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Part I: Executive Summary
1.1 Executive Summary

Program Background

The City of Augusta, Georgia’s second largest city, is the center of a region of 300,000 people in east central Georgia and west central South Carolina. It has a diverse work force that includes medicine, biotechnology, and military activities.

Augusta, like many U.S. cities, experienced suburban growth starting in the 1960s, when residents and businesses moved to subdivisions, suburban malls, and office parks. Augusta’s vibrant downtown declined, leaving behind empty storefronts and vacant houses. Today, there is a large vacant mall, which is the anchor of the Rocky Creek neighborhood located at the southern end of Augusta Way. As people travel 4.5 miles from the dead mall to downtown, a swath of blight exists. This path of blight underlies the problems with unsustainable suburban sprawl.

Now, as communities across the nation have decided to reinvest in the urban core, a collaborative effort is being undertaken in Augusta. In 1996, a collaborative approach to government began with the consolidation of city and county. There have been five planning efforts since 2006. In 2010, The Augusta Sustainability Development Agenda (ASDA) was completed as a high level planning strategy for smart growth and sustainable development throughout Augusta for the next twenty years. The Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program includes priority recommendations derived from the ASDA Study.

The area considered for Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program is a 4.5 mile north-south spine in the core of the city. This spine includes 15th Street and Deans Bridge Road. The two streets have been dubbed Augusta Way.

The project entails four interrelated work tasks affecting the Priority Development District:

1. Developing a detailed plan for the Priority Development District and action/feasibility plans for up to three prototypical projects;
2. Developing a detailed plan for a multi-modal transportation corridor bisecting the district;
3. Revising current codes to facilitate higher density, mixed use, mixed-income development in the district;
4. Creating an implementation plan for green, affordable housing in the district. The project is a community-based blueprint with extensive public and stakeholder involvement throughout the process.

Study Area Boundaries

The study area runs along 15th Street and Deans Bridge Road from Wightboro Road to Gordon Highway. It encompasses four Augusta neighborhoods from south to north: Rocky Creek, Southgate, Oates Creek, and Cherry Tree. The area totals 1,812 acres of land. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 on pages 7 and 8 illustrate the study area and its context.

Previous Planning Efforts

The five planning efforts mentioned previously that led to the Sustainable Implementation Program are as follows:

- 2006. The Augusta Canal Authority’s Strategic Concepts and Recommendations for Augusta Third Level Canal/Laney-Walker Neighborhood. This plan focuses on revitalizing a neglected, yet world-class asset that separates Augusta’s downtown from the remainder of the urban core.
- 2008. The Augusta-Richmond County Comprehensive Plan. This plan provides an encyclopedic analysis of and implementation strategies addressing population growth, housing, economic development, transportation, community facilities and services, cultural resources, natural resources and greenspace, and land use.
- 2009. Augusta Tomorrow’s Westobou Vision and Master plan for a Sustainable Future. The cities of Augusta and North Augusta, SC, together with a non-profit consortium of local business leaders, funded a 20-year urban area master plan focused on linking Augusta’s historic downtown neighborhoods to the Savannah River and North Augusta, SC located across the river.
- 2009 - 2010. Augusta Housing & Community Development Department’s Plan for the Revitalization of Laney Walker/Bethlehem Neighborhoods. This plan focuses on revitalizing the blighted urban core of two historic neighborhoods located just south of the city’s historic downtown.
- 2010. The Augusta Sustainability Development Agenda (ASDA). Commissioned by Augusta/Richmond County, this conceptual plan focuses...
Figure 1.2: Study Area Neighborhood Map
on the rural, suburban, and urban rings just beyond downtown Augusta, essentially linking Augusta Tomorrow’s Westobou Vision to the rest of the City.

**Livability Principles, Policies & Projects**

This program aims to address the following six Livability Principles:

**Provide more transportation options.** The 15th Street Corridor, currently a major part of Augusta’s blighted urban core, is the key linkage between most of the city’s neighborhoods. It extends southward out of the city and its key employment centers. The objective is to develop mixed-use, transit-oriented nodes along this corridor, fed by a multi-modal plan that involves widening existing roadways to include pedestrian and bicycle greenways, transit, and electric vehicles.

**Promote equitable, affordable housing.** The Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program expands the scope of work already in place in the adjacent Laney Walker/Bethlehem neighborhoods, which is focused on providing equitable, affordable housing on 1,100 acres in these two communities. Taking housing affordability a step further, this initiative proposes an affordable housing green building overlay district for the 15th Street Corridor, providing energy and water cost savings for residents.

**Enhance economic competitiveness.** In keeping with transit oriented developments (TODs) throughout the U.S., the Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program creates dense, mixed-use development centers that provide jobs in close proximity to mixed-income housing, and promote the growth of locally-owned enterprises, and leverage the presence of strong, existing businesses in the fields of health care, education, and technology.

**Support existing communities.** There are over a dozen old, established neighborhoods adjacent to 15th Street, with another several dozen embedded in the Corridor generally. Most are in need of significant revitalization. Hence, the focus on this Corridor.

**Coordinate policies and leverage investment.** This study was designed to synthesize master planning efforts already conducted by various entities. This program is both a binding agent and a frame, pulling the disparate pieces together and shaping them into a clear, integrated picture.
Land Use and Zoning Policies

- Maintain and encourage a balanced mix of land uses
- Increase the number of residential units
- Redevelop existing vacant sites and dilapidated structures
- Protect and preserve the Troup Hill Historic District
- Protect and preserve the Shiloh Orphanage
- Promote a variety of affordable housing types to accommodate the aging population
- Promote jobs by creating land uses that provide employment
- Support pedestrian-oriented commercial streets
- Increase the amount of open space in the area
- Promote neighborhood redevelopment

Land Use and Zoning Projects

- Comprehensive Plan Updates (O-1)
- Establish a form-based zoning code (O-2)
- Cherry Tree Redevelopment Concept Plan
- Rosa T. Beard Memorial Bridge Improvement
- Cherry Tree Crossing Public Housing Redevelopment
- Redevelop Industrial Areas adjacent to the railroad
- 15th Street Frontage
- Oates Creek Redevelopment Concept Plan
- Southgate Redevelopment Concept Plan
- Rocky Creek Redevelopment Concept Plan

Transportation Policies

- Create a balanced transportation system that does not promote one form of travel at the expense of another
- Design pedestrian-scale blocks and buildings in new development
- Utilize a “complete street” approach for new streets & streets under redesign
- Create new streets and inter-parcel connections
- Promote accessibility for those with disabilities and the elderly
- Require streets in new developments to connect to adjacent developments
- Minimize dead-end streets

Transportation Projects

- Require developments to install or upgrade adjacent sidewalks
- Adopt bicycle parking requirements
- Install bike lanes and upgrade streetscapes
- Modifications to GDOT State Route 4/15th Street road widening project
- Implement the Street Framework Plan
- Intersection improvement at Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road
- Sidewalk improvements along Essie McIntyre Blvd, Olive Street, and Cherry Road
- Multi-use trail at Oates Creek and at the railroad and Whitesboro Road
- Addition of bicycle lanes at Deans Bridge Road between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road and at GDOT Widening Project, PI #220680
- Addition of bus connections and stop improvements

Economic Development Policies

- Prevent the involuntary displacement of residents
- Strive for a community that allows residents to age in place
- Encourage a mix of housing price points
- Focus growth into activity nodes along the corridor
- Target all potential funding sources and use them strategically in the study area
- Encourage business retention and work on attracting new businesses

Economic Development Strategies

- Obtain annual funding for securing and maintaining neighborhood’s vacant and blighted properties (O-3)
- Add inspection staff to Code Enforcement, Department of Planning & Development (O-4)
- Foreclosure proceedings for approximately 60 vacant/dilapidated houses annually (O-5)
- Increase annual budget to secure and maintain neighborhood’s vacant and blighted properties
- Expand workforce training with new transportation construction activity (O-7)
- Pursue partnerships with area institutional anchors and community colleges (O-8)
- Catalytic Redevelopment Project (O-9 to O-12)

Historic Resource & Urban Design Policies

- Create a connected grid of streets where feasible
- Fill in gaps between buildings, parking lots, and vacant lots with buildings
- Use new buildings to create an appropriate scale and reflect Augusta’s character
- Promote traditional building forms in new construction
- Ensure appropriate building height
- Allow architectural variety, but require quality building materials
- Provide open spaces to compliment new development
- Ensure that new buildings have active ground floor uses with doors accessible from the sidewalk
- Provide pedestrian scaled signs
- Encourage public art
- Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles
- Preserve the historic fabric
- Preserve and renovate historic buildings
Historic Resource & Urban Design Projects
- Improve Rosa T. Beard Memorial Bridge
- RA Dent Boulevard to 15th Street Pedestrian/Bike Connections (T-4)
- Create flexible, user friendly zoning for mixed-use and infill development (O-2)
- 15th Street/Milledgeville Road GDOT Project (T-1, T-2, T-15, T-17)
- Uniform Sign Program (O-13)
- Establish historic markers for historic sites and buildings (O-14)

Environment & Public Facilities Policies
- Incorporate sustainable development practices
- Reduce the storm water impacts of parking
- Encourage the use of permeable paving
- Encourage the use of renewable energy
- Minimize exterior light pollution
- Support local food production
- Encourage green roofs
- Encourage tree planting on private property
- Encourage xeriscaping and native species use
- Improve accessibility to existing facilities and promote the creation of new community facilities that are easy to access
- Encourage public facilities to reach out to all community members by conducting outreach programs and providing materials
- Encourage utility burial on all new streets
- Cooperate with existing infrastructure providers and other municipality for input on water quality planning
- Encourage the creation of shared stormwater facilities among different projects
- Encourage child care centers, adult day care centers and in-home nursing care providers
- Incorporate parks and open spaces into new developments
- Promote parks and plazas where public events can occur
- Include public art and historic markers in public spaces
- Encourage an appropriate relationship between parks and adjacent development

Environment & Public Facilities Projects
- Sustainable Education Program (O-16)
- Stormwater Management Program (O-17)
- Make zoning changes to improve open space preservation (O-2)
- Acquire land to develop a park (Oates Creek Park) located on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. This site is located in between Olive Road and Fifteen Avenue (O-18)
- Acquire land to expand and improve Doughty Park (O-19)
- Develop a park with lakes in the Rocky Creek area to eliminate flooding in the downstream area.
- Landscape the area in front of the T.J. Josey High School after the GDOT widening project (O-21)

Utilities & Infrastructure Policies
- Embrace sustainable storm water management.
- Possible sanitary sewer relocations due to 15th Street and MLK Boulevard improvements
- Possible water main relocations due to 15th Street and MLK Boulevard improvements
- Relocation of overhead utilities to underground installations if feasible
- Possible gas main relocations due to 15th Street and MLK Boulevard improvements
- Incorporation of water resource issues early in the land use planning and site development/redevelopment processes
- Incorporating stormwater management retention and detention features into the design of parks, walkways, common areas, and open spaces
- Use vegetation (particularly indigenous vegetation) in stormwater management to promote filtering and slowing stormwater runoff to maximize the settling of particulate pollutants and materials
- Protect or restore creek corridors for natural hydrology
- Improve the storm water collection and conveyance systems (storm sewer networks) throughout the study area
- Incorporation of water resource issues early in the land use planning and site development/redevelopment processes
- Incorporating stormwater management retention and detention features into the design of parks, walkways, common areas, and open spaces
- Use vegetation (particularly indigenous vegetation) in stormwater management to promote filtering and slowing stormwater runoff to maximize the settling of particulate pollutants and materials
- Protect or restore creek corridors for natural hydrology
- Improve the storm water collection and conveyance systems (storm sewer networks) throughout the study area
- Address stormwater management issues on a regional level (for example: regional stormwater detention systems versus multiple small stormwater detention systems)
- Consider sustainable stormwater alternatives and “green” solutions for all future development to improve water quality and reduce run-off
- Address stormwater management issues on a regional level (for example: regional stormwater detention systems versus multiple small stormwater detention systems)
- Consider sustainable stormwater alternatives and “green” solutions for all future development to improve water quality and reduce run-off

Utilities & Infrastructure Projects
- Create Oates Creek Park with stormwater management function (O-18) (O-20)
- Remove and replace deteriorated corrugated metal/HDPE culverts and replace with reinforced concrete culverts (Olive Road and Fayetteville Drive). (O-22)
- Implement a stream restoration project along open channel sections of Oates Creek and Oates Creek Tributary #1. (O-23)
Part II: Existing Conditions
2.1 Land Use

Land Use

Land uses and the relationship between them impact the quality of life in a community. Different land uses have varying impacts on transportation and utility systems. The arrangement of land uses and their proximity also support or discourage different modes of travel, including bicycling, walking, and transit; this can directly impact the vehicular system by reducing or increasing traffic.

Towns and cities were traditionally built as mixed-use environments with housing, shops, offices, religious institutions, schools, parks, and factories all within a short walk of one another. As the benefits of mixed-use areas are rediscovered, it is increasingly important to understand the uses that can operate within an acceptable walking distance of five to ten minutes. Many uses are compatible, including retail, office, open space, civic, and residential uses. Others, such as industrial and transportation services, are more difficult to reconcile in a mixed-use setting.

Existing Conditions

The study area is marked by a variety of land uses, as shown in Table 2.1. With the four intown neighborhoods—Rocky Creek, Southgate, Oates Creek, and Cherry Tree—along the corridor, the predominant land use is single-family residential, which forms the core of each neighborhood except Rocky Creek. Commercial uses are the second most common land use, and are concentrated along Deans Bridge Road and Gordon Highway. Multifamily residential exists in the study area mostly in the form of public housing, which occupies 4.7% of the land area. Industrial uses are concentrated at the northern end of the study area along the railroad. Park and open spaces are very limited in the study area, occupying only 0.9% of the land. There is a significant amount of vacant and undeveloped land (16.3%) in the study area. The biggest vacant property is the Regency Mall near Gordon Highway, which has been closed for more than a decade. Vacant parcels in single-family residential areas can be seen primarily in the neighborhood areas north of Olive Road, which are ripe for redevelopment.

Strengths

- There is a wide mix of land uses, ensuring that most daily needs are provided.
- Neighbors provide a good single-family residential base.
- Institutions, including schools and churches, serve the area.

Weaknesses

- The overall quality of housing is substandard.
- A lack of housing types suitable for an aging population could be a challenge as residents age and their needs change.
- Existing land uses along the thoroughfares are generally auto-oriented.
- There is a lack of mixed-use or pedestrian-friendly areas.
- The vacant Regency Mall and dilapidated commercial properties increase blight.
- There is a large amount of vacant and underutilized land.

Opportunities

- Potential activity nodes along the corridor could better serve the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Improved land use patterns could support alternatives to driving.
- Additional housing options for all ages could be provided.
- Vacant and underutilized properties provide opportunities for catalytic development projects.

Threats

- Long term, the auto-oriented commercial uses on Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road may become unsustainable; regional and national trends are favoring more concentrated commercial activity at strategic locations.
- The state of the region’s real estate markets could limit growth for years to come.
- Poorly planned development and redevelopment could preclude a new growth model.

Table 2.1: Existing Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-family</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institution</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Recreation, Conservation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Undeveloped</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights-of-way</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,832</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,812</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II: Existing Conditions

Vacant commercial property needs to be addressed

Dilapidated residential properties are ready for redevelopment

Figure 2.1: Existing Land Use
Character Areas

The character areas of the local comprehensive plan express a long-term vision for growth and do not necessarily reflect on-the-ground uses today. They establish local policies that, under state law, must support proposed rezoning requests.

Existing Conditions

Figure 2.2 shows the Character Area Map for the study area based on the 2008 Augusta-Richmond County Comprehensive Plan. The study area falls into two neighborhood character areas—Old City and South Augusta. Additionally, Gordon Highway, Deans Bridge Road, part of Milledgeville Road, and Olive Road are designated as commercial corridors. Two commercial nodes are also identified along Deans Bridge Road, with a major one at Gordon Highway and a minor one at Milledgeville Road. The area north of Olive Road is designated as an “area in need of redevelopment.” North of the study area, the Medical Center area is designated as a regional activity center. The following are general policies regarding designated development areas affecting the study area corridor:

- Commercial Corridors – These represent existing commercial corridors that have developed along the principal arterial highways in the city. There are opportunities for infill development and redevelopment at locations along these corridors. The overall objective is to minimize the extension of these corridors beyond their current limits and, when extended, provide sufficient buffers between non-residential uses and adjoining residential areas.

- Minor Commercial Nodes – These represent intersections of principal and minor arterial highways where commercial development is already established or is desired as part of the future vision for the city. These are intersections where neighborhood-oriented businesses, convenience shopping and smaller shopping centers are or will be located.

- Major Commercial Nodes – These are located where I-20 and I-520 intersect the principal arterials highways in the city. These are the locations where the highest concentration of commercial, light industrial and warehousing development are and will be located. The commercial uses include a mix of highway and freeway-oriented businesses, larger shopping / retail centers, entertainment and eating / drinking establishments and some neighborhood and convenience type businesses.

Table 2.2 summarizes the character areas in the Comprehensive Plan’s Community Agenda section as they affect the study area.

Strengths

- Character areas provide guidance on the nature and patterns of development in each designated area.

Weaknesses

- The character area map is too general to guide development or redevelopment effectively.

Table 2.2 2008 Comprehensive Plan Character Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Area</th>
<th>Recommended Development Pattern</th>
<th>Quality Community Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Old City Neighborhoods | 1. Maintain low-density single-family residential development in areas where it is already the predominant land use. Protect from encroachment by conflicting land uses.  
2. Infill residential development at densities compatible with the surrounding area. Site design reflects traditional neighborhood patterns and existing architectural styles.  
3. Redevelopment projects (housing and economic development) in neighborhoods targeted for such activities.  
4. Additional commercial and retail development in under-served neighborhoods.  
5. Neighborhood activity centers that provide a focal point for community services and a location for appropriately-scaled retail establishments.  
7. Expanded academic facilities at Augusta State University campus on Wrightsboro Road  
8. Attractive gateways supplemented by a coordinated way finding signage | Regional Identity  
Heritage Preservation  
Open Space Preservation  
Environmental Protection  
Educational Opportunities  
Employment Options  
Transportation Alternatives  
Housing Opportunities  
Traditional Neighborhood  
Infill Development  
Sense of Place |
| South Augusta         | 1. Maintain low-density single-family residential development in areas where it is already the predominant land use.  
2. Infill residential development at densities compatible with the surrounding area. Site design reflects existing neighborhood patterns and architectural styles.  
3. Redevelopment projects (housing and economic development) in targeted neighborhoods, and at large abandoned commercial or industrial sites, targeted for such activities.  
4. Additional commercial and retail development at major intersections near under served neighborhoods.  
5. Expanded regional activity center in the areas around Augusta Mall, Augusta Technical College and Diamond Lakes Park.  
6. Reduce the reliance on autos by using sidewalks, bike lanes and multi-use trails to connect residential neighborhoods to activity centers (schools, parks, community centers, greenways, neighborhood businesses and services).  
7. Attractive gateways supplemented by a coordinated way finding signage | Open Space Preservation  
Environmental Protection  
Educational Opportunities  
Employment Options  
Transportation Alternatives  
Housing Opportunities  
Infill Development  
Sense of Place |
Figure 2.2: Character Area Map  
(from the 2008 Augusta-Richmond County Comprehensive Plan)
Zoning

The third major land use consideration is zoning. Zoning is the legal framework that codifies the character area vision of a comprehensive plan to regulate development. It directly shapes the form, placement, and design of new buildings, parking, and open spaces, and therefore affects the future of how a community feels and functions more than any other element.

Existing Conditions

The study area contains a variety of zoning districts. The Deans Bridge Road corridor is primarily zoned General Commercial (B-2). The properties on the corridor close to the intersection of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and 15th Street are mostly zoned Neighborhood Business (B-1). Properties with commercial (B-1 and B-2) zoning take up 26% of the land in the study area. One Family Residential (R-1A through R-1E) are the predominant zoning districts in the study area and take up 43% of the area. R-1B and R-1C zoning can be seen in Cherry Tree and part of the Oates Creek neighborhoods. Moving south along the corridor to the suburban areas, R-1A is common in residential areas. Multifamily Residential zoning districts (R-3A to R-3C) are scattered throughout the study area and take up about 10% of the total land area. Industrial zoning designations are mostly concentrated at the north end of the study area along the railroad.

One-Family Residential zoning districts ranging from R-1A to R-1E vary by lot size and density. R-1A through R-1C allow detached single-family dwellings only, while R-1D and R-1E allow both detached and attached dwellings. Multifamily Residential districts ranging from R-3A to R-3C generally allow multifamily uses, with some differences regarding lodging and group homes as well as lot sizes and densities. No zoning district in the study area allows a mix of residential and commercial uses.

Strengths
- The existing mix of zoning supports a variety of development types.
- The Residential and Business districts allow mixed-use development.

Weaknesses
- No design standards exist today.

Opportunities
- A design-based overlay for the corridor could raise the bar for development.
- Zoning changes could support the vision emerging from this plan.
- Flexible, mixed-use zoning could allow projects to respond changing market conditions and position the corridor area to capitalize on growth trends.

Threats
- Opposition to zoning changes could hinder the ability to achieve the vision emerging from this plan.
- Zoning changes that do not match the City of Augusta’s ability to administer them could threaten their effectiveness.

Many communities successfully use zoning tools to support quality growth (Source: Department of Development, City of Columbus, Ohio).
### Table 2.3: Existing Zoning Districts Within Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Max Density/Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agricultural district allows single-family residential dwellings developed with R-1 zone standards. Agricultural, dairying, and ranching uses are allowed. Buildings incidental to agriculture, dairying and ranching are allowed.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1A</td>
<td>Allows only single-family residential dwellings with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 80 feet. The maximum residential density is 4 units per acre in this district.</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1B</td>
<td>Allows only single-family residential dwellings with a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet and a minimum lot width of 75 feet. The maximum residential density is 5 units per acre in this district.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1C</td>
<td>Allows only single-family residential dwellings with a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 60 feet. The maximum residential density is 7 units per acre in this district.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1D</td>
<td>Allows single-family detached and attached dwellings in groups of two joined at a common lot line. Minimum lot size for this district is 4,000 square feet with a minimum lot width of 40 feet. The maximum building height is 2.5 stories or 45 feet in this district.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1E</td>
<td>District allows single-family attached dwellings and multi-family condominium structures. It has no minimum lot size or lot width requirement. The maximum building height is 2.5 stories or 45 feet. The maximum density for this district is 10 units per acre.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>District allows single-family detached and two-family dwellings. The maximum building height is 2.5 stories or 45 feet. The maximum lot area per dwelling unit shall be 2,500 square feet in an R-2 Zone.</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>District allows multifamily dwellings. No building structure can be more than 2.5 stories or 45 feet in height. The minimum lot area per dwelling unit is 4,000 square feet in this district.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3B</td>
<td>District allows multifamily dwellings, single-family attached dwellings, lodging or tourist home, family and group persona care homes, and fraternity or sorority house. The maximum building height is 4 stories or 75 feet. The minimum lot area per dwelling unit is 2,500 square feet in this district.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3C</td>
<td>District allows multifamily dwellings, single-family attached dwellings, and congregate personal care homes. The maximum building height is 6 stories or 105 feet. The minimum lot area per dwelling unit is 1,500 square feet in this district.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-MH</td>
<td>Allows manufactured home parks and manufactured homes on individual lots. The maximum building height in this district is 2.5 stories or 45 feet. Minimum lot width for this district is 100 feet. Every lot in an R-MH (Manufactured Home Residential) Zone where public sewer is to be used shall be 15,000 square feet. Every lot in an R-MH (Manufactured Home Residential) Zone where an individual sewage disposal system is to be used shall be developed in accordance with the provisions of the Groundwater Recharge Area Protection Ordinance.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-1</td>
<td>District is intended for professional and office uses. Building height cannot exceed 3 stories or 55 feet. Maximum individual building area cannot exceed 15,000 gross square feet.</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>District is intended for neighborhood business uses. Building height cannot exceed 3 stories or 55 feet. Maximum individual building area cannot exceed 15,000 gross square feet.</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>District is intended for general business uses. The maximum height of any structure in B-2 district cannot exceed 165 feet.</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>District is intended for light industrial uses with a maximum building height of 165 feet.</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>District is intended for heavy and light industrial uses with a maximum building height of 300 feet.</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2.4: Existing Zoning
2.2 Transportation

A community's transportation system is comprised of several interconnected components that work together to move people and goods within a given area. These include vehicular, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities. Together, these different components interact with one another to affect travel mode, land use and system flexibility.

The ability to efficiently transport people, goods, and services through and within a corridor is vital to the development or redevelopment of an area. Therefore, a full understanding of the current network is necessary to identify deficiencies and potential future needs. The following sections discuss current roadway, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure located within the study area.

Existing Conditions

Strengths

• US 1/SR 4 connects to potential development areas and provides access to south Augusta to downtown.
• The Turpin Hill historic area and the surrounding community has a well connected grid.
• The bus route, rural transit on-demand, and paratransit services are all provided within the study area.

Weaknesses

• Bottlenecks exist at intersections on major corridors.
• Intersections are skewed and have minimal offsets in certain areas.
• The sidewalk system is not adequate within the study with missing sidewalks located throughout.
• There are no bicycle facilities located within the study area.

Opportunities

• Provide turn lanes at intersections at major intersections.
• Realign intersections and improve street design to improve safety.
• Create a bicycle connection throughout the study area.
• Complete the sidewalk network throughout the study area.

Threats

• Poorly planned development, which could occur without provisions for connectivity can create a burden on existing streets.
• A lack of pedestrian and bicycle improvements will cause safety concerns for residents using multimodal options.

ROADWAYS

The US 1/SR 4 corridor connects downtown Augusta to the suburban areas of Richmond Hill, Meadowbrook, Jamestown, Wrens, and Fort Gordon. The roadway is classified as an urban principal arterial and changes names several times within the study area. The southern portion of the roadway is referred to as Deans Bridge Road, a name the facility maintains as it travels southwest to Wrens. North of the intersection of Deans Bridge Road and Milledgeville Road, the roadway assumes the name of Milledgeville Road until the intersection of Milledgeville Road and Olive Road. The roadway is named Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard between the intersections of Olive Road and 15th Street/15th Avenue. North of the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard/15th Street/15th Avenue intersection, the roadway is named 15th Street.

Daily traffic volumes vary between 15,000 and 23,400, with the lowest volumes being along the 15th Street portion and the highest volumes being along the Milledgeville Road/Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard segment. There are multiple signalized intersections along the corridor. While most intersections serve local or collector roads, major intersections exist at US 78/278 (Gordon Highway), Milledgeville Road, and Central Avenue. Due to the roadway geometry along the corridor, several of the intersections are skewed or offset.

Intersection Performance

Bottlenecks often form at intersections on major corridors. Typically, sufficient capacity exists along corridor segments, but additional capacity, in the form of additional turn lanes, is needed in the vicinity of intersections. The storage space provided by turn lanes reduces the potential for turning vehicles to impact through vehicles. A full intersection analysis was completed using Synchro 8 to evaluate intersection delay and level of service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Completely free-flow conditions. Operation of motor vehicles is virtually unaffected by the presence of other vehicles. Drivers are constrained only by the geometric features of the highway and his/her personal driving preferences. Minor disruptions to traffic flow are easily absorbed without a change in travel speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Free-flow conditions, but the presence of other vehicles begins to be noticeable. Average travel speeds should still be the same as LOS A, but drivers have slightly less room to maneuver. Minor disruptions to traffic flow are still easily absorbed without a change in travel speed. Nevertheless, there could be some brief, localized deterioration in flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Represents a range of driving conditions where the influence of traffic density becomes very noticeable. Average travel speeds begin showing some reduction. Drivers' ability to maneuver is clearly affected by the presence of other vehicles. Minor disruptions can be expected to cause queuing and serious, localized deterioration in traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Represents a range of driving conditions where the ability to maneuver is severely restricted because of traffic congestion. Average travel speeds are reduced because of increased volumes. Only minor disruptions can be absorbed without the formation of extensive queuing and deteriorating traffic flow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Represents driving conditions at or near capacity and is quite unstable. Vehicles can operate with minimum spacing at which uniform flow can be maintained. Disruptions cannot be readily dissipated. Disruptions will likely cause queues to form and service to deteriorate to LOS F. Passenger car mean speeds at capacity are highly variable and unpredictable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Represents forced or breakdown flow. Occurs either at a point where vehicles arrive at a rate greater than the rate at which they are discharged or at a point on a planned facility where forecasted demand exceeds computed capacity. Although operations at such points and on sections immediately downstream will appear to be at capacity, queues will form behind these breakdowns. Operations within queues are highly unstable with vehicles experiencing brief periods of movement followed by stoppages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Highway Capacity Manual 2000, Transportation Research Board
Part II: Existing Conditions

Delay is the average amount of time a vehicle will be waiting at an intersection, and LOS is a letter grade assigned to the intersection based on intersection delay. Table 2.4 describes the roadway conditions a driver would experience at each LOS. The analysis indicated that all signalized intersections in the corridor are performing at acceptable LOS (LOS D or better). Table 2.5 and Figure 2.4 show detailed delay and intersection LOS for each of the signalized intersections.

Safety

In addition to vehicular mobility, safety is an important aspect related to development of the US 1/SR 4 corridor. Traffic incidents (crashes) cause traffic congestion, economic loss, and injuries or loss of life. When analyzing crash data, it is important to note that there are usually multiple underlying reasons for each crash. These include roadway geometry, weather conditions, driver behavior, traffic operations, on-road or roadside hazards, and construction activity. In most cases, no single factor causes a crash to occur. This report focuses on identifying the underlying causes of crashes to determine where motorist safety may be improved by means of upgrading roadway geometry, installing safety-related features, and/or improving traffic conditions.

The latest three years (2007 through 2009) of crash data were collected from GDOT and analyzed to quantify the severity, type, and spatial distribution of the crashes on US 1/SR 4 between Gordon Highway and Central Avenue.
The corridor was divided into three segments based on varying historical average annual daily traffic (AADT) information. The segments analyzed were US 1/SR 4 between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road, represented by mile point 20.56 to mile point 21.34; US 1/SR 4 between Milledgeville Road and 15th Street, represented by mile point 21.35 to mile point 22.09; and US 1/SR 4 between 15th Street and Central Avenue, represented by mile point 22.10 to mile point 23.35. Each of the segments was analyzed to determine crash rate, crash type, and the distribution of crashes along the corridor.

Crash Rate Analysis

The crash data was analyzed to calculate crash rates for each of the three segments analyzed. Table 2.6 presents a comparison of calculated crash rates on US 1/SR 4 with the statewide average crash rates. Text shown in a blue box denotes a value that is above the corresponding average statewide rate.

The table shows that, on average, the frequency of total crashes on US 1/SR 4 within the study corridor is higher than the statewide average during all three years studied. The average injury crash rate is also higher than the statewide average injury crash rate for all three years. Finally, the table shows that fatal crashes are less frequent on US 1/SR 4 as compared to statewide averages for all three years studied.

Crash Type Analysis

Crash data was analyzed to determine the frequency and type of each crash occurring on the corridor. With the exception of one type, not a collision with a motor vehicle, crash types focus on the manner in which the vehicles collided. A crash categorized as Not a Collision with a Motor Vehicle occurs when a vehicle strikes a fixed object (utility pole, guardrail, curb, structure, etc.) or when the vehicle leaves the roadway. Figure 2.5 illustrates the number of each type of crash that occurred along the entire study corridor. The Figure shows that 377 rear-end crashes and 195 angle crashes occurred. This represents approximately 79 percent of the total crashes. These crash types are most prevalent at signalized intersections and non-signalized access points.

Figure 2.5 also shows that 91 sideswipe crashes occurred on the corridor. This represents approximately 12 percent of the total crashes. This crash type is common in locations where traffic must weave across lanes to access adjacent land uses.

Crash Spatial Distribution

The crash data was analyzed to determine the spatial distribution of crashes along the US 1/SR 4 corridor. Figure 2.6 illustrates the crash frequency by mile point for the entire corridor.

The segment of US 1/SR 4 between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road (mile point 20.56 and mile point 21.34) represents 28 percent of the corridor length yet includes approximately 50 percent of the total crashes within the corridor. The segment of US 1/SR 4 between Milledgeville Road and 15th Street (mile point 21.35 and mile point 22.09) represents 27 percent of the corridor length and includes approximately 30 percent of the total crashes. The segment of US 1/SR 4 between 15th Street and Central Avenue (mile point 22.10 and mile point 23.35) represents 45 percent of the corridor length yet includes only approximately 20 percent of the total crashes.

Additionally, the severity of the crashes was analyzed by determining which percentage of each crash type included injuries or fatalities. Injuries are common among all of the crash types that occurred on the corridor. Approximately 30 percent of the angle crashes, 20 percent of the rear-end crashes, 35 percent of the sideswipe crashes, 40 percent of the crashes not involving another motor vehicle, and 50 percent of the head-on crashes involved injuries. There were no fatalities associated with any of the crash types analyzed.
Figure 2.8: Existing Sidewalks
the injuries that occur on the corridor. These two major intersections are the locations of approximately 44 percent of the crashes and approximately 41 percent of the injuries that occur on US 1/SR 4.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**

Pedestrian mobility is equally as important as vehicular mobility for development in a corridor. Households without vehicles and those making short trips benefit from pedestrian facilities. Pedestrian facilities also improve access to and use of transit.

While conditions vary greatly, sidewalks are available throughout much of the corridor. In the northbound direction, sidewalks are missing between Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Essie McIntyre Boulevard. In the southbound direction, sidewalks are missing in two segments: Government Road to Essie McIntyre Boulevard and Koger Street to Wooten Road. Sidewalk conditions range from good at the northern and southern ends to fair/poor in the middle sections. Some areas of sidewalk are overgrown; have frequent obstructions such as signs, utility poles, and fire hydrants; or pass through parking areas where the pedestrian area is not clearly marked.

In the corridor neighborhood areas, sidewalks only exist in public housing complexes, on major roads, and along some residential streets in the

Without appropriate signage and lane markings, the narrow shoulders, numerous access points, and relatively high volumes in the priority corridor make biking difficult.

**Public Transportation**

Augusta Public Transit operates fixed route bus, rural transit on-demand, and paratransit services. Service is available Monday through Friday on all routes, with many of the routes also operating on Saturday. Regular fare is $1.25 (transfers an additional $0.50) and discounted fare is $0.60 (transfers an additional $0.25). Weekly and monthly passes are available.

Four of the agency’s nine bus routes utilize a portion of US 1/SR 4 within the study area. Routes 13 and 16 operate in the southern portion of the study area serving the Barton Chapel and Richmond Hill areas, respectively. Routes 4 and 6 utilize SR 1/SR 4 for a few blocks to connect neighborhoods just north of Gordon Highway to downtown Augusta. Transfers are available between the four routes via a transfer station located
on the western side of the K-Mart parking lot. Headways range from 40 minutes to one hour. In 2011, annual ridership on each of the four lines varied from just over 51,000 on Route 13 to over 168,000 on Route 6. Additionally, 2012 ridership data is available through September. Ridership numbers are expected to be similar for all routes except Route 6. Ridership data for each of the four routes are shown in Table 2.7.

Table 2.7 Transit Ridership for 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Number</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011 (Jan.-Dec.)</td>
<td>2012 (Jan.-Sept.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>62,445</td>
<td>45,759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>168,555</td>
<td>75,546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>51,566</td>
<td>40,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>74,690</td>
<td>51,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the bus stops are identified only by a small sign and have no shelter or seating for waiting passengers. A couple of stops, including the transfer station, feature covered benches.
2.3 Urban Design & Historic Resources

The historic patterns of a community’s blocks, lots, and buildings often remain unchanged for generations, and are important for determining the feel of an area, how easy it is to travel through, how people relate to each other, and how land is used. Urban design refers to the collective physical patterns that define a community and their ability to create a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts. A key component of urban design is the experience that a place provides. This experience is defined by an interaction of building, street, trees, sidewalks, topography, and other physical features that work together to define “place” and establish physical character.

Block and Street Patterns

Block and street patterns have a significant impact on the transportation system of a community. Additionally, they can impact parcel size, which can, in turn, impact the economic resiliency of an area.

Existing Conditions

The study area stretches along a 3.1 mile corridor and includes four neighborhoods. Among these neighborhoods, Cherry Tree is one of the Old City neighborhoods and has a grid street network in the residential area. Oates Creek, Southgate, and Rocky Creek are South Augusta neighborhoods built around and after the 1950s. These three neighborhoods have varied street patterns which range from grid street blocks in the residential areas to superblocks surrounded by curvilinear streets in non-residential areas. The smallest blocks are located in Oates Creek, near Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, where residential blocks have perimeters between 1,500 and 2,000 feet. Along Gordon Highway, Deans Bridge Road, and Milledgeville Road, commercial development is in typical suburban superblock pattern. Some block perimeters are more than 8,000 feet. Industrial areas near the railroad also have large blocks with less connected streets.

Strengths

- There are small blocks in the residential areas.
- Interconnected streets exist in most residential areas.
- Alleys exist in some residential areas in Cherry Tree and Oates Creek neighborhoods.

Weaknesses

- Large blocks in the commercial areas along Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road force pedestrians and drivers to travel longer distances than would be necessary with a well connected street network.

Opportunities

- The interconnected street system in residential areas could be expanded with development and redevelopment.
- Newer small blocks can be created by dividing existing superblocks in commercial areas.

Threats

- The creation of dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs could reduce connectivity.
Lot Patterns

Lots are the second major element in shaping communities. Like streets and blocks, lot patterns tend to be fixed for long periods, regardless of land use. Historically speaking, lot size was also an indicator of where in the community a lot was located, with the smallest lots dedicated to mixed-use buildings near the center of town and larger lots dedicated to farmland located at the fringes. Today, with the increasing scale of redevelopment economics and the large amounts of capital necessary to finance infill projects, the notion that lots at the center of a community should be small is no longer universal. Modern financial models often demand that redevelopments occupy an entire block and be undertaken by large developers. The existence of small lots with many different owners can be a challenge to redevelopment, particularly if land assembly is critical. Diverse ownership, however, can be beneficial to creating a rich character and sense of place where small lot owners are motivated to develop on a smaller scale.

Existing Conditions

More than 93% of parcels in the study area are less than 1 acre in size, with the smaller single family lots are located mostly in the Cherry Tree and Oates Creek Neighborhoods. There are only 25 parcels larger than 10 acres, but these parcels constitute nearly one third of the total land area. These large parcels are home to commercial, industrial, institutional, and multifamily uses. Table 2.8 shows study area parcels by size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Size</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Percent of Total Parcels</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percent of All Parcel Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.5 acres</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51 - 1.0 acres</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 - 5.0 acres</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01 - 10.0 acres</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10.0 acres</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Parcels</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths
• Traditional neighborhood lot patterns characterize some residential areas.

Weaknesses
• Suburban lot patterns dominate along Gordon Highway, Deans Bridge Road, and Milledgeville Road.
• Lot patterns are inconsistent along the corridor from north to south.

Opportunities
• Redevelopment of vacant and underutilized non-residential lots along the corridor could allow for better lot patterns.
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Threats
- “Holdout” property owners could hinder community supported redevelopment.

**Building Patterns**

The placement and massing of buildings can work together to form spaces greater than the individual buildings. Different spatial forms have different impacts on psychology and the ability of places to support activities. For example, most people like to feel protected while walking. This is best achieved by providing a sense of enclosure. A street with a height-to-width ratio of between 1:1 and 1:3 provides the necessary sense of enclosure, irrespective of how tall the buildings are. Enclosure also has a direct impact on driver behavior because buildings close to the street psychologically narrow it and can decrease vehicular speeds. Building patterns also affect the legibility of a place, or how easy it is for a visitor to quickly understand its organization. A figure ground study is a valuable tool for understanding this component of urban form because it reduces buildings and their relationships to a simple map showing their location on an otherwise negative background. This allows an understanding of buildings and the spaces between them. These public or semi-public spaces often are the most commonly experienced spaces.

**Existing Conditions**

The study area exhibits varying degrees of building order, with the best defined areas found in residential neighborhoods. Consistent with lot sizes discussed previously, building density decreases from north to south as the location shifts from Old Town neighborhoods to South Augusta neighborhoods. In general, single family buildings all have consistent setbacks along the same street or in the same block.

On the other hand, most buildings located along the main thoroughfares are fragmented and fail to contribute to a positive urban form. Along Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road, spatial form is the weakest in the commercial areas. Buildings are set back far from the street and are fronted by vast expanses of parking. Lack of connectivity between buildings, coupled with large setbacks, causes these areas to have the feeling of an open space, inhospitable to pedestrians and not conducive to creating a sense of place.

**Strengths**
- Most residential buildings are not set back too far from the street, which helps create successful urban form.

**Weaknesses**
- Frontal parking, large setbacks, and low building heights in commercial areas along major thoroughfares create poor spatial definition.

**Opportunities**
- Planting street trees along major roadways could create a strong edge.
- Infill housing could be appropriately scaled to fill in breaks in neighborhood fabric.
- Historic building patterns could be extended in redevelopment areas.

**Threats**
- Inappropriate redevelopment along the corridor could create poorly defined and aesthetically unpleasant areas.

**Building Conditions**

A key factor in determining the revitalization and historic preservation opportunities of an area is the current condition of buildings. There are four categories into which buildings can be classified, including:

- Standard, a building in good condition and needing few or no repairs.
- Substandard, a building in moderate condition and requiring some general repair.
- Deteriorated, a building requiring one or more major repairs, such as a new roof, foundation, siding or windows.
- Dilapidated, a building with significant structural problems and representing a public health threat.
Figure 2.13: Building Conditions
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Building Conditions:
- Good: A building is in good condition and needs few, if any, repairs.
- Fair: A building is in moderate condition and requires some general repair.
- Poor: A building requires one or more major repairs, such as a new roof, foundation, siding or windows.
- Dilapidated: A building has significant structural problems and represents a public health threat.
Each category is based on exterior conditions. A determination of final condition requires both interior and exterior review.

**Existing Conditions**

A field survey found that two thirds of study area parcels have structures in good or fair conditions. About one third of parcels are either vacant or have poor/dilapidated buildings. Most buildings in poor or dilapidated conditions are located in the residential area at Cherry Tree, and the part of Oates Creek close to downtown. The same situation applies to vacant parcels. Table 2.9 shows a detailed list of parcel conditions in the study area.

Table 2.9 Building Conditions by Number of Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th># of Parcels</th>
<th>% of Parcels</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% of Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidated</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park/Open Space</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,801</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,535</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic Resources**

Preserving a community’s heritage is becoming increasingly important in today’s world of homogeneous cities and towns. Many places have found that the best way to promote future growth is by preserving the past. This is particularly true where historic buildings are of a quality would be financially prohibitive to construct today. People are increasingly drawn to communities with a sense of character and history. In addition, “place-oriented” retail has become one of real estate’s hottest commodities, with many new “Main Streets” emerging across the nation.

**Existing Conditions**

The neighborhoods in the study area were established at different time periods. As part of the Old City neighborhood, the area along 15th Street was mostly built between the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries. The maps of Augusta from the 1920s and 1940s on the right show the historic street network. The area south of 15th Street was mostly built out after World War II.

Currently, the Shiloh Orphanage (now known as the Shiloh Comprehensive Community Center) is the only site in the study area listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It was founded by leaders of the African American community in 1904. Another potential area for designation is the historic Turpin Hill district in the Cherry Tree neighborhood. The boundaries for the district are 15th Street to the west, Essie McIntyre Boulevard to the south, Roosevelt Street to the east, and a visual boundary to the north. The district was primarily African American. Houses are mostly bungalows built between 1896 and the 1950s. Today the area is somewhat distressed, with some vacant lots, and structures in poor or dilapidated condition.

In addition to the Turpin Hill Historic District, there are some scattered historic buildings that should be valued and potentially listed on the National Register. They can be seen along 15th Street, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, and Milledgeville Road. Some of them, however, are in poor or dilapidated conditions due to lack of maintenance and reinvestment.

Among the historic structures identified, most are houses. There are also a few examples of commercial and institutional buildings. Table 2.10 contains a list of major historic structures, also shown in Figure 2.13.

**Strengths**

- Shiloh Orphanage is an important historic place.
- Historic structures and neighborhoods are key to the area’s identity.

**Weaknesses**

- Some historic structures are in poor or dilapidated conditions.
- The Old City neighborhood fabric has become fragmented because of vacant parcels.

**Opportunities**

- Historic structures could be preserved or renovated to help contribute to the area’s identity.
- Historic building styles can be applied as prototypes for future development.
- Appropriate infill development could mend the Old City neighborhood fabric.
Table 2.10 Study Area Historic Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jefferson Davis Memorial Hwy Monument</td>
<td>2340 Milledgeville Road</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>20 x 20 feet area centered around the monument</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tubman Daycare Cottage</td>
<td>2340 Milledgeville Road</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Example of early twentieth century brick institutional building</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mildred Woodward House</td>
<td>2258 MLK Boulevard</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Craftsman-style front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hon House</td>
<td>1903 Olive Road</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Beard House</td>
<td>1905 Olive Road</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tomie Property</td>
<td>1904,1906 Olive Road</td>
<td>1931, 1936</td>
<td>Cross gable bungalow and American small house</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collins House</td>
<td>2140 MLK Boulevard</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>New south cottage</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. McLeod House</td>
<td>1955 15th Street</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Hip roof bungalow</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Avery House</td>
<td>1950 15th Street</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Hip roof cottage</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Freeman House</td>
<td>1949 15th Street</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Side gable bungalow</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pugh House</td>
<td>1945 15th Street</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Side gable bungalow</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. McLeod Garage</td>
<td>1901 15th Street</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Brick and concrete commercial building example</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Walker House</td>
<td>1778 15th Street</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Side hall cottage</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Eubanks-Walker House</td>
<td>1774 15th Street</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Thomasina Walker House</td>
<td>1654 Hester Street</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Good Shepherd Bungalow</td>
<td>1503 Essie McIntyre Blvd.</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lanham House</td>
<td>1673 15th Street</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Evelyn Loo Building</td>
<td>1671 15th Street</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Two story commercial building</td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Wells House</td>
<td>1651 15th Street</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Front gable bungalow</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Williams Memorial CME Church</td>
<td>1630 15th Street</td>
<td>1935, 1953</td>
<td>Brick church building features Gothic Revival and Colonial Revival elements</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A historic house in good condition at the intersection of 15th Street and Dewitt Street.

A beautiful historic house in fair condition is located on 15th Street.

McLeod Garage is an example of a historic commercial building located on 15th Street.

Williams Memorial CME is an historic church on 15th Street.
Figure 2.14: Historic Resources
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Part II: Existing Conditions

Threats
- Continued lack of maintenance to historic structures could lead to their loss.

Streetscape Audit

Streetscape audits are performed for the study area to determine the quality of public street spaces. The following factors are considered to determine the condition of each streetscape:
1. Existence and quality of sidewalk
2. Relationship of buildings to street
3. Location of parking as it relates to street
4. Amenities like shade and landscaping
5. Pedestrian safety
2.4 Environment and Public Facilities

Environment

Patterns of human development are closely related to the natural environments in which they are located. Communities affect and are affected by the natural environment in direct and indirect ways that must be considered in any planning process.

The direct environmental effects of development are those with a physical, on-site impact. These include things like topography, streams, forests, building performance, and noise. They must be considered during site design if negative environmental impacts are to be minimized.

Recent thinking has embraced a broader understanding of environmental impacts that also considers indirect factors. This perspective looks beyond the immediate impacts of activity on an individual site to also consider off-site impacts, especially energy consumed by transport. Given that in 2007 nearly 29 percent of the nation’s energy use was for transportation, and that in 2010 nearly 61 percent of transportation energy was used by cars, land use patterns that reduce driving can have a significant environmental impact. In some cases, their macro level benefits can outweigh on-site disadvantages.

Existing Conditions

There are many direct environmental factors in the study area, both natural and man-made, that have a significant impact on its future. The most notable natural feature is the hydrology or water system. The study area has two stream corridors—Rocky Creek and Oates Creek. The Rocky Creek watershed covers the western portion of the study area, and the creek itself is mostly in its natural condition. Frequent flooding of the surrounding area has spurred the City of Augusta and the Corps of Engineers to develop an overall drainage plan that includes a proposed flood control dam and detention pond. The city has acquired properties that have experienced flood damages. Oates Creek is primarily channelized. Wetlands and floodplains can be seen on Figure 2.15 Natural Features and Community Facilities. Generally, the entire corridor is flat except for the Rocky Creek area.

Tree coverage is moderate in the study area. Trees are present in single-family residential areas, but do not form a significant canopy in most areas. The area with the most significant tree canopy is along Rocky Creek south of Milledgeville Road. Commercial and industrial areas fronting the main thoroughfares have the least trees.

Man-made factors are also present, including noise and air pollution, radiant heat, stormwater runoff, and potential ground contaminants. Noise levels from Gordon Highway are high, as is localized air pollution around it. Research shows that airborne particulate matter is greatest within 300 meters downwind of highways. Parking lots are another factor; they can contribute to water runoff and localized heating. Finally, the presence of commercial uses, particularly gas stations, may suggest that ground contaminants exist on some sites, although this can only be determined through an Environmental Site Assessment.

Indirect environmental factors in the study area are more difficult to quantify, but still significant. Most notable is the driving patterns of area residents that result from the community’s design, the lack of major employment, and the lack of some amenities in the area. If jobs, services, housing, and other amenities were provided in a walkable setting, it is certain that many more people would walk or bicycle than currently do, benefiting public health, the environment, and their wallets in the process.

In terms of the social environment, neighborhoods along this corridor generally consist of low-income and minority population, who have been living in the area for decades.

Strengths

• Streams exist in the study area.
• Flood zones ensure that many areas will remain open space.

Weaknesses

• Parking lots contribute to radiant heating and stormwater runoff.
• There is a lack of landscaping along streets and in parking lots.
• The area’s urban form encourages driving.

Opportunities

• “Green” building and planning techniques could allow growth with a lesser impact on the local environment.
• Water retention ponds could be environmental amenities.
• Stormwater management techniques, such as bioswales or pervious paving, could reduce runoff and improve water quality.
• “Green infrastructure” such as rain gardens and bioswales could be implemented with redevelopment.
• Creek corridors could be protected, for their ability to convey storm water as well as provide public open space.

Threats

• Poorly planned development could increase stormwater runoff and radiant heating.
• Existing gas stations could contaminate soils if not maintained.
• Tree coverage could be lost if new development fails to provide street trees, landscape parking lots, and similar contextually appropriate landscaping.
Figure 2.16: Natural Features and Public Facilities
Public Facilities

Many services are provided in the study area by a variety of providers, including local, state, and federal governments, as well as private organizations. These include basic facilities for public health, safety, and welfare, as well as additional services that make a community an inviting place to live or do business. An example of the latter includes open space, which is becoming an important development strategy in some places.

Existing Conditions

The study area has the following basic public facilities:

- W. T. Johnson Community Center
- Jones Pool
- Cherry Tree Crossing Head Start (School)
- Collins Elementary School
- T. W. Josey Comprehensive High School
- Jenkins-White Elementary School
- Dogwood Terrace Head Start (School)
- Dougherty Park
- Murphy Middle School
- Wilkinson Gardens Elementary School
- YMCA Tubman branch

Generally, the area is undeserved in terms of parks, libraries, and public safety facilities. Health care facilities are nearby at the University Hospital and Trinity Hospital of Augusta. There are also several religious institutions and private community facilities along the corridor and in the neighborhood that serve the area. For example, the Shiloh Community Center on 15th Street is a non-profit organization working to provide social services.

Strengths

- A variety of public and private community facilities are present.
- The corridor is close to the medical center.

Weaknesses

- Public safety is a significant concern.
- There are no facilities dedicated to serving seniors.
- There is a lack of public parks.
- There is no public library.

Opportunities

- Public and private parks could be created with development and redevelopment.
- New community facilities could be created either publicly or as part of private developments.
- Both Rocky Creek and Oates Creek corridors are opportunities for public open spaces.

Threats

- Growth without facility expansion and improvements could strain existing resources and reduce quality of life.
2.5 Utilities and Infrastructure

The following analysis looks at existing conditions of five utility and infrastructure systems within the study area and specifically, the 15th Street, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, and Deans Bridge Road corridor. These are the wastewater (sanitary sewers), water distribution, power and communications, natural gas, and stormwater systems.

**Wastewater (Sanitary Sewers)**

The wastewater system is owned and operated by the Augusta Utility Department. The system consists of gravity fed sanitary sewer lines and manholes for maintenance access (Figure 2.16). The age of the system varies, as do the pipe materials. Older pipe sections within the system were typically constructed of vitrified clay and newer systems have been installed with either PVC or ductile iron pipe. All wastewater ultimately drains to the James B. Messerly Waste Water Treatment Plant located on Doug Barnard Parkway. There are no known problems within the system at this time.

**Water Distribution**

The drinking water distribution system is owned and operated by the Augusta Utility Department. The system consists of water mains typically ranging in size from 6 to 12 inches in diameter (Figure 2.17). The predominant water main material is ductile iron, but older sections may include cast iron and newer sections may include PVC. The water system includes widespread valve locations to allow for segments of the system to be isolated and shut down for maintenance activities and repairs. There are no known problems within the system at this time.

The water distribution system operates within a “normal” pressure range between 40 and 80 psi. Water main diameters are sized to provide adequate...
Power and Communications

Power and communication systems located throughout the project area are owned and operated by Georgia Power, AT&T, Comcast, Knology, and Level 3 Communications. Facilities for each of these utilities are generally owned and operated by Georgia Power, AT&T, Comcast, Knology, and Level 3 Communications. Contact Information:

Georgia Power: Jack Hickson - 706-667-5651 (Distribution)
Georgia Power: Anita Kattegat - 706-667-5654 (Transmission)
AT&T: Warren Geitgey - 706-210-8283
Comcast: Kevin O’Meara - 706-706-739-1865
Knology: Richard Strength - 706-533-2066
Level 3 Communications: Tim Boykin - 720-888-7280

Natural Gas

The natural gas system in the study area is owned and operated by Atlanta Gas Light. The portion of the system along the length of the primary corridor (Figure 2.19) consists of a 4-inch diameter main (plastic and steel) operating at between 15 and 40 psi. There are also two large diameter steel line crossings located at Gordon Highway (6 inch diameter/40 psi) and Olive Road (12 inch diameter/150 psi).

Stormwater

Stormwater systems fall into two distinct watersheds: the Rocky Creek watershed and the Oates Creek watershed. Each is a typical urban watershed characterized by areas of residential, commercial, and industrial development, with large expanses of impervious area surrounding schools, shopping malls, and retail shopping centers. Stormwater collection and conveyance is accomplished through a network of curb and gutter, catch basins, storm sewers, open channels, culverts, and natural streams.

The proposed road improvements along 15th Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard include “traditional” stormwater management consisting of new storm sewer infrastructure and improvements to existing infrastructure.

Rocky Creek Drainage Basin

Stormwater Flows: The western portion of the study area (primarily west of Gordon Highway) lies within the Rocky Creek watershed, which encompasses nearly 20 square miles. The portion of the watershed upstream of the Deans Bridge Road bridge is approximately 10 square miles and the portion upstream of the Wheelless Road bridge is approximately 7 square miles. The corresponding peak storm flows within the creek at these two bridge crossings are shown in Table 2.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.11 : Rocky Creek Peak Stormwater Flows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak Storm Flows (cf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Deans Bridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Wheelless Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Richmond County Flood Insurance Study – FEMA
Table 2.12: Existing Conditions – Oates Creek Storm Flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peak Storm Flows (cfs)</th>
<th>10-Year Storm Event</th>
<th>50-Year Storm Event</th>
<th>100-Year Storm Event</th>
<th>500-Year Storm Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oates Creek at MLK Blvd.</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>2,276</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>3,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oates Creek at Olive Road</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary No.1 at Mouth</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>2,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary No.1 at White Road</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>2,330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Richmond County Flood Insurance Study – FEMA

Flood Plain: The flood plain for a 100-Year Storm event is shown in Figure 2.21. It should be noted that the limits of the study area stop at Olive Road.

Site Conditions: Oates Creek and Oates Creek Tributary No.1 both generally flow in a southeast direction. Oates Creek flows within an open channel to the east of Fayetteville Drive. It flows through dual 36-inch culverts at Fayetteville Drive and continues downstream within an open channel. The stream then transitions into a closed pipe system and crosses Tubman Home Road in an approximately 6-foot diameter reinforced concrete pipe. The stream then transitions back to an open channel and crosses Olive Road via an elliptical pipe arch approximately 5 feet high and 8 feet wide. The stream continues to flow downstream within an open channel. Oates Creek Tributary No.1 flows within an open channel from Olive Road and under a Bridge at White Road, to the confluence with Oates Creek just to the north of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. At the confluence of Oates Creek and Tributary No.1, the stream is conveyed by a concrete lined open channel and then through a quadruple box culvert under MLK, Jr. Blvd (Photographs 12 & 13).

Many of the channel and culvert improvements along Oates Creek are the result of a flood control project completed in the 1980’s by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers. However, due to the flat topography typical within the Oates Creek drainage basin and the age of the infrastructure, there are still areas of localized flooding as outlined in the Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan prepared for the City of Augusta in 2004 which identified roads (Milledgeville Road) as a “Flood‐Prone” road.
Creek and Tributary No. 1, the stream is conveyed by a concrete lined open channel and then through a quadruple box culvert under Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard. Many of the channel and culvert improvements along Oates Creek are the result of a flood control project completed in the 1980s by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers. However, due to the flat topography typical within the Oates Creek watershed and the age of the infrastructure, there are still areas of localized flooding as outlined in the Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan prepared for the City of Augusta in 2004 which identified roads (Milledgeville Road) as a “Flood-Prone” road.
2.6 Sustainability

Existing Conditions

Sustainability encompasses social, economic, and environmental dimensions of communities. This section focuses mainly on the social and economic aspects of sustainability.

Strengths
- The Augusta Medical Center is north of the study area providing access to health care.
- Public transportation provides access to health care facilities and downtown.
- The study area contains affordable neighborhoods close to downtown.

Weaknesses
- A significant amount of the population does not have access to healthy food.
- The affordable housing within the study area is generally in poor condition.
- Limited walking and biking options exist within the study area.

Opportunities
- Integrate more farmer markets, locally grown food, and supermarkets within the study area to improve access to healthy food.
- People drive less in this area, promoting the improvement of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.
- Incorporate green infrastructure within the community to mitigate flooding.

Threats:
- Population may decrease within study area due to low pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, as well as low access to healthy food.
- If the existing community is not improved the deterioration of residential units will continue to follow the current downward trend.

Access to Healthy Food

Supermarkets are one of the most popular and convenient ways which Americans gain access to healthy food, such as fresh meat and fish, or fresh fruits and vegetables. Figure 2.22 shows study area residents’ accessibility to available supermarkets and farmers markets. In this case, a reasonable trip to a supermarket was defined as a ten minutes drive, or a one mile walk. The green dots represent populations in poverty who live within one mile of a supermarket. The red dots represent populations in poverty who live beyond a one mile walk to a supermarket, but may live within a 10 minute drive, assuming the population has access to a car. The gray dots represent the total population in a given area.

Access to Health Care

The geographic access to health care is generally good since the Augusta Medical Center is located just north of the study area. The neighborhoods further north along the study corridor have better access since they are closer to the Medical Center. To the south, a CVS is located on Gordon Highway and meets a number of everyday health needs. There is also a small health care facility located south of the study area on Deans Bridge Road, which may serve some study area residents. In reality, accessibility to health care for low-income populations in the study area may be difficult based on affordability. The area has adequate physical accessibility to health care given existing public transit options.

Affordable Housing

Figure 2.23 shows housing affordability in the study area and surrounding communities. The study area’s housing is affordable, but a great amount is in need of redevelopment and renovation as previously discussed in the

land use section. Public housing is the only type of multifamily housing in the study area. There are three public housing complexes in the study area: Cherry Tree Crossing, Dogwood Terrace, and Jennings Place.

Low housing quality and limited housing types make the area unsustainable for people to age in place. Relatively concentrated poverty also hinders sustainability of the study area.

Transportation Choices

A sustainable community normally provides more choices than driving, which includes public transit options and active modes of transport like walking and cycling.

In terms of public transit, the study area is served by several city bus routes, which go to downtown and south Augusta (details can be found in Section 2.2 Transportation). Figure 2.24 Transit Connectivity Index map shows that all neighborhoods in the study area have an average weekly ridership of 1,200 to 5,000.

Opportunities for walking and bicycling in the study area are limited. There are not many sidewalks and existing sidewalks are not continuous and generally do not provide a buffer from the street. No dedicated bike trails or bike lanes exist. There are also few destinations for people to walk or bike to. However, Figure 2.25 (Green House Gas per Household) indicates that people living in the study area drive less than those in surrounding areas except downtown.

Diverse Job Prospects with Living Wages

The study area’s unemployment rate stands at 9.4 percent as of August 2012, which is 0.2% higher than that in the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). The study area’s economy is dominated by the service industry, with half the residents employed in this sector. The area has 48% of residents working in white collar jobs, while 25% are in the service industry, and 28% have blue collar jobs. These percentages indicate that the area has 10% less white collar jobs compared to the MSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Healthy</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Affordable</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Diverse Job Prospects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Tree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oates Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.24 Housing affordability

Figure 2.25 Transit Connectivity Index

Figure 2.26 Green House Gas per Household

Table 2.13 Geography of Access Index
Geography of Access Index

Based on the above analysis of existing conditions, an index was created for each study area neighborhood in terms of geography of access. The index ranges from 1 to 5 for each category, with 1 providing low accessibility and 5 having high accessibility.

In the category of healthy food, Southgate ranks highest among the four neighborhoods, because most populations in poverty live within a one mile walk of a supermarket. Residents of all other neighborhoods have to drive or take a bus to reach a supermarket.

In terms of health care, the access index is higher for neighborhoods closer to the Medical Center. Considering that over 60% of the population in the study area has low or moderate income, their access to health care may be affected. As a result, Cherry Tree receives a 4, Oates Creek receives a 3, and the other two neighborhood score an index of 2.

Housing is affordable in all four neighborhoods. Most of the area’s housing cost is less than 20% of income, with a few blocks of housing reaching between 20-30% of income as shown in Figure 2.23. However, considering the relatively low quality and limited types of housing, the index of each neighborhood receives an index of 4.

All four neighborhoods transportation index scores a 3 because they all have access to transit within a reasonable walking distance, because people walk in these areas but there are very limited pedestrian facilities, and because no bike facilities currently exist.

Potential Sustainable Opportunities

Public/private improvements and redevelopment should incorporate green infrastructure practices to make the study area more sustainable. Unlike single-purpose gray stormwater infrastructure, which uses pipes to dispose of rainwater, green infrastructure uses vegetation and soil to manage rainwater where it falls. By weaving natural processes into the built environment, green infrastructure provides not only stormwater management, but also flood mitigation, air quality management, and much more.²

Green infrastructure opportunities include but are not limited to:

- Protect/restore Rocky Creek and Oates Creek greenways.
- Incorporate bioswales in streetscape improvement and new street projects.
- Use pervious paving for parking and pedestrian hardscape surfaces.
- Encourage green roofs in new development.
- Avoid building surface parking where feasible.

Community agriculture can improve a community’s access to healthy food and support local food production. There are many opportunities for community agriculture in the study area. They include:

- Incorporate community gardens as one of the components of mixed-use and mixed-income development.
- Vacant publicly owned parcels located in infill areas can be used to create community gardens in each neighborhood.
- Local churches could develop community gardens as one of their outreach programs.
- A farmers market could sell locally produced food.


Greenways along creeks should serve a stormwater management purpose as well as providing recreational opportunities.

Bioswales along streets enhance water infiltration and reduce surface runoff.
Part III: Market Conditions
Executive Summary

Augusta-Richmond County has the second largest population of any city in Georgia and continues to grow with the influx of new residents. In 2010, Wells Fargo highlighted the resilience of the Augusta economy and its slightly faster pace of recovery compared to the rest of the state. The economic landscape is dominated by the health care industry, manufacturing, technology, and education. Educational assets include Georgia Regents University, Augusta Technical College, Aiken Technical College, Paine College, and Savannah River College—as well as branches of Georgia Military College, Virginia College, and Southern Wesleyan University.

Communities in Augusta continue to rebuild after the Recession. Neighborhoods along the 4.5 mile Sustainable Augusta Priority Development Corridor include the following:

- Rocky Creek, home to the dead Regency Mall
- Southgate, a residential neighborhood with a Kmart anchored shopping center
- Oates Creek, a residential neighborhood with underutilized commercial sites and used car lots
- Cherry Tree, a low-income neighborhood with stable non-profit stakeholders including community church anchors

These distinct areas run along Deans Bridge Road, Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, and 15th Street. Major transportation improvements planned for this corridor served as the impetus to prepare a cohesive plan for land use upgrades and strategic implementation to improve the quality of life for area residents and workers.

Existing Conditions

The study area contains an overlooked section of the city characterized by:

- A declining population and household base
- A median household income that is only 57 percent of the metropolitan area’s median income
- One-third of households who made less than $15,000 in 2010 and almost one-half who made less than $25,000
- High unemployment and underemployment
- One-half of employed residents who work in services industries
- An aging housing stock, of which nearly 70 percent was built before 1970, and only about 4 percent has been built since 1990
- Residential vacancy rates above 15 percent, well in excess of an ideal rate of less than five percent
- 54 percent renter households
- More than one-half of renter households spending 30 percent or more of their income for housing, the accepted standard for housing affordability
- Significant foreclosure activity

Residential Potential

New housing will need to address both the homeownership and rental markets. While new homeowners can bring greater stability and higher levels of maintenance to the community, fewer households are able to qualify for home mortgages today, and rental housing demand is increasing. Given the costs of new construction, the revitalization strategy should include both new construction and rehabilitation of existing housing where the cost of renovation does not exceed the value of the house.

Potential target markets include 1) Georgia Regents University students; 2) medical staff and workers; 3) current residents who want to upgrade their living situations; and 4) some military families from Fort Gordon.

Meeting the demand for new housing at prices the market can support will require public financial investment to defray some of the redevelopment costs. There is a gap between what private investors are willing to fund based on future rents and the cost to develop quality rental housing. For-sale housing has the same problem where the incomes of prospective home buyers may not support the full costs of new construction. Extensive development of new housing in the study area will require significant financial investment by local, state, and federal governments. The pace and scale of supportable new development will be dependent on the level of that investment.

Commercial Potential

Office development opportunities are quite limited, focused primarily on local business professionals serving neighborhood residents. A food industry incubator could help to support emerging food-related businesses. Greenhouses and food cultivation in the neighborhood could be developed in conjunction with the Georgia Regents University as a source of healthy produce for its students and Medical District patients.

The existing retail inventory is limited to strip shopping centers. The closest grocery store is the Kroger located a mile north of the study area. A new Walmart is proposed for construction on 15th Street, which will expand available shopping opportunities. A Kmart shopping center is located in the Southgate neighborhood in the southern end of the study area.

The population base and income levels of the study area neighborhoods are not sufficient to support significant new retail development.

3.1 Introduction

This market analysis is based on best available data and information collected from a variety of local, regional, and national sources. This information reflects recent trends and current market conditions. However, changes in national and regional economic conditions and in the regulatory environment could significantly impact the feasibility conclusions of this plan.

Market Area Definition

The Market Area (MA) utilized in this report represents the geographic area along the corridor that best describes the social and economic context. It is broader than the defined Study Area, due to the inclusions of complete census tracts. The MA, as shown in Figure 3.1, incorporates the following seven census tracts: 13, 14, 103, 104, 105.06, 105.07, and 105.08.

This section provides detailed information on local demographic and economic trends and a profile of Augusta-Richmond County’s role within the regional economy. Data are primarily derived from ESRI and American Community Survey from the US Census, with additional information from the 2000 and 2010 Census. All data tables referenced in this section appear in Appendix A.

Figure 3.1 Study Market Area
3.2 Demographic Profile

This section identifies and quantifies demographic and housing trends affecting the study area as the basis for the next phase of planning for recovery and revitalization.

Population Trends

The population of the MA diminished significantly during the 1990s, decreasing by 9.6 percent. During the 2000-2010 period, the resident population continued to decline, with 1,612 residents leaving the area, as shown in Table 3.1. In contrast, the population of Augusta-Richmond County and the Augusta Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) areas grew during the 1990s, increasing by 4.8 and 14.7 percent, respectively. Growth continued during the 2000-2010 period, with the County adding 2,666 new residents (1.4 percent growth) and the MSA adding 58,224 residents (11.7 percent growth).

The number of households followed the same pattern as the population trends. The number of households within the MA decreased by 6.7 percent during the 1990s and another 2.8 percent during the 2000s. In the County, on the other hand, the number of households increased by 6.6% during the 1990s and 3.0% during the 2000s. Growth was even more significant in the MSA, where the number of households increased by 18.4% during the 1990s and 9.9% during the 2000s.

Population by Age

The populations of all three of the selected areas are relatively young in age. Table 3.1 shows that half the MA population is under the age of 34, half of the County population is under the age of 33.3, and half of the MSA population is under 36.5.

Household Characteristics

Within the County and MSA a majority of households own, rather than rent, their homes. Specifically, 57 percent of the County’s households are owners and two-thirds of the MSA households are owners. Within the MA, however, renters have a slight edge in numbers over owners, with renters representing 53.9 percent of households.

Roughly one-quarter of MA households are married-couple family households. In the same category, the proportion for the County is about one-third, and almost one-half for the MSA. The proportion of married-couple family households with children also increases as the selected areas increase in size, with 8.3 percent of MA households, 13.9 percent of County households, and 19.4 percent of MSA households.

The number of female-headed households is a significant statistic to highlight. One-third of MA households are female-headed families, including 18.2 percent that have children under the age of 18 (see Appendix Table A-1). Table 3.2 provides similar data for the County and MSA.

Sixty to 66 percent of all households in the selected areas have only one or two persons. Average household size ranges from 2.41 persons in the MA to 2.59 persons in the metropolitan area. Household sizes have been declining nationwide over the past four decades with higher divorce rates, fewer children per family, young people delaying marriage, and more of the elderly living independently.

The data show significant disparities among the selected areas in terms of the number of vehicles owned per household. Approximately one-third of the households in the MA own two or more vehicles as compared with one-half of county households and two-thirds of MSA households.

Table 3.1 Population and Age Distribution, and Households by Type, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>Augusta - Richmond County</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population Trends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>31,108</td>
<td>186,555</td>
<td>435,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>28,112</td>
<td>195,504</td>
<td>499,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>198,170</td>
<td>557,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 2010 Change</td>
<td>(4,608)</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>122,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 2000 Change</td>
<td>(2,996)</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
<td>63,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 2010 Change</td>
<td>(1,612)</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>58,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Trends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>11,953</td>
<td>67,584</td>
<td>156,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,147</td>
<td>72,053</td>
<td>184,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10,838</td>
<td>74,199</td>
<td>203,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 2010 Change</td>
<td>(1,115)</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
<td>46,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 - 2000 Change</td>
<td>(806)</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>28,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 2010 Change</td>
<td>(309)</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>18,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population by Age (2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 Years</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>56,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 Years</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 Years</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>28,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 Years</td>
<td>2,769</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>24,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 Years</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>27,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 Years</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>21,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 Years</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>12,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84 Years</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Years and Over</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>198,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Age</strong></td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part III: Market Conditions

### Table 3.2 Household Type, Size, Tenure and Vehicle Ownership, 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>Augusta - Richmond County</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Household by Type, 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-Couple Families</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Family (No Spouse)</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Households by Household Size, 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Person</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two People</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to Four People</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or More People</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Household by Sex, 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Ownership, 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Owned per Household</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Household Size, 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Tenure, 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Renter</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI; U. S. Census 2010; 2005-2009 American Community Survey (ACS); partners for Economic Solutions, 2012

### Table 3.3 Household Income, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>Augusta - Richmond County</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>9,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>9,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>12,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>12,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>7,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or More</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td>10,838</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>74,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$25,799</td>
<td>$37,870</td>
<td>$45,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS); partners for Economic Solutions, 2012

### Employment

Employment trends are key indicators of commercial and residential demand. Jobs are integral to where people reside, what people can afford, and what they are willing and able to pay for housing. Office demand depends directly on employment growth in industries that require office space.

Unemployment rates for Georgia, the Augusta MSA, and Richmond County exceed the national average. In October 2012, the U.S. unemployment rate was 7.8 percent, compared with a 9.2 percent average rate in Georgia. As of August 2012, unemployment in the MSA was 9.4 percent and unemployment within Richmond County was 11.2 percent. Richmond County unemployment remains much higher than in surrounding counties and suburbs.

The study area’s economy is dominated by the service industry, with one-half of MA residents employed in the service industry. Half of the employed MA residents have white-collar occupations and one-quarter have blue-collar occupations. Residents of the County and the MSA have similar distributions but higher percentages of white-collar occupations, particularly those in management, business, financial, computer, engineering, science, education, legal, and health care positions.

Commute times to work of 30 minutes or more were 19.7 percent of MA residents’ work trips, 18.8 percent of county trips, and 28.7 percent of MSA trips, as shown in Appendix Table A-5. The majority of the employed population...
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benefit from working living close to work. The majority of the workers use their own cars to get to work, with more than three-fourths of the employed population driving alone to work for all three of the selected areas. (See Appendix Table A-6.)

**Housing Stock**

The housing stock within the Augusta metropolitan area consists primarily of single-family homes and low-density garden style apartments. In fact, only two percent of all multifamily housing stock within the metro area are buildings with more than four stories. A review of housing in the MA reveals that 65 percent of the more than 8,350 residential units are single-family detached houses, as shown in Figure 3.2 and Appendix Table A-7.

The lack of diversity in the housing stock is shaped not only by the housing product but the age of the housing stock. As of the 2000 Census, the majority of the housing stock in the County and the MSA was built before 1980, but housing in the MA was significantly older, with almost 70 percent dating from before 1970. Less than four percent of all housing units in existence in 2000 were constructed after 1990 in the MA, with a median year built of 1962, a decade older than the County’s median year built of 1972. Appendix Table A-8 provides greater detail on units by year built.

**Housing Vacancies**

Vacancy rates were high across the three selected areas in 2010. The MA, County, and MSA all had double-digit vacancy rates at 15.3 percent, 13.8 percent, and 12.7 percent, respectively. Ideally, rental housing would have vacancy rates closer to five percent, with ownership housing vacancies around one percent. The highest contribution to the vacancy rate is the “other vacant” category, which may reflect houses caught in the foreclosure process or encumbered by an estate. The breakdown is provided in Appendix Table A-9.

**Rental Housing**

Rental units by gross rent is an important indication of the poverty level in the study area. The median cash rent for rental units in the MA is $588 per month, compared to $703 in the MSA. (See Appendix Table A-10.) Seventeen percent of MA rental units rent for less than $400 per month, creating a concentration of households dependent on very low rents. In part, this reflects the presence of Augusta Housing Authority units.

The Augusta-Richmond County rental housing stock consists of small to medium apartment complexes, small townhouses, and duplexes. The majority of the rental units in the study area are single-family homes rented by local or out of town property owners. As might be expected, multifamily apartments are a small component of the study area’s housing.

Private apartment complexes and other multi-unit rental properties within the study area were surveyed, supplemented by data from REIS for the following seven comparable properties: Sunset Villa

**Table 3.4 Comparable Rental Properties’ Rents, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Size</th>
<th>1 Bedroom</th>
<th>2 Bedrooms</th>
<th>3 Bedrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>$484</td>
<td>$484</td>
<td>$505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>$582</td>
<td>$582</td>
<td>$866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td>$0.83</td>
<td>$0.83</td>
<td>$0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Vacancies range from 6.5 to 7.3 percent within the MSA, with a 6.5 percent average. Older multifamily housing stock has higher vacancy rates, with properties built prior to 1970 averaging

**Figure 3.3 Rental Properties In and Near the Study Area**

Apartments, Hickman Arms, Oak Hill Apartments, Avery Pointe Apartments, Woodhaven, Providence Place, and Singleton Apartments. Figure 3.3 shows the location of these rental properties along the corridor and in the adjacent neighborhoods.
an 11.4-percent vacancy rate. However, among the properties profiled, vacancy rates reached higher than 25 percent for one property and varied significantly based on the upkeep and maintenance provided by individual property owners. Figure 3.4 depicts the vacancy rate fluctuations over the last five years for these seven selected properties.

For most rental markets a healthy vacancy rate is five percent, allowing sufficient time for turnover between tenants. In some cases, a high vacancy rate may reflect the entrance of new products into the market which change market dynamics. Unfortunately, a review of permits for multifamily housing in the Augusta-Richmond area demonstrated limited growth in new residential rental offerings, with the market having only 185 new units authorized by building permit annually over the last 10 years.

The information presented on rental family conditions represents the data on garden style apartment complexes. Rentals of single-family homes could not be captured. In addition to the REIS information, a search was conducted of classified advertisements. This search indicated many smaller rental apartment complexes with less than 20 units and no formal property management competing for renters. Within the study area, property owners tend to place signs in yards or on the properties to attract tenants. The informal nature of these advertisements limits our review. The ad search showed that rents for many of these houses are between 10 to 20 percent below rents in more traditional apartment complexes with professional property managers.

**Assisted Housing**

The Augusta Housing Authority provides low-income housing options. Within the study area there are three public housing properties: Cherry Tree, Dogwood Terrace, and Jennings Place.

The study area also includes two private housing developments that use low-income housing tax credits (LIHTC): the 48-unit Linden Square Apartments at 1425 Linden Street, which opened in 2003, and the 192-unit Cedarwood Apartments at 527 Richmond Hill Road West, which was rehabbed in 2007.

**For-Sale Housing**

Recent residential sales activity data was compiled using both Internet research and Multiple Listing Service (MLS) data from the Navica new homes database. A review of home sales across the three close-by zip codes revealed price differences based on condition, year built, size and specific neighborhood location. When purchasing a home, buyers tend to consider a myriad of factors, such as quality of schools, crime rates, proximity to goods and services, recreational opportunities, and churches.

Data on recent home sales activity included information on 347 sales. Of the units sold for which data on the number of bedrooms was available, 52 had two or fewer bedrooms. Sale prices were under $200,000 for two-bedroom units and under $300,000 for three-bedroom units. Sales of 24 houses with four or more bedrooms showed more variability. One-third of these units sold in the $50,000 to $149,999 range, while another third sold between $150,000 and $499,999.

Homeowners across the country are struggling with high unemployment rates, economic displacement, and the recent housing crisis, and Augusta-Richmond County has not been immune. Current information on home foreclosures was obtained from RealtyTrac for the three close-by zip codes. RealtyTrac.com, which tracks properties in the foreclosure process, identified 460 single-family, duplex, and triplex houses in foreclosure or bank-owned in the zip code area. For those houses where sales prices are identified, the median price is $96,261. RealtyTrac also estimates market value for the 245 properties going to auction; the average estimated market value is $97,398. RealtyTrac reports 287 (recently sold) deed transfers recorded in the zip code area during the past nine months. For the 44 properties with reported sale prices, they ranged from $33,896 to $435,443. The median price was only $79,385.

At this point in the housing recovery, many area realtors estimate the Greater Augusta market has more than a 10-month supply of available homes for resale, meaning that at the current sales pace the current supply of housing would take 10 months to absorb. As such, it is a buyer’s market in the region, and the number of active for-sale listings has remained high over the past few years.
Housing Needs

HUD and housing analysts discuss housing needs in brackets of extremely low, very low, low, and moderate incomes, each defined in terms of percentages of area median income (AMI) and adjusted by household size. For the MSA, HUD estimates the 2012 area median family income at $57,900 for a family of four. Appendix Table A-12 provides the income limits for different household sizes and AMI levels. Extremely low income is defined as 30 percent of AMI or less, which would be $17,370 or less for a family of four and $13,896 or less for a family of two. Very low income is defined as 30-50 percent of AMI, or less than $28,950 for a family of four or $23,160 for a family of two. Low income is defined as 30 to 80 percent of AMI, or less than $46,320 for a family of four or $37,056 for a family of two. Many individuals and families have incomes much lower than these levels and subsist on supplemental security income. Based on these income levels, the assumption that only 30% of a household’s income should go toward rent, and assumptions about the number of persons per unit, Table 3.5 provides maximum affordable gross rents by unit size and household income bracket.

Table 3.5 Maximum Affordable Rent by Unit Size and Income Bracket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>30% of AMI</th>
<th>50% of AMI</th>
<th>80% of AMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$510</td>
<td>$810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>$930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedroom</td>
<td>$440</td>
<td>$730</td>
<td>$1,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Gross rents reflect HUD’s affordability standard of 30 percent of income for gross rent, including utilities. Source: HUD, 2012; Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012

As documented in Appendix Table A-12, just over half of the renters in the MA spend 30 percent or more of their household income on rent; 43 percent spend 35 percent or more. The share of County and MSA households spending 35 percent or more of their income is five to seven percent lower than in the MA. These statistics underscore the need for more housing that is affordable for existing residents. Also critical is the need for better quality housing for low-income families, given the dilapidated condition of some of the study area’s rental housing.

For affordable homeownership, it is assumed that 35 percent of income can be spent on mortgage principal and interest, property taxes, and insurance. For a low-income household of four with an income of $46,320 (80 percent of AMI), that would translate into an affordable sales price of not more than $206,000, assuming a 5 percent mortgage and a 5 percent down payment. At 50 percent of AMI ($28,950 for a family of four), the affordable price would be capped at $126,000. Poor credit scores or other outstanding debt would reduce that supportable price.

Housing Conclusions

Ultimately, the demand for housing reflects the dynamics of the regional economy, considering both the jobs available that provide a sufficient wage or salary for area residents and the available housing stock. Population characteristics also influence the type and price of housing. The study area’s current stock of available housing can attract only limited market segments. Without new housing development, the area is limited to resale of existing property to price-sensitive buyers.

Demand exists for additional affordable housing for seniors and single-parent households. The MA offers an opportunity to expand residential development with infill development, offering new products not currently found in the broader marketplace. The experience of the Laney Walker/Bethlehem redevelopment efforts provides a good example of the extensive and holistic efforts needed to meet affordable housing needs and rebuild the residential foundation of these neighborhoods. Often, the transience of renter households works against a neighborhood organization’s efforts to enlist residents in fighting crime and improving the neighborhood. Without an ownership stake, it can be difficult to persuade renters to maintain their houses and yards. Too often, absentee landlords allow their properties to decline. For this reason, many infill projects focus solely on homeownership opportunities. Following the housing mortgage crisis, however, fewer households have good enough credit to qualify for a mortgage. Coupled with a growing skepticism as to the relative financial benefits of homeownership as an investment, the demand for rental housing has been increasing for several years. The revitalization strategy for the study area needs to combine both homeownership and rental housing.

Infill housing raises the question of whether to fund new construction versus rehabilitation when targeted areas contain both vacant or underutilized parcels and obsolete or deteriorated structures. While infill housing usually connotes new construction to "fill in" the urban fabric, a substantial number of new residents could be housed in existing, abandoned housing units with appropriate rehabilitation. An emphasis on rehabilitation can preserve the character of an urban neighborhood, restore historic structures, and is sometimes less expensive than new construction. Moreover, new residents are often attracted to the ambiance of historic structures when floor plans, finishes, and fixtures are modernized. The real concern for those attempting such renovations becomes the cost gap between the level of investment justified by the market and the high costs of modernization. In many cases, the deterioration following abandonment precludes renovation. Removal of those dilapidated structures will be an important step toward making the study area competitive for new development.

Target Housing Markets

Residential development in the northern section of the study area, particularly along 15th Street, offers an opportunity to live close to the medical center district and downtown Augusta. The southern section of the study area provides opportunities for residential development with excellent access to major highways and Fort Gordon. The diverging strengths of these sections of the study area reflect distinct demand characteristics, with some overlap in the target audiences.

An analysis of the current residential market for the residential sites in the northern section of the study area suggests a few potential types of customers. These include: (1) Georgia Regents University students; (2) medical staff and workers; and (3) current residents who want to upgrade their living situations. The southern section could attract some military families from Fort Gordon. Target audiences are expected to capture 80 percent of housing demand, with investors and others making up the remaining demand. The fastest growing market segment in the immediate area will be both university students and medical staff, as the Medical District and Georgia Regents University continue to spur the economic growth. It is anticipated that this market segment may represent 65 percent of demand for new rental housing and 45 percent of demand for for-sale housing.

As documented in Appendix Table A-12, just over half of the renters in the MA spend 30 percent or more of their household income on rent; 43 percent spend 35 percent or more. The share of County and MSA households spending 35 percent or more of their income is five to seven percent lower than in the MA. These statistics underscore the need for more housing that is affordable for existing residents. Also critical is the need for better quality housing for low-income families, given the dilapidated condition of some of the study area’s rental housing.

For affordable homeownership, it is assumed that 35 percent of income can be spent on mortgage principal and interest, property taxes, and insurance. For a low-income household of four with an income of $46,320 (80 percent of AMI), that would translate into an affordable sales price of not more than $206,000, assuming a 5 percent mortgage and a 5 percent down payment. At 50 percent of AMI ($28,950 for a family of four), the affordable price would be capped at $126,000. Poor credit scores or other outstanding debt would reduce that supportable price.

Housing Conclusions

Ultimately, the demand for housing reflects the dynamics of the regional economy, considering both the jobs available that provide a sufficient wage or salary for area residents and the available housing stock. Population characteristics also influence the type and price of housing. The study area’s current stock of available housing can attract only limited market segments. Without new housing development, the area is limited to resale of existing property to price-sensitive buyers.

Demand exists for additional affordable housing for seniors and single-parent households. The MA offers an opportunity to expand residential development with infill development, offering new products not currently found in the broader marketplace. The experience of the Laney Walker/Bethlehem redevelopment efforts provides a good example of the extensive and holistic efforts needed to meet affordable housing needs and rebuild the residential foundation of these neighborhoods. Often, the transience of renter households works against a neighborhood organization’s efforts to enlist residents in fighting crime and improving the neighborhood. Without an ownership stake, it can be difficult to persuade renters to maintain their houses and yards. Too often, absentee landlords allow their properties to decline. For this reason, many infill projects focus solely on homeownership opportunities. Following the housing mortgage crisis, however, fewer households have good enough credit to qualify for a mortgage. Coupled with a growing skepticism as to the relative financial benefits of homeownership as an investment, the demand for rental housing has been increasing for several years. The revitalization strategy for the study area needs to combine both homeownership and rental housing.

Infill housing raises the question of whether to fund new construction versus rehabilitation when targeted areas contain both vacant or underutilized parcels and obsolete or deteriorated structures. While infill housing usually connotes new construction to “fill in” the urban fabric, a substantial number of new residents could be housed in existing, abandoned housing units with appropriate rehabilitation. An emphasis on rehabilitation can preserve the character of an urban neighborhood, restore historic structures, and is sometimes less expensive than new construction. Moreover, new residents are often attracted to the ambiance of historic structures when floor plans, finishes, and fixtures are modernized. The real concern for those attempting such renovations becomes the cost gap between the level of investment justified by the market and the high costs of modernization. In many cases, the deterioration following abandonment precludes renovation. Removal of those dilapidated structures will be an important step toward making the study area competitive for new development.

Target Housing Markets

Residential development in the northern section of the study area, particularly along 15th Street, offers an opportunity to live close to the medical center district and downtown Augusta. The southern section of the study area provides opportunities for residential development with excellent access to major highways and Fort Gordon. The diverging strengths of these sections of the study area reflect distinct demand characteristics, with some overlap in the target audiences.

An analysis of the current residential market for the residential sites in the northern section of the study area suggests a few potential types of customers. These include: (1) Georgia Regents University students; (2) medical staff and workers; and (3) current residents who want to upgrade their living situations. The southern section could attract some military families from Fort Gordon. Target audiences are expected to capture 80 percent of housing demand, with investors and others making up the remaining demand. The fastest growing market segment in the immediate area will be both university students and medical staff, as the Medical District and Georgia Regents University continue to spur the economic growth. It is anticipated that this market segment may represent 65 percent of demand for new rental housing and 45 percent of demand for for-sale housing.
The close proximity to Fort Gordon should be an advantage in marketing new housing in the southern portion of the study area. However, many military families do extensive research before relocating to the area, using the Internet and discussions with other military families to investigate area schools, housing, and other community characteristics to get an idea of where to look for housing before they arrive. This word-of-mouth network and the lack of modern housing units may work against this section of Augusta based on perceptions of the area as having high crime and poor schools.

**Recommended Unit Mix and Tenure**

The recommended unit mix shown in the following table presents the best mix of new housing floor plans given current demographic trends and market conditions. It is based on the nature of recent residential activity of new and existing developments in the local area, prevailing household incomes, and attributes unique to the broader community. All pricing is shown in 2012 dollars.

New homes in the area should incorporate a variety of housing types in traditional neighborhood development patterns, with patio style houses to complement existing cottages and attached townhouses. Buyers currently have only a few choices when purchasing a new home, which results in a steady pace of sales for new developments outside the urban core in Richmond County. For-sale demand appears strongest for single-family detached homes along the southern portion of the neighborhood.

Market conditions within the study area may receive a boost from nearby employees with strong credit due to the historically low interest rates. According to ABC News, the weekly average for the 30-year fixed-rate mortgage in the U.S. fell to 3.36 percent as of the end of the first week of October.1 Lower interest rates can entice would-be renters to purchase their first home and become owners.

**Table 3.6 Recommended Study Area Rental Housing Market Mix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Mix</th>
<th>Rent per sq. ft.</th>
<th>Monthly Rents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>525 - 600</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$1.24 - $1.31</td>
<td>$690 - $740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>759 - 800</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1.19 - $1.22</td>
<td>$910 - $950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>925 - 1,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1.13 - $1.16</td>
<td>$1,080 - $1,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedroom</td>
<td>1,050 - 1,150</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$1.09 - $1.12</td>
<td>$1,170 - $1,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012

**Table 3.7 Recommended Study Area For-Sale Housing Market Mix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Mix</th>
<th>Price per sq.ft.</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplex - 2 BR</td>
<td>1,150 - 1,225</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$110 - $115</td>
<td>$132,000 - $135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex - 3 BR</td>
<td>1,275 - 1,350</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$106 - $109</td>
<td>$139,000 - $143,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse - 2 BR</td>
<td>1,225 - 1,350</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$100 - $103</td>
<td>$126,180 - $135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse - 3 BR</td>
<td>1,400 - 1,525</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$96 - $99</td>
<td>$138,600 - $146,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio Home - 3 BR</td>
<td>1,450 - 1,550</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$98 - $101</td>
<td>$146,450 - $151,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012

Meeting the demand for new housing at prices the market can support will require public financial investment to defray some of the redevelopment costs. There is a gap between what private investors are willing to fund based on future rents and the cost to develop quality rental housing. For-sale housing has the same problem, where the incomes of prospective home buyers may not support the full costs of new construction. Extensive development of new housing in the study area will require significant financial investments by local, state, and federal governments. The pace and scale of supportable new development will be dependent on the level of that investment.

**Additional Residential Potential**

The creation of a new recreational amenity on Rocky Creek, west of the former Regency Mall, presents a unique opportunity to generate residential demand. Given the competition from suburban developments, residential development should focus on townhouses, which have the advantage of lower prices and less direct competition. Total build out could reach 200 units within 10 years of the new recreational anchors opening to the public.

---

3.4 Commercial Market Conditions

This section of the report focuses on office, retail and, to a lesser extent, industrial market conditions in the region and Augusta-Richmond County, as well as development trends and the impact of future growth patterns on development potential.

Office Conditions

The analysis considers the market support for office space based on historic absorption and development data for the region, Richmond County, Downtown Augusta, and non-downtown areas. It considers both the county’s and corridor’s ability to compete for office development based on their competitive advantages and disadvantages, including access, proximity to major employment centers, workforce, office environment, cost, support services, and other factors.

Traditional office demand forecasts rely on the expected growth in the number of employees who need a place to work. Focusing specifically on industries that tend to locate in office buildings provides more specific insight into the demand for office space. Industries that use office space most heavily include information; finance and insurance; professional, scientific, and technical services; health care and social assistance; other services; and government. Typically, the first three are most important for the general occupancy office market.

In Augusta, the regional health care industry drives office demand. The Medical College of Georgia, University Hospital, and the Medical College of Georgia Health System are all located just over the bridge from the study area. In addition to these institutions, other related medical centers include the Charlie Norwood Veterans Affairs Medical Center and Dwight David Eisenhower Army Medical Center. These institutions together provide more jobs than the county government.

In January 2012, the Georgia Board of Regents voted to consolidate Georgia Health Sciences University with Augusta State University, one of the state’s oldest liberal arts universities. The new entity, Georgia Regents University, may greatly impact future office development potential should the institution initiate new development across the bridge within the study area.

The health care industry dominates the employment base. More price-sensitive office users or those in need of office space close to their neighborhood customers represent the only other demand for office space in the study area.

The Augusta-Richmond County area has a total inventory of 12.4 million square feet of office space, with average annual rents ranging dramatically from $8 to $19 per square foot. CoStar, a national data provider, reported no new office developments planned as of the second quarter of 2012 and a metro vacancy rate of nine percent with asking rents averaging $12. For Class A properties, which represent approximately 677,000 square feet in only 10 buildings, the vacancy rate drops to less than five percent, reflecting a tight market.

Classifying of commercial space helps to properly evaluate existing supply by differentiating buildings according to physical condition and operating performance. Class A represents those buildings that command the highest rents and Class C represents those properties in average condition with lower than average rents. One-quarter of the existing office space in Augusta-Richmond County consists of Class C buildings renting on average for $10 per square foot or less. A large percentage of these buildings may be in need of replacement in the mid-term, which might create an opportunity in the study area.

Downtown Augusta’s vacancy rate stood at 10.4 percent as of the first quarter of 2012. This represents a healthy vacancy rate for office space and reflects the reasonable average asking rent of $17 per gross square foot, according to REIS. It is important to note that these rents reflect the average rents across all classes of building inventory. Class A office space at Augusta Riverfront Center, which includes utilities and maintenance, lists at $21.50 per square foot. Office space in areas outside downtown, including the study area, struggle with rents that average $15 per square foot and a vacancy rate in excess of 23 percent.

Office Conclusions

Neighborhood-serving office space along major thoroughfares or on the ground level of other commercial buildings does not command rents sufficient for speculative construction of office space and remains only a factor for filling existing space in this market.

Retail Conditions

The potential performance of new retailers in the study area depends on their ability to compete for and “capture” the expenditures of local residents as well as attract “inflow” from residents or workers from other areas. Each cluster of retail in Augusta has a distinct area from which retailers expect to draw the bulk of their customers. In some instances, these areas extend into neighboring jurisdictions. Large regional malls or clusters of stores can draw from a wide geography.

Competitive Framework

To better understand the competitive retail environment for the study area, the retail inventory in existing shopping centers and other retail buildings was examined. Customers choose retail opportunities based on convenience not only as it relates to their place of residence but also where they work. Customers are mobile and will travel to locations with multiple shopping alternatives and a cluster of stores to meet their retail needs. For the most part, neighborhood goods and services are the only retail category that requires a location in close proximity to residents.

The study area consists of several different neighborhoods and activity clusters, but retail development patterns reflect the historic importance of traffic. Much of the retail stock consists of older commercial strip centers, separated from the road by an abundance of parking. Neighborhood shopping centers in excess of 30,000 square feet dominate the landscape, followed by community shopping centers in excess of 100,000 square feet. In the neighborhood retail centers, Grocery stores or pharmacy operations serve as anchors for neighborhood retail centers, while junior or discount department stores serve as anchors for community shopping centers. These tend to include national chains such as Kmart (located in the Southgate neighborhood) that draw a large customer base. Many local residents travel outside the county to shopping centers that offer a wider variety.

Figure 3.6 depicts the location and clustering of retailers and service providers within the study area and on the outskirts of this area but still within a reasonable distance. Appendix Table A-13 provides an inventory of these competitive retail centers.
The study area is also included within the trade areas for some of Augusta’s large shopping centers, including Augusta Mall with 1.1 million square feet and more than 130 stores. The Augusta Mall is possibly the most visited shopping destination in the region due to the presence of five national department store chains. The addition of the Augusta Promenade in 2006-07 expanded the mall’s capacity by 180,000 square feet and allowed Dick’s Sporting Goods and upscale stores like William Sonoma. Given the shopping opportunities at Augusta Mall, the new Walmart, and the existing nearby Kmart, the study area cannot compete to attract shoppers, goods customers and retailers.

Future Retail Potential

The demand for retail facilities relates to the ultimate sales potential, estimated based on expenditures of residents within reasonable proximity as well as visitors. Retail analysis breaks retailers into three main categories:

- **Convenience Goods**, including food and beverage stores and drugstores
- **Shoppers Goods**, including merchandise typically sold in a department store: apparel and accessories, furniture and furnishings, electronics, sporting goods, books, etc.
- **Eating and Drinking**, including the full range of fast food and sit-down restaurants, and bars

Table 3.8 shows annual expenditures by area residents according to these three retail types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.8 Annual Retail Expenditures, 2012</th>
<th>Residents of Market Area</th>
<th>Residents of Zip Code Tabulated Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenience Goods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage Stores (NAICS 445)</td>
<td>$20,823,103</td>
<td>$94,157,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores (NAICS 4461)</td>
<td>$7,100,345</td>
<td>$32,183,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenience Goods Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$27,923,448</td>
<td>$126,340,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eating and Drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services and Drinking Places (NAICS 722)</td>
<td>$22,741,284</td>
<td>$103,694,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoppers Goods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 452)</td>
<td>$20,448,384</td>
<td>$93,347,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores (NAICS 448)</td>
<td>$6,481,579</td>
<td>$29,578,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishing Stores (NAICS 442)</td>
<td>$3,413,987</td>
<td>$15,878,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliance Stores (NAICS 443/NAICS 4431)</td>
<td>$3,545,780</td>
<td>$16,317,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores (NAICS 451)</td>
<td>$1,913,425</td>
<td>$8,735,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers (NAICS 453)</td>
<td>$1,861,521</td>
<td>$8,601,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shoppers Goods Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$37,664,676</td>
<td>$172,459,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ESRI Business Analyst, Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012

These expenditures include all spending, regardless of where it occurs. The Zip Code Tabulated Areas help to quantify spending that might be captured in the Study Area should adequate retail offerings be available.

Comparing the spending by MA residents to the actual sales by stores within the Study Area highlights gaps in current retail offerings.
Table 3.9 shows retail leakage or surplus for the three retail categories and two different geographies. Leakage (shown as a positive number) represents the dollars that area residents spend outside the area. Negative values represent inflow, or categories for which retailers’ sales exceed spending by area residents by attracting shoppers from outside the area. While the table shows many dollars being spent outside the area (positive values), that should be expected given the incomplete retail offerings along the corridor, and the presence of highly competitive big box retailers and the Augusta Mall nearby.

As confirmed by the data in Table 3.9, retail leakage rates for a given area are typically lower for convenience goods such as drugstore items and groceries than for shoppers goods, because most consumers do not need to travel far to find the types of food and goods they are seeking. Consumers need to purchase these types of goods more frequently than they do clothing or gifts, and they value convenience more than being able to comparison shop among several similar stores. For shoppers goods, however, most consumers prefer the opportunity to comparison shop and will travel to a shopping center or district with a variety of retail options. Due to the large or unique nature of these purchases, shoppers are willing to drive further to find what they want.

Table 3.9 Retail Leakage/Surplus, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Market Area</th>
<th>Zip Code Tabulated Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage Stores (NAICS 445)</td>
<td>-$18,785,975</td>
<td>-$36,053,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care Stores</td>
<td>$346,167</td>
<td>-$38,781,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Goods Subtotal</td>
<td>-$18,439,808</td>
<td>-$74,834,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating and Drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Services and Drinking Places</td>
<td>-$12,695,059</td>
<td>-$54,506,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandise Stores (NAICS 452)</td>
<td>$11,380,294</td>
<td>-$21,428,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Clothing Accessories Stores (NAICS 448)</td>
<td>$1,532,111</td>
<td>$15,186,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishing Stores (NAICS 442)</td>
<td>$2,434,706</td>
<td>$9,173,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Appliance Stores</td>
<td>$1,330,338</td>
<td>$11,248,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Book, and Music Stores (NAICS 451)</td>
<td>$1,286,088</td>
<td>$3,989,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Store Retailers</td>
<td>-$1,568,688</td>
<td>-$4,983,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoppers Goods Subtotal</td>
<td>$16,394,849</td>
<td>$13,186,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, there is demand for specific new retail store types, but the ability of the study area to capture this retail suffers from significant locational disadvantages. Along 15th Street in the Cherry Tree neighborhood, the perception of crime and low incomes, as well as the low density of current residents, limit retailers’ willingness to locate in the area. Although high traffic volumes exist along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard in both Oates Creek and Southgate, these traffic volumes relate to commuters, who are not necessarily shoppers for the types of possible retail. Commuters’ typical shopping habits include dropping off dry cleaning or stopping at a local convenience store (sometimes associated with a gasoline station) for a morning breakfast alternative, or stopping to pick up dinner or a few groceries on the way home from work.

Residents’ expenditures do not justify any additional department stores, warehouse clubs, or home improvement/hardware stores. Many of these retail store types already exist in clustered retail environments within the Augusta area and accommodate the demand from area residents and workers. Although sites within both the Southgate and Rocky Creek can attain some new retail square footage, there are several barriers to achieving its full supportable square footage potential. Primarily, the study area suffers from a lack of significant residential and employee density. Although the broader area includes a greater number of households, the cluster of competitive, viable retail in other sections of Augusta captures a large majority of resident and employee expenditures, primarily due to their clustered configuration and proximity to each other. Such features are very desirable to consumers when comparison shopping. Retail within the study area would be rather isolated in comparison. Any new retail should target convenience needs for area residents; however, the demand will support very little new space.

Additional Retail Demand

The construction of a new lake, to the west of the former mall site and along Rocky Creek, may present an opportunity for new retail in the marketplace. The creation of a unique environment with water views offers the opportunity for a new dynamic restaurant. In this instance the lake creates a waterfront eating venue (between 6,500 to 8,000 square feet) able to attract customers from outside the area.
Niche Market Opportunities

Many neighborhoods throughout Augusta search for unique ways to brand their residential neighborhoods and retail districts, as well as build on distinct commercial users. These efforts reflect the principles that highly-specialized and clustered stores and possibly restaurants can attract customers from broader areas, and that niche housing can similarly attract residents from a broader market area to live, work, and stay in the target area. Essentially, a niche market becomes a destination for customers, residents, and employers.

The following section describes existing conditions and the potential for specific new uses related directly to the strengths and opportunities present in the existing communities. These uses may need financial support to be established as a viable option, but these unique assets and opportunities will cultivate destination appeal and drive further market potential along the corridor.

Urban Agriculture

The movement to expand agriculture in urban environments continues to gain interest. Many low income communities do not have access to fresh produce and healthy food. Urban agriculture, including community gardens, can address concerns by offering affordable produce.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Urban Agriculture Network funds an urban agriculture training program known as Helping Africa By Establishing Schools at Home and Abroad, Inc. (HABESHA). HABESHA, a non-profit based in Atlanta, trains community members in establishing urban agriculture programs.

Other sponsors of urban agriculture can be larger institutional organizations. In Michigan, the Henry Ford West Bloomfield Hospital invested $1 million in an organic greenhouse. Greenhouse products are used in the hospital café and patient meals. The self-sustaining greenhouse has solar, geothermal, and wind power, and includes an adjoining education facility that offers tours, cooking demonstrations, and classes to educate consumers about healthy food alternatives.

Food Incubator

Small businesses are a major economic engine. David Birch’s seminal research in the 1970s and 1980s demonstrated that 80 percent of new jobs are created by small businesses. This is not to deny the importance of large businesses in creating the income and demand that small businesses build upon, but America’s economic vitality lies primarily among its small businesses. As a result, policy makers are coming to recognize the importance of small business and entrepreneurs for the future economy.

Entrepreneurial economies have been shown to perform better economically. Recent research for the Small Business Administration examined the links between economic performance and entrepreneurship. It found that from 1990 to 2001, the most entrepreneurial regions had 125 percent higher employment growth, 58 percent higher wage growth, and 109 percent higher productivity than the least entrepreneurial regions.

For small cities, entrepreneurial development is particularly important as they struggle to create good jobs that provide long-term opportunities for youth who otherwise will move to larger metropolitan areas for jobs.

In Georgia, educational institutions understand the promise in assisting small businesses. The University of Georgia Small Business Development Center provides business consulting and continuing education services to entrepreneurs. The Center sees roughly 315 clients per year, including 62 percent existing businesses and 10 percent growth-oriented businesses, as well as owner-operators (part-time) and start-up companies.

According to the National Business Incubator Association, incubated companies have an 87 percent success rate in their first three years, versus a national average of approximately 20 percent for all new business starts.

The University of Georgia continues to fund opportunities to build entrepreneurs in the food products industry sector. The Georgia Department of Agriculture and UGA Food Science & Technology as well as the National Center for Home Food Preservation continue to support emerging food related businesses. While these programs target local food product entrepreneurs, the expansion beyond programs at the Athens campus to Augusta may be feasible. The availability of land and interest in creating fresh and healthy food options for the community may spark a niche market opportunity along the corridor.

Recreation

Outdoor recreation continues to grow in popularity as residents seek ways to remain fit and healthy with outdoor activity. Over the last four years, the Recession has not damped the level of recreation activity. According to data from the Outdoor Industry Association, 60 percent of all recreation participants spent about the same amount on indoor and outdoor sports and recreation as in previous years.

The study area does not have an adequate system of parks and green space and is limited by a disconnected sidewalk and pedestrian trail system.

Pedestrian access should be improved through sidewalk installation and repair, as well as with a new network of trails. Trails should connect neighborhoods with each other and with parks. This plan explores ways to fund new recreation activities in parks and create an anchor greenspace in the southern portion of the study area, where large parcels of underutilized property may spur park development.

The potential for a new recreational amenity at the former Regency Mall site presents an opportunity to spur residential and commercial development with a new recreational lake. The impact of this anchor depends on the accessibility, visibility and scale of the lake. Although the specific details do not indicate how much access and use the lake will receive, the visual appeal of a lake with a small trail will create enough market energy to spur residential development.

Finally, new recreational opportunities with a natural setting and the addition of water views along a lake present an opportunity for new restaurants. The popularity of alfresco seating continues to rise with an obvious advantage for outdoor seating adjacent to a park. Scientific evidence links health and wellness to an individual’s exposure to nature, and the biophilia theory shows the positive therapeutic value of both the physical and visual exposure to nature. This evidence suggests the ability to attract between one to two new restaurants with immediate views of the new lake.
Part IV: Public Process
Part IV: Public Process

This section summarizes all public engagement activities designed and implemented for the planning effort. It includes an introduction to the study and its purpose, a description of the extensive outreach techniques used for disseminating information and engaging stakeholders, and a list of the public meetings conducted. The following section describes the custom-tailored three-level approach to stakeholder participation that incorporates information sharing and education, visioning to design for the future, and capacity building for implementation.

The purpose of the public engagement process is to educate, inform, and engage citizens, business owners, and other project stakeholders, while gathering input from those most strongly impacted by future development. The study describes outreach methods used to allow all segments of the public to learn about issues under consideration in the planning process. In addition, it will serve as a guide to improve public awareness efforts with each subsequent round of public meetings for the remaining three initiatives.

Participation and Engagement Techniques

The planning effort conducted a series of public forums that served as a fundamental element of public outreach and engagement. These meetings provided the opportunity to receive public opinion on study area conditions and the vision for the future through a meaningful dialogue that influenced plan recommendations. These forums are listed in Table 4.1.

Level 1: Leadership

Leaders guide the planning process, ensure it maintains the schedule, and provide technical expertise to ensure that the plan process and recommendations are consistent with the goals of the City of Augusta and its partners. The leadership team consists of a project management team, steering committee, and sub-committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, August 16, 2012</td>
<td>Stakeholder Focus Group Meetings City of Augusta Municipal Building and Offices of W. R. Toole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, August 29, 2012</td>
<td>Project Management, Steering and Sub-Committee Meetings City of Augusta Municipal Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, August 29, 2012</td>
<td>Public Kick-off Meeting T. W. Josey High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, November 13, 2012</td>
<td>Visioning Workshop T. W. Josey High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday and Friday November 15 and 16, 2012</td>
<td>Visioning Week Public Open House Augusta Mini Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, November 17, 2012</td>
<td>Visioning Resulting Presentation T. W. Josey High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, January 24, 2013</td>
<td>Steering and Sub-Committee Meetings, W. R. Toole Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 12, 2013</td>
<td>Recommendations Review Public Open House T. W. Josey High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project Management Team serves as the executive decision-making group. It is comprised of the project manager, City of Augusta planning and transportation staff, and the consulting team. This group guides the planning process at key milestones and ensures that it is on schedule and that deliverables/outcomes are developed as outlined in the scope of work.

The Steering Committee is a 15-20 member body that represents a cross section of the planning effort stakeholders, business owners, community leaders, surrounding institutions and agencies, City of Augusta staff, and select members of the project management team that meet with the consulting team quarterly. In addition, the group serves as a sounding board for assessments and recommendations prior to presenting to the community. Representatives included Mayor Deke Copenhaver, State Representative Wayne Howard, and representatives from Augusta Tomorrow, Williams Memorial CME Church, Georgia Bank and Trust, YMCA, the local business community, Paine College, Shiloh Ministries, and Georgia Regents University.

The four Sub-Committees have a diverse representation similar to the steering committee and also meet quarterly to focus on more specific subject matters based on expertise in their respective areas. The sub-committees are District Action Plan, Transportation, Code/Ordinance, and Land Acquisition.

Level 2: Community Forums

Community forums are organized meetings that provide opportunities for stakeholders to receive information, provide input, and be heard. These forums consisted of:

Stakeholder Interviews - Early in the process, a list of elected officials, city staff, service providers, faith-based institutions, civic and cultural organizations, business owners, real estate professionals, educational institutions, property owners, community leaders, and residents were asked to participate in stakeholder interviews. Throughout the planning effort, several interview methods were utilized, including one-on-one interviews, group sessions of 4-5 participants, and telephone interviews. On August 16th, 2012, the planning team conducted a series of focus groups. Stakeholders were divided into groups reflective of their specializations: planning, architecture, and engineering; transportation; neighborhood; and community housing.

Questions were generated by the consultants and interview summaries were compiled to share among the entire team. Stakeholder interviews will continue on an as needed basis throughout all initiatives to gather information that might impact recommendations.

Leadership Meetings - The first round of leadership meetings convened on August 29th, 2012 at the Municipal Building, Room 802. They included a
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steering committee meeting and separate meetings of all sub-committees. For this initial round of meetings, the agenda and format were consistent. Each meeting began with the introduction of the planning team, followed by introductions of the participants. The team provided an overview of the planning process, scope, and schedule including benchmarks. Special attention was given to presenting the four major initiatives, along with a brief overview of preliminary findings collected through stakeholder interviews and a windshield tour of the study area. A brief overview of the public engagement strategy was provided, specifically describing the process of selecting committee participants and role of the committees. A summary of each of these events is described in the following section.

Level 3: Outreach Activities

Methods of notifying citizens and stakeholders of the meetings and public forums were varied and determined by the most effective methods of communication for this target audience. An overview of the outreach activities are described below.

Brand Messaging

A logo was developed with elements that represent both development and sustainability. Throughout this process, the logo established common language to brand the planning process. It was included on all collateral, communications, and marketing materials. To reinforce the brand message and identification, shirts that incorporated the logo were worn by the planning team and City staff during public meetings.

Committee Meeting Invitations

Initial kickoff meetings were scheduled with the steering committee and sub-committees on August 29th. These meetings allowed the planning team to provide an overview of the study area, scope of work, public engagement process, and to gather input on the vision and goals of the plan. An email invitation was distributed 3 weeks in advance, extending an invitation to join one of the committees and attend the initial meeting. Over 80 stakeholders accepted the invitation to join a committee.

Press Releases

Press releases communicated key messages to the target audiences impacted by the planning process and announced the two public forums: Public Kickoff Meeting and the Visioning Week. Press releases were distributed via email to local television stations, local and community newspapers, radio stations, bloggers, and individuals with a large networks of constituents. Major media contacts included the following:

- 88.3 FM Radio
- Augusta Chronicle
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- Augusta Metro Chamber of Commerce
- Channel 12 News
- Channel 26
- Channel 6 News
- Clear Channel Communications
- Fox 54 Augusta
- Georgia Public Broadcast
- Kick 99 Country Radio
- The CW
- The Star North Augusta
- WFXG Radio
- WGAC New Talk Radio

Media

Media outreach efforts to promote the planning process to the general public included announcements on Channel 12, 6, 54, and 26. In addition, the media covered all public forums in August and November. The media coverage at the Kickoff Meeting and the Visioning Workshop captured a snapshot of the presentations of goals and objectives, as well as brief interviews with John Paul Stout (City of Augusta Sustainable Development Manager) and Adam Williamson (project manager for the consulting team). During the Open House, reporters interviewed property owners as they interacted with the consulting team, reviewed the plan findings, and review draft concept plans.

Fliers

In August, the team distributed fliers to various locations along the corridor including municipal buildings, businesses, libraries, churches, schools, and community groups. Community leaders also distributed the flyer to their stakeholder and public outreach lists.

Yard Signs

Yard signs were installed at active intersections and businesses along 15th Street, Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, Deans Bridge Road, Milledgeville Road, and other secondary roadways announcing the public forums. Several churches and multi-family developments also located signs on their property. A total of 50 signs were scattered throughout the study area for each forum.

Banners

In an effort to increase visibility and increase interest for Visioning Week, two large banners were installed on the property of convenience.

The website was a valuable tool for distributing information to the public.
stores located at major intersections (Popular Street at 15th Street, and 15th Street at Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard).

Email
Constant Contact was used to distribute an email message to over 300 contacts announcing Visioning Week and encouraging recipients to forward the information within their network. See Appendix B for a copy of the electronic notification.

Fact Sheet
A fact sheet was created to introduce the study and provide simple and straightforward information to the public and stakeholders. A copy of the fact sheet was made available at all public forums. The sheet included a study area map, the web site, and City and consultant contact information. See Appendix C for a copy of the fact sheet and map.

Web Site
An interactive web site (www.augustasustainable.com) was developed to provide the public with accurate and timely information on a wide range of topics, as well as accept comments. The site announced all public forums on the home page and also provided a map of the study area, information on the consulting team, and presentations from all public forums for those unable to participate. The website also allowed users to submit comments that were immediately received by the study team, who provide responses on a regular basis.

Postcards
Over 5,100 postcards were mailed to addresses and property owners within the study area to announce Visioning Week. In addition, postcards were distributed at the transit transfer station, public libraries, municipal buildings, churches, schools, and community groups.

Canvassing
This pre-engagement activity consisted of door-to-door canvassing of businesses along the corridor. This method served as a vehicle to inform citizens about the process, encourage their participation, and collect contact information to build the stakeholder list.
Meeting Summaries

Steering Committee: August 29, 2012

Following introductions and the plan process overview several discussion topics were raised by the Steering Committee and addressed by the team. Specifically, members made inquiries regarding the make-up and selection process for each of the standing committees. In response to concerns, the planning team remarked on its reliance on the City’s input and knowledge of individual’s participation in previous planning processes. Recommendations on additional participants were welcomed by the planning team to fill gaps in community stakeholder representation. There are currently a number of organizations at the leadership level that are impacted by the plan, and the planning team has attempted to select the best cross-section of representatives to participate in the sub-committee process who will raise critical points of consideration throughout the process.

Questions regarding future funding to support the construction and maintenance of improvements in the study area were raised. As part of the planning team, the economic consultant group, Partners for Economic Solutions, will be tasked with providing financial projections and make recommendations for potential implementation dollars.

It was proposed that demonstrating immediate action, such as the proposed mural project currently under consideration is an important first step. Additional activities such as installing trash receptacles that encourage community beautification may also be effective. These points raised other relevant points affecting the implementation process regarding community awareness and stewardship.

District Action Plan Sub-Committee: August 29, 2012

This group convened to introduce the planning process and begin preliminary discussion of the committee’s role to review plan options and alternatives within the study area. With representation from the Downtown Development Authority, Historic Augusta, Inc., Laney Walker Neighborhood Association, City of Augusta Parks and Recreation and the Historic Preservation Commission, the discussion turned to the committee structure and identifying stakeholders and organizations that will be impacted by the project and should be at the table. The group suggested that the Richmond County School District, neighborhood associations, and the business community be represented.

Potential Steering Committee:
- Commissioner
- Mayor
- Paine
- GHSU/ASU
- Williams Memorial
- Developer
- Georgia Bank and Trust
- Planning Commission Member
- Housing Authority Member
- Josey High School Representative
- Mini Theatre
- YMCA
- Shiloh or Mercy Ministries
- Private Business Owner/Property Owner
- Local Resident
- Augusta Tomorrow

Potential Management Team:
- Administrator’s Office
- Paul DeCamp
- John Paul Stout
- Karyn Nixon
- Steve Cassell
- Hawthorne Welcher
- Adam Williamson, TSW
Next, the discussion stressed the importance of integrating previous plans for the target area and adjacent communities such as Laney Walker/Bethlehem, which is currently undergoing a major redevelopment initiative. The City’s Parks and Recreation Department commented on their efforts to complete a master plan that would in part identify park spaces in the corridor.

Other participants volunteered their organization resources to support the planning process. In response to the maintaining the historic fabric of the residential communities in the study area, Historic Augusta volunteered to conduct a windshield survey and document all the historic structures and landmarks. One of challenges discussed was the lack of an organized business association. The Downtown Development Authority volunteered assistance with developing relationships between the larger business community and those business owners operating in the study area.

Transportation Sub-Committee: August 29, 2012

This session primarily focused on improving multi-modal transportation options, infrastructure and community facilities, and the integration of the GDOT 15th Street project with this plan’s recommendations. Following the team’s overview of the planning process, committee roles, and next steps, representatives from Augusta Planning and Development Transit and Traffic departments discussed the integration of the transportation recommendation and the GDOT 15th Street widening project with the team. ARCADIS will lead the transportation efforts for this project with the assistance of the local team member W. R. Toole. Tasks would address major priorities around transportation emphasized considerations for street widening at 15th Street and other traffic features along this major thoroughfare that would improve traffic flow and pedestrian access while working in tandem with GDOT and informing their designs.

Members from the committee raised concerns regarding the history of the area and the numerous attempts to improve the 15th Street area in the past. Participants shared that plans have been postponed for the area for nearly 30 years due to historical issues along the corridor. It was suggested that the current funding within the City’s Code Enforcement Department have been prioritized toward demolitions. The study area contains many properties to review findings and considerations specific to code regulations. The work process was shared that current funding within the City’s Code Enforcement Department have been prioritized toward demolitions. The study area contains many properties that are slated for demolition. Other properties have liens and overgrowth issues and many properties are auctioned on a regular basis. There are also a number of unkempt mobile home properties in the study area that need greater consideration.

Some concerns arose related to the project’s effect on economically disadvantaged residents within the community. Specifically, some residents may be challenged by keeping up with code ordinances that are particular to historic preservation. Participants shared that some challenges may be incurred when engaging the historic board, which upholds stringent design standards and funding is limited to comply with historic districts.

Overall, members felt that the City would be fair in considering code variances/changes. Sustainable plans are welcomed by the City with the exception of inherent costs associated with these development strategies. When making recommendations, participants suggested that a specific focus on incentives supporting ordinances would be beneficial.

Another consideration raised by the Fire Department related to issues of flooding in the Rocky Creek area. The community needs a storm water mitigation and disaster preparedness plan. Also, for fire rescue, roads need a 20 foot clearance due to the new fire truck design that is not supported by the narrow right of way of older streets.

In closing, members recommended that other representatives from the permitting office and the planning staff participate in future meetings. It was also suggested that the planning team connect with members of the Gordon Highway Committee on Beautification, which is working in the study area and focused on beautifying entryways into the corridor.

Land Acquisition Sub-Committee: August 29, 2012

This meeting included an introduction to the planning process, an overview of the committee’s role, and a review of findings and considerations specific to providing new housing and other economic development opportunities in the corridor. Participants included Chamber of Commerce, Land Bank Authority, 30901 Development Corp and APD Urban Planning and Management.

Upon an initial presentation of the planning process, members of the committee raised questions regarding the strategy to provide implementation dollars to carry the final recommendations. In response, the planning team intends to conduct an initial market analysis and make recommendations on funding strategies. A financial feasibility analysis will focus on filling the gaps and finding project specific dollars.

Other concerns were raised in regards to maintaining a grassroots component to the planning process to ensure that the community understands the direct impact of the project, both positively and negatively.

Others addressed specific considerations in terms of economic development opportunities in the corridor that address the food desert. A commercial kitchen incubator was identified as a strategy to provide healthy food options. Currently, several parcels along Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard are used
to sell goods out of cars. A flea market may be an ideal alternative for such activities as well as an economic generator.

In closing, the Land Bank Authority volunteered to assist in identifying properties being foreclosed and provide maps of potential acquisitions for proposed development.

Public Kickoff Meeting: August 29, 2012

Approximately 115 stakeholders attended this meeting, representing residents, business owners, elected officials, community leaders, and members of the faith-based community. The purpose of this initial public meeting was to inform community stakeholders on the goals and outcomes of the planning process. Participants were also able to identify the project’s boundaries including major thoroughfares such as 15th Street, Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, Deans Bridge Road, and Gordon Highway. The community was provided a description of the four initiatives, which emphasized transportation, mixed use development and supportive zoning, and affordable green housing and implementation strategies. The presentation culminated with overview of future public involvement opportunities, including a 5-day visioning charrette and seven additional tentative meetings to be scheduled over the next year.

There were several opportunities during the kick-off session for stakeholders to provide immediate input into the planning process. Prior to the meeting’s start, the community was asked to provide one-word descriptions of their perceptions of 15th Street in its current condition. They were also asked to give a descriptive word of their vision for the corridor. Responses were used to create a Wordle, which graphically displays word repletion (see previous page). Unsafe and dilapidated were the most common words used to describe the current condition of 15th Street, while sidewalks and employment describe the vision for the future.

Immediately following the meeting’s presentation, participants were able to ask questions about the planning process. Responses were provided by planning team representatives as well as John Stout from the City of Augusta’s Department of Planning.

The kickoff meeting concluded with stakeholders participating in a Visual Preference Survey. The planning team provided model designs to illustrate traffic improvements and best practice housing developments. Utilizing red and green dots, the community identified their likes/appropriate (green) and dislikes/inappropriate (red) solely based on the physical appearance of the design. This also allowed participants to ask direct questions to planning team representatives. Additionally, this feedback allowed the planning team to better understand stakeholders’ vision for the future of the area.

Most of the images selected as appropriate showed places with a blend of character, permanence, and pedestrian scale. The most popular images were of vibrant public spaces and parks, mixed-use buildings, and tree lined sidewalks, and streets that were pedestrian friendly and framed with buildings. Other preferred images indicate a need for more transportation options such as bicycle lanes, multi-use trails, bus, and wider sidewalks. This suggested the community desires to have a pedestrian friendly area with multi-use paths, outdoor dining, open space, and a mix of uses including more retail options. Those images deemed inappropriate were suburban auto-oriented places that lacked local identity. The results of the Visual Preference Survey are discussed in detail in Section 4.2.

Visioning Week: November 13-17, 2012

As part of the public engagement process for this project, the planning team hosted a five-day event known as Visioning Week. Stakeholders were invited to participate in a series of visioning exercises designed to bring the community into the process of co-planning and co-designing project elements. The week’s activities consisted of a Visioning Workshop, Public Open House and Visioning Results Presentation.

Visioning Workshop - A kickoff meeting was held on Tuesday evening at T. W. Josey High School, in which approximately 50 residents, business owners,
and community leaders attended. The purpose of this meeting was to share with the community the desired outcomes of the week-long engagement process and to also capture an initial community response to aid in the development of preliminary design recommendations. The planning team introduced the four initiatives to provide context and general understanding of the plan’s elements.

Participants were then invited to participate in round-table discussions centered on identifying key considerations. Groups of 8-10 people were led by a facilitator representing the planning team and were provided maps of the study area to note at points of interest. The facilitator provided guiding discussion questions about key project considerations including, transit, zoning, affordable housing, economic development, and public space. A representative from each group was asked to keep record of the discussion and each table provided a group report to summarize points of interest to all participants. As a result, there were several areas of consensus raised from each of the round-table groups.

- Improving safety and transportation. Specifically, groups identified a need for lighting improvements and other potential considerations including security cameras at bus stops.

- Need to improve the street design for better pedestrian access. This would take into consideration a need for better sidewalks, bike lanes, and other features to improve safety for pedestrians.

- Need for more bus routes within the corridor as well as providing transit amenities such as bus shelters with better lighting and potentially wifi hotspots.

- Need to revitalize the Regency Mall, Southgate Shopping Center, and the Cherry Tree public housing complex. Recommendations for Regency Mall included ideas for adaptive reuses of the property, which would provide better housing, retail options and recreation.

- Introduce more businesses at the Southgate Shopping Center. Ideas for business opportunities included introducing a FedEx Office that provides professional printing and copy services.

- In addressing the future redevelopment of Cherry Tree, it was suggested by participants that attention to a full revitalization of the entire area surrounding the property was also essential.

- An additional project opportunity was also identified near Martin Luther King and Steiner Avenue. The property is currently vacant warehousing, and participants saw this area as an ideal use for multifamily housing and small retail.

- Other concerns raised during round-table discussions focused on the need to improve drainage issues within community.

- Participants also desired to beautify the community, increase food outlets, and utilize alternative energy sources such as solar. Ways to improve the aesthetic along the bridge serving as a gateway into the community were also discussed by participants. Lastly, the need to provide housing for lower income residents was greatly emphasized.

In closing, the planning team invited participants to continue their involvement by attending the open house sessions held at the Augusta Mini Theater as well as a final wrap-up meeting held on Saturday back at the high school.

Visioning Week Open House - Following the Visioning Workshop, the team established a design studio at the Augusta Mini Theater to serve several purposes throughout the remainder of the week. On Wednesday, the team (along with City staff) reviewed technical findings collected over several months, including an overview of economic market conditions and realities, existing land use, landmarks and facilities, areas that are stable, and areas susceptible to change. Also presented was the existing DOT transportation plan, inventory of facilities, traffic counts and intersection efficiency, internal and external multi-modal connections,
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Figure 4.1 Master sketch plan and renderings as the result of the charrette visioning week.

- Photo of the existing conditions below 15th Street bridge.
- Visioning results of the area below the bridge with a bike/pedestrian path connection.
- Visioning of the Cherry Tree redevelopment along 15th Street.
- Photo of existing conditions at the 15th Street bridge.
- Visioning results of the improved bridge in the future.
and options of lane widths, utilities, and analyze storm water management systems. Finally, an overview of the existing code and regulations was presented, along with policy on green building standards. These findings would create the foundation for developing the design concepts. Following the presentation, large scale maps of the study area, existing conditions analysis and neighborhoods were posted and reviewed by the team. During this brainstorming session, the findings from the technical analysis and windshield surveys were used to generate consensus on a general program for Rocky Creek, Southgate and Deans Bridge Road, Oates Creek and Deans Bridge Road, and Cherry Tree and 15th Street. Over the remainder of the week, the team members, each with a specific target area, created development concepts representative of the results from the visioning workshop.

During this session, the planning team shared data collected on the study area, which was used to guide specific design and other program considerations. Some of this information was reflective of feedback provided during previous public involvement meetings such as the visual preference survey and descriptive words shared by residents during the project’s kick-off meeting. A market analysis on the economic conditions, housing conditions, commercial uses, and supply and demand factors impacting development in the area was introduced. Transportation findings affecting the area were outlined and specifically highlighted the need to plan for future growth within the area and provide better pedestrian safety features. Finally, detailed recommendations along with illustrative designs for Cherry Tree, Oates Creek, Rocky Creek, Southgate, and the Regency Mall were presented.

In addition to the presentations, a polling exercise was conducted in which the participants were presented a sequence of questions relating to the various presentation topics. Using small hand-held devices, participants were invited to vote on the provided responses to the posed questions. The questions related to home location, travel patterns, approaches to revitalizing the corridor, and opinion regarding a possible corridor vision statement. While it was interesting to get some real-time feedback from the audience, the group was too small to draw any conclusions.

The presentation concluded with an unveiling of the draft mural concept drawing that will be the first beautification project to be implemented. The proposed mural will be installed on the side of the 15th Street bridge at Poplar Street. The intent of the mural is to reflect a collaboration of the entire community to influence change.

**Public Open House: February 12, 2013**

The purpose of the open house was to share initial project recommendations with the community and stakeholder audience. Approximately 60 community stakeholders were in attendance, representing residents, business owners, public officials, and other community leaders. Attendees had the opportunity to review recommendations, which were left on display, and engage the planning team one-on-one with questions about the project. A formal presentation was also given. John Paul Stout, project manager, provided introductions and spoke on the importance of involving community in the process of developing implementation strategies for the study area.

Stout also indicated that the project was on schedule to be completed by fall, and that a surplus of funding for the project was now available. This meant funding could be reallocated to address some immediate improvements to the study area, specifically in reference to enhancing the 15th Street bridge. Such efforts would be helpful in demonstrating the City’s commitment to revitalizing the community through this plan.

The lead project consultant, Adam Williamson, led the presentation and recapitulated the activities leading into the open house. Williamson also indicated that after the open house, the planning team would be working to finalize all recommendations based on input offered by those in attendance. After reviewing key project considerations other information relating to land acquisition, transportation, and code and zoning was also explained. The planning team also used this as an opportunity to share conceptual renderings of the sub-area projects including development considerations of the Cherry Tree, Oates Creek, Southgate and Rocky Creek neighborhoods.

Members of the audience posed a number of questions, largely concerning property acquisitions, which are necessary to complete the road widening led by GDOT. Concerns were raised about the specific locations along the 15th Street corridor that were to be affected by the GDOT project. The planning team offered to identify these locations for those interested using project maps, which were displayed during the meeting. Additionally, it was suggested that attendees reference the GDOT plan if there were specific inquiries, such as requirements for property upgrades.
Other questions included concerns regarding the increase in property values as a result of new development. In response, it was shared that tax values could be subject to increase, but that the project is not scheduled in the short term. The project is expected to have at least a 20 year horizon, so property values could incrementally go up. It was reiterated that the purpose of the planning effort was to establish a community vision and that most aspects of the project were preliminary. It was also expressed that no recommendations on code or zoning presented during the open house were under consideration, but would be discussed in greater detail during the public meeting planned for March.

**Zoning Code Workshop: March 5, 2013**

The purpose of this meeting was to inform and engage community stakeholders and specifically property owners in a discussion on how to use zoning as an implementation tool for revitalizing the study area. Over 60 community stakeholders attended the meeting and received a brief overview of the plan recommendations, focusing on improving transportation and walkability, reviving underused commercial properties, preserving historic neighborhoods, creating a diversity of housing options and open spaces, addressing new ways to boost economic development, and job creation.

Prior to the formal presentation, the participants were asked to engage in an interactive activity using large-scale maps and posters documenting existing and proposed zoning codes. With these tools, they were easily able to determine if the draft proposed zoning code would impact the existing use of property and proposed uses.

The planning team presented the existing ordinance (which includes a total of 16 zones) and recommendations to simplify the zoning to support future development using a form-based code. The presentation of the code recommendations also included examples of redevelopment options using ‘do nothing’ or ‘change’ scenarios.

Much of the discussion following the presentation focused on how the zoning changes would be implemented. The team reiterated that form-based code recommendations would be presented to the commission for approval and all existing uses would be grandfathered. There would be additional public meetings focusing on code before the plans are finalized to address concerns and questions from the public. Other questions posed addressed concerns regarding future redevelopment in the area and its impact on property taxes. The team explained that the master plan is a 20 year vision for the area. All redevelopment project recommendations are concepts and will require funding and partnerships to ensure implementation. An increase in property values is inevitable, but there will be plans in place to address and discourage financial hardship on existing property owners. Finally, the GDOT 15th Street widening project and acquisition strategy was also discussed. The team provided a large-scale map of the project for public viewing and to address specific questions.

**Conclusions and Next Steps**

The public engagement program for the planning effort was a very interactive cycle of meetings and dialogue with attendees about the needs, issues and vision for the study area in terms of land use/development, economic development/services and transportation/safety. The planning team developed concepts representative of this vision that were vetted by the Committees and during public forums.
4.2 Visual Preference Survey

A key visioning tool of the Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program was the use of a visual preference survey. Held at the public kickoff meeting on August 29, 2012, participants were given the opportunity to review a variety of images for their appropriateness for the future of the study area. Each person was asked to choose two images preferred and two images less preferred in different categories. Categories included transportation, public spaces, commercial, mixed-uses, multifamily housing, and townhouses/single-family houses. Following the survey, the most and least appropriate images were identified based on the results received. The following pages summarize key findings.

**Transportation**

Transportation images showed different facilities, including roads, bicycle lanes, multi-use paths, sidewalks, and buses/shuttles. Results indicated that people would like to expand the range of transportation options beyond driving. Images related to driving received negative responses almost unanimously.

The top rated images in this category showed a multi-use path in a linear park setting along a street. The second highest ranking image was a well-designed park-and-ride station. On-street bike lanes and pedestrian-friendly sidewalks were also preferred. Images that received negative responses are road images that tended to be designed predominately for the automobile.

---

*This image of a multi-use path in a linear park next to a street received the most green dots in the transportation category.*

*The community preferred this image of a sidewalk with street trees and landscape buffer.*

*This image of a park and ride station also received many positive responses. (source: Charlotte Area Transit System)*

*This image of a roadway received mostly negative responses.*
Public Spaces

This image category showed a series of open spaces including parks, plazas, playgrounds, markets, courtyards, and community gardens. A community

This image of open space received most positive responses in public space category.

The community preferred this image in the commercial category.

Most participants think this image of a courtyard was not appropriate for the area.

This image of a farmer’s market also received positive responses.

This image of a cafe with outdoor seating received positive responses.
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This is the highest rated mixed-use building image of the survey. Most participants preferred this image of a two-story mixed-use building. This office image was thought not to be appropriate for the study area by most participants.

Most participants disliked this image of mixed-use buildings in downtown Augusta. Most participants preferred this image of a two-story mixed-use building. This image of a mixed-use building received mostly negative responses due to its large scale. The top rated image in this category was of a farmer’s market, followed by an image of a large open space with a path and benches. A courtyard image scored poor probably because it is too small to meet the need for open space in the study area. Mixed feelings on the community garden image indicates that some community members have a desire for the space, but not in the way the image depicted.

Commercial

There are currently many commercial uses in the study area, especially along Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road, which provides services to the study areas neighborhoods and surrounding areas. However, they are all automobile-oriented and not easy to access on foot. The survey garden and courtyard received negative responses, but all other images received positive feedback. The study area currently lacks many public spaces, and responses suggest a desire to increase the type and amount of quality public spaces in the future.
results suggest a desire for more choices and high-quality buildings with a pedestrian-friendly environment.

Within this category, the image ranked highest is of a supermarket, which is no surprise because the study area currently only has one grocery store and it is not easily accessible. An image of the existing Kmart on Gordon Highway received mostly negative responses because of its auto-oriented setting. Images of office buildings did not receive good responses, although they are a desired type of development in the area.

**Mixed-Use**

One goal of this study is to promote mixed-use development in appropriate areas. Currently there is no mixed-use development in the study area. Survey participants have mixed feelings about this type of development. The results indicate that the community welcomes quality mixed-use development that fits the area's context.

Generally, images of two to three-story mixed-uses with pedestrian-friendly environment were accepted. An image of five-story mixed-use building was considered out of scale and not appropriate for the area. The image of downtown Augusta received mostly negative responses due to the appearance of dated storefronts.

**Multifamily Housing**

The study area currently has three aging public housing complexes and a couple of small apartment complexes. They all serve low-income residents. There are no for-sale condominiums in the study area. The survey results suggest a desire to redevelop existing complexes into higher-quality multifamily housing, as well as increasing multifamily housing in other parts of the study area. Townhouses are also a desired type of housing the community would like to see built in the area. The survey did not ask if multifamily housing should be owner-occupied or rental, nor whether it should have an affordable housing component, but concurrent stakeholder interviews generally expressed support for a mixture of types, provided they were well designed.

The image that received the most positive responses showed three-story garden apartment buildings. Another image participants preferred showed a modern apartment/condominium building. An image of quality and affordable townhouse received positive responses as well.
Single Family

The study area’s residential housing is predominantly aging single-family houses. The area historically has provided affordable housing to residents. To this end, people would like to see small, affordable, single-family houses through both renovation, redevelopment, and new development. The results of the survey clearly proved that traditional compact, small single-family houses are mostly desired, while larger houses or modern designs are not appropriate for the area.

General Findings

The images selected as most appropriate represent places from around the nation; regardless of origin, all share certain design elements. Most notable is that all show a vibrant, human-scaled environment. Survey participants rejected images of sprawling suburban areas and large-scale buildings. Results indicate that people all share a common respect for pedestrian scale, quality landscaping, and well-designed buildings. Another key indication is that people think the study area should provide facilities that serve a wide range of people. This is reflected in terms of business types, housing types, open space types, and transportation facilities.
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Part V: Recommendations
5.1 Overview of Recommendations

This section provides recommendations in the area of land use, transportation, market and economics, urban design and historic resources, environment and public facilities, utilities and infrastructure, and sustainability. Recommendations are divided into policies and projects. Projects are specific tasks with a defined cost and description. More project details are found in the implementation section.

Policies are general guidelines that provide direction to the implementation of the Master Plan vision. They often support recommended projects and should serve as the basis for future actions on the part of the decision makers. Recommendations are a synthesis of the existing conditions assessment and community input, coupled with sound planning principles. They offer a visionary yet achievable blueprint for sustainable growth that will benefit the City of Augusta for decades to come.

Future Vision

The Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program is an unprecedented opportunity for the 15th Street - Deans Bridge Road corridor area to plan for growth and redevelopment in a way that maximizes its benefits and achieves a community-based vision for the area’s future. The recommendations that follow have been developed to realize a vision that emerged from an open and inclusive planning process.

All of the recommendations in this plan will guide the study area toward a model of sustainable redevelopment. The concept of sustainability is broad and difficult to define, since it touches on all aspects of life. An ideal plan for sustainability benefits the environment, improves the lives of humans, and provides economic benefits at the same time. As such, sustainability can be distilled into three broad components:

- Environmental sustainability, which strives to reduce or eliminate humanity’s impacts on the planet’s natural systems, and to remedy previous damage.
- Social sustainability, which strives to solve serious social problems, create a quality community life for all, and even improve the social quality.
- Economic sustainability, which strives to provide a decent or improved standard of living for all.

Based upon these three key system components, recommendations of this plan focus on providing a mix of employment, housing, retail, civic, and open spaces connected by a balanced system of roads, trails, sidewalks, transit, and bicycle facilities. The goal is to arrange these elements in a way that transforms the study area into a place where people want to live, work, and play, both today and in the coming decades.

Framework Plan

The framework plan in Figure 5.1 demonstrates general aspirations for the study area. The redevelopment concept for specific areas are for illustrative purposes only, it represents one possibility of redevelopment. The guiding principles of the Framework Plan include the following:

- Organize development into a series of walkable, mixed-use centers.
  
  Due to its large size, it is not feasible to expect people to walk from one end of the study area to another. However, by concentrating redevelopment and growth into compact, human-scaled centers, walking becomes viable.

  Envisioned redevelopment/growth centers include:
  - Rocky Creek Village Center - The redevelopment of Regency Mall is envisioned to have a mixed-use village center near Deans Bridge Road to provide both jobs and housing.
  - Rocky Creek Neighborhood Center - Due to the large size of the Rocky Creek redevelopment area, a secondary neighborhood node is recommended near Milledgeville Road to provide basic community services.
  - Southgate Transit Plaza - Centered around the existing bus transfer stop near the intersection with retail and offices framing the streets. It also offers mixed housing options in a compact setting.
  - Milledgeville/Deans Bridge Road Intersection - Redevelop the area around the intersection with retail and offices framing the streets. It also offers mixed housing options in a compact setting.
  - Olive Road/MLK Jr. Blvd. Intersection - A commercial node at this prominent intersection with a mix of housing connecting to the existing residential neighborhood.
  - 15th Street/MLK Jr. Blvd. Intersection - A major mixed-use node with a grocery store, restaurant, retail along the corridor, and housing in the rear along the proposed Oates Creek Park.
### Land Use and Zoning Policies

**Maintain and encourage a balanced mix of land uses.**
Significant erosion of the neighborhoods and commercial areas has occurred in the last twenty years. Reestablishing and expanding the mix, particularly through infill development on vacant or underutilized land, will attract new population, with the majority of daily necessities within a short walk.

**Increase the number of residential units.**
New housing is central to the success of the plan. Not only will new housing bring life and activity to the study area, it will also provide a much-needed captive market for existing and future businesses.

**Redevelop existing vacant sites and dilapidated structures.**
In areas with vacant lots, dilapidated structures, parking lots, or on otherwise underutilized properties, infill development should be constructed in a way that is compatible with the character of adjacent structures and respects local history. Redevelopment will be a key ingredient in maintaining and improving the urban fabric.

**Protect and preserve the Turpin Hill Historic District.**
The study area includes the Turpin Hill Historic District that should be protected. However, if the road widening moves forward as 5 lanes, the adjacent land use should change to reflect the improvement of the transportation system. The parcels that front on 15th Street should be medium to high density residential, mixed-use or commercial uses that respect and enhance the existing historic area.

**Protect and preserve the Shiloh Orphanage.**
The Shiloh Orphanage is a collection of three historic buildings associated with the former orphanage. The property is listed as a National Registered Historic Place and comprises of approximately 6.6 acres.

**Promote a variety of affordable housing types to accommodate the aging population.**
Build housing types that provide programs for older adults that keep them independent and in the neighborhoods in which they have lived for years. The types can range from single family houses to senior apartments and assisted living facilities.

**Promote jobs by creating land uses that provide employment.**
These include office, retail, and industrial uses, along with live-work units.

**Support pedestrian-oriented commercial streets.**
The concentration of retailers in appropriate locations is important for their long term success. The study recommends concentrations of retail and services in nodes along 15th street in the Cherry Tree neighborhood, at the intersection of 15th Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard in the Oates Creek neighborhood, around the intersection of Deans Bridge Road and Milledgeville Road, and along part of Deans Bridge and Gordon Highway located both in the Southgate and Rocky Creek neighborhoods. In these areas, sidewalk-oriented businesses should replace auto-oriented strip commercials. If the market for such space is limited, it should nevertheless be built to commercial specifications and temporarily occupied by other uses such as apartments.

**Increase the amount of open space in the area.**
There is a lack of green space in the overall study area. As areas redevelop green space should be provided or new parks should be built to attract development.

**Promote neighborhood redevelopment.**
All four neighborhoods in the study area are ready for redevelopment to bring new life and attract future residents. They each have special needs and directions in terms of redevelopment. A concept plan has been developed for each neighborhood based on the results of a public charrette. The concept plan only represents one option for redevelopment assuming that willing property owners sell land to willing developers. It reflects basic planning and design principles for sustainable communities. A brief overview of the redevelopment goals of each neighborhood is described below:

- **Cherry Tree Neighborhood:** Redevelop the Cherry Tree public housing complex and underutilized industrial properties as well as promote infill development in the existing single family residential areas. Redevelopment concept plan can be seen on page 75-77.
- **Oates Creek Neighborhood:** Redevelop and renovate exiting commercial super blocks into pedestrian friendly commercial villages with improved connectivity. See concept plan on page 81-83.
- **Rocky Creek Neighborhood:** Redevelop Regency Mall and surrounding urban area into a mixed-use community. Preserve Rocky Creek corridor by creating a nature park with minimal environmental disturbance. Redevelopment concept plan can be seen on page 84-86.

### Land Use and Zoning Projects

**Comprehensive Plan Updates (O-1)**
Update the comprehensive plan to reflect the Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program’s vision.

**Establish a form-based zoning code (O-2)**
To ensure that the proper regulatory framework is in place to support the redevelopment envisioned by plan, a form-based zoning code should be in place.
Cherry Tree Redevelopment Concept Plan

The Cherry Tree neighborhood is positioned for redevelopment with a major public improvement project moving forward. The 15th Street GDOT project should improve traffic flow and create a safer environment for pedestrians and bicyclists. The recent announcement by the Augusta Housing Authority that Cherry Tree Crossing will be demolished and replaced by a mixed income project should help spur development in the area. With these in mind, the refined charrette concept plan include the following key elements:

**Rosa T. Beard Memorial Bridge Improvement (O-15)**

Improve the Rosa T. Beard Memorial Bridge by adding bike lanes, decorative railing, and lighting. The bridge improvements will create a gateway into the area. Running parallel to the bridge, a multi-use trail will connect the study area to the north and downtown.

**Cherry Tree Crossing Public Housing Redevelopment (O-9)**

The Cherry Tree Crossing redevelopment is envisioned to have several residential building types including single family, townhouse, and multifamily buildings. In addition, neighborhood commercial buildings are proposed along 15th street.

**Redevelop Industrial Areas adjacent to the Railroad (O-10)**

A variety of housing types are shown in the concept plan. They include targeting graduate student housing, senior housing complexes, market driven apartments, as well as four-plexes, townhouses and single family houses that blend in with existing single-family neighborhoods.

**15th Street Frontage**

Further down 15th Street toward Josey High School townhouses and four-plexes are proposed along the frontage. Fourplex units are well suited for seniors. The buildings have flats with surface parking to create more affordable units. All buildings are setback from 15th Street to create green spaces or courtyards. The 15th Street GDOT project will create additional land that should be used for green space or linear parks with a multi-use trail. The proposed multifamily buildings are appropriate for 15th Street due to the proposed road widening. They serve as an ideal transition to the existing single-family residents that are adjacent to 15th Street.

The concept plan illustrates parking located behind the buildings to create a pedestrian friendly streetscape. Several pocket parks/green spaces are located throughout the redevelopment area to provide outdoor space to the residents.
Playgrounds, gardens, and open lawns are some of the elements envisioned for the green space. New streets that connect with existing streets are proposed to create opportunities for new development and improve connectivity.

Existing aerial view of Cherry Tree Crossing public housing area from the north.

Existing aerial view of the industrial/warehouse area in Cherry Tree neighborhood next to the railroad tracks.

View of the redevelopment concept plan for the Cherry Tree Crossing public housing area after redevelopment. It includes a small commercial node on 15th Street, affordable single-family, townhouse, and multi-family in a compact neighborhood setting. The design incorporated several parks to provide amenities for residents.

View of the proposed development showing graduate student housing on the left, senior housing in the middle front with single family in the back connecting to the existing neighborhood. The area in the distance is the proposed Oates Creek Park and redevelopment around 15th Street/Martin Luther King Jr. interaction.
This is an aerial view of the redevelopment of the Cherry Tree Crossing Apartments in the foreground and the Mercy Ministries site in the background at the intersection of 15th Street and Government Road.
Oates Creek Redevelopment Concept Plan

The Oates Creek neighborhood is centrally located in the overall study area. The neighborhood area has mainly residential uses with commercial along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and around the intersection of 15th Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Development potential in this neighborhood mainly exists in the above mentioned commercial area and the Dogwood Terrace Public housing and its adjacent area.

Redevelop the Commercial Area

The node located at the intersection of 15th street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard offers an opportunity for a mix of uses. One option at the intersection is to have a roundabout, which is not shown in the plan. A mixed-use building is proposed where the current gas station is located, along with townhouses in the same block. The plan depicts a small grocery store with other potential commercial uses on the south side of the intersection. Further down MLK on the south side an affordable multifamily/townhouse development is depicted. New street connections are proposed connecting the existing neighborhood grid to 15th street.

North of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, two existing commercial buildings near the 15th Street intersection are kept. The area west of these two buildings are primarily in the floodplain of Oates Creek and should be converted to a community park with a small organic farm or community garden, seed and feed, and market buildings near the Olive Road intersection. The Oates Creek stream should be returned to its natural state where feasible. The park should have a trail system that connects to the proposed Oates Creek trail system. At the northwestern corner of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Olive Road, a couple of commercial buildings are shown with predominately single family houses in the back. A few townhouses behind the commercial buildings are proposed to transition from commercial to single family. A linear park in the rear of the property with a multi-use trail connects the development to the park with a small organic farm or community garden.

Dogwood Terrace Public Housing Redevelopment (O-11)

As a result of the public charrette, the concept plan shows that the public housing should be redeveloped into a mixed-income community with a variety of housing types. The plan also indicates an expanded Doughty Park with a community pool and sports facilities.

Similar to the concept plan developed for the Cherry Tree neighborhood, parking will be located behind the buildings to create a pedestrian-friendly streetscape. Ex-
Community Gardens or Organic Farms
Finding ways to accelerate the growth of community and private gardens will continue to strengthen the effect of local food networks. Whether the food is used to supplement existing resources at food banks or other community service organizations, or to simply provide resources for neighborhood friends and families, enhancing the use of private and public open spaces that abound throughout the study area will cultivate the soils as well as the spirit. In addition, improving the ability to cultivate locally provides a permanent opportunity for local youth to stay involved in an activity that rewards hard work and community participation. Local food production should be connected with area schools from kindergarten through high school to support long-term reinvestment into the neighborhood. As mentioned above, a major community garden is located in the Oates Creek Park. Other small gardens can be created as part of neighborhood pocket parks.

Charrette concept rendering for the commercial node at the 15th Street/MLK Blvd. intersection

Existing aerial view of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Olive Road intersection area

Existing aerial view of Dogwood Terrace public housing area

An aerial view of the proposed concept plan for Oates Creek. It includes two commercial nodes at the intersections of Martin Luther King Jr. Drive with Olive Road and 15th Street, Oates Creek Park with a community garden, and different type of residential development in between and around the nodes.

Aerial view of proposed redevelopment concept plan for Dogwood Terrace. It includes a variety of housing types from single family, townhouse, to multifamily, with an expanded and improved Doughty Park in the background.
This is an aerial view of the redevelopment of the Dogwood Terrace Apartments into a mixed income neighborhood. The project also provides senior housing to accommodate all ages.
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Southgate Redevelopment Concept Plan

Development opportunities exist mainly in the commercial areas for this neighborhood.

Bi-Lo Shopping Plaza (Southgate Mall)

When Southgate Mall opened, it was one of the largest shopping centers in the study area, and was among the first to cater to auto-oriented suburban needs. Over the years, however, the shopping center faced increasing competition from neighboring retail centers and experienced a steady decline. The redevelopment of Southgate Mall presents an important opportunity to reshape this important node within the neighborhood. By providing a variety of uses, the site should become a dynamic, diverse development that will create a center for the surrounding community.

Excess surface parking has been used to create one-story main-street with office and retail buildings along a linear central green and angled parking. Existing large commercial buildings are broken into smaller blocks to allow new streets to connect with adjacent properties, which forms an interconnected new network of blocks and streets. Retained parking spaces are provided mid-block, out of view from the streets. The concept plan shows how new infill development can be accomplished without interfering with existing structures on the site.

K-Mart Shopping Center

K-Mart has been part of the Augusta landscape for a few decades and is still a thriving part of the neighborhood. A bus stop located on the site is widely used and serviced by the #4 (Turpin Hill), #6 (K-Mart), #13 (Barton Chapel) and #16 (Lumpkin Road) routes. During the charrette, residents asked for increased activity and visibility at the bus transfer facility. The plan incorporates a re-imagining of the transfer facility, including a commercial building along Deans Bridge Road with restrooms, ticket booth, a plaza, covered shelter, wireless internet connection and seating. Also proposed are infill buildings along Gordon Highway to complete the missing gaps along the street. Infill development with streetscape improvements should transform this portion of the district currently characterized by sporadic development and vacant lots.

The Augusta Mini Theatre & Black Box expansion

At the heart of the community, the Augusta Mini Theater provides affordable art instruction and performances to develop the artistic and life skills for area youth. The facility currently contains 9,333 sq. ft. of space, including offices, four studios (dance, music, art, and drama), the James Brown Music Wing and a media center. The Mini Theater has planned an expansion of its facilities by including a Black Box Theater, with a seating capacity of 298. A plan was developed for the site during the charrette process and improved afterwards, which includes additional parking spaces, commercial buildings along Deans Bridge Road, and a main entrance off Gordon Highway. The entrance is an important feature, because it connects residents and visitors to the Southgate Mall’s improved facilities. The Augusta Mini Theater gives the neighborhood a unique character and provides a place for gatherings and special events where the entire community can come together.

Neighborhood Center – Milledgeville and Deans Bridge Road Intersection

The master plan proposes a series of complete neighborhoods and centers, designed to include a full range of uses and building types within the study area. The Milledgeville and Deans Bridge Road intersection is an important anchor in the realization of this concept. An existing gas station at the intersection is redeveloped into a “gas-backwards” or reverse gas station, allowing the

CONCEPT PLAN ESTIMATES:

1. Kmart Plaza Redevelopment
2. Southgate Mall Redevelopment
3. Fish Farm
4. Community Garden
property to have a more dignified presence along the street and terminating the view from Milledgeville Road. Southwest along Deans bridge Road, viable commercial buildings are suggested to be renovated and the gaps between them be infilled with new buildings to form a more continuous building facade. Parking is rearranged to the back of the buildings to improve the pedestrian environment along the street. New streets are introduced to facilitate redevelopment in the back, which includes single-family lots, duplexes, and townhomes.

Community Gardens and Aquaculture
As mentioned in the Oates Creek concept plan description, community gardens are a major part of a sustainable community. It is proposed that gardens be created in the Southgate area within the neighborhood parks.

Fish farming is the principal form of aquaculture, and involves raising fish commercially in tanks or enclosures, usually for food. There is an increasing demand for fish and fish protein, which has resulted in widespread overfishing in wild fisheries. A series of culture tanks and filters where water is continuously recycled and monitored to keep optimal conditions year round.

A fish farm is proposed north of the Augusta Mini Theater site. The facility proposed for the Fish Farm site is a 30,000 sq. ft. above ground tank system.
This is an aerial view of the intersection at Deans Bridge Road/Milledgeville Road that depicts a reverse gas station and a mix of uses lining the streets with parking behind.
Rocky Creek Redevelopment Concept Plan

Neighborhood Centers

The plan proposes a series of complete neighborhoods designed to include a full range of uses and building types. Recent development in the surrounding area has consisted of isolated residential subdivisions with separate commercial areas, requiring residents to drive for all their daily needs. Instead of following this precedent, the proposed neighborhoods incorporate a diverse mix of uses within a walkable urban fabric that supports and encourages a pedestrian-oriented lifestyle.

The area fronting Deans Bridge Road is envisioned to be a “town center” in a traditional main-street setting. It is then transformed into a mixed-residential neighborhood with a significant senior living facility. Continuing west, single-family homes dominate the neighborhood area with a commercial node centered conveniently to Milledgeville Road. The residential area north of Rocky Creek has many lots located in the floodplain area. The concept plan recommends the area be redeveloped into a cluster that respects the environmental factors.

Rocky Creek Park

As the revitalization of Augusta continues, and as more people begin living and working in the area, the need for open space will increase and green spaces within the neighborhoods will need to be made available to all. Located to the north of the vacant Regency Mall, Rocky Creek can be transformed into a beloved park. The proposed park contains an extensive network of walking trails, basketball and tennis courts, baseball fields, open spaces, stream overlooks, pavilions, and a community garden for public enjoyment.

Today Rocky Creek is for the most part inaccessible to the public. The site is located in the floodplain and occasionally experiences instances of flooding; several homes in the area have been removed because of this.
Senior Living Community (O-12)
A portion of the neighborhood could be developed as a continuing-care retirement community (CCRC). As shown in the concept plan, the facility can be integrated into the block and street network, giving residents easy access to the neighborhood center as well as the surrounding parks and recreational amenities.

This image shows the proposed concept plan from the same angle as the above existing image. It depicts the continuing-care retirement community facility (CCRC), mixed with single-family and multifamily units. A community garden and a school is in the background.

Aerial view of existing vacant Regency Mall from Gordon Hwy

Aerial view of existing vacant Regency Mall from Deans Bridge Road

Aerial view of a proposed development for the same area as above. The foreground shows a mixed-use village center entered from Deans Bridge Road. In the background are several residential neighborhoods, CCRC, school, community garden, and the proposed Rocky Creek Park.
This is an illustration of the village main street with a green in the foreground. The background shows a school, single family houses, townhouses, and a CCRC.
As it transforms, the study area corridor should provide a range of transportation options. In addition to driving, the area should encourage bicycling, walking, and transit use. Smooth traffic flow should be provided along 15th Street, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, Milledgeville Road, and Deans Bridge Road, but local streets should be more focused on responding to adjacent land uses and development patterns, rather than simply moving as many vehicles as possible in the shortest amount of time.

**General Transportation Policies**

Create a balanced transportation system that does not promote one form of travel at the expense of another.

The study area is largely auto-oriented, especially in the southern half of the corridor area. As the area grows and transforms, it must do so in a way that expands non-vehicular facilities and ensures that travel types are balanced with the land use vision. Transit serves the study area but not in an efficient way since 15th Street is largely bypassed. The 15th Street corridor improvement should take this in mind and accommodate transit in its design.

**Develop pedestrian-scale blocks in new development.**

A system of small blocks is essential to encourage walking and provide multiple routes for other types of transportation. To ensure this, new developments should be divided into blocks having a maximum face of 600 feet and maximum perimeter of 2,400 feet. The historic Turpin Hill district in the Cherry Tree neighborhood and some areas in the Oates Creek neighborhood are good examples for pedestrian-scale blocks.

Streets defining these blocks should be pedestrian friendly, but some more than others, as follows:

- **Primary Grid Streets:** Should provide the highest level of pedestrian access and pedestrian-friendly building orientation. Sidewalks should be provided on both sides, and on-street parking encouraged.
- **Secondary Grid Streets:** May provide less pedestrian orientation today, but should still have sidewalks on at least one side. They may even include drives through parking lots, provided utilities are located under them. This will enable adjacent parking areas to easily redevelop in the future.
- **Long-term, Secondary Grid Streets may convert to Primary Grid Streets as parking is redeveloped into pedestrian-supportive uses. This principle can be used in the Regency Mall redevelopment area.**

Utilize a “complete street” approach for new streets & streets under redesign.

A “complete street” is designed to consider the array of potential travel modes and how each mode would use the street, with a balance between motorized and non-motorized modes.

**Create new streets and inter-parcel connections.**

As the area transforms, new interconnected streets should be created to provide more routes for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians. In addition, where new streets are not feasible, connections between adjacent properties should be provided so people can drive, walk, or bicycle between them without going onto adjacent roads. The framework plan in Figure 5.1 should be used as a guide for creating new streets when development occurs.

**Require streets in new developments to connect to adjacent developments.**

Where developments abut land likely to develop or redevelop in the next ten years, street stubs should be built to the property line so that those streets can one day be extended onto the adjoining property. When possible, the adjoining property owner should be made aware of the desired future inter-parcel connection. Where a new development adjoins an existing street stub, it should connect to it.

**Minimize dead-end streets.**

Other than stub streets designed to one day connect to adjacent sites, cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets should be minimized to facilitate pedestrian connectivity and support multi-modal travel.

**Roadway Improvement Policies**

**Promote access management along arterial and collector roads.**

Access management ensures smooth traffic flow, reduces pedestrian-vehicle conflicts, and reduces conflicts between on-street bicyclists and drivers. Techniques can include shared driveways, inter-parcel access, alleys, and side street access. For example, inter-parcel access makes it possible to drive from one lot to another without going onto the roadway. Such is encouraged in all commercial and transitional use areas, particularly along Deans Bridge Road, Milledgeville Road, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, and 15th Street.

**Promote shared parking arrangements wherever possible to decrease the number of under used parking spaces.**

Different land uses have parking needs at different times of the day and week. Allow-
ing shared parking can make more efficient use of land and keep parking lots from sitting empty.

Maximize on-street parking except on state highways.

On-street parking can buffer pedestrians from moving cars, calm traffic, and support adjacent land uses, especially retail.

**Roadway Improvement Projects**

**Intersection Improvement at Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road intersection. (T-14)**

This is a high accident location in the project corridor. This project includes modification of existing intersection to better delineate vehicular lane assignments via additional pavement markings, signage and advance warnings to enhance safety. Pedestrian crossings are also included to provide designated locations for crossings.

**Modifications to GDOT State Route 4/15th Street road widening project, PI # 220680 in the vicinity of TW Josey High School. (T-15)**

In the vicinity of TW Josey High school, current GDOT design calls for a major realignment of the western leg of the intersection to provide a perpendicular intersection between these roads. This intersection realignment would result in significant impacts to the TW Josey High School property including loss of parking spaces, disruption to internal vehicular circulation, and impact to a fenced area beyond the parking lot. Proposed modification calls for a less drastic realignment of Essie McIntyre Boulevard to minimize impacts to the high school.

**Modifications to GDOT State Route 4/15th Street road widening project, PI # 220680 at Government Road and 15th Street Intersection. (T-16)**

In the vicinity of Government Road and 15th Street intersection, current GDOT design calls for a major realignment of Government Road so that it aligns with the entrance to the soon to be redeveloped Cherry Tree Crossing apartments. With this redevelopment, the entrance to this property can be relocated to match the existing Government Road, eliminating the need to realign Government Road.

**R-4 Modifications to proposed medians on GDOT State Route 4/15th Street road widening project, PI # 220680 (T-17)**

This project maximizes the areas along the corridor where full median width is available to install grassing, landscaping, and a mid-block crossing without compromising the operations of the intersections. This is done by reducing the length of the proposed left-turn bays without impacting the operations of traffic signal.

**Install raised medians along Deans Bridge Road between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road (southern end of GDOT project, PI # 220680). (T-18)**

This project installs a raised landscaped median along Deans Bridge to enhance mobility and safety along this corridor. A potential for a median opening and a traffic signal will be examined to allow traffic to make U-turn maneuvers. This project has to be further coordinated with GDOT to establish a concrete conceptual design.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Policies**

The focus for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure is to provide safe, accessible, and connected facilities. Primary considerations for pedestrian and bicyclist safety are traffic speed, traffic volumes, design and separation.

The following recommendations strive to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety in the area.

**Require developments to install or upgrade adjacent sidewalks.**

As development and redevelopment occurs, developers should be required to upgrade the adjacent sidewalks on local streets as follow:

- Minimum 5-foot landscape zone with canopy trees; minimum 6 foot sidewalk

**Adjacent to commercial uses, wider sidewalks are encouraged for outdoor dining or retail displays.**

The provision of sidewalks alone is not enough to create a place where people want to walk. Use of areas adjacent to the sidewalk for merchandise displays or outdoor dining can activate the sidewalk and make walking more enjoyable and safe.

**Design new buildings to support walking with basic urban design elements.**

In addition to outdoor displays and dining, the design of buildings can greatly
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Impact the walkability of an area. Where walking is desired, buildings should front the street with doors, windows, stoops, interesting architecture, and active uses.

Provide clear and direct pedestrian access to buildings from sidewalks and trails.

People choosing to walk should have safe, convenient, and direct routes to building doors from sidewalks and trails.

Provide accessible pedestrian facilities.

All new facilities must be designed to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Encourage new development to incorporate bicycle facilities.

Large new developments should include trails or bike lanes connecting to nearby existing or proposed bicycle facilities.

Promote bicycle facilities in and around the study area.

Currently there is no bicycle facility in the study area. The 15th Street-Deans Bridge Road corridor improvement is targeted to include bicycle facilities to serve its multi-modal purpose. In addition, a bicycle network should be established in the neighborhood areas to connect with this spine.

Implement requirements for non-vehicular improvements for all future transportation projects.

All future transportation projects, including new roads, should serve bicycles and pedestrians. This means, at a minimum, providing sidewalks and shade in all locations, and dedicated bicycle facilities in areas where traffic volumes and travel patterns make shared roadways unsafe. Development patterns along these roads should also support alternatives travel.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Projects

Modifications to Bicycle and Pedestrian features of GDOT Widening Project, PI # 220680, (T-1)

This project includes modifications to GDOT Project PI#220680 that is under design. It is our recommendation to GDOT to provide a 5-foot bicycle lane and a 5-foot sidewalk along each side of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and 15th Street. Current GDOT design proposes an 8-foot path along the west side of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and 15th Street to jointly accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic, however the 8-foot path is too narrow to function as two way multi-use path.

Addition of 5-foot bicycle lane along Deans Bridge Road between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road (southern end of GDOT project, PI # 220680), (T-2)

This project includes continuation of bicycle lanes proposed under project T-1. This project will require widening of Deans Bridge Road and reconstruction of existing curb, gutter and sidewalks. To achieve this goal, additional right-of-way and easements will be required along each side of Deans Bridge Road.

Addition of mid-block crossing (T-3)

There are stretches of corridor that doesn’t include designated pedestrian crossing locations. Mid-block crossings should be added in the vicinity of pedestrian destinations or at location that are more than ¼ mile (approximately 5 minutes of walking time) from a designated pedestrian crossing location. For this project corridor, these areas include:

- Vicinity of transit transfer station at the K-Mart Parking lot
- Augusta Mini-theater
- Stretch of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard between Olive Road and 15th Street

Multi-use trail across railroad and Whitesboro Road (T-4)

This project includes constructing a permanent path in a location that is frequently used by pedestrians to cross the railroad and Whitesboro Road. There is a well beaten path visible in this area that is created by frequent pedestrian use in this area (see image on previous page).

Oates Creek Multi-use Trail (T-5)

This project will create a trail along Oates Creek from Olive Road to Jenkins-White Elementary School.

Essie McIntyre Blvd. Sidewalks (T-6)

Fill in sidewalk gaps along the south side of Essie McIntyre Boulevard.

Olive Street Sidewalks (T-7a & b)

Build sidewalks along Olive Street. It can be implemented in two phases. The first phase will be from the railroad tracks to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard on both sides. The second phase will be from Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to Gordon Highway on one side.

Cherry Road Sidewalks (T-8)

Build sidewalks on the south side of Cherry Road from Deans Bridge Road to Tubman Home Road.

Public Transportation Policies

Establish development patterns that could one day support enhanced transit service.

For transit to be effective, development patterns must support it. The Framework Plan in Figure 5.1 does this by concentrating mixed-uses in a walkable, compact setting. These could be ideal stops for future transit.

Public Transportation Projects

Study the feasibility of Bus Route 6 extension through the project corridor. (T-9)

Study the feasibility of extending the existing Bus Route No. 6 through the project corridor. It has been discussed the potential of this route becoming viable after the widening of 15th Street is completed. Currently, the existing 15th Street is a two lane road, which makes it inconvenient to operate a bus route that stops multiple times along the corridor to drop-off and pick-up riders.

Extension of Bus Route 6 through the project corridor (T-10)

If the extension of Bus Route No. 6 is deemed feasible under (T-9). Add additional bus shelters and bus stops to service this route extension.

Addition of Covered Bus Stops in the Project Corridor

Provide more bus shelters for Routes 4, 6, and 13 at the following locations. Locations and prices of bus shelters discussed in detail below.

- Gordon Highway bus stops (Route 13) which serves the various commercial establishments along the corridor
- Milledgeville Rd. bus stop (Route 6) serving the family YMCA, Wilkerson
Gardens Elementary School, and Augusta Christian School

- Olive Rd. bus stop (Route 6) serving Jennings Homes housing facility and Ebenezer Seventh Day Adventist School
- Lee Beard Way bus stops (Route 6) serving Cherry Tree Crossing housing facility, Cherry Tree Crossing apartments, Collins Elementary School, Johns Pool Park, and WT. Johnson Park
- Old Savannah Rd. (Route 4) bus stop serving Dogwood Terrace housing facility
- Martin Luther King Blvd. (Route 4) bus stops serving dense residential neighborhoods and the Alternative School

**Permanent Transfer Station (T-12)**

It is recommended that a permanent long term transit transfer station be constructed in the vicinity of Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road intersection. One potential site of this transfer station could be at the current location of the Regency Mall if the mall goes through a redevelopment.

**Short term improvements at the K-Mart Transfer Station (T-13)**

The existing Kmart transfer station includes a few covered shelters with benches, advertising, and trash receptacles. In the short term, it is recommended that the K-mart transfer station be improved as part of a plaza with retail, restrooms, nice covered shelters with seating, route maps and information, lighting, and potentially vending machines (see transit plaza concept illustration on the right). In the long term the transfer station can be relocated to Regency Mall area with redevelopment, and this area can still be an ideal location for bus stops serving the commercial village.

**Potential plaza at the existing K-mart transfer station location shown with improved transit facilities.**
5.4 Economic Development

**Economic Development Policies**

**Prevent the involuntary displacement of residents.**

Residents who want to remain in the study area must be able to do so as the area grows and changes. The City of Augusta, the Augusta Development Authority, for-profit developers, and others whose decisions have a direct impact on affordability must strive to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize long-term residents.

**Strive for a community that allows residents to age in place.**

The study area must provide housing types and amenities for people of all ages. This approach means that a person can be born here, live here, and die here, with all of the different types of housing that are needed at different life stages being provided.

**Encourage a mix of housing price points.**

Housing should be provided at a variety of price points to attract a diverse range of new residents and allow existing residents access to new housing. This will have the effect in the long term of preserving the diversity of the area.

**Focus growth into activity nodes along the corridor.**

The neighborhood redevelopment areas discussed in the land use & zoning recommendations will be economic drivers.

**Target all potential funding sources and use them strategically in the study area.**

Details of potential funding sources will be discussed in the Action Plan section.

**Encourage business retention and work on attracting new businesses.**

The focus of business retention and attraction include:

- Grocery and fresh food stores;
- Unique shops and retailers;
- Restaurants and entertainment;
- Convenience shopping and services;
- Personal services.

**Economic Development Implementation Strategies**

- Obtain annual funding for securing and maintaining neighborhood’s vacant and blighted properties (O-3)
- Add inspection staff to Code Enforcement, Department of Planning & Development (O-4)
- Foreclosure proceedings for approximately 60 vacant/dilapidated houses annually (O-5)
- Increase annual budget to secure and maintain neighborhood’s vacant and blighted properties (O-6)
- Expand workforce training with new transportation construction activity (O-7)
- Pursue partnerships with area institutional anchors and community colleges (O-8)
- Catalytic Redevelopment Project (O-9 to O-12)

See the implementation section for more details.
5.5 Urban Design and Historic Resources

As public and private investment occurs in the study area, attention to design will be critical to creating a place with a strong identity and lasting value. Central to this will be building on the area's history, while recognizing that its future must incorporate timeless place-making principles from the best town and city centers across the region and the nation.

**Urban Design Policies**

**Create a connected grid of streets where feasible**

In addition to the construction of specific new streets recommended in this plan, other opportunities should be pursued for improved connectivity and the creation of smaller blocks. The Turpin Hill Historic District has appropriate block sizes that could be replicated throughout the study area.

**Fill in gaps between buildings, parking lots, and vacant lots with buildings**

Infill development should meet the standards of traditional urbanism codified in the form-based zoning code.

**Use new buildings to create an appropriate scale and reflect Augusta’s character**

Buildings should define the public street, like walls define a room, and should have balconies, porches, etc. to provide articulation, but do not destroy the delineation of the street.

**Promote traditional building forms in new construction**

Commercial and mixed-use buildings should have simple massing and provide roofs that appear primarily horizontal from the street. Other buildings should reflect local historic forms. In all cases, multiple smaller buildings are preferred over single large ones.

**Ensure appropriate building height**

Human-scaled buildings are a key part of the future vision. To avoid conflicts with existing zoning, buildings should be limited to six stories in commercial nodes, although three to five stories is ideal.

**Allow architectural variety, but require quality building materials**

Brick, stone, glass, terra cotta, masonry, hard coated true stucco, stacked stone, wooden clapboard siding and hardiplank are acceptable for street facades, but the use of exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS) is not. Other facades that are not facing the street should be any material permitted, including metal, painted concrete, masonry units or EIFS.

**Provide open spaces to compliment new development**

The provision of open spaces within a short walk of residences is important, and should include playgrounds where feasible. Open spaces should respond to context, with hardscaped plazas in more intense areas and landscaped parks or greens in less intense spaces.

**Ensure that all new buildings have active ground floor uses with doors accessible from the sidewalk**

These are essential to creating a walkable community and encouraging vibrant street level commerce.

**Provide pedestrian-scaled signs**

Signs should be tailored to walkers, not designed exclusively for visibility from cars. Small blade signs, banners, or hanging signs can achieve this.

**Encourage public art**

Installing art or creating wall murals in proposed streetscape projects and open spaces would enliven the area and provide interest. Partnerships with local artists are encouraged.

**Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPT-ED) Principles**

Design can support or discourage crime. Techniques that minimize opportunities for crime and support effective policing should be incorporated into public and private projects. Please see page 94 for details.
**Urban Design Projects**

**Improve the Rosa T. Beard Memorial Bridge (O-15)**
The bridge should be aesthetically improved to create an enhanced gateway into the area. See sketch rendering from charrette below.

**RA Dent Boulevard to 15th Street Pedestrian/Bike Connection (T-4)**
Below the Rosa T. Beard Bridge is a potential pedestrian and bike multi-use trail connection. The current use by pedestrians and bicyclist is obvious by the existing dirt trail and should be improved. See transportation recommendations for details.

**Create flexible, user friendly zoning for mixed-use and infill development (O-2)**
The proposed zoning should incorporate design standards that ensure appropriate design and quality. See Land Use Projects for more details.

**15th Street/Milledgeville Road GDOT Project (T-1, T-2, T-15 to 17)**
The project should be redesigned within the proposed right of way using a context sensitive approach. See transportation recommendations for details.

**Uniform Sign Program (O-13)**
The program is to develop consistent design for directional signage, GDOT signs, city signs and historic signs.

**Historic Resources Policies**

**Preserve the historic fabric**
It is important that the historic fabric of the Turpin Hill Historic District be preserved. Not only does it represent the community's memories, but it also has a very real economic value. Homes should be preserved and rehabilitated where feasible. In addition, the existing pattern of small blocks and heavy tree cover should be preserved and enhanced.

**Preserve and Renovate Historic Buildings**
The existing conditions section has outlined major historic buildings in the study area. They should be preserved or renovated based on their conditions. The vacant ones should be renovated and put to new uses.

Historic Augusta Inc. is an organization working on preserving historically or architecturally significant sites in Augusta and Richmond County. The City and area residents can work with them on this initiative.

**Historic Resources Projects**

**Establish historic markers for historic sites and buildings (O-14)**
Historic markers can provide information for historic resources and make the history of the area known to residents as well as visitors.

**Table 5.1 Most Prevalent Crimes in Augusta, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft by Taking</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A uniformed sign program can be developed based on existing signs in downtown (Source: Augusta Movers)

A Beautiful home in South Augusta that received a 2011 Preservation Award serves as a good example of historic preservation (Source: Historic Augusta Inc.)
Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

The following summarizes elements of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles. It was compiled using information from wikipedia.com accessed on May 20, 2010.

CPTED is a multi-disciplinary approach to deterring criminal behavior through design. Its strategies rely upon the ability to influence offender decisions that precede criminal acts. Research into criminal behavior shows that the decision to offend or not to offend is more influenced by cues to the perceived risk of being caught than by cues to reward or ease of entry. Consistent with this research, CPTED strategies emphasize enhancing the perceived risk of detection and apprehension.

**Natural Surveillance**

Natural surveillance increases the threat of apprehension by taking steps to increase the perception that people can be seen. Natural surveillance occurs by designing the placement of physical features, activities and people in such a way as to maximize visibility and foster positive social interaction among legitimate users of private and public space. Potential offenders feel increased scrutiny and increase the perception that people can be seen. Natural surveillance occurs by designing the placement of physical features, activities and people in such a way as to maximize visibility and foster positive social interaction among legitimate users of private and public space. Potential offenders feel increased scrutiny and increase the perception that people can be seen.

**Natural Access Control**

Natural access control limits the opportunity for crime by taking steps to clearly differentiate between public space and private space. By selectively placing entrances and exits, fencing, lighting and landscape to limit access or control flow, natural access control occurs.

**Natural Territorial Reinforcement**

Territorial reinforcement promotes social control through increased definition of space and improved proprietary concern. An environment designed to clearly delineate private space does two things. First, it creates a sense of ownership. Owners have a vested interest and are more likely to challenge intruders or report them to the police. Second, the sense of owned space creates an environment where “strangers” or “intruders” stand out and are more easily identified. By using buildings, fences, pavement, signs, lighting and landscape to express ownership and define public, semi-public and private space, natural territorial reinforcement occurs. Additionally, these objectives can be achieved by assignment of space to designated users in previously unassigned locations.

- Maintained premises and landscaping such that it communicates an alert and active presence occupying the space.
- Provide trees in residential areas. Research results indicate that, contrary to traditional views within the law enforcement community, outdoor residential spaces with more trees are seen as significantly more attractive, safer, and more likely to be used than similar spaces without trees.
- Restrict private activities to defined private areas.
- Display security system signage at access points.
- Avoid cyclone fencing and razor-wire fence topping, as it communicates the absence of a physical presence and a reduced risk of being detected.
- Placing amenities such as seating or refreshments in common areas in a commercial or institutional setting helps to attract larger numbers of desired users.
- Scheduling activities in common areas increases proper use, attracts more people and increases the perception that these areas are controlled.

Territorial reinforcement measures make the normal user feel safe and make the potential offender aware of a substantial risk of apprehension or scrutiny.

**Maintenance**

Maintenance is an expression of ownership of property. Deterioration indicates less control by the intended users of a site and indicates a greater tolerance of disorder. The Broken Windows Theory is a valuable tool in understanding the importance of maintenance in deterring crime. Broken Windows theory proponents support a zero tolerance approach to property maintenance, observing that the presence of a broken window will entice vandals to break more windows in the vicinity. The sooner broken windows are fixed, the less likely it is that such vandalism will occur in the future.
5.6 Environment and Public Facilities

Environmental Policies

Incorporate sustainable development practices
New public and private buildings should strive to meet an established standard for sustainability, such as LEED (Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design).

Reduce the storm water impacts of parking
Sustainable parking lot and hardscape design and redesign mitigates storm water runoff and preserves the health of downstream ecosystems.

Encourage the use of permeable paving
Permeable paving is appropriate for parking and pedestrian hardscape surfaces, where it allows water to percolate into the soil rather than contributing to runoff and flooding. It can take the form of pervious materials or open grid pavers.

Encourage use of renewable energy
Renewable energy helps increase energy independence and reduces environmental impacts.

Minimize exterior light pollution
Reducing light pollution saves energy, preserves views of the night sky, and benefits wildlife.

Support local food production
Even if they produce only a small portion of a household’s food, community gardens and related programs make a difference long-term by changing society’s thoughts about food production.

Encourage green roofs
Green roofs significantly reduce urban heating and reduce storm water runoff. They are highly encouraged in new development.

Encourage tree planting on private property
Property owners are encouraged to plant trees to ensure the long-term preservation of the tree canopy.

Encourage xeriscaping and native species in all landscape design projects
Xeriscaping, where plant materials are native to the region and use available water, should be promoted in public and private projects.

Environmental Projects

Sustainable Education Program (O-16)
City of Augusta should develop education programs to inform residents of ways they can participate in sustainable living.

Stormwater Management Program (O-17)
The City should develop a plan to reduce the impact of increased runoff from development and explore options to remove pollutants with bioswale systems.

Public Facilities Policies

Improve accessibility to existing facilities and promote the creation of new community facilities that are easy to access
There are several schools located in the study area. Doughty Park, located on Nellieville Road in the Oates Creek, is the only existing park in the entire study area. Pendleton King Park and Minnick Park are located close to the study area boundaries. All these facilities are not easily accessible except by cars. It is important that community facilities are centrally located and can be accessed by a multi-modal system. It is the goal to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to existing parks and other public facilities. New community facilities should be located in areas where they are accessible to people without cars. Placing them in areas served by quality pedestrian access or potential future transit will maximize their use.

Encourage public facilities to reach out to all community members by conducting outreach programs and providing materials
Public outreach programs can maximize and help improve usage of existing facilities and better understand community needs.

Encourage utility burial on all new streets
Electric and other above ground utility wires should be underground to avoid harming aesthetics and interfering with trees. While this is not an inexpensive proposition, it is essential to create a place of lasting value. Furthermore, by burying utilities when new streets are built, rather than years later, the costs are greatly reduced.

Cooperate with existing infrastructure providers and other municipalities for input on water quality planning
Water quality issues do not stop at political boundaries, and neither should planning for improved water quality in the area. The City of Augusta is encouraged to work with the Central Savannah River Area to improve water quality in the greater area.

Encourage the creation of shared stormwater facilities among different projects
Shared facilities can reduce the cost to individual developers and the amount of land dedicated to stormwater detention. In addition, shared facilities can often be designed as community assets and integrated into planned public spaces.

Encourage child care centers, adult day care centers and in-home nursing care providers
These will support plan recommendations aimed at serving people of various ages and with disabilities.

Bioswales are landscape elements designed to remove silt and pollution from surface runoff water. They should be used along sidewalks to minimize stormwater runoff.
Incorporate parks and open spaces into new developments

New pocket parks and plazas should expand the amount of open space in the area and reduce demand on existing parks. Significant open space should be preserved for passive use. Figure 5.2 shows potential parks and open space that should be created/preserved associated with the area’s redevelopment.

Promote parks and plazas where public events can occur

Public spaces over 0.25 acres should be designed to accommodate public events.

Include public art and historic markers in public spaces

Public spaces should be enriched with public art and should celebrate the area’s history, where applicable.

Encourage an appropriate relationship between parks and adjacent development.

New development adjacent to public spaces should front them with doors, windows, and walkways. Parking decks, loading zones, dumpsters, or similar uses should be minimized and hidden from view in these areas. New, publicly-accessible streets should be created to separate parks from new development where feasible.

Integrate food systems planning into development to create opportunities for community gardens and agriculture

Even if they produce only a small portion of a household’s food, community gardens and related programs make a difference long-term by changing our society’s thoughts about food production.

Figure 5.2  Proposed Parks and Open Space
**Public Facilities Projects**

Make zoning changes to improve open space preservation. (O-2)

Add an open space requirement for developments of more than ten acres, since a site of this size can easily accommodate pocket parks or plazas. Well designed open spaces need only occupy five to ten percent of a site.

Acquire land to develop a park (Oates Creek Park) located on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The site is located in between Olive Road and Fifteen Avenue. (O-18)

The City should acquire land located in the flood plain from Good Shepherd Baptist Church to develop a park. The park is envisioned to be a mini farm providing healthy food to the neighborhood and provide trails for exercise. The park would help increase adjacent property value and incentivize development. Most of the surrounding land is vacant or the structures are in poor condition. See the Oates Creek Park concept plan on the right.

Acquire land to expand and improve Doughty Park (O-19)

This project will expand the existing Doughty Park toward the east and improve it with new sports field, pool, playground and other amenities. See Oates Creek area redevelopment concept plan on page 78.

Develop a park with lakes in the Rocky Creek area to eliminate flooding in the downstream area. (O-20)

This project should be a flood hazard mitigation project that could serve to attract development opportunities around the park. The concept plan on the right shows one possible design for the park. It includes a multi-use trail system, a community garden, sports fields, and most importantly large areas of protected natural waterways and vegetations.

Landscape the area in front of T.J. Josey High School after the GDOT widening project (O-21)

This project should include improved lighting, banners, and a monument sign. It should also include a landscape plan that guides the installation of plant materials and sidewalks that addresses the impacts after the widening of 15th street.
5.7 Utilities and Infrastructure

Utility improvement recommendations for the general project area and specifically, the 15th Street, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, and Deans Bridge Road corridor includes the following:

Wastewater (Sanitary Sewers) Policies
The wastewater system located throughout the study area is owned and operated by the Augusta Utility Department. There are no known problems within the system at this time and no specific improvements have been requested. Depending on the extent of the final road improvements along 15th Street and MLK Boulevard, sanitary sewer relocations may be necessary.

Water Distribution Policies
The water distribution system located throughout the project area is owned and operated by the Augusta Utility Department. There are no known problems within the system at this time and no specific improvements have been requested. Depending on the extent of the final road improvements along 15th Street and MLK Boulevard, water main relocations may be necessary.

Power and Communications Policies
Power and communication systems located throughout the project area are privately owned and operated by Georgia Power, AT&T, Comcast, Knology, and Level 3 Communications. Improvements to these facilities are the responsibility of the owner. It is assumed that the road improvements along 15th Street and MLK Boulevard will require relocation of overhead utilities. We recommend options to include relocation of overhead utilities under ground installations if feasible.

Natural Gas Policies
The natural gas system located throughout the project area is privately owned and operated by Atlanta Gas Light. There are no known problems within the system at this time and no specific improvements have been requested. Depending on the extent of the final road improvements along 15th Street and MLK Boulevard, gas main relocations may be necessary.

Stormwater Policies
- Incorporation of water resource issues early in the land use planning and site development/redevelopment processes.
- Incorporating stormwater management retention and detention features into the design of parks, walkways, common areas, and open spaces.
- Use vegetation (particularly indigenous vegetation) in stormwater management to promote filtering and slowing stormwater runoff to maximize the settling of particulate pollutants and materials.
- Protect or restore creek corridors for natural hydrology.
- Improve the stormwater collection and conveyance systems (storm sewer networks) throughout the study area.
- Address stormwater management issues on a regional level (for example: regional stormwater detention systems versus multiple small stormwater detention systems).
- Consider sustainable stormwater alternatives and “green” solutions for all future development to improve water quality and reduce runoff.
  - porous pavements
  - grass channels
  - treatment basins
  - wet ponds
  - filter strips/bioswales
- Encourage the Georgia Department of Transportation to consider improvements to address water quality with its road improvements along 15th Street and Martin Luther King Boulevard.

Stormwater Projects
The stormwater systems located within the project area fall within two distinct watershed areas; The Rocky Creek Drainage Basin and the Oates Creek Drainage Basin.

Create Oates Creek Park with a stormwater management function (O-18)
Many of the past channel and culvert improvements along Oates Creek are the result of a flood control project completed in the 1980’s by the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers. However, due to the flat topography typical within the Oates Creek drainage basin and the age of the infrastructure, there are still areas of localized flooding as outlined in the Flood Hazard Mitigation Plan prepared for the City of Augusta in 2004 which identified roads (Milledgeville Road) as a “Flood-Prone” road.

In this context, a park is recommended north of Milledgeville Road/MLK Jr. Blvd with a stormwater management function to alleviate the problem.

Create Rocky Creek Park with a stormwater management function (O-20)
Flood issues have been noted in the Rocky Creek basin and are currently being addressed by the Augusta Richmond County Public Works and Engineering Department. The Department is in the process of concept development for a large regional stormwater detention pond located upstream of Regency Boulevard. This regional pond was identified as predominant water feature in the “Rocky Creek Mixed-Use Park” as outlined in the Augusta Master Plan. Construction plans for this project are scheduled for completion in 2013 and upon completion of construction, new hydrological studies will be required to map revised floodplain boundaries.

Remove and replace deteriorated corrugated metal/HDPE culverts and replace with reinforced concrete culverts (Olive Road and Fayetteville Drive). (O-22)

Implement a stream restoration project along open channel sections of Oates Creek and Oates Creek Tributary #1. (O-23)
5.8 Sustainability

Due to the lack of development opportunities in the study area the team proposes a sustainability agenda for the city administration. The intent is to build industries around sustainability initiatives within the corridor and the city at large. The industrial areas of the corridor are well suited to an expanded materials management industry, the underutilized commercial land provide a low cost start up opportunity around a value added urban agriculture industry. The two low lying creeks combined with the planned implementation of a stormwater utility provides the land and management for an urban agriculture movement. These examples and the detailed others that follow are not possible in the current economic and regulatory environment of Augusta. Local and state tipping fees are among the nation’s lowest, zoning regulations do not envision urban agriculture as an allowed use and the stormwater utility as proposed does not envision a green infrastructure approach.

Cities that adopt comprehensive sustainability agendas are leading the way in adaptation to a developing economic paradigm, which acknowledges the benefits of sustainability. Big Cities like Portland, Boston and San Francisco are well known for their sustainability initiatives but smaller southeastern cities like Chattanooga, Asheville and Charleston are taking leadership roles with ambitious projects and initiatives.

A National Association of Counties (NACo) 2010 survey cited staff time and knowledge of sustainability solutions as the main barriers to implementation of sustainability strategies. “The NACo survey (and other municipal association surveys) shows that there is a trend amongst counties to establish sustainability staff positions. Approximately 34 percent of the counties that responded to NACo’s survey have a staff person to coordinate sustainability initiatives. Seventy percent of the large counties (those with populations over 500,000) that responded to NACo’s survey have sustainability staff positions. Therefore, the team recommends that Augusta initiate a sustainability position within the government or an associated enterprise, for the purpose of managing sustainability initiatives. Additionally, the team proposes the following regulatory changes and program initiatives to expand the economic opportunities in the study area and the city at large.

**Sustainability Policies**

**Promote and facilitate urban agriculture in the study area**

Underutilized and marginal land, especially land near a waterway, often has soil appropriate for agricultural uses. In traditional development the highest and best use of the first development of land rarely looks at the agricultural value of land. But in redevelopment scenarios abandoned and condemned land can be analyzed for agricultural value and restored to productive use.

The food movement puts high value on local food sources. Organic farming operations often occur on very small plots, which can be part of a neighborhood or utilize a vacant lot in existing neighborhoods.

**Expand materials management industry**

From a strict cost perspective landfilling waste is always cheaper in Georgia due to favorable transportation infrastructure and regulatory environment. However, as evidenced by a 2010 Southeast Recycling Development Committee (SERDC) study on recycling in the southeast United States, Georgia’s waste stream contains $300 million worth of recyclable materials, including feedstock that is needed by more than thirty-one (31) manufacturers located in the state. As Georgia’s second largest metro area the economic development argument for enhanced recycling policy can only expand the recycling industry’s presence. The marginal industrial lands in the study area lie and lend themselves well for separation plants, reuse locations and second generation product reclamation. Specifically, single stream separation, electronics recycling, Fats, Oils and Grease (FOG) program, Bio Diesel, Household hazardous waste and composting all would be supported by an Expanded Materials Management program.

**Promote green infrastructure wherever possible**

Urban infrastructure such as roads, bike lanes, driveways, sidewalks, and curbing are necessary for community access, safety and mobility. However, much of this infrastructure also contributes to high levels of imperviousness, which results in surface runoff that can pollute streams and rivers and cause flooding that can result in property damage. Green infrastructure practices protect natural resources. Stormwater management practices and techniques can be used to help prevent increases in stormwater runoff rates, volumes and pollutant loads. A green infrastructure approach that includes 1) better site planning, 2) better site design techniques and 3) low impact development...
practices can help improve water quality and reduce flooding impacts within the study area. The green infrastructure practices outlined in the 2009 Georgia Coastal Stormwater Supplement could help address stormwater challenges within the study area in a more sustainable way than traditional engineered designs. These practices could also positively position local properties for any applicable credits under Augusta’s proposed Stormwater Utility Program.

**Sustainability Projects**

**Adopt language changes in the zoning ordinance to allow urban agriculture. (O-24)**

The City of Augusta zoning ordinance does not formally acknowledge nor define Urban Agriculture as a permitted use. These changes will allow urban agriculture at appropriate scales and intensities for the respective zoning categories defined.

**Create a composting Initiative (O-25)**

A compost separation education initiative can be run by the Downtown Development Authority or other appropriate business association. Commercial food processors, University Food services and local restaurants all are good candidates for participation. Surveys show that participation in “green” programs gives business a marketing advantage and food service associations at the national level are developing voluntary programs. This involves separation of food waste from the waste stream and rather than landfilling, composting it in a variety of ways. The product of which would be available to an Urban Agriculture industry.

Previous examples indicate that a mandatory program would create unnecessary hardship on smaller operations, but a program approach with marketing support can create the enduring support necessary for a program to survive start up. Some regulatory changes are proposed but they are service provider oriented. Specifically, performance standards for composting facilities within certain distances of incompatible uses would allow an operator the security necessary for an urban facility.

**Weatherization / Housing Authority (O-26)**

With redevelopment of the Cherry Tree Apartments in the works an opportunity to implement weatherization and housing authority/department lessons from Augusta’s Laney Walker neighborhood and other cities is present. Federal weatherization program investments are implemented by the Central Savannah River Area Economic Opportunity Authority (CSRA). This agency has extensive training in proper weatherization and with a coordinated program could focus efforts on the area surrounding the Cherry Tree redevelopment. Weatherization would help local residents save energy and create a more stable community environment. Recently the Federal Weatherization Innovation Pilot Program announced another round of potential funding and this sort of program would align well with their requirements.

**Develop high performance building incentives (O-27)**

Despite recent national press attention Green Building represents an ever increasing portion of the construction market. Additionally, the Department of Community Affairs recently implemented an updated minimum Energy Code for Georgia. The Augusta Building Department has embraced this code and is a state leader in implementation. This all bodes well for increasing the resource efficiency of the built environment. However, continued adoption of High Performance Building Technology drives efficiency and innovation and attracts investment by leading national institutions. As such it is recommended that Augusta adopt an optional High Performance Building standard such as ASHRAE standard 189 and ICC-700, setting up property tax incentives to offset the additional cost of compliance. While a tax credit delays collection of taxes this delay would be more than offset by the increased value of a high performance building.

**Develop a green business recognition program (O-28)**

A Green Business Recognition Program, perhaps initiated by the Chamber of Commerce, would help businesses in varying sectors implement sustainability measures to their daily operations. Businesses commit to program standards and select measures in areas related to energy, water, waste, pollution, and education to make improvements applicable to their respective business sector and internal capacities. Businesses must commit to program standards and applicable environmental regulations to be eligible for recognition. The program provides a valuable opportunity to: implement sustainable business practices, receive technical assistance, achieve cost savings from resource conservation, efficiency upgrades and utilities and receive recognition as a green business in the region. The success of the Charleston Program provides some potential highlights.

- Challenge Participants: 76 in 2011-2012

**Expand Recycling with, deconstruction, household hazardous waste and E-waste (O-29)**

Programs could range from greater recycling pick up to a Pay As You Throw (PAYT) program.
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Part VI: Action Plan
6.1 Action Program

The Action Program outlines the next steps after this plan is adopted by the City of Augusta. It includes a list of projects, timelines and responsible parties, and is intended to serve as a blueprint for achieving the community’s vision for its future.

The Action Program shows all of the projects described in Part IV in table 6.1 and 6.2. They are divided into two main categories, “Transportation” and “Other,” as well as a number of subcategories.

Stakeholders identified several efforts to ensure implementation. These included continued diligence on the part of area residents, businesses, and the City of Augusta to promote and monitor development in the community and ensure compliance with the vision of this plan. Part of this should involve revisions as needed. Stakeholders must also work with the City to implement land use and zoning changes which support the vision.

Recommendations are provided on an aggressive schedule. Projects in the near future represent those addressing areas with the most critical need for public improvement or those where public investment can spur private investment. Longer-term projects are less urgent, but equally key to the long-term success of this study.

The program is based on a list of assumptions about the cost of materials and labor, which are calculated in 2013 dollars and are subject to change.

A general time horizon is provided for each project to show whether it is to be implemented in the short, medium, or long term.

For a more detailed description of each project, refer to the related text in Part V above.

Each project on the program can be considered for implementation only if and when funds from the appropriate sources become available.

All projects assume cooperating and willing public agencies, organizations, and private property owners.

---

Figure 6.1 Action Plan Projects Map
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Units/Length (ft.)</th>
<th>Est. Cost</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>Modifications to Bicycle and Pedestrian features of GDOT Widening Project, PI # 220680</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>TIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2</td>
<td>Addition of 5-foot bicycle lane along Deans Bridge Road between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road (southern end of GDOT project, PI # 220680)</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>$1,740,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City/GDOT/ Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>Addition of mid-block crossing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-4</td>
<td>Multi-use trail across railroad and Wrightsboro Road</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>Oates Creek Multi-use Trail - includes trail connection to Jenkins-White Elementary School</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City/GDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-6</td>
<td>Essie McIntyre Blvd Sidewalks - fill in gaps on south side from Olive Road to 15th Street</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-7a</td>
<td>Olive Road Sidewalks Phase A - both sides from railroad to MLK Jr. Blvd</td>
<td>7,450</td>
<td>$223,500</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-7b</td>
<td>Olive Road Sidewalks Phase B - one side from MLK Jr. Blvd to Gordon Hwy</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-8</td>
<td>Cherry Road Sidewalks - south side from Deans Bridge Road to Tubman Home Road</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-9</td>
<td>Study the feasibility of Bus Route 6 extension through the project corridor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-10</td>
<td>Extension of Bus Route 6 through the project corridor (after completion of GDOT Widening Project)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-11</td>
<td>Addition of Covered Bus Stops in the Project Corridor (within GDOT Project Limits)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>TIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-11a</td>
<td>Addition of Covered Bus Stops in the Project Corridor between Deans Bridge Road and Milledgeville Road</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City/FTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-12</td>
<td>Permanent Transfer Station (In the vicinity of Deans Bridge Road and Gordon Highway Intersection)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>FTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-13</td>
<td>Short term improvements at the K-Mart Transfer Station</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City/FTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-14</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement at Gordon Highway and Deans Bridge Road intersection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-15</td>
<td>Modifications to GDOT State Route 4/15th Street road widening project, PI # 220680 in the vicinity of TW Josey High School</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Included in T-1</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>TIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16</td>
<td>Modifications to GDOT State Route 4/15th Street road widening project, PI # 220680 at Government Road and 15th Street Intersection  Install raised medians along Deans Bridge Road between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road (southern end of GDOT project, PI # 220680)</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>Included in T-1</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>TIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-17</td>
<td>Modifications to proposed medians on GDOT State Route 4/15th Street road widening project, PI # 220680</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>Included in T-1</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>GDOT</td>
<td>TIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-18</td>
<td>Install raised medians along Deans Bridge Road between Gordon Highway and Milledgeville Road (southern end of GDOT project, PI # 220680)</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>Included in T-2</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City/GDOT/ Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Est. Cost</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Update to Implement Changes</td>
<td>Staff time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>Establish a form-based code</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>Obtain additional funding to secure and/or demolish more vacant and blighted properties</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City- Code Enforcement Division in Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4</td>
<td>Add inspection staff to Code Enforcement, Department of Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City- Code Enforcement Division in Planning &amp; Development</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5</td>
<td>Conduct foreclosure proceedings for approximately 60 vacant/dilapidated houses annually</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td>City / Land Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-6</td>
<td>Increase annual budget to secure additional funding to acquire and maintain neighborhood's vacant and blighted properties</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td>City / Land Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-7</td>
<td>Expand workforce training to support new transportation construction activity</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-8</td>
<td>Pursue partnerships with area institutional anchors and community colleges</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-9</td>
<td>Cherry Tree Neighborhood Redevelopment-Cherry Tree Public Housing Catalytic Project</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Augusta Housing Authority</td>
<td>Augusta Housing Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-10</td>
<td>Cherry Tree Neighborhood Redevelopment-Mercy Ministry Catalytic Project</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Private Developer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-11</td>
<td>Oates Creek Redevelopment Area-Dogwood Terrace Public Housing Catalytic Project</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Augusta Housing Authority</td>
<td>Augusta Housing Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-12</td>
<td>Rocky Creek Redevelopment Area-Regency Mall Site Catalytic project</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>Private Developer</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-13</td>
<td>Uniform sign program</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-14</td>
<td>Create historic markers for historical sites and buildings</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-15</td>
<td>Rosa T Beard bridge improvement project</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-16</td>
<td>Sustainable Education Program</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-17</td>
<td>Stormwater Management Program</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-18</td>
<td>Acquire land to develop a park (Oates Creek Park) located on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The site is located in between Olive Road and Fifteen Avenue.</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City/ Non-Profit Good Shepherd Church</td>
<td>City/ Non-Profit Good Shepherd Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-19</td>
<td>Acquire land to expand and improve Doughty Park.</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-20</td>
<td>Develop a park in the Rocky Creek area to include passive recreation areas and a regional stormwater detention pond to mitigate downstream flooding</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-21</td>
<td>Landscape the area in front of TJ Josey High School after the GDOT widening project.</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Est. Cost</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-22</td>
<td>Remove and replace deteriorated corrugated metal/HDPE culverts and replace with reinforced concrete culverts (Olive Road and Fayetteville Drive)</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-23</td>
<td>Implement a stream restoration project along open channel sections of Oates Creek and Oates Creek Tributary #1</td>
<td>$4,300,000</td>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Utilities and Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-24</td>
<td>Adopt language changes in the zoning ordinance</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-25</td>
<td>Create a composting Initiative</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City/DDA</td>
<td>City/DDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-26</td>
<td>Weatherization/Housing Authority</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City/Housing Authority/CSRA</td>
<td>City/Housing Authority/CSRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-27</td>
<td>Develop high performance building incentives</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-28</td>
<td>Develop a green business recognition program</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City/Augusta Metro Chamber</td>
<td>City/Augusta Metro Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-29</td>
<td>Expand Recycling with, deconstruction, household hazardous waste and E-waste</td>
<td>Admin time</td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>City/Lifecycle Building Center</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All costs are in 2013 dollars. Estimated cost includes 15% of construction cost for engineering costs.
Sidewalk costs are based only on width within right-of-way, not including supplemental width on private property for outdoor dining, etc.
Cost of Transit Projects assumes capital cost only. Right-of-Way is not included.
Cost of Projects T-14, T-15 and T-16 is offset by savings realized by implementing projects for T-1.
6.2 Catalytic Project

Redevelopment of Catalytic Sites

Part V has recommended neighborhood redevelopment concept plans as a guidance for redevelopment. It showed a vision that the community embraces for the future of the area. Among these concept plan areas, the project team has identified four opportunity sites as catalytic project sites. They will be the focus for redevelopment under public-private partnerships. The plans for each site are described below, and key financial feasibility fundings are listed in the following section for implementation references.

Cherry Tree Crossing Redevelopment (O-9)

This catalytic project will redevelop the existing Cherry Tree Crossing public housing into a mixed-use community with integrated parks. The project includes a variety of housing types from single family houses, townhomes, to multifamily units. It also includes a small amount of commercial space along 15th Street to serve the community. See Figure 6.2 below for details.

Cherry Tree Graduate Student and Senior Housing (O-10)

Taking advantage of the nearby universities, the plan recommended that the redevelopment west of 15th street include graduate student housing. Senior housing is also recommended to help people aging in place. The plan in Figure 6.2 shows a pedestrian friendly village setting for these two types of developments along with other housing types and uses adjacent to them.
**Dogwood Terrace Redevelopment (O-11)**

This catalytic project is to redevelop the existing public housing into a mixed-income community, which will include a range of housing options from single family houses, townhomes, to multifamily units. Pocket parks are integrated into the design to provide neighborhood amenities. The plan also encourages maximum street connectivity with the surrounding neighborhoods. See Figure 6.3 below for details.

**Continuing Care Retirement Community (CCRC) (O-12)**

Planned as part of the Regency Mall redevelopment area, the CCRC will provide independent living, assisted living, and skilled nursing home to accommodate aging resident’s changing needs. It is conveniently located near the planned village center in a mixed-use, mixed-income community. See Figure 6.4 below for details.

---

**About the Concept Plan:**

This plan shows one option for the design of the site. It is conceptual and includes the following estimates:

- 150,000 to 200,000 square feet of commercial space
- 700 to 900 multifamily units
- 80 to 100 townhomes
- 300 to 400 single family lots
- School

**Legend**

- Rocky Creek Park
- Village Center
- Neighborhood Center
- Existing Buildings
- Figure 6.4 CCRC Catalytic Development Project

**Figure 6.4 CCRC Catalytic Development Project**

This is an example of a mixed-income community currently located in Augusta. It is the Walton Oaks community, which serves housing authority residents, middle income residents, and 55+ residents who all enjoy the same amenities.
6.3 Financial Feasibility & Funding

Financial Feasibility - Key Findings

To evaluate the financial feasibility of the four redevelopment options within the Study Area, PES detailed the financial gap based on each concept plan. Static pro formas (i.e., financial analyses) by product type outlined the cost to develop, the private investment justified by the future returns and the resulting surplus or deficit, based on current market conditions for new development. The difference between the total development costs and the amount of supportable private investment results in a financial gap for the proposed uses.

- The costs to redevelop sites in close proximity to the institutional anchors within the medical and university district exceed the private investment justified by potential revenues. This is particularly true for former industrial sites with high costs for environmental remediation.
- Achievable rents for new residential and commercial space are too low to attract developers and investors for a pure market deal without public investment.
- Extensive development of new housing in the Study Area will require significant financial investments by local, state and federal governments. The pace and scale of supportable new development will be dependent on the level of that investment.
- Graduate student housing in a four- to five-story wood-frame development with guaranteed state participation could generate enough revenue to interest a private developer. Although the development process through the Georgia Board of Regents requires more time than traditional private-market development, the guaranteed state involvement would reduce costs and increase revenues allowing for a more easily financeable deal.
- On the Rocky Creek site where redevelopment options include the creation of a new lake amenity at the Rocky Creek site.

These conclusions represent one series of alternatives for how the future economy may unfold; it is likely that these findings will shift over future business cycles. Increased investment in real estate can result from a number of factors, including problems in other markets (e.g., stocks) that limit returns from alternative investments, tax policies that favor real estate and higher inflation that encourages investment in fixed assets. Under such conditions, project economics would become more favorable. Certain types of development will become feasible at some points over the 30-year life of the plan.

Following are more details on the financial feasibility of individual product types.

Institution-Related Housing

The presence of the University Hospital and the Medical College of Georgia Health System across the Rosa T. Beard Memorial Bridge from the Study Area’s Cherry Tree neighborhood provides a unique market condition. In addition to these institutions, the University System of Georgia’s Board of Regents consolidated both the Georgia Health Sciences University (GHSU) with Augusta State University, one of the state’s oldest liberal arts universities. The new entity, named Georgia Regents University (GRU), along with Paine College and others require more student housing as their campus enrollments increase. Properties across the bridge along the popular north-south transportation corridor of 15th Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard are naturally positioned to meet these needs, particularly the former Castleberry property.

While market dynamics suggest that building private rental housing within these neighborhoods may not be feasible based on current costs and rents, a non-market transaction such as graduate student housing will be feasible. The Board of Regents and the State procurements will require a competitive process for the construction of new graduate student housing. The financial analysis reviewed the potential to develop an estimated 300 graduate student apartments on the former Castleberry property owned by Mercy Ministries. This analysis highlighted the need for institutional support to access more favorable financing and structure the deal to attract private investment. The privatization of student housing continues to be a popular trend for educational institutions as building and managing housing is not the main focus of these institutions. Private entities dedicated to housing can provide operational and development efficiencies not typically achieved by a strictly public sector development project.

Senior Housing

Americans continue to age in place and the population over the age of 65 is growing rapidly. In fact, the over 65 population is projected to reach approximately 55 million by the end of 2020. The demographics of these aging cohorts can be separated into distinctive categories. Those over the age of 85 with more significant needs for health care services are usually unable to live independently and can become reliant on family. This compares to those just entering the senior age bracket, who are more active, still travel, start new careers and remain in their existing homes. The vast differences among those within the age cohort highlight the complexity of providing housing for this growing population. The expense of remaining in your own home and paying for healthcare services continues to climb and many Americans over 65 do not have sufficient retirement savings to afford the necessary care.

As the population continues to age, the needs continue to outstrip supply for senior housing options. The production of more quality Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRC) and repositioning of existing institutional housing alternatives for the aging population has not kept pace with demand. According to the Urban Land Institute (ULI), the nation’s existing supply of 50,000 senior housing communities has declined over the last decade. In large part this decline can be attributed to the high cost of providing retirement housing services and the fact that many suburban CCRCs have an

Public and private partnerships to ensure long-term project sustainability. Newly built CCRCs need non-profit or institutional support from project inception. New financial models are being developed that do not require substantial non-refundable entrance fees.

In the Augusta metropolitan region, demand exists for more senior housing alternatives, including affordable senior housing products. The options for creating more affordable multi-family senior housing requires public support. HUD's Section 202 program offers either direct loans or capital advances for supportive senior housing defined as serving those households headed by an individual age 62 or older. Many operators have been successful in using the public subsidy to meet the growing demands of the aging population. Typically HUD's Section 202 program targets the very low income elderly households and couples and links to Medicaid services with Meals on Wheels and other community programs, providing a higher quality of life for these low-income residents. This type of senior housing project may be especially valuable in the Cherry Tree and Oates Creek neighborhoods, where publicly owned land is available to accommodate a HUD Section 202 development. For CCRCs, the layout of multi-family buildings, townhouse or patio home alternatives require substantial land area. The former Regency Mall property and surrounding parcels present the best opportunity for large-scale CCRC development. The typical CCRCs provide different housing options, ranging from independent living to assisted living to skilled nursing centers, allowing residents to stay within the community as they age and their needs change. Most include single-family housing designed for older residents who can live on their own but may take one or two daily meals in the communal dining room. Residents who need more assistance with the daily activities live in apartments with access to support staff. A skilled nursing center is offered for those that need nursing care. CCRCs offer meal services, shared recreation activities and other amenities.

Mixed-Income Developments

The prospect of redeveloping former public housing developments with new mixed-income communities within the study area presents the opportunity to improve the quality of life and market condition. The mixed-finance approach to public housing redevelopment emphasizes the formation of new public and private partnerships to ensure long-term project sustainability. Both the Cherry Tree public housing development and Dogwood Terrace have preliminary plans for large-scale redevelopment.

Following the housing mortgage crisis, fewer households have credit scores that will allow them to qualify for a new mortgage. Mixed-income communities with homeownership opportunities could take advantage of existing federal subsidies such as the Neighborhood Stabilization Program funds to further leverage homeownership opportunities in the Study Area.

The revitalization strategy for the Study Area needs to combine both homeownership and rental housing. Coupled with a growing skepticism as to the relative financial benefits of homeownership as an investment, the demand for rental housing has been increasing for several years. Mixed-income rental housing developments may offer low- to moderate-income households to live in the same building with minimal differences among unit appearance, allowing for a comfortable mix for those households earning less than 80 percent of Area Median Income (AMI) and those at more than 120 percent of AMI. A review of the financial viability of these mixed-income communities highlights the need for subsidy assistance per unit ranging from $90,000 to $120,000 per unit, depending on the product type. It is important to note that free land does not eliminate the financial gap, and additional subsidy per unit is necessary.

Pioneering Products

The use of new housing products helps to attract different audiences and expands alternatives for existing residents. In Augusta the affordable housing stock offers two standard housing types: detached single-family residential and townhouses. While these alternatives offer a variety of architectural differences, these products limit consumer housing options. The majority of the rental units in the Study Area are single-family homes rented by local or out of town property owners. As might be expected, multi-family apartments are a small component of the Study Area’s housing market. The successful market of newly constructed apartments in downtown Augusta, patio-style homes in the suburban areas and duplexes elsewhere in the city show the appetite for new housing products.

Intergenerational Housing

Another major demographic shift is the growth in the Generation Y population (born between 1982 and 2001) estimated at more than 70 million. Research suggests that Generation Y households prefer urban and first-ring suburbs with walkable communities, smaller housing units and easy access to transit. As this generation forms new households and enters the housing market, there are opportunities to combine the needs of this generation and the younger senior population between the ages of 65 and 75. Additionally, the national trend indicates upticks in household size with the increase in multi-generational homes or young adults living with their parents for longer periods of time before forming their own households.

Co-housing combines multiple housing units in a layout with shared common space, including kitchen and recreational areas, creating a sense of community. In these housing arrangements residents share resources and assist each other with child care, meal preparation and other household responsibilities, while retaining separate living quarters with kitchens, etc. Co-housing options and group living that allow multi-generational living environments tend to require a mix of younger and older residents in order to maximize benefits from communal living. In Georgia, the East Lake Commons project in DeKalb County, offers a successful example with 77 residential units on 10 acres with the remaining 10 acres used for organic gardens, bee hives and natural woodlands. This suburban model built in 1999 offers 67 townhouses and 10 rental apartment units. Residents are asked to volunteer four hours monthly toward community projects, which typically involve the community garden. East Lake Commons’ biggest draw is the fresh vegetables and honey available from the community-supported agriculture, which the community estimates provides between 6 to 20 percent for residents. This type of a model might work well in the Oates Creek area where designated areas for community gardens have been identified. Matching these sites with opportunities for co-housing could provide a long term operator or caregiver for the garden, ensuring sustainability and success.

While not reasonable in the immediate future, long-term projections for the Cherry Tree neighborhood show the potential to create unique housing products for the intergenerational housing market. These products may include stacked townhouses in which the first floor apartment or mother-in-law suite allows adult children to live with their parents while attending one of the nearby educational institutions. Other less dense models may be
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possible as well or simply adjusting the code to allow for accessory dwelling units.

**Manufactured Housing**

New construction techniques and mass manufacturing procedures offer a lower cost manufactured housing product that can be indistinguishable from stick-built construction. While manufactured housing's reputation as a lower quality product persists, newly engineered manufactured housing products offer the same aesthetics and quality as traditional housing.

In both the South Gate and Oates Creek areas, existing and former mobile home parks provide a unique opportunity for redevelopment as manufactured housing communities. The costs for entrance into these communities may offer real benefits to existing mobile home park tenants interested in remaining in place and owning their home and site.

**Redevelopment Funding Alternatives**

The detailed cash flow analysis prepared for the redevelopment of opportunity sites within the Study Area outlines the potential sources of funding available for the redevelopment in the sources table. These funding sources include private and public investments as both debt and equity. As noted below, many of the alternative funding sources represent opportunities to reduce the amount of public sector investment needed to make the project financially viable.

There is clearly a need to obtain private sector investment, as public sources are relatively scarce. However, the following list of public sector sources represents a first cut at sharing the high cost of redevelopment across agencies. Alternatively many of these funding sources help leverage private sector investment to offset public sector outlays. The mixed-finance approach to redevelopment, particularly in low-income communities with new transit access, emphasizes the formation of new public and private partnerships to ensure long-term project sustainability.

The redevelopment opportunities within the Study Area require both public and private investment during different phases of development depending on market conditions and current land ownership interests. The following list of development funding sources recommend leveraging several public sector programs including Healthy Food Financing Initiative, New Markets Tax Credits, Historic Tax Credits, Green Communities and Tax Increment Financing (TIF).

**Healthy Food Initiative**

The Reinvestment Fund (TRF), based in Philadelphia, offers a Healthy Food Initiative that finances grocer operations and other small-scale healthy food retail outlets in underserved low-income communities. In these instances TRF finances the gap between conventional lending for grocers, providing additional access to credit. The program extends to grocery store operators, developers, public markets and less formal food co-op start ups. Currently the TRF’s Healthy Food loans range from $200,000 to $3.5 million with variable rates, fees and underwriting requirements based on risk and unlike conventional lending the potential community benefit.

Examples of statewide programs such as the Pennsylvania Fresh Food Financing Initiative show the potential success from the addition of new grocery options to low-income neighborhoods. For example, Pennsylvania’s Fresh Food Financing Initiative began in 2004 with $30 million of State seed money and leveraged $190 million of additional investment. In 2011, the Pennsylvania Fresh Food Financing Initiative had created and/or retained over 5,000 jobs with the opening of 88 new or improved fresh food stores.

For efforts to expand this program into a National Healthy Food Initiative began in 2011. Congress introduced legislation to use the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to designate a Community Development Financing Institution (CDFI) as a National Fund Manager to administer a National Healthy Food Initiative. The program modeled after the TRF program offers one-time grants as well as loan financing options. According to Policy Link, the President’s fiscal year 2013 budget requests $285 million for the HFFI (Healthy Food Financing Initiative) through Treasury ($25 million), Health and Human Services ($10 million) and a $250 million set-aside within the New Markets Tax Credit program².

**New Markets Tax Credits**

New Markets Tax Credits provide equity through Community Development Entities (CDE) to assist commercial development projects in low-income communities. Similar to Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, tax benefits offered by the New Markets Tax Credit attract investors willing to make an equity investment in a CDE. The annual dollar volume of New Markets Tax Credits allocated by the U.S. government is capped, creating a competitive process for the allocation of credits during each annual funding round. The most common model used by non-profits for New Market Tax Credits allows up to 95 percent of a project’s cost to be financed, with favorable debt coverage ratios as low as 1.1 times net operating income, and interest-only loans at rates as low as three percent. Loans can also be structured so that debt service is tied to available cash flow. An essential requirement for New Markets Tax Credit derived financing is that it must involve debt (unlike other tax credit programs) in order to meet Internal Revenue Service requirements. This debt must be structured so that it will be repaid after a certain period (i.e. write-down or forgiveness provisions are not acceptable). In addition to this requirement, New Market Tax Credits may not be combined with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits. It is likely that area CDEs with an outstanding allocation for New Market Tax Credits would find several of the catalytic sites attractive for credit investments.

**Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program**

The U.S. Department of Justice’s Office of Justice Program’s Bureau of Justice Assistance (previously Weed and Seed) provides funding to local governments and non-profits for community safety. The program targets persistently distressed neighborhoods that generate a significant proportion of crime. These neighborhoods or pockets within communities impede the broader neighborhood development goals.

Applicants need to designate one agency or organization as the fiscal agent to oversee the award, fund projects, and meet all the applicable federal rules and regulations. The program rewards those applicants that not only identify a neighborhood with a concentration of crime but offer ongoing community engagements, capacity building and effective partnerships with research partners. The Cherry Tree and Oates Creek communities are proximate to Georgia Regents University and Paine College, which might find a joint research effort attractive.
Green Communities Initiative

The Enterprise Community Loan Fund offers additional financial resources for “green” developments. The Green Communities Initiative provides resources for developers and communities to build well-located green affordable homes. Green Communities provides planning and construction funding for redevelopment of existing residential developments. Planning funds may be used for architectural work, engineering, site surveys, energy use studies and environmental reviews. Construction funds may be applied to green construction items including green materials and energy-efficient appliances. Any community-based housing developer may apply for these funds and receive up to $3 million at 6.5 percent interest for up to 36 months. These funds require that rental housing projects serve households with incomes at or below 60 percent of the area median income. For homeownership units, households with incomes at or below 80 percent of area median income are eligible for assistance. As a competitive process, it is important that projects meet green standards set out by the Enterprise Foundation.

Immigrant Investor Program

The Immigration Act of 1990 created a visa program for foreign nationals who invest money in the United States. The prospective immigrant must invest $1 million and create or preserve at least 10 jobs for U.S. workers in order to qualify for a green card. The immigrant may invest in a job-creating commercial enterprise or in a qualified Regional Center that becomes responsible for the job creation. The investment threshold is reduced to $500,000 in a Targeted Employment Area, either a rural area or an area with unemployment of at least 150 percent of the national average. In exchange, the investor receives EB-5 visas for himself and his family. To date, roughly 80 percent of the investors have come from China.

Existing Programs

The State of Georgia’s OneGeorgia Authority established a series of financial assistance programs using proceeds from the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement. The Entrepreneur and Small Business Development Loan Guarantee program offers for-profit entrepreneurs, start-ups and small business owners loan guarantee assistance from $35,000 to $250,000 with a 10-percent equity investment. The ESB program guarantees up to 50 percent of $112,500 to the company. While Richmond County-Augusta is not an eligible county, it qualifies as a conditionally eligible county and applicants should work with the Augusta Richmond County Economic Development Authority.

Small Business Fast Growth Tax Credit

The State of Georgia provides income tax credits to small businesses in Augusta-Richmond County whose taxable income grew at least 20 percent or more each year for three consecutive years. While many of the businesses in the area may not be eligible immediately, these programs should help to retain and attract new small business growth along the corridor. Small businesses that receive this credit may apply and continue to receive the credit until the business growth exceeds $1.5 million.

Sales Tax Exemptions

The State of Georgia offers exemptions for state and local sales tax for machinery associated with manufacturing facilities. The program was expanded to include the warehouse and distribution users already in existence along the corridor. The sales tax exemption includes material handling equipment as long as the investment exceeds $5 million for an expanding or new facility. The aquaculture niche market suggested in the market analysis would meet the criteria and be eligible for this type of incentive. An example of such a facility in Nashville produces both vegetables and fish. One in Milwaukee offers an urban agriculture product. Start-up and fast growing businesses in Augusta could have access to both the Sales Tax Exemption and Small Business Fast Growth Tax Credit.

Equity Fund

Georgia’s Equity Fund provides financial assistance for community economic development infrastructure. These funds may be used as loans for constructing speculative buildings in order to attract additional industries to the area.

Philanthropic Funding

Foundation funding – financial support from small to large foundations for development of new open space, parks and sustainable green alternatives for stormwater management as a grant or a mission-driven investment – may provide an excellent source for those critical redevelopment projects within the Study Area. The variety of foundation funds and opportunities ranges from monies available for local governments to expand capacity to support from area educational institutions. Many of the private foundations fund direct assistance to improve and clean up former industrial properties into thriving public open spaces.

Financial support also is available from small to large foundations for development of affordable housing. Opportunities range from monies available for local governments to expand capacity or study affordable housing issues/policies (such as the Center for Housing Policy’s grants) to specific grants for developers or builders (which include the Home Depot Affordable Housing Built Responsible Grant and Wells Fargo Housing Foundation grants). Many of the private foundation funds provide direct assistance to improve homeownership opportunities. Interestingly, the following three private foundations offer funds particularly targeted to the population within the study area.

Robert and Polly Dunn Foundation

The Robert and Polly Dunn Foundation provides funding support for both capital and operational support for after-school care to children in grades K through 12. There are two separate deadlines in the spring and a second in fall to apply for grant funding.

Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, Inc.

The Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, Inc. is an independent private foundation with a broad charter to support charitable, scientific, and educational activities. The Foundation is governed by a self-perpetuating board of trustees under the laws of the state of Georgia. Grants generally are limited to tax-exempt public charities located and operating in Georgia.

Lettie Pate Evans Foundation

Focused on support to specific charitable organizations located and operating in Georgia the Lettie Pate Evans Foundation funds private secondary and higher education, arts and culture and museums and historic preservation. The foundation prefers to provide funding for one-time capital improvements but would be willing to support proven nonprofits such as the Mini Theatre to provide after-school arts programs.

Georgia Afterschool Investment Council (GAIC)

The Georgia Afterschool Investment Council is a coalition of more than...
70 nonprofit and private and public organizations working to expand after-school programs for Georgia’s children and families. This organization received funding previously from federal and state programs that no longer have funding resources. For example, the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers program to support high quality after-school programs lost funding.

**Crowd Funding**

The potential to tap sources outside of conventional financing alternatives has become more popular over the last five years. Crowd funding offers a quick option to raise money for a variety of projects. The 2012 Jumpstart Our Business Startups (JOBS) act removed a ban against public solicitation for private companies to raise funds. More regulation from the Securities Exchange Commission is expected regarding rules for equity crowdfunding companies. Neighborly, the civic crowd funding site, allows both individuals and companies to invest in civic projects throughout the country. Essentially, these crowd funding options give citizens and corporations an opportunity to sponsor public infrastructure. In Kansas City the Kickstarter website hopes to raise sufficient funding for a downtown payment on a streetcar line. The amount of funding available from these sources ranges from 10 percent to upwards of 50 percent but varies greatly depending on the scale of the project and interest of the public at large. Recent experience suggests these sources are more consistently a source for company investment as opposed to private individuals’ contributions.

**Federal Affordable Housing Tools**

The federal government plays a major financial role in affordable housing through its many programs. The following list includes the most prominent federal programs for affordable housing:

- **Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)**: Tax credits that provide an offset to federal income taxes in exchange for qualified rehabilitation of designated historic properties.

These resources are, of course, limited by statewide caps on the value of credits and formulas for distributing funding across the U.S. In particular, the capacity and mere existence of many federal programs rely on support from the U.S. Congress. Changes to the political will may result in the loss of these programs or significant reduction in funding capacity. Recently, the federal government has reviewed the potential for significant budget cuts to the Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Community Development Fund (CDF), which includes CDBG.

**HOME Investment Partnership Funds**

In addition to the funding alternatives mentioned previously, there are a variety of programs that may assist in offsetting the public investment.

**Dedicated New Taxes for Affordable Housing**

The creation of a new property tax for affordable housing within a specific district or county-wide could generate additional funds to support the creation of affordable housing. This alternative could be combined with other
tools as the funding source.

Once created, a new tax stream could be used to finance municipal bonds. Municipal bonds that are backed by the full faith and credit of Richmond County require voter approval to fund investment as the general fund secu-
ritizes the bonds. It should be noted that Augusta-Richmond County has a series of funding priorities with which affordable housing would compete and therefore access to G.O. bonds may be unlikely.

**Pooled Investment Fund**

Many municipalities and jurisdictions search for additional funds and seek to leverage a larger pool of foundation and private lender capital. Denver, San Francisco and other localities use a commitment of local public funds to fund the most risky portion of affordable housing development. If a project’s cash flow is not sufficient to repay the total loan, it is the City’s loan that is not repaid. Foundations provide additional funding that is at risk of not being repaid if the shortfall exceeds the City’s share of the fund. This reduces the risk to cooperating private lenders, who are assured that their loans will be repaid in full. This tool would be combined with other tools to acquire and make available sites for preservation or creation of affordable housing at a reduced cost.

In one example, Enterprise Foundation is currently seeking support for its regional Green Preservation of Affordable Transit-Oriented Housing (Green PATH) initiative to acquire existing apartment buildings near transit stations and preserve them as long-term affordable housing. Its first investments have been in Southeast Washington, DC.

**Bank of America’s Community Development**

In 2013, the Bank of America’s Charitable Foundation will issue a request for proposals (RFP) to provide funding priorities to preserve neighborhoods and revitalize communities. The program offers funding to assist in home-
owner retention, promoting financial stability and transitioning foreclosed properties now owned by the bank. The specifics of the program may in-
clude expanding financial capacity. The Cherry Tree area and Regency Mall site offer site-specific opportunities to access the funds available through this grant process. In order to revitalize communities this fund may be used to directly support nonprofits, such as the Mini-Theater, for large infrastructure investments.
6.4 Implementation Strategies

Implementation Steps

This document is an aggressive, but achievable, plan for building on the rich history of the City of Augusta to create a model sustainable community. However, for the vision contained in these pages to become a reality, there must be both short and long-term commitments to its principles. The following paragraphs are intended to provide steps that guide the short and long-term implementation processes.

Short-Term

Short term implementation should remove regulatory barriers to the vision contained herein. Plan approval should be accompanied by updates to the future land use plan, and zoning code amendments needed to support the vision.

Long-Term

The realization of the vision contained herein will also require a long-term commitment. The plan’s aggressive vision cannot be achieved overnight, and must be regularly reviewed to remain relevant. Any plan that does not do this risks obsolescence.

As the City of Augusta moves forward with implementing the vision of this study, it is critical that the following are kept in mind:

The Plan’s Lasting Vision: Of all of the components of this study, its policies should represent its most lasting legacy. The ideas contained in the Recommendations section are the results of an extensive and inclusive public involvement process. It is highly unlikely that the general vision and goals resulting from such process will change significantly, although the steps to achieving them may.

The Need for Flexibility: While the vision is unlikely to change, it is critical that the community recognizes the ways in which the vision is achieved can and will change. The future addition or subtraction of policies or projects should not be viewed as a compromise of the plan, but rather its natural evolution in response to new conditions. Many of the assumptions used to guide this process, including the regional and national economy; land costs; transportation costs; transportation funding programs; and development trends are never fixed. The City of Augusta must be prepared to respond to changes of these factors and others in order to ensure a fresh, relevant plan.

A Development Guide: One of the greatest long-term values of this document, in addition to its role in procuring transportation funding, is that it lays out a detailed land use vision. To this end, as development proposals are submitted to the Town, those proposals should be reviewed for compatibility with the plan. The plan contains specific recommendations for specific sites, and the City should use the development review process to work with the private sector to achieve this vision.

By being mindful of these four ideas, the Augusta Sustainable Development Initiative Program can guide positive change in the study area for years to come.

Implementation Strategies

Adjust Regulatory Environment

Typically the regulatory environment offers protection and guidelines for business owners but it also can create barriers that slow down the development process. Providing a review of the current regulatory environment and delineating the steps and appropriate contacts at the different government levels adjusts the regulatory environment. Some jurisdictions offer expedited review and assign government staff to support businesses and coordinate across different agencies. These minor adjustments to the regulatory environment can greatly improve business operations.

The experience of Augusta area developers suggests that the approval process for zoning relates to an outdated code and procedures creating risk and uncertainty in the marketplace. It would be useful to mitigate these problems with updates to the code and procedures.

Vacant Structures

Clearly, the issues of cleaning up the neighborhood and preventing crime are inextricably linked to the extensive presence of vacant structures throughout the neighborhood. While most are securely boarded up now, a few are open havens for prostitutes, addicts and drug dealers. Several have experienced severe deterioration from fires or holes in the roof. The message they send is one of decay and lack of security.

In Augusta, the current count for vacant properties within this study area exceed 500 residential units. Augusta-Richmond County continues to aggressively seek title to abandoned and vacant properties, turning the properties over to the Augusta, Georgia Land Bank Authority (AGLBA). Augusta recently secured funding for the demolition of structures, but does not have additional funding to secure many of the other abandoned and vacant properties.

Chicago requires owners of vacant properties to post a sign with their contact information. New Haven (CT) property owners, primarily banks and institutions, must register foreclosed properties or face fines of $250 per day. Allentown (PA) requires local agents to register and assigns them the same legal responsibilities as the owners.

In addressing this scourge, the community has been hindered by lack of information as to who owns each unit. It can take several months for the lenders to sort through who holds title to the vacant houses. Then, following foreclosure, many units were purchased by investors who hid behind corporate identities. Legislation that requires owners of all vacant properties to register could help to identify the responsible parties. Several communities charge penalties of 10 to 20 percent per month for unpaid registration fees. A State requirement that mortgage services register and provide specific contact information also could help to identify responsible parties.

The amount of the registration fees can be used to discourage holding units vacant. Wilmington (DE) assesses fees tied to the number of years a building has been vacant: $500 for one year; $1,000 for two years; $2,000 for three to four years; $3,500 for five to nine years; and $5,000 for 10 years plus $500 for each additional year, regardless of changes in ownership. This helped Wilmington reduce the number of vacant houses by 22 percent from 2003 to 2007.

San Diego (CA) requires an action plan for returning vacant units to status allowing occupancy, including a maintenance plan during vacancy and a schedule for rehabilitation or demolition. The City charges fines up to $1,000 and/or six months in jail for failing to register, file a reuse plan or follow the property maintenance standards.

In Augusta, the Augusta-Richmond County code may determine a property is blighted if it is detrimental and a menace to the safety, health and welfare of the area residents. Structures can be designated as blighted if the property meets the following criteria:

- **structure is open, cannot be secured against entry and is unsafe for occu-
In April, Maryland passed new legislation on foreclosure prevention measures, which included a measure to help struggling homeowners before they lose their home. The new law creates a statewide database of foreclosed properties to help localities keep track of the inventory and contacts. The statewide registry will also capture the amount of time following each step in the foreclosure process and help communities struggling with vacant properties. The new law also provides a tax credit for potential homeowners as an incentive for purchasing foreclosed properties in targeted communities.

**Code Enforcement**

Enforcing building and housing codes is a key tool for cleaning up the neighborhood. Richmond County-Augusta codes require maintenance of houses in habitable condition. Properties must be maintained, the grass cut and vacant structures secured against entry. Property owners who fail to maintain their properties are fined. The City has the authority to maintain or repair the property, charge the property owner and/or put a lien on the property. Concentrated code enforcement can be effective, particularly when coupled with incentives and forgivable loans for rehab by current owners and cooperativel landlords.

Baltimore’s Vacants to Value Initiative has new authority to issue $900 citations, targeting 1,000 vacant buildings. A new public/private partnership has code enforcement attorneys working with committed, capitalized developers. Every owner of a vacant property must rehab it or sell to someone who can. The City invests in infrastructure and maintenance, clearing and land banking in the most severely distressed areas.

**Clean It or Lien It**

One of the most common tools is City action to correct code violations and put a lien on the property to recover the cost. A problem arises, however, when the lien takes a secondary position behind the mortgage, meaning that the proceeds from sale are used first to repay the outstanding mortgage. The Court will collect outstanding liens for cleaning properties when the lien takes a secondary position behind the mortgage, meaning that the proceeds from sale are used first to repay the outstanding mortgage.

One remedy is to legislate “super priority” for nuisance abatement liens. This means that along with unpaid property taxes, the cost of cleaning up and securing the property would be paid first from any proceeds from sale.

3. Community Review: the official blog of the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, Governor O’Malley Signs Foreclosure Prevention Measures Establishing Early Mediation and Foreclosed Property Database

Pennsylvania requires purchasers of a building with substantial code violations to bring it into compliance within one year. If not, the owner is personally liable for maintenance, repair and/or demolition costs as well as a fine of $1,000 to $10,000.

**Targeting of Problem Landlords**

The City and the community should target their efforts to “the worst of the worst” property owners who incur repeated and multiple code violations. Several cities have adopted ordinances and pursued programs designed to push landlords into compliance with city codes.

Specialized housing courts focus on code enforcement, going after problem property owners. Responding to the city’s extreme problems with abandoned housing, a special Cleveland Housing Court adjudicates code enforcement and related cases. The Court has nine specialists to assist with non-trial remedies for code non-compliance. Corporations that fail to respond to a criminal complaint are held in contempt and charged $1,000 per day. Court dockets are reviewed to determine if any landlords seeking evictions are refusing to appear in Housing Court; in which case, the Court will refuse to assist in the eviction. If a defendant appears in Housing Court for another reason, the Court will collect outstanding liens for cleaning properties owned by the defendant.

Memphis hired private attorneys in October 2010 to file nuisance abatement cases under the State Neighborhood Preservation Act. In response, the Environmental Court judge issues court orders for nuisance abatement that allows the City to recover its litigation and abatement costs. Raleigh’s Probationary Rental Occupancy Permit charges fees for landlords with repeated, multiple violations. An owner who has violated codes and failed to repair the property pays $500 per year for a two-year permit and must attend a property management court.

The successful St. Louis Property Problems Unit conducts 4,000 inspections of problem properties monthly, charging $97 per visit. This dedicated group of attorneys and other staff focuses on getting properties back into productive use. Police assigned to the unit bring problem property owners to court. Expenses are attached to the properties.

**Outreach to Property Owners**

Area residents and community leaders need to reach out to the owners of vacant properties, ideally as soon as they purchase a property in the neighborhood. That contact should include discussion of:

- the community’s expectations of property owners;
- county codes that apply to vacant properties;
- the owner’s plans and concerns;
- the community’s continued scrutiny; and
- an invitation to join with the community in enforcing property standards.

Many communities conduct landlord training classes to help new landlords and property managers learn how to screen tenants, deal with problem tenants, and prevent drug and other problems. Buffalo’s Crime Free Rental Housing Program couples training with a survey of the property by a police officer and a landlord commitment to take action. One useful training handbook is available at www.cdri.com/library/LTPNat4_3.pdf.

It is also important to provide incentives to behave responsibly. Utah reduces its rental housing fees through the “good landlord program” if the landlords carry out specified actions. Other incentives for good landlords include greater access to available properties, expedited eviction of problem tenants, free safety inspections, free or subsidized security/safety equipment (e.g., smoke detectors), property improvement loans or grants, and improved access to Police and City officials.

- unsafe structure is secured against entry but may pose a threat to the neighboring property or Right of Way (ROW) because of potential collapse or other threat;
- structure houses rodents or other nuisances which may negatively impact neighboring property; or
- unsafe structure’s state of disrepair threatens the general welfare of the public by reducing the real or perceived value of an adjacent property, presenting a visual blight due to collapse, fire damage, or other unrepaired damage, lying in a state of incomplete construction, resulting in a negative view of the surrounding properties or other similar conditions.
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# Appendix A: Committee Structure

## Steering Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>Deke S. Copenhaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor’s Office</td>
<td>Karyn Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Bank and Trust</td>
<td>Zach Daffin, Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Bill Crowder, District VP Augusta South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiloh Ministries</td>
<td>Elizabeth Jones, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Tomorrow</td>
<td>Camille Price, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Business Owner / Property Owner</td>
<td>Monique Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams Memorial</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Paul W. Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House District 121</td>
<td>Wayne Howard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paine</td>
<td>Brandon Brown, Vice President,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paine</td>
<td>Tiffany Brooks, Dir Institutional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHSU / ASU</td>
<td>Cedric Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHSU / ASU</td>
<td>Shirley Schulte, Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Housing Authority</td>
<td>Richard Arfman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josey High School Representative</td>
<td>Keturah Mingleedorph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Theatre</td>
<td>Tyrone Butler, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Bill Lockett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Cory Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>William Fennoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Mary Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Marion Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Richard Roundtree, Sheriff/ Robert Partain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Von Daniel, exec asst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## District Action Plan Subcommittee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta CVB</td>
<td>Jennifer Bowen, VP Product Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta CVB</td>
<td>Barry E. White, President CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDA</td>
<td>Margaret Woodard, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Augusta</td>
<td>Erick Montgomery, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preservation Commission</td>
<td>Jimmy Anderson, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCBOE</td>
<td>Dr. Frank G. Roberson, Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCBOE</td>
<td>Alex Howard, Board Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josey High</td>
<td>Ron Wiggins, Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>Ron Housk, Planning &amp; Development Mgr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
<td>Maurice McDowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Raymond Olsbee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Trans. Corridor Subcommittee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Engineer</td>
<td>Steve Cassel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Public Transit</td>
<td>Juriah Lewis, Planner Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.R. Toole</td>
<td>Erick Hammarlund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Ministries</td>
<td>Fran Oliver, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithview Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Mrs. Daisy Brown, President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Utilities</td>
<td>April Myers, Administrative Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Utilities</td>
<td>Tom Wiedmeier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Canal Authority</td>
<td>Dayton Sherrouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Pine Homeowners</td>
<td>Chawnette Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabernacle Baptist Church</td>
<td>Rev. Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laney Walker Nbhd Assoc.</td>
<td>President, William Fennoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>Bob Munger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>Eric Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDOT District 2</td>
<td>Neal O’Brien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Transit</td>
<td>David Jones, Interim General Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Code/ Ordinance Sub.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/ Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Engineering</td>
<td>Abie L. Ladson, P.E., Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Green Building Council</td>
<td>Drew Weigl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Fire Department</td>
<td>Chris James, Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing and Inspections</td>
<td>Pam Costabile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builders Association of Metro Augusta</td>
<td>Debi Donaldson, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Property Owner</td>
<td>Dee Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Greenway Alliance</td>
<td>Maria Hough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Planning Commission</td>
<td>Paul Decamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Planning Commission</td>
<td>George Patty, Planning Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Acquisition Subcommittee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/ Department</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beulah Grove Church</td>
<td>Ms. Wright, Director 30901 CDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Land Bank</td>
<td>Norman Michael, Exec. Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>Hawthorne Welcher Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Blaire Stover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD Urban Planning and Management</td>
<td>Warren Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Resident</td>
<td>Ms. Margaret Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>Christine Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>William Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Larry Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Wilbur Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Lenzell Ponder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Jay Delley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Linda Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Mildred Iris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Mary Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Electronic Notification

Augusta Sustainable Development Area
Zoning & Potential Projects
PUBLIC MEETING

You are invited to participate in a public open house to review draft zoning recommendations and identify early phase projects that can influence investment and the revitalization of the 15th St, Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd and Deans Bridge Rd area.

Tuesday, May 7, 2013
6:00PM - 8:00PM
T.W. Josey High School

There will not be a formal presentation, so drop in anytime between 6-8pm

Agenda Topics:
- What is the proposed zoning?
- How will the rezoning impact existing property owners?
- What are the potential project sites?
- What funding sources and programs are available for implementation?
- What is next?

For more information visit

www.augustasustainable.com

This event is free to the public and children/youth are welcome!

Contact:
John Paul Sturt, City of Augusta Sustainable Development Manager | 706-821-1796
Contene Terry, Public Relations Manager | 404-808-9916
Appendix C: Fact Sheet

Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program

Information Sheet

City of Augusta is going to develop a detailed corridor plan and implementation program for a Priority Development Corridor, which is a 4.5 mile north-south “spine” in the core of the City. This spine runs from downtown to the vacant Regency Mall area along 15th Street, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, and Drexel Bridge Road (See map on the backside). The project, called the Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program, entails four interrelated initiatives:

1. Creating a detailed plan and implementation program for a cluster of transit-oriented development neighborhoods along the corridor.
2. Developing a detailed plan for a multi-modal transportation corridor.
3. Revising current codes to facilitate higher-density, mixed-use, and mixed-income development.
4. Creating an implementation plan for green, affordable housing in the corridor.

How can I participate?

Public Meetings: The City and consultant team will hold a series of public meetings from late August 2012 to April 2013 to solicit input and gather feedback. Upcoming Public Meetings:

Visioning Session
Tuesday, November 13th, 2012 - 6:00PM - 8:30PM T.W. Josey High School

Visioning Results Presentation
Saturday, November 17th, 2012 - 10:30AM - 12:00PM T.W. Josey High School

Contact Information: Community stakeholders and citizens are invited to join a series of Sub-Committees to review and comment on the plan findings and recommendations. The committees include: District Action Sub-Committee, Code, Ordinance Sub-Committee, Land Acquisition Sub-Committee, and Transportation Corridor Sub-Committee. Contact Committee Chair, Public Relations Manager for additional information. More meeting information will be provided throughout the process.

Study Area Map

Augusta Sustainable Development Implementation Program
August 2012
Prepared by: Turner-Sparling-Wadler & Associates

Map Source: Augusta City Draft Map

Legend:
- Study Sites
- Studies
- Buildings
- Land Use
- More Wards
- Roads
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### Table A-1. Household Type, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PMA</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household by Type, 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>6,927</td>
<td>47,692</td>
<td>137,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-Couple Families</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>27,267</td>
<td>94,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>10,459</td>
<td>38,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Family (No Spouse)</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>20,065</td>
<td>43,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>16,790</td>
<td>34,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>10,239</td>
<td>21,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>3,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>12,468</td>
<td>4,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>61,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td>11,219</td>
<td>75,392</td>
<td>199,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A-2. Augusta Households by Income and Tenure, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PMA</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household by Sex, 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>16,790</td>
<td>34,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>10,239</td>
<td>31,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>3,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Related Children</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>12,468</td>
<td>4,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td>4,286</td>
<td>20,065</td>
<td>43,167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table A-3. Tenure by Age of Householder, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PMA</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age of Householder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 24 years</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>1,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34 years</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>9,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44 years</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>6,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 years</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>5,923</td>
<td>10,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 years</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>9,157</td>
<td>9,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 years</td>
<td>1,010</td>
<td>6,649</td>
<td>1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84 years</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>11,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A4. Employed Population Aged 16 and Over by Industry and Occupation, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry/Occupation</th>
<th>PMA Augusta-Richmond County</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Mining</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Utilities</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Mining</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Utilities</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A5. Journey to Work, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute Time</th>
<th>PMA Employed Residents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Employed Residents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MSA Employed Residents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 minutes</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6,284</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 minutes</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10,188</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>22,453</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 minutes</td>
<td>1,974</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>14,538</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>32,739</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 minutes</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>18,134</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>41,921</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 minutes</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>13,614</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>37,319</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 39 minutes</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13,876</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 minutes</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8,511</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>30,024</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 minutes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5,978</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 minutes</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5,627</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 minutes</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 minutes</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or more minutes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work from home</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6,169</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | 10,138 | 100.0% | 78,955 | 100.0% | 228,461 | 100.0% |

### Table A-6. Means of Transportation to Work, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Transportation</th>
<th>PMA Employed Residents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Employed Residents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MSA Employed Residents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car, Truck, or Van</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>70,674</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>208,361</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove alone</td>
<td>7,627</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>61,716</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>182,770</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpooled</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>8,658</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>25,591</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding taxicab)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle, Bicycle,</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>8,178</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>18,484</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked, Other Means or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,497</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>79,963</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>225,521</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table A-7. Housing Units by Number of Units in Structure, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units in Structure</th>
<th>PMA Number</th>
<th>PMA Percent</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Number</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Percent</th>
<th>MSA Number</th>
<th>MSA Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, Detached</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>49,543</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>132,542</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, Attached</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3,086</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5,061</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5,205</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8,406</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>7,428</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>9,997</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>6,987</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>35,997</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,885</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>80,646</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>204,601</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table A-8. Housing Units by Year Built, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>PMA Number</th>
<th>PMA Percent</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Number</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Percent</th>
<th>MSA Number</th>
<th>MSA Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990 to March 2000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>5,524</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 to 1998</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>18,766</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1994</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>22,474</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>15,213</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>43,904</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>16,813</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>40,576</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 or Earlier</td>
<td>8,960</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>36,511</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>73,327</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Year Built</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table A-9. Vacancy Status, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>PMA Number</th>
<th>PMA Percent</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Number</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Percent</th>
<th>MSA Number</th>
<th>MSA Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing</td>
<td>10,888</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>74,199</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>203,083</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11,888</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>29,530</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6,251</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented, not occupied</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For sale only</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1,485</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold, not occupied</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For seasonal, recreational,</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For migrant workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vacant</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>12,048</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>86,087</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>232,613</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A-10: Competitive Multi-Family Rental Properties, Augusta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Address</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Floor Plans</th>
<th>Rental Rate</th>
<th>Square Foot</th>
<th>Rent per Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Occupancy Rate</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Villa Apts</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>$423</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$0.47</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Dishwasher, shared laundry, parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 Sunset Ave</td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman Arms</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>$666</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>$0.65</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Dishwasher, washer dryer, internet, shared laundry, pool, parking lot, pet friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914 Hickman Rd</td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Hill Apts</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>$0.77</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677 Hickman Rd</td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery Pointe Apartments</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>$448</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Dishwasher, shared laundry, parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814 Fayetteville Dr</td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodhaven</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>Clubhouse, shared laundry, pet friendly, health club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840 Killipoworsh Rd</td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence PI</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1BR</td>
<td>$419</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>$0.79</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Dishwasher, internet, health club, pool, tennis, parking lot, shared laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2205 Southgate Dr</td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleton Apts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2BR</td>
<td>$529</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Dishwasher, shared laundry, parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2801 Damascus Rd</td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A-11: Rental Units by Gross Rent, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>PMA Number</th>
<th>PMA Percent</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Number</th>
<th>Augusta-Richmond County Percent</th>
<th>MSA Number</th>
<th>MSA Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With cash rent</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>30,153</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>58,457</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $400</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>6,968</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400 to $499</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>5,968</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 to $599</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>9,425</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600 to $699</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>4,985</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>9,255</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$700 to $799</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4,115</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>7,989</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 to $899</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>6,004</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$900 to $999</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4,263</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,249</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 to $1,499</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 to $1,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 or more</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cash rent</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5,156</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median cash rent**

- **PMA**: $668
- **Augusta-Richmond County**: $706
- **MSA**: $703

**Total**

- **PMA**: 8,641
- **Augusta-Richmond County**: 31,907
- **MSA**: 68,613

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008-2010 American Community Survey (ACS); Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A-12. Income as Percent of Area Median Income, Augusta MSA, 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income as Percent of AMI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% (Median)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: HUD, 2012; Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A-13. Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household Income, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rent as a Percentage of Household Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20.0 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 to 24.9 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0 to 49.9 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0 to 69.9 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0 to 89.9 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0 to 102.9 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not computed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Householders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS); Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A-14: Competitive Retail Inventory, Augusta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmart Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centera Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Galleria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kmart Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee Shopping Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Village Shopping Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey (ACS); Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Lease Rate</th>
<th>GLA</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Anchors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regency Exchange</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>$13.50</td>
<td>61,251</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>Sears, 41,909 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2870 Regency Blvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midway Plaza</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Barber Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 Gordon Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peach Orchard Plaza</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>$8.11</td>
<td>148,430</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>Big Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2708 Peach Orchard Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Market Place</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>$13.86</td>
<td>52,274</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Kroger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3128 Deans Bridge Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Augusta, GA 30906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Reis, Inc.; Partners for Economic Solutions, 2012.