of this period in the landscape. Well into the middle of the twentieth century, the tabby ruins of nearby Elizafield Plantation, and perhaps ruins on Altama, were thought to be Spanish mission remains. However, these were later proven to date from the nineteenth century.¹⁵¹ Most of the conflict between Spanish and British soldiers occurred on St. Simons Island or other sites south of Glynn County.

Many nineteenth-century built landscape elements are still present. These include the extensive ruins of the sugar mill, chimney and foundation ruins in Hopeton, the canals in the rice fields, and remnants of locks and other canal structures (see Appendix B). Noteworthy landscape elements from this era include the rice fields and drainage ditches that leave patterns one can still see from satellite photographs (see Appendix B). The hill on which the Altama Plantation house was built is still recognizable, and it is possibly still the highest point in Glynn County. It is possible that some vegetation survives from this era, including live oak trees, gardenias at Hopeton, sago palms, and magnolias (see Appendix B). Elements such as cypress swamp and pine barren were not planted by owners but could reflect past conditions. Further research into the remaining vegetation is needed. The road that leads to the Altama plantation house site also could date from the
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nineteenth century, as well as other roads, such as the possible carriage road to
Hammersmith dock on the creek.

After the American Civil War, there were few major changes to the landscape
until the 1930s, when the pool, play house, gardens and other features were built. All of
these features remain in good to fair condition as of the author’s last visit to the site in
2010. The airstrip dates to the 1910s when it was used a horse racing field. It was later
adapted for use by small aircraft after 1945. Other remaining elements include an extra
wing added to the playhouse in the 1950s, the tennis court, oat patches for hunting,
artificial ponds, and planted pines for timber. There are many examples of surviving
ornamental vegetation from the early to mid-twentieth century including boxwood,
camellias, oaks, and magnolias. These surviving historic landscape features could be used
in future development and interpretation to enable residents to learn about the history of
their home sites and to allow developers to profit by marketing the site’s unique past.
Figure 1: Altama Plantation House with Du Pont addition, Jones family archives, c. 1940.

Figure 2: Altama Plantation House, Jones family archives, c. 1880.
Figure 3: Formal garden, Jones family archives, c. 1940.
Figure 4: Playhouse pool area, Jones family archives, c. 1940.
Figure 5: Sugar mill ruins, Jones family archives, c. 1930.
CHAPTER 4
OVERVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND PLAYERS

Development Process

The process of developing vacant land into a residential subdivision requires many steps and players. The real estate development process has been simplified many times into flow charts with varying degrees of complexity. The basic process consists of six steps: (1) idea; (2) feasibility; (3) pre-construction; (4) construction; (5) stabilization; (6) asset management/sale.\textsuperscript{152} Feasibility of the project consists of determining a site’s best and highest use.\textsuperscript{153} The goal of real estate is to gain a profit. The government, community and developer all have roles within this process.\textsuperscript{154}

Other factors in the development process include existing infrastructure, existing zoning, and environmental or historical factors. For example, if land to be developed was home to an endangered species or contained the remains of Native Americans then certain steps would have to be taken to get development plans approved. The existing infrastructure, such as water and sewer systems, dictate how many units an area can support.\textsuperscript{155}
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If the land is not zoned, the owner must apply for zoning or rezoning. The owners hire professional engineering or planning firms to produce the planned development documents which include information on lot size, setbacks and other specifics. This document goes to the local planning board and then the commission, which approves or denies the plans based on any future land use or comprehensive plan that is in place for the county. The protection and promotion of historic resources is up to the owner, but could be encouraged with incentives such as a similar incentive in place in Glynn County that gives credit for keeping large trees. The government, community and developers can work together to ensure new development is high quality and respects natural and historic resources.

Development Players

The government, community and owners/developers all have a place in the development process. The developers have the vision, capital and preliminary plans to create a profitable subdivision. The government provides a framework of planning, zoning and regulation to which new developments must adhere. The community has the chance and responsibility to speak for or against development plans before they are approved. The community also provides the demand for this product and can let the local government and developers know what kind of growth they prefer by supporting those developments that they feel are responsible and right for the area.
Government

Introduction

There are various ways that the government can be part of a sustainable solution to the problem of characterless and poorly planned new residential development. From a national level down to a local level, governments have implemented regulations and incentives that affect the building of new subdivisions. Planning, zoning and the use of incentives are all ways to influence developers to use the historic resources on a landscape in their design. There are challenges as well as opportunities for the government to regulate development of historic landscapes.

The national government has had a say in the planning and settlement of undeveloped land since the country was founded. Regulations giving pioneers a certain number of acres if they improve the land in a set time, or planning cities like Savannah, Georgia, are historic examples of higher powers regulating land use. By the 1920s the automobile had opened up a wider range of settlement for those working in cities.

The Standard State Zoning Enabling Act published by the Advisory Committee on City Planning and Zoning formed by the Coolidge administration was the model for state legislation. The Standard City Planning Enabling Act, published in 1928, covered six subjects dealing with planning and zoning: (1) the organization and power of planning commissions, which was directed to prepare and adopt a master plan; (2) the content of the master plan; (3) provisions for a master street plan; (4) provisions for approval of all public improvements by the planning commission; (5) control of private subdivision of land; and (6) provisions for the creation of regional planning commissions.
The federal government has implemented regulations to prevent federal projects from causing harm to historic resources. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) requires a review and mitigation for any federally funded project that could affect historic elements. The National Register of Historic Places is managed by the federal government, but the register does not have regulatory power over sites it designates. Other regulatory measures, such as enforcing design guidelines, are left up to the state or local government.

The state government does not have the same power as the federal government over historic resources on land to be developed. Any federally-funded projects through the state are subject to section 106 review. The Department of Transportation is an example of a state agency that uses federal funds in projects. There is a State Register of Historic Places run by the State Historic Preservation Office, but these programs have little regulatory power on their own.

The state or local government can use its power to encourage owners to preserve and interpret history in new residential areas through nominations of sites to the national or state register of historic places. Even if a subdivision is being built on a historic landscape, the state or local government could purchase any piece of land that holds particular historic significance, nominate it to the register and develop easements and other restrictions to preserve it. The local government will be more likely to be invested in the historic resources of their own community that the state might overlook.
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The local government has more influence over the preservation of historic resources in new residential development than state or federal governments. Many local governments are struggling to maintain a desired level of growth while also maintaining the character of the community or region. It is often difficult to convince the necessary people of the need for changes in policy and priorities that would allow for a smarter and more sustainable future.

The local government has a high level of power in the issue of historic landscape development, but it may take a long time to implement changes to policy. By using zoning, planning, incentives to developers and other policy the local government can exert some control over new residential development. The government also has the power to market their area to visitors and people interested in moving there. In areas with remaining physical history, heritage tourism can be used as a tool to bring money to the area. Decisions about policy and zoning could be difficult to implement quickly and efficiently due to number of people and steps it requires. The local government upholds regulatory measures like covenants, easements and design guidelines put in place by property owners and developers.

Ways to Regulate

Local governments use planning as a way to control growth and identify priorities within the community. The government makes a land use plan for the county that is revised regularly to outline where the county should be developed and how. This specifies green space, zoning, places with potential for growth and any other uses. The
land use plan is part of the comprehensive plan for the county which includes identifying the goals of the county based on its character and existing infrastructure. As part of these plans, firms are hired to assess natural and cultural resources within the county. Historic resources are documented, and goals for their protection are identified. Planning could be helpful to keeping history in new residential areas because it is a way for the government to clarify character areas and preservation goals to potential developers and the community.

Zoning regulation is one way for the local government to exercise control over development. Zoning laws dictate what kind of development can go where based on growth plans, infrastructure and opinions of government officials. Sometimes these laws are not updated to reflect a community’s changing goals. Zoning regulation does not always take into account the character of the area or all the ways that the development will affect the community. Rewriting the zoning laws could allow for other types of development that would promote sustainable growth. These are positive changes that will require support and cooperation from the community to have an effect. Possible changes include zoning for Traditional Neighborhood Development style, mixed use zoning, thinking about what is desirable over what is possible, and allowing for recreational trails and other infrastructure in wildlife management areas.

The government cannot force property owners to protect or interpret the historic elements on a landscape. They can, however, motivate owners and developers through incentives. This can already be seen in some places with monetary reward for keeping large trees when developing land. Historic Preservation incentives include tax freezes on
income producing properties that are restored according to the Secretary of the Interiors Standards. The same idea could be applied to maintaining historic elements or providing interpretation in new subdivisions.

**Strengths/Weaknesses of Regulation**

The local government has many tools at its disposal to encourage the use of historic site interpretation in new residential development. The government has a responsibility to the community to protect the identity of the area through the use of planning, zoning and incentives. The time and motivation it takes to implement changes in policy that could help preserve local history and character could be an obstacle. The local government’s regulations imposed to protect and promote history do not have to be seen as restricting, since they can still allow for new development and can increase jobs. The more history is protected and made available, the more potential there is for history to be seen as an investment that can bring economic growth to the community. In order for many of these decisions to be made, the government must have support and motivation from the community and land owners.

**Community**

**Introduction**

The local community has an influence and a stake in many of the decisions made concerning historic properties and resources in the area. The community and various groups within it have the potential to be part of the solution to the problem of losing
character and history in new residential development. The community is a large and diverse group that includes the local government and developers. It has power as a whole and as smaller entities such as land trusts, historical societies, nonprofit organizations, homeowners associations and individuals. A community’s motivations for keeping the historic fabric of a landscape might differ from those of government and developers. The community might be concerned with retaining historic resources primarily because they can add to sense of place, belonging and identity which all improve quality of life rather than focusing on profit potential. The community is not only the prime benefactor of the preservation of history through site interpretation, but also an important influence.

Groups

Land trusts, historical societies and nonprofit organizations have many tools at their disposal to influence the use of historic site interpretation. The main function of organizations formed by the community is to educate and raise money for a cause. These groups often raise money and get grants to support causes such as restoration of a building or preservation of green space. Homeowners’ associations can regulate activities and design in subdivisions once they are built. This kind of organization makes decisions about how a neighborhood should look and function. Regulatory measures such as design guidelines and covenants can be instrumental in preserving the character of a neighborhood or historic landscape. Groups within the community can have direct power over historic resources and the implementation of interpretation through fee simple
purchase of land or buying and holding easements. Members of the community can also influence the protection of history in development through individual efforts.

*Individuals*

Community members need not be a part of official organizations to change how history is dealt with in new residential areas. The power of supply and demand in a free market system will dictate developer’s and government’s priorities. The more the community voices its opinion about the development of this area, the more likely the local government is to prioritize these kinds of changes. Individuals can influence how developers prioritize the inclusion of site interpretation in new development by being willing to pay more for character adding features. As consumers they have some control over the nature of new products.

*Strengths and Weaknesses*

The community’s indirect power over keeping history in new development has its strengths and weaknesses. Groups such as land trusts and historical societies can educate people to make better choices when buying new homes or investing money. These types of groups can also raise money to buy and protect historic resources. Homeowners associations can protect historic elements or implement interpretation but only after the developer has chosen to integrate that history into the design of the subdivision. Members of the community might not have much power in directly influencing each developer, but collectively, the demand for character enhancing features like historic or natural elements
will lead to their protection. If people show they will pay more for a home in a responsively developed neighborhood, developers will accommodate them to maximize profit.

Developers

Introduction

Developers have direct control over any historic properties they choose to purchase. There are many ways that they can be part of a profitable and sustainable solution to the problem of loss of history in new residential development. Developers can use site interpretation in their projects to foster identity, promote heritage marketing, and provide mitigation of the loss of historic resources. This should be an important part of any owner’s plan for new residential areas within historic landscapes because it can be beneficial in terms of economics and public relations.

The difficulty in defining the value of historic resources should not discourage developers from using heritage marketing to make a greater profit from their projects. There are many resources that are available at little cost to developers to assist in preserving history and implementing site interpretation. Local community groups, the local government, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) can provide advice, services, and incentives for developers. By preserving what history they can, and using historic site interpretation to mitigate unavoidable losses, developers can make more profit and cultivate a sympathetic public image.157
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**Differing Views**

There are many different types of people who choose to be developers, all with one common goal: to make a profit. Differences in education, priorities and location lead to different decisions on what the best way to make a profit is. Some developers will have the added motivation of being a part of the community they are working in and therefore also benefit more from retaining history. Other developers could come from elsewhere and not have as much personal concern for the retention of historic character in a project.

Historic site interpretation in new residential development can provide developers with more profit by increasing the place’s cultural capital. Calculating the economic value of history is a challenge as many historic or cultural values are intangible. Most people value some element of history in their environment, whether in a direct or abstract way. When those in the position of making money from the design and sale of new residential areas recognize the earning potential of incorporating the site’s history into design, they will benefit monetarily, and consumers will benefit in other ways. People will be more willing to invest and buy land or homes where heritage is evident as it improves quality of life.

In the face of characterless sprawl that has dominated new residential development, people are more willing than ever to invest in a place with notable, visible
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history. Developers can both profit from history and mitigate the loss of historic resources by designing their projects to include elements of history.

**Opportunities and Challenges**

Because of the freedom land owners have over their own property, there are many opportunities for developers to implement historic preservation and interpretation in their projects. The challenge is convincing developers that the extra effort it takes to use history and interpretation in new design will be worth it because of the profit a high quality development will make. By leaving ruins or putting in interpretive signage, developers increase the property value of each lot. Owners who are willing to spend extra time on each part of the development process to produce a high quality place to live will make more money and increase the character of the community.

---

CHAPTER 5

OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF INTERPRETATION OF HISTORIC RESOURCES IN NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

There are many opportunities and challenges to interpreting historic resources in new residential development. Each facet of the process described by this thesis holds potential for success and failure of preserving the history of a place. After identifying the opportunities and challenges that can be found in the subjects of identity/sense of place, interpretation, mitigation, heritage marketing and the development process and players, they will be applied to the application site: Altama Plantation.

Identity and Sense of Place

Opportunities

The opportunities and incentives for maintaining a sense of place through historic site interpretation are both intangible and concrete. The intangible values and opportunities include the wellness and happiness of residents and visitors. The actual value of sense of place can be seen in profits. People will take better care of their home and community if they feel it is worth more. People will pay more when they feel something is a better value.\textsuperscript{161}

History and the landscape have a strong link to a sense of place and identity. A sense of personal and community identity is believed to be important to quality of life, as well as fostering a sense of stewardship toward the environment. Being connected to one's past is an essential element to being fully cognizant of a sense of identity and belonging.\footnote{Graham and Howard, \textit{Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity}.} A connection to the past can be provided when the community members share the same spatial experiences with previous occupants of the landscape throughout history.\footnote{Lamme, \textit{America's Historic Landscapes}, 179.} It is not just the landscape that provides a sense of place, but also the people associated with it.\footnote{Sopher, “The Landscape of Home,” 136.} Social connections are formed through shared use of a landscape.

The formation of identity and sense of place is extremely important to the quality of life of individuals, as well as to the collective well-being of the community. A feeling of belonging that comes from identity and involvement in community pursuits can lead to a sense of stewardship that will add further protection to historic resources and their interpretation.\footnote{Kristin Litz, and Denise Mitten, "Inspiring Environmental Stewardship: Developing a Sense of Place, Critical Thinking Skills, and Ecoliteracy to Establish an Environmental Ethic of Care," \textit{Pathways: The Ontario Journal Of Outdoor Education} 25, no. 2 (Winter 2013): 5, \textit{Education Research Complete}, EBSCOhost (accessed November 22, 2013).}

Heritage that is present in an area provides a reference point to remind consumers who are dealing with an uncertain world that some things can remain relatively constant.\footnote{Misiura, \textit{Heritage Marketing}, 10.} When people are reminded of the history of a place they are reminded of their own desire to be remembered after they are gone. If consumers can see the marks of
those who were there before on a landscape, then maybe they also will be remembered long after they are gone. If they support the preservation of historical elements by buying homes in neighborhoods where residents are sensitive to the issue of maintaining historic character, then they will be helping to provide a historic context for future generations.\textsuperscript{167}

To provide incentive for preserving character areas state and local governments could implement a program like the Georgia Green Space Program which gives funds to local governments who show a commitment to preserving green space.\textsuperscript{168} This program:

Promotes the voluntary adoption, by such counties and cities, of policies and rules, which enables them to preserve at least 20 percent of the county's land area as connected and open greenspace which can be used for informal recreation and natural resource protection. The permanent protection of such lands enhances a community's quality of life and its economic competitiveness and, therefore; should be considered as part of the necessary infrastructure for a community's development, as are roads, water supply, and sewage. As such, the program provides a mechanism for local governments to incorporate greenspace into their long-term planning for development. Therefore, planning for a local greenspace program is unique to the needs of that community.

The same framework could be adapted for preserving and interpreting historic elements in new development.

The local government is key to establishing and maintaining community and regional identity in an area. The people involved in government make decisions about the

\textsuperscript{167} Throsby, “Seven Questions,” 17.

\textsuperscript{168} Senate Bill 399 (codified as Official Code of Georgia Annotated Sec. 36-22-1 et seq.) http://www1.gadnr.org/greenspace/description.html
character of the community and how to maintain it through projects, funding and incentives. Each member of the government is also an individual community member who benefits from and adds to the community’s identity and sense of place.

Local non-profits could work with government officials to protect more resources. This would add character and value to the area while not restricting development. Historic landscapes are filled with remnants of the built environment, as well as with human-made patterns within the natural environment, that can facilitate a connection with history. To destroy these historic landscapes is to erase the most prominent and easy connections to a community’s heritage.

Challenges

The biggest challenge to identity through interpretation in developments is the intangible value versus the real cost of implementation. The term “sense of place” has been described as “an intangible characteristic of a locality that makes that place attractive to people,” and “understanding the environment close to where you live but not beyond it.” Before modern ease of mobility, generations of people would live on the same land and almost unconsciously became connected to the place through shared experiences and memories. Currently, developers must work harder to provide a way for communities to feel like they are connected to their homes.

---
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To feel a sense of belonging to a place, one symbolically defines oneself by certain physical and social qualities of that place. Many people in the development process do not take sense of place into account when planning.

It is also difficult to identify what elements of a landscape’s long history to include in interpretation. Because each individual is looking at remnants and records on the landscape through unique lenses tinted by their individuality, the past looks different to every person. Even though each person's views of the past are slightly different, a collective knowledge of past events or scenes is important nonetheless. It provides guidance and validation of one’s place in the present, as well as an escape from uncertainties that are inherent in the present.

Opportunities

Site interpretation is a visible and easily accessible way for all members of a community to learn about the history of a landscape. Site interpretation could help residents learn the history of a recently developed landscape that would otherwise only be thought of as “new” and devoid of meaning. Encouraging site interpretation in new development is one way to promote growth, while also retaining historic integrity. Even if historic buildings or landscape features are removed because of new development plans, interpretation can provide a way for observers to remember and appreciate what used to be on the property. This retention of history can then be highlighted by the local government when promoting the unique qualities of the area. Community groups could

\[170\] McDowell, “Heritage, Memory and Identity,” 38.
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implement interpretive elements at historic sites they own, or offer to design and
implement interpretation in development for free. Elements of site interpretation, such as
signage, recreational activities/areas and education, inform residents about their home.
This adds character and value to the landscape, bringing in people and money to the area.

Challenges

There are many challenges to interpretation including the cost of implementation
and choosing what to interpret. Though interpretation would add value to a landscape,
that value is intangible and difficult to determine. Some aspects of a places history might
be uncomfortable or polarizing and tact would be needed when dealing with sensitive
subjects like violence or oppression. History and heritage often provide a context for the
present, and it can be difficult to reconcile the negative aspects. The desire to escape from
unpleasant elements of one’s past and present lead to a glorification of a selective past,
unrealistic nostalgia, and a longing for “the good old days.”¹⁷² But even the
uncomfortable elements of history are valuable in creating a sense of belonging in the
present. Both the negative and positive lessons from the past are most easily perceived
through physical reminders such as interpretive signage or historic elements.¹⁷³

¹⁷² Lowenthal, “Age and Artifact: Dilemmas of Appreciation,” 104.
¹⁷³ Ibid., 108.
Mitigation

Opportunities

Through assessment, analysis and federal funding, the goal of mitigation is to protect, restore and sometimes replace damaged properties. Mitigation tactics similar to those used for environmental conservation could be applied to historic preservation and interpretation in new developments. The definition of mitigation is “to make less severe or painful.”\footnote{Mitigation,” Merriam-Webster, Inc., 2013, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mitigate.} This can apply to a wide range of subjects including environmental, disaster and risk mitigation. As it applies to historic preservation, mitigation deals with the loss of historic and cultural property.

There are many agencies who use different methods to mitigate the loss of historic elements due to disaster. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the National Park Service (NPS) both have guidelines for the mitigation of the destruction of historic properties due to disaster. FEMA, SHPOs and the NPS use similar mitigation methods. Traditional mitigation methods include the recovery and curation of archaeological data, photographing, and measured drawings of buildings or landscapes to be destroyed.\footnote{U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guideline (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2002), http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/nps28/28chap8.htm} The Historic American Building Survey (HABS), Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) and the Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) are all NPS programs that facilitate the recording of historic resources in the U.S. The National Park Service also has measures to mitigate loss of historic resources due to


federally-funded projects. These are specified in Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which states:

The head of any Federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed Federal or federally assisted undertaking in any State and the head of any Federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any Federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any license, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register. The head of any such Federal agency shall afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation established under Title II of this Act a reasonable opportunity to comment with regard to such undertaking.176

Recent approaches to mitigation are more creative and involve more than just preserving records of the historic resource. These methods include assisting in the development of local preservation plans, development of educational materials like websites or apps, or developing historic property management plans.177

Examples of creative mitigation can be found in a number of places and projects across the country. The Grand Canyon park management website includes education,
outreach and adaptive management as ways to creatively mitigate negative impacts of weather and visitor use on the park and visitor experience.\textsuperscript{178}

The Georgia DOT anticipated that looting would be a problem at an archeological data recovery site in a road expansion project in Bartow County. They partnered with the Department of Natural Resources to sponsor a seminar with local police about archeological resource protection and looting. The officers were educated about how to identify unauthorized activity at the site and about the laws protecting archaeological resources. Because of this education, an officer was able to identify a looter and make an arrest.\textsuperscript{179}

Another example of a creative mitigation strategy in Georgia is the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site Education Program, which has partnered with the Georgia Department of Transportation (DOT) to help kids understand their area’s history through archeology. Hands-on activities dealing with field methods and excavation are meant to spark interest in kids as well as fulfill obligations of the Georgia DOT.\textsuperscript{180}

In Washington State the DOT, along with a local community, used interpretation to mitigate the adverse effects of construction in a historic district. They developed an interpretive center that would draw people to a historic neighborhood and educate them
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about the significance of the area as well as the necessity of the construction project. The interpretive center was more active than just a panel or brochure. It drew people into the area, which not only educated more locals but helped local businesses that were isolated by the construction attract customers. Whatever the method, mitigation should serve the public by ensuring that historic resources are not forgotten when they are damaged or lost.

Interpretation could provide a way for the community to be involved with mitigation. People would be able to see and understand what resources were damaged or lost. Interactive interpretation that involves and educates the community could inspire people to treat what elements remain with respect. Examples of this could be lectures, interpretive centers with exhibits, workshops or other hands-on ways to get educated.

Site interpretation that is planned and executed by the government or developers could be used as a form of mitigation in historic landscapes. Citizens could contribute oral histories of the place, artifacts and relics, or time and money to establish this kind of mitigation. Unlike mitigation efforts such as HABS, HAER, and HALS documentation, these records of the community’s history could be easily accessed by local residents and visitors to provide education and inspiration for further learning.

Although mitigation of the loss of historic properties is usually associated with federally-funded projects and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, developers can adopt some of the same mitigation tactics to their projects. They can consult with the SHPO when planning projects that affect historic landscapes, and

---

when the loss of historic fabric is unavoidable they can use site interpretation in their
design to retain a sense of the history.

By using site interpretation as a form of mitigation, developers can show the
local community that they care about increasing residents’ quality of life and fostering a
sense of connection to their homes. This effort in good public relations could lead to
more trust from consumers and perhaps greater willingness to pay more for a higher-
quality product. Mitigation efforts can be tied back to the value of heritage marketing in
residential developments.

Challenges

The biggest challenge to using historic site interpretation to mitigate loss of
historic resources due to development is that this approach is rarely taken. Most
regulations pertaining to mitigating the loss of historic and cultural properties are related
to disaster management. Both FEMA and the NPS have many resources available that
describe their role in disaster management of historic resources. When adverse effects are
unavoidable, FEMA consults with the SHPO and other involved parties to develop
mitigation.182 FEMA’s Fact Sheet on mitigation and historic preservation gives examples
of disaster assistance such as “grant funding for repair, restoration, or replacement of
damaged eligible publicly owned and private non-profit facilities”.183 Disaster mitigation
focuses on the material of the damaged property rather than on the intangible historic

and Mitigation Administration, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources: Protecting Our Heritage,

183 Ibid.
narrative. Stakeholders like the SHPO and the federal government work together to decide the best outcome which is stipulated in a memorandum of agreement that is signed by all parties. Section 106 is only applicable to federally-funded projects; therefore, any mitigation of adverse effects to historic properties caused by privately-funded projects is up to the individual owners. If the point of mitigation is to counteract the negative aspects of damage to a historic resource then the community should, perhaps, be more involved in planning or reaping rewards from mitigation measures. It is the community around the historic resource that will be most affected by its loss or damage. The problem with many traditional mitigation methods is that they are not easily used by people who could benefit from knowing about a now lost historic resource. The HABS, HAER, and HALS records are accessible online, but many people do not know what they are or where to find them. Since it is useful for people to understand their environment, then it would be helpful if the history of that environment was more a part of their daily lives. There are ways to use creative mitigation to educate and reach out to the public.

**Heritage Marketing**

*Opportunities*

Opportunities for heritage marketing include using interpretation, branding and advertising to make a profit for developers and community. Heritage marketing is a growing field and essential to the growth of communities that have a rich history. Some marketing principles rarely change. These include understanding the consumer and fitting
a product or service to him or her, while also allowing the business to achieve its goals.\textsuperscript{184}

Organizations must decide to whom they are marketing. Demographics, like age and gender; socioeconomic and cultural characteristics, like class, education, race and religion; and psychographic characteristics like lifestyle and personality should all be taken into account.\textsuperscript{185} The bottom line of heritage marketing is just a re-wording of the bottom line of marketing in general: to figure out what the customer wants and deliver it without harm to historic resources.\textsuperscript{186}

In order to market heritage effectively, developers must promote an image that is relevant, meaningful and tangible to consumers.\textsuperscript{187} This strategy builds on the premise of that modern consumers are more aware of the importance of sense of place and willing to pay for character and identity. As one author puts it,

The experience economy extends our horizons into valuing the emotional and spiritual assets of communities. It builds on the concepts of understanding our brand heritage, our sense of place in relation to the natural and built environment, our sense of space in the virtual environment, our dreamscape and our storytelling for current and future generations.\textsuperscript{188}

By making historic preservation and interpretation a priority in both protected and developed areas, a local government can provide itself with more heritage marketing

\textsuperscript{184} Misiura, \textit{Heritage Marketing}, 2.
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potential. Just as green space, nature preserves, parks, and historic sites are attractions to
visitors; site interpretation can be used to attract visitors and future residents.

Giving official designation to historic resources and local governments is another
heritage marketing opportunity. Encouraging properties to be nominated to the National
Register of Historic Places or designated as a local historic district with character-
protecting design guidelines will give authenticity to the claim that the area holds historic
significance and interest. In addition, getting the local government designated by the
National Park Service and the State Historic Preservation Office as a Certified Local
Government will open the door to more funding for the protection of historic resources,
as well as earning a reputation for the responsible treatment of historic and cultural
resources.

The main way that the community can be a part of heritage marketing is to make
their desire for preservation of the area’s history known. By joining and donating money
and time to community organizations that protect historic resources, each individual can
affect the value of heritage. The more interest in preserving history and the more money
contributed could spur the local government and developers in to giving more time and
thought to how they could prioritize the preservation of history in the community. If the
history of a neighborhood is fully advertised, potential residents may be more likely to
feel a connection to the place through an understanding of that places history even before
they move there.189

189 Misiura, Heritage Marketing, 2.
One way that developers can make the most out of marketing heritage in new residential development is the use of branding. Branding and marketing in general provide a way for people to feel connected to a cohesive group. This connection strengthens senses of identity and belonging.\textsuperscript{190} Because every place’s history is unique, branding provides the perfect opportunity to use history to make a place desirable.\textsuperscript{191} By commodifying the past and promoting “heritage ambiance” a strong regional and community image that will attract consumers can develop.\textsuperscript{192}

Thankfully, developers in the U.S. are becoming more aware of the power of branding heritage through the use of place names and other distinct qualities to attract residents.\textsuperscript{193} Aspects of branding and interpretation come together to construct identity for consumers, especially when naming things. “Marketing clearly has a role to play in bringing history and aspects of the past to the people through appropriate targeting of consumers and suitable physical interpretation.”\textsuperscript{194} More than just benefits to individuals, the marketing of history could benefit the entire community of which the new development is a part.\textsuperscript{195} Economics has been the primary source of design inspiration for new development in the recent past resulting in many neighborhoods that neglect the rich history of their location.\textsuperscript{196}
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Challenges

Heritage marketing has many challenges as well as opportunities. The relationship between heritage and marketing is a complicated one. Places like Williamsburg have been successful in marketing their heritage, but often the value of intangible history is difficult to assess. Because many elements of history are intangible and hard to define, the marketing strategies for historic places can also be nebulous. People sympathetic to preservation tend to over-value historic resources while others disregard intangible value completely. Some theorists, such as Roger Bolton, claim the intangible quality of sense of place is an economic asset because it makes a place more attractive to people; however, it is difficult to put a numerical value on historic elements, especially landscapes.

Most of the marketing terms used to describe historic resource value are equally indefinable. “Option value,” “bequest value,” and “existence value” are all ways to value heritage, but each of these concepts involves more perceived value than actual quantifiable value. For instance, “existence value” describes the value derived from something, like a historic building, that comes not from using the resource but simply knowing that it is there. Cultural capital is another marketing term that refers to historic resources. This is the value of a place which is separate from the value of the physical land or buildings. It “embodies the community’s valuation of the asset in terms of its

198 Lamme, America’s Historic Landscapes, 38.
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Another term, “merit good,” refers to a place’s intrinsic value, but many economists argue that merit good is not real economics.\textsuperscript{201} These theoretical values sometimes conflict with the actual monetary values of a resource. Just as the public might put value on a historic building simply because it exists and adds to the historic milieu of a community, an owner who does use the resource might put more value in it if changes were made.\textsuperscript{202}

There are many reasons why it is difficult to put a numeric value on heritage and historic resources. The vocabulary is indefinite, the use of a resource is extended and nonrenewable, everyone has their own version of history, and people are fickle in their tastes. Non-market values are likely to always be a factor in the value assessment of historic resources.

The physical elements of history are more easily valued than the intangible qualities. It is easier to put a value on a house, even if different people value it differently, than to put a value on a feeling or essence. But even tangible things are subjective. One author advises against ignoring the economic value of the intangible context around tangible objects of cultural heritage because the intangible value often is greater than the object itself.\textsuperscript{203} Another reminds us that the “value of cultural heritage is in the eye of the
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Although assigning value to intangible elements of history is complicated, the potential monetary profit and preservation of historic resources is worth the effort.

Determining potential consumer’s preferences can be difficult. A common way to obtain the opinion of potential consumers is to conduct surveys. Despite the fact that people tend to misrepresent themselves in surveys, this method has been used for years. Some other concerns with this method are that it does not take into account the fact that history is constantly changing, both in physical remnants and in people’s perceptions. Also, this method does not consider future generations of consumers who will benefit from the resource. Some might scoff at the consideration of the opinions of those not yet born, but other issues related to intangible historic value are equally obscure.

Because of the difficulty of heritage marketing and economics it will be a challenge for policy makers, developers, or other people who have power over historic resources to come to the best solution for the preservation of historic resources.
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Application of ideas to Case Study: Altama

Summary of Glynn County

The local government in Glynn County has outlined their plans for protecting and promoting local history in their strategic plan, which was last updated in April 2012. The Glynn County vision statement states that, “Glynn County will be the nation’s premier, uniquely diverse, most desirable eco-friendly coastal community.”

The county says it will be focusing on developing as well as protecting and lists heritage and history as one of its priorities. Within five years, the county plans to identify and inventory historic resources as well as plan for their protection. The county also wants to create a marketing plan for heritage tourism and an economic stimulus for culture and history. Within ten years the local officials expect to restore and protect more resources, as well as identify other means of support such as local ordinances and a historic registry. Plans to develop a program of self-guided tours that help the community embrace historic resources are in place.

The county has assessed its own weaknesses and threats. These include: future funding, lack of buy-in from stakeholders, lack of leadership to guide a comprehensive program, diminishing and unprotected assets. Strengths and opportunities are identified as increased tourism, expansion of existing assets, preservation of assets, more educated


210 Ibid.

211 “Strategic Planning Subcommittee Reports,” Glynn County, Georgia, 3/27/12, http://glynncounty.org/documents/342/Subcommittee%20Reports%20with%20Wellne_1.PDF

212 Ibid.

213 Ibid.
local public, increased collaboration among existing entities, national and regional awareness of local resources, and identification of future assets.\textsuperscript{214}

Altama Plantation is currently owned by Stratford Land, a company based in Texas with offices in Atlanta, whose website states, “Stratford Land creates value by positioning land to its highest and best use. We acquire land in the path of growth, providing innovative structures for land buyers and sellers, and seek to add value through envisioning, planning, entitlement and predevelopment work.”\textsuperscript{215} Glynn County has zoned Altama for low-density residential development, as well as a part of a plan to develop the I-95 corridor. Part of Altama is protected as wetlands and as part of the Altamaha River Wildlife Management Area. Glynn County has completed two cultural resource inventories during the past ten years, neither of which correctly identified the resources on Altama, probably because the land has restricted access.

An application for rezoning submitted in 2008 outlines a plan for growth in Glynn County’s northwestern corner, where Altama Plantation is located. It describes development goals based on a Traditional Neighborhood Development District, which strives to create a development similar to that of Charleston, South Carolina, or Savannah.\textsuperscript{216} Features include a pedestrian-friendly plan, environmental sensitivity, and preservation of at least 25% open space.\textsuperscript{217} The report also says that the state-owned
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Altamaha River Wildlife Management Area should be allowed to support pedestrian trails, boardwalks and possible limited agriculture. The current zoning of the Altamaha land is forest agriculture, conservation preservation and freeway commercial. The rezoning application does not mention a priority of historic narrative or physical history of the Altama site.

*Site Recommendations*

The recommendations given by this thesis are based on the research done on the benefits of keeping history present in the daily lives of residents of new suburban neighborhoods as well as the history of the application site. This thesis does not attempt to be a complete assessment of the historic landscape at Altama. It is also suggested that a thorough analysis of the Altama Plantation site be conducted to determine its historic integrity and value. Recommendations are both general and specific regarding what should be done to insure the history of Altama remains in the new development.

Site interpretation is the primary way to educate the residents and the visiting public about the significance of the site. Interpretation will only compliment whatever historic features are kept on the property and cannot ever take the place of historic buildings, gardens, ruins or other tangible features from the past.

Finally, these suggestions should be considered both specific to Altama and applicable to any historic landscape that is planned to be developed. With the support of all the groups discussed in this thesis, new residential development can shed its reputation

---
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as characterless sprawl, and historic site interpretation can be used as a compromise between static preservation and excessive growth.

Because of Altama’s lack of current documentation and restricted access, unknown factors remain. The specific development plans for the property are unknown. Since Altama was sold to Stratford Land, the historic brick and wrought iron gate has been removed, but it is not known what other features, structures, or buildings remain on the site or their conditions. All existing conditions are based on personal and family memories of past visits from 1945 to 2010 (see Appendix B).

**Recommendations for the Government**

Glynn County should become a Certified Local Government (CLG). Becoming a CLG would open opportunities for partnership, consultation, and funding from the state and federal government, as well as with other preservation professionals. This would allow more money and resources to help protect Altama and other historic properties.

The local government could purchase easements on parts of Altama that have the most historic or ecological integrity, such as the ruins of the sugar mill or gardens. Easements could be purchased in partnership with a local preservation organization or land trust that also could hold the easement.

More funding should be put toward developing public educational materials about the effects of unsustainable development and growth, as well as about the historic and ecological value of Altama. These materials could promote awareness of the site and motivate community members to ask for responsible development.
Local government could provide financial incentives for developers to maintain the history of the site or use site interpretation to mitigate unavoidable loss of historic resources. These could come in the form of tax credits such as the state income tax credit for rehabilitating an income-producing property according to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and the Georgia Green Space Program.

The local Government also could provide grants or loans for businesses willing to spend extra funds on preserving and interpreting Altama’s history. In addition to directly influencing Altama’s development, the local government could encourage the owner to enlist a local group, volunteer or employee to properly survey and submit a nomination for Altama to the National Register of Historic Places. In order to have the funding for these programs and matching grants, the local government could prioritize allocation of funds toward historic preservation as well as introduce taxes or penalties for development that is less than beneficial to historic or natural resources.

The Altamaha Wildlife Management Area could be made a priority for sustainable recreation and interpretation. Parts of the Management Area on the northern side of the Altamaha River are already used by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources for public hunting land. The southern side, where Altama is located, could be used for other forms of recreation that provide access to areas of natural beauty or historic significance and connect to residential and commercial areas. Hammersmith Creek could be used as an access point to the Altamaha for water recreation such as kayaking or
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canoeing. These areas also could include interpretive signage to inform visitors about the ecological and historical significance of the area.

Glynn County could work with future owners to receive grants to aid in the implementation of interpretation and responsible development at Altama. The Coastal Incentive Grant (CIG) headed by the Georgia DNR is one example of an applicable grant (Appendix C). Applications for up to $80,000, plus matched funding, could be used to purchase or improve the most sensitive historic areas at Altama. Altama would fit the CIG’s themes of ocean and wetlands, public access and land conservation and sustainable communities (Appendix C).

Recommendations for the Community

The community can influence how history is preserved and interpreted at Altama Plantation, especially through the work of organized groups like the Coastal Georgia Historical Society and homeowners associations.

Although Altama is on the mainland and out of the range of the St. Simons Island Land Trust (SSILT) according to their mission, the SSILT could help raise awareness of the site due to Altama’s connection with Cannon’s Point, a recently-acquired SSILT property.221 The SSILT could work with the local government or developers to purchase or hold easements on Altama, as well as research and design interpretational elements for the development. The Coastal Georgia Historical Society could use educational events
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like lectures or exhibits to raise awareness of the site’s history and significance within the community.

A future neighborhood homeowners’ association could develop interpretational elements, design guidelines, community gardens, and adaptively reuse the site’s existing structures for community activities. Design guidelines could reflect the site’s history while also allowing for the natural evolution of the landscape’s use. Landscaping of public areas of the site could use historic or native plants to reflect land use history. Community gardens could provide recreation, a reference to the agricultural history of the site, and local fresh produce that is otherwise lacking in the area. If the barns and buildings are retained and stabilized, they could be used as gathering places, activity centers or rentable workshops.

The SSILT, Coastal Georgia Historical Society (CGHS) or an independent firm could develop relevant interpretation elements, including signage, lecture series, trails and new technology such as Quick Response codes and smartphone applications. The playhouse could be used as a community center and library dedicated to the history and ecology of the site and open to residents and visitors to further their knowledge of the area. If any historic fabric is kept on the site, such as the play house, barns or formal garden, the homeowners’ association could advertise the site as an event or wedding venue and earn money toward community events and interpretation.

The SSILT is planning interpretation and recreation at Cannon’s Point on St. Simons Island which is related to Altama by history and significance. Also in Glynn
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County, The Coastal Georgia Historical Society holds lectures on local history to get locals more involved with protecting local resources including recent talks about James Hamilton Couper.\textsuperscript{223} It would be easy for these groups to raise awareness about Altama.

*Recommendations for Developers*

The future owners and developers of Altama have the most direct control over what happens to the landscape. Through fee simple purchase they have every right to remove or keep any historic remnants. The developers should consider Altama’s history when naming elements of the new development. Names that are already in place, such as “Altama,” “Hopeton,” and “Hammersmith,” could be used to name neighborhoods or streets. Other street names or area names could also be pulled from Altama’s history. This is a powerful way to provide a link to the past. All periods of historical significance must be well represented, including American Indian occupation and African-American influence.

Developers have a chance to maintain some of the historic fabric by building around the significant historical elements of the site. Altama’s historical elements should be preserved if possible. The sugar mill and other Hopeton ruins could be stabilized and accessed by residents by trails. The barns can be adapted for use as community spaces, or rentable units for workshops or other uses. The gardens, playhouse and pool could be preserved for use as community space as well. Getting local colleges to use these restorations as educational opportunities for students could reduce costs and benefit the

communities. The Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD), The College of Charleston, The American College of the Building Arts and the University of Georgia (UGA) all have programs dealing with preservation and restoration.

Developers could turn over interpretational responsibilities to outside organizations or work with outside groups to develop and implement interpretation at all of these sites. Developers can use the unique qualities of Altama to advertise and gain more profit.

In addition to the built environment, the landscape has interpretation potential for developers. The use of traditional or native plants when landscaping can allude to the site’s history. Camellias, gardenias, boxwood or even agricultural plants such as rice and sugar cane can be used to help tell the story of the land use history. Garden space can be set aside by developers to be used by the community. This could appeal to potential consumers as well as link Altama’s residents to the site’s agricultural history. Community gardens also could appeal to future residents because of the potential for local, fresh produce that would not otherwise be so easily available.

Special consideration should be given to density and layout in any development at Altama. Because there is little infrastructure in place, low density residential is the most practical development. Developers could develop large lot areas and smaller lot areas to accommodate consumers with different budgets. New neighborhoods should not be gated in order to encourage community members to partake of any trails or interpretation. Visitors should have access to trails, recreation areas, and places of historic significance within Altama to build awareness and appreciation of the site within the community.
Developers should use the unique and significant history of Altama to advertise their development. By showing commitment to respecting Altama’s historic elements, people will be willing to pay more for homes. The people who would be attracted to responsible development would also likely be more committed to enhancing and protecting their neighborhood.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

There is a need to interpret the history of a landscape after the physical elements of history are no longer present. Heritage marketing, heritage tourism and developing a positive public image for developers and local government can contribute to economic growth.\textsuperscript{224} History is linked to forging identity and establishing a sense of belonging which improves quality of life for residents and encourages stewardship of resident’s home. In the \textit{Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity} published in 2008, Sara McDowell reaffirms the social nature of place identity and elucidates the need for memory—and therefore heritage—in a place to facilitate the formation of both personal and community identity.\textsuperscript{225}

Local governments, communities, and developers should all encourage some level of historical interpretation in their rural/suburban edge projects. The local government, community and developers all have the power to influence the incorporation of historic interpretation into development in their area.\textsuperscript{226} The government can promote historic resources in its area, provide incentives for the protection of historic resources and educate the public about the area’s historic value. Community members can come

\textsuperscript{224} Misiura, \textit{Heritage Marketing}, 96.

\textsuperscript{225} McDowell, “Heritage, Memory and Identity,” 42.

together through nonprofit groups to protect places of historic value, or wield influence based on their power as consumers. Developers can make a commitment to protect historic resources in their projects by using methods like site interpretation in their design. Preserving history through interpretation benefits all of these groups by allowing for growth without erasing character. This is essential to an economy based on tourism, such as on the economy of the Georgia Coast.

Altama Plantation is a significant historic landscape that has unprotected historic elements as well as prime real estate potential. It has gone through a series of private owners who did not protect the rich cultural resources that remain on the landscape. These resources represent the histories of Native Americans, antebellum planters, enslaved workers and people seeking a retreat from daily life. Altama’s history is linked to the history of the entire region, which prides itself as a destination for tourists seeking heritage and natural beauty. To lose that history is to eliminate a potential for sustainable growth and enhanced wellbeing of citizens.

The case studies of I’On and Palmetto Bluff give an idea of a new development style that could work at Altama. I’On used the architectural style of its surrounding region, the low-country of South Carolina, to inform the style of homes and lot characteristics there. The developers also attempted to make new construction look old by giving it a false patina. Although I’On is a beautiful and responsibly planned community, the attempt to make people feel at home by pretending it has a longer history falls flat. There is little interpretation of the history of the landscape prior to I’On’s construction.

---

Palmetto Bluff incorporates the rich history of the landscape into the new design. By retaining ruins of a mansion and using them in the landscaping, having a small museum space for artifacts found on site, and incorporating interpretive signage into the design, the developer has helped visitors connect to the landscape’s history. Altama would benefit from retaining ruins, having a museum space or interpretive center for artifacts, and using interpretive signs to convey the story of the area. The new construction at Altama should respect the historic style of the coast while still being modern.

Methods of interpretation should include both classic and modern ideas. Freeman Tilden’s principles are still the interpretation cannon, but new technology should be incorporated as well. One of the buildings already present on site could make a center for interpretation at Altama, such as the museum space at Palmetto Bluff. Permanent interpretation that offers ways to continue learning about the site, such as educational lectures, a website or a community library of relevant works, would cater to permanent residents who spend more time at the site. All of these facilities could also be open to visitors and tourists who wish to take advantage of the area’s heritage tourism opportunities.

The benefits of preserving the history of an area—even if only through interpretation—include the development of identity and sense of place, economic gain through the use of heritage marketing, and a public record of what was there through site interpretation as mitigation of the loss of historic elements.
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APPENDIX A: Maps

The following pages contain maps of Altama’s location to orient the reader, as well as site maps of built and landscape elements.

Figure 6: Glynn County, Georgia
Figure 7: Altama Plantation’s location within Glynn County
Figure 8: Close up of Altama Plantation. Hopeton, Altama, rice fields, I-95, the Altamaha River and other features
Figure 9: Altama house site and playhouse site close up
Figure 10: Glynn County proposed character areas, Glynn County website
Figure 11: Land Use Master Plan for Altama, Glynn County website
APPENDIX B: Existing Conditions

Because this thesis is not a complete cultural landscape inventory, the following description of existing conditions is not an attempt to thoroughly catalogue every landscape characteristic within Altama. Instead, the existing conditions are listed to the best of the author’s knowledge in order to give readers a basis for understanding the site and a context for the recommendations.

Existing Conditions to the Best of the Author’s Knowledge as of 2010

- Structures and Buildings
  - playhouse and pool (figs. 28 and 23)
  - three bedroom addition to the playhouse (fig. 31)
  - two bedroom “office” (fig. 19)
  - green house and game cleaning shed with boiler (fig. 29 and 30)
  - tennis court
  - two caretakers houses (fig. 41)
  - laundry house (fig. 25)
  - barn 1 - “commissary” (fig. 15)
  - barn 2 (fig. 13)
  - barn 3 - garage, blacksmith and storage (fig. 14)
  - three cabins
○ deer stands

○ sugar mill ruins (tabby mill and brick chimneys) (figs. 20, 21, 24, 36, 37)

○ other tabby ruins in Hopeton (figs. 32 and 34)

○ pump house

○ gate was torn down recently (fig. 12)

● Landscape

○ hill is highest in Glynn County and the former site of the Altama Plantation house built in 1857 and razed in the 1950s

○ formal boxwood garden with terraced hillside, tabby paths, frog pond, camellias and bridge to rice fields built in the 1930s

○ rice fields including dykes, ditches, and built elements

○ other agricultural ditches

○ possible historic plants like sago palm, live oaks, magnolias, gardenias, camellias (figs. 27 and 33)

○ possible Native American trails that are now roads

○ carriage road from Hammersmith dock

○ Hammersmith dock and landing (fig. 17)

○ airstrip that was former horse racing track, and agricultural field

○ oat patches for hunting

○ artificial ponds (fig. 35)

○ an abundance of possible archaeological sites
Figure 12: Gate, now demolished, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 13: Crib barn, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 14: Barn/garage, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 15: Commissary, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 16: Gate to playhouse and garden compound, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 17: Hammersmith dock, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 18: Interior of playhouse, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 19: Office, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 20: Sugar mill chimney, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 21: Sugar mill ruins, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 22: Formal garden, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 23: Pool and oak with tennis courts, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 24: Sugar mill ruins interior, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 25: Laundry house, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 26: Formal garden facing terraced hillside, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 27: Sago palm near Altama Plantation house site, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 28: Playhouse, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 29: Cleaning shed and boiler, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 30: Green house, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 31: Playhouse addition, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 32: Chimney ruins at house site in Hopeton, Jones family archive, c. 2000
Figure 33: Large magnolia in Hopeton, photo by author, c. 2008

Figure 34: Tabby ruins in Hopeton, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 35: Man made pond, photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 36: Sugar mill chimney with date (1829), photo by author, c. 2008
Figure 37: Sugar mill chimneys, photo by author, c. 2010

Figure 38: Formal garden and terraced hillside, photo by author, c. 2009
Figure 39: Frog pond in formal garden, photo by author, c. 2009
Figure 40: Bridge in rice field, photo by author, c. 2009

Figure 41: Caretaker's house, photo by author, c. 2010
Figure 42: Remnants of structure in rice field, photo by author, c. 2009
APPENDIX C: Coastal Incentive Grant

Georgia Coastal Management Program

COASTAL INCENTIVE GRANT
CYCLE 17

2014-2015 GRANT YEAR REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

COASTAL INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM, MATCH, TERM AND REIMBURSEMENT

The Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Coastal Resources Division (CRD), solicits proposals for Coastal Incentive Grants (CIG) awarded under the Georgia Coastal Management Program (GCMP). The following announcement provides background and describes funding priorities, selection criteria, and application procedures.

This Request for Proposals solicits projects that are:

1) related to the themes identified by the Coastal Advisory Council (CAC) for the Cycle 17 awards; or

2) deemed by a local government to be a project of “Critical Local Need.”

Greatest consideration will be given to proposals that are related to the listed theme areas. “Critical Local Need” project proposals that are unrelated to any of the themes established by the Coastal Advisory Council will also be ranked and awarded according to the availability of funds.
All Coastal Incentive Grants must be matched annually $1.00 federal: $1.00 local (1:1). Match may be either cash from local, state or private sources or “in-kind” service(s).

If selected, Coastal Incentive Grant contracts will run for one year beginning October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2015. Applications will be accepted for two-year grant requests with the second year of support contingent upon sufficient progress in year one and the receipt of federal funds. Projects that are acceptable but for which there are no available funds may be awarded a Coastal Incentive Grant at a later date if funds become available.

Coastal Incentive Grants are reimbursable grants. A Request for Reimbursement of federal project costs, along with a report of applicable non-federal match, is to be submitted with the Final Report, using the format provided by the DNR. Reimbursement will be made following completion of the terms of the grant contract and receipt and performance of all deliverables.

**MISSION STATEMENT**

It is the mission of the Georgia Coastal Management Program to balance economic development in Georgia’s coastal area with preservation of natural, environmental, historic, archaeological, and recreational resources for the benefit of Georgia’s present and future generations.

**ELIGIBILITY AND CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS**

Coastal Incentive Grant applicants must meet the following Minimum Eligibility Requirements:

**Eligible Entities:** Only Georgia Qualified Local Governments (counties and municipalities approved by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs) in the eleven-county coastal area, Georgia state government agencies (except DNR), and government affiliated educational and research institutions are eligible for Coastal Incentive Grant awards. Applications from other parties will be considered if sponsored by an eligible entity.

Eligible projects must concentrate entirely or be physically located within at least one of the eleven (11) designated Georgia counties within the Georgia Coastal Management Program service area. GCMP eligible counties include Brantley, Bryan, Camden, Chatham, Charlton, Effingham, Glynn, Liberty, Long, McIntosh, and Wayne.

**Equal Opportunity:** The applicant must comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, The Age Discrimination Act of
1975, The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and all other state and federal laws of non-discrimination. The applicant must certify that no person shall be discriminated against on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, or physical or mental handicap for any program, activity, or facility sponsored, operated, or constructed under the grant project.

State and Federal Laws/Regulations: The applicant must comply with all existing laws and regulations for receiving and expending state and federal grant money including, but not limited to, public notices, bidding and purchasing requirements, and the Georgia Environmental Policy Act. Proposed projects must comply with existing state and federal environmental laws, rules, and regulations including, but not limited to, the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act, the Shore Protection Act, the Georgia Coastal Management Act, the federal Clean Water Act, the Georgia Clean Water Quality Control Act, the federal Endangered Species Act, and the Georgia Endangered Wildlife Act. If the applicant is a county or municipal government, the applicant must be in compliance with the Georgia Planning Act and be certified as Qualified Local Government as defined by the Act before any Program funds will be awarded.

Consistency: The applicant must include a statement certifying that project activities will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the mission, goals, and policies of the Georgia Coastal Management Program

Grant Contract: A legally binding contract will be executed between the granting organization and recipients of grant awards. The contract will set forth the program requirements, grant conditions, and define the project scope of work, deliverables, and timeline with milestones of accomplishments.

AWARDS

Theme-Related Projects: Applicants may apply for up to $80,000 per year in federal funds if the proposed project is related to a funding theme designated below. Up to two year proposals will be accepted.

Critical Local Needs Projects: Projects that fulfill a Critical Local Need are eligible to receive a maximum of $25,000. Critical Local Needs projects are those projects that have been identified by a county or municipal government as being a “critical project” and the project is identified as such in the official minutes of a commission meeting, or local or area plan. Critical Local Need projects must be related to the mission of the Georgia Coastal Management Program but do not have to address a specific theme. Projects must be completed within the twelve (12) month award period.
FUNDING THEMES

The themes of the 2014-2015 Coastal Incentive Grant Program Cycle 17 as adopted by the Coastal Advisory Council are (bulleted items are provided only as examples):

Oceans and Wetlands
  · Maintaining or improving the quality of wetlands
  · Conservation and restoration of wetland habitats
  · Improved understanding of ocean and wetland habitats and functions

Public Access and Land Conservation
  · Add or enhance physical access for the public to coastal water resources, e.g., rivers, wetlands, beaches
  · Public access planning
  · Conservation of riparian habitats through acquisition
  · Land conservation through management planning and practices
  · Analysis of land conservation needs and opportunities for habitat protection

Sustainable Communities
  · Increase communities’ ability to achieve sustainable development goals, improve quality of life, and become more economically and environmentally sustainable
  · Strengthen local capacity to implement sustainable approaches.
  · Identification and preservation of unique community qualities, including historical and cultural features
  · Increase understanding of costs and benefits associated with sustainable approaches to coastal development
  · Implementation and evaluation of coastal management practices in support of sustainable development

Disaster Resiliency and Coastal Hazards (includes climate change)
  · Improved understanding of coastal hazards and potential impacts
  · Develop, implement or incorporate adaptation and mitigation strategies/plans or policies

*Projects that involve land acquisition (fee simple or easement) or construction activities may not exceed a total project cost of $100,000, including $50,000 from CIG funds and $50,000 from non-federal match funds. Projects require a pre-application meeting and a site visit by DNR staff.*
Low cost construction or land acquisition projects may be either Theme Related or Critical Local Need projects. Allowable construction / acquisition activities are defined under Section 306A of the Coastal Zone Management Act, and as such are defined by statute. Theme related construction / acquisition projects are limited to expenditures of no more than $50,000 in federal funds and no more than $100,000 total project costs (federal and non-federal match combined). Critical Local Needs construction / acquisition projects are limited to $25,000 in Coastal Incentive Grant funding and no more than $100,000 in total project costs (federal and non-federal). Applicants may be asked to revise scope of work of construction projects to meet eligibility guidelines. All construction or land acquisition projects must undergo a pre-application site visit by DNR staff.

Applicants must meet the objectives and allowable use guidelines for Section 306A Coastal Zone Management Act to be considered. (Refer to Coastal Zone Management Act Section 306A Guidance for full text of objectives and uses.) In summary, grants for construction / acquisition projects made under Section 306A may be used for the following activities only:

- The acquisition of fee simple and other interests in land;
- Low-cost construction projects, including but not limited to, paths, walkways, fences, parks, and the rehabilitation of historic buildings and structures;
- The rehabilitation or acquisition of piers to provide increased public use, including compatible commercial activity;
- The establishment of shoreline stabilization measures including the installation or rehabilitation of bulkheads for the purpose of public safety or increasing public access and use of urban waterfront areas;
- The removal or replacement of pilings where such action will provide increased recreational use of urban waterfront areas;
- Engineering designs, specifications, and other appropriate reports related to these activities; and
- Educational, interpretive, and management costs and other related costs NOAA determines to be consistent with the purposes of this section.

Georgia Historic Preservation Division (HPD): All construction projects must obtain a clearance letter from the Georgia HPD stating no significant impact as required under Section 106 of the federal Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Applications are considered incomplete until a clearance letter from HPD has been returned to the DNR/CRD. It is the applicant’s responsibility to provide the HPD clearance letter as a supporting document of the RFP.

Endangered Species Act: All construction projects must obtain a letter from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (US FWS) stating there will be no significant impacts from the
proposed project according to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Applications are considered incomplete until a clearance letter from US FWS has been returned to the DNR/CRD. It is the applicant’s responsibility to provide the US FWS clearance letter as a supporting document of the RFP.

**NOAA Involvement:** All construction project proposals are required to submit a completed 306A Project Environmental Checklist with their application including documentation in the form of reports, permits, coordination letters from state and federal agencies, maps, and photographs when necessary. Federally funded projects are required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to assess the environmental impact (Public Law 91-190, as amended; 82 Stat. 852, as amended; 42 U.S.C. 4321-4347). NOAA is responsible for determining and advising the DNR/CRD whether a proposed grant action is eligible for a low-cost construction categorical exclusion (CatEx). 306A construction projects that are deemed ineligible for this type of categorical exclusion are also deemed ineligible under the programmatic guidelines for CIG funding. Work may not begin on any construction projects until the 306A Project Environmental Checklist has been reviewed and signed by NOAA’s Coastal Programs Division Chief, and the GA DNR/CRD.

**BUDGET, MATCH REQUIREMENTS AND INDIRECT COSTS**

All funding components must be supported by a direct line item budget. Applicant overhead cost must be itemized and included as a direct expense. No indirect cost rates, percentages, or contingencies will be considered as allowable costs for reimbursement under the Coastal Incentive Grant Program. These costs may only be used as match. If using indirect costs as match, the applicant must include a statement of the negotiated rate with the budget narrative.

The applicant must match the federal funds requested through the Coastal Incentive Grant Program. The minimum required match ratio for Coastal Incentive Grants is $1.00 federal: $1.00 local (1:1) for all projects. 1:1 match must be accrued annually. Match may be either cash from local, state or private sources, or “in-kind service(s).” Generally, funds from other federal agencies may not be used as match, unless the program authorization for that funding program indicates that their funds may be used to meet an applicant’s local share. If federal dollars are to be used as match, the applicant should provide a copy of the authorizing language or a statement from the federal agency that it is allowable, including a statutory citation for the authorizing language.

**In-Kind Match:** A match source that is considered “in-kind services” must meet the following criteria:

- Verifiable from your records
- Directly attributable to the project
- Personnel time must be documented and submitted with the appropriate form
- Performed or provided within the contracted period
- Personnel salary or in-kind labor cannot be derived from any other federally assisted program and cannot be paid by the federal government under another award.

The federal Coastal Zone Management Act predetermines match requirements.

**RFP APPLICATION SUBMITTAL**

Prior to submission of a full application, all applicants must submit a 2 page Letter of Intent that includes a brief description of the project for which funds are requested, its usefulness to coastal management, and the total amount of funding requested. The Letter of Intent must be submitted by November 1, 2013. Subsequent to the submission of a Letter of Intent, a Georgia CMP staff member will contact the applicant to offer comments on the proposed project. This is a non-competitive Letter of Intent, intended to allow applicants the opportunity to receive comments from staff prior to development and submission of a full proposal.

Following the submission of a Letter of Intent by November 1, an applicant may submit a grant application. All applicants must complete the application form provided and include complete, concise responses to the project requirements. Applications must be prepared on 8 ½” X 11” white paper, printed on both sides. Text must be typed, single-spaced and in 12-point font. All pages must be numbered and must not be bound by staples. Facsimiles and E-mail submissions will NOT be accepted. Submission packet must include one original, five copies and one digital copy saved to a CD in Microsoft Word. Application materials must be submitted to the following address by no later than 4:30 p.m., Friday, January 17, 2014:

GA DNR/CRD  
Susan Snyder Reeves  
Grants and Contracts Manager  
One Conservation Way, Suite 300  
Brunswick, GA  31520  
(912) 264-7218

Applications received after the 4:30 p.m. deadline on January 17, 2014 will not be accepted.

**APPLICATION REVIEW PROCESS**

Applications should be submitted with a cover page and supporting documentation as described above. DNR Staff will review applications for timeliness, completeness, and eligibility. Late, incomplete, and ineligible applications will be returned to the applicant.
DNR staff will schedule a review committee comprised of five (5) coastal community professionals from the following fields: state resource management, local government, non-governmental organization, scientific research, and citizen at large. The review committee will review and score the applications based on the criteria supplied in this document. The review committee will consider the applications in a roundtable forum from highest to lowest score. All applicants will be notified of grant decisions in May 2014. Unsuccessful applicants may contact the Ecological Services Section of the DNR/CRD within 30 days of notification to discuss reason(s) for denial.

Applications that are approved for funding by the review committee will be included in the DNR’s application for annual funding from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Georgia Coastal Management Program Grant. NOAA makes the final review and approval of all Coastal Incentive Grants.

**TIMELINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2013</td>
<td>Letter of Intent Submission Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2014 – 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Grant Application Submission Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Review process complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Submit 306/306A application to NOAA-OCRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Notify applicants of awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>CIG Grant Agreements executed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2014</td>
<td>Project and Grant Term start date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

Georgia Coastal Management Program  
Department of Natural Resources/ Coastal Resources Division  
One Conservation Way, Suite 300  
Brunswick, Georgia 31520-8687  
Phone: (912) 264-7218

Susan Snyder Reeves, Grants and Contracts Manager  
E-mail: Susan.Reeves@dnr.state.ga.us

Sonny Emmert, Coastal Resources Specialist  
Bryan, Chatham, Effingham, Liberty and Long Counties  
E-mail: Sonny.Emmert@dnr.state.ga.us

Kelly Hill, Coastal Resources Specialist  
Camden, Charlton, Glynn, and Wayne Counties
E-mail: Kelly.Hill@dnr.state.ga.us

Jennifer Kline, Coastal Resources Specialist
Brantley and McIntosh Counties
E-mail: Jennifer.Kline@dnr.state.ga.us
APPENDIX D: I’On and Palmetto Bluff

Images of I’On in Mt. Pleasant, SC and Palmetto Bluff in Bluffton, SC.

Figure 43: Homes at I’On

Figure 44: Large live oak at I’On
Figure 45: Row of houses in I’On that resemble historic Rainbow Row in Charleston

Figure 46: Historic style double porch with blue ceiling in I’On
Figure 47: Side garden in l’On

Figure 48: Historic ruins at Palmetto Bluff
Figure 49: Interpretive sign at Palmetto Bluff

Figure 50: Historic water spigot at Palmetto Bluff
Figure 51: Village center at Palmetto Bluff

Figure 52: Interpretive sign at the bocce court at Palmetto Bluff
Figure 53: Ruins and inn at Palmetto Bluff