Expanding Landscapes
An Exploration of Large-scale Privately Owned Public Spaces

Simone A. M. Heath
Cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody.

- Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*
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I. Introduction

Ownership of public space and “the right to public space” are important matters of consideration for planners given the social, economic, and political undercurrents driving the contemporary America city (Miller, 2012). Early city design encompassed this concept by including large public areas for people to gather publically, often in the form of squares and plazas. With the trend towards globalization, the privatization of public spaces is diminishing the amount of public land available to public use. In his introduction to Variations on a Theme Park, Michael Sorkin attributes the new global economy to creating “a city without a place attached to it” naming it “ageographical” and being in a very “advanced condition in the United States (1992).” The sprawling city no longer needs open public spaces, with televisions for entertainment and the Internet for interaction. Shopping malls and office atria being the only places of random social interaction, Sorkin criticizes public space as a function of ability to pay. This description of privatizing public space that is present in all urban downtowns. In a sense, the public desire for goods was satisfied by giving up the “city” through the conversion of public lands. The purpose of this research is to answer the question, “Is privately owned public space, still public?”

Since 2010, the United States has seen a huge growth in urban areas post-Great Recession, with a national average growth rate of 2.4% (Weismann, 2015). This is a major departure from the suburban typology that is characteristic of Atlanta and many southern cities (ARC, 2016). This rapid growth puts governments under significant financial strain with a greater demand to provide public services for populations growing at rates higher than
previously planned. Many local governments have turned to private investors to create public amenities\(^1\). While many see this resurgence of growth and private investment into the city center, some believe that private ownership may limit public spaces to consumption. This research seeks to understand the dynamic of large scale privately owned public spaces through an empirical case evaluation of Atlantic Station. By identify factors affecting “publicness,” the complex relationship between context and the use/users, ownership, and management will be used to provide recommendations for the future development of the Oakland City/Fort McPherson LCI Study area, which has cited Atlantic Station’s development model as inspiration for the planned development. The approach is to use the Public Space Management Index created by Nemeth and Schmidt (2007) for small public spaces and expand its use to larger privately owned public spaces. The overarching goal is to understand what factors make a place more or less public, and how they can be used to improve the design of future site design.

A. The Constitutional Right to Public Space

For decades the debate of whether or not spaces can truly be “freely and openly public.” In principle, a “truly” public space belongs to everyone and no one. All people are welcome, and cannot be excluded for a subjective reason. This does not mean a person can do whatever they would like because there are certain uses that are prohibited by the government to provide safer spaces for more people to enjoy. Murder, for example is illegal, regardless of whether a space is privately or publically owned and operated. This aside, there is an unsettling

\(^1\) State Farm is creating its hub in the Perimeter Center, one of Atlanta’s jobs hubs, adjacent to an existing MARTA line. The company will add an additional 3,000 jobs to the 5,000 that are already located in the city. The goal is to consolidate its sprawling employees by creating a convenient “live, work, play” community (Transportation for America, 2015).
ability to discriminate against certain uses and users who may be deemed as unacceptable by a private owner. In a privately owned space, protestors can be removed from the area at the owner’s will. Historically, public space has been a noted area in which the public, through peaceful protests, may be heard. The notion of the privatization of public space has often been a topic among planning professions, in which the limiting of public use of public space is a direct violation of democracy, but enforcing these rights has become increasingly complex. The First Amendment guarantees the rights of free expression and to peaceably assemble and petition, yet the trend of privately owned public spaces begins to tie ability or perceived ability to pay to access to public spaces. In fact, today, it is popular belief that the loss of public space through privatization would equate to a threat, stifling the ability for individual citizens to fully exercise their guaranteed First Amendment rights by limiting access and, thus, speech.

When looking at the First Amendment, it becomes unclear as to how public spaces, being areas where free speech and assembly occur, are defined. With the popularization of the Internet and social media, these ideas are further complicated, though directly related. In *Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District* 1969\(^2\), Justice Fortas contends, “only traditional public forums such as parks, streets, sidewalks, get full protection of the First

\(^2\) In 1965 three teens wore black arm bands to a Des Moines, Iowa public middle and high schools to protest American involvement in the Vietnam War. The principles of these schools wrote a policy that would require to remove the arm bands or they would face suspension. The students violated this policy, and were suspended. The parents of the children sued the schools, with the case reaching the Supreme Court. The outcome of this was that if there was no disruption caused by this protest, well within their First Amendment rights. The *Tinker Test* is still used today in cases arguing school’s disciplinary rights (*Tinker v. Des Moines School Dist. United States Supreme Court. 12 Nov., 1968*).
Amendment. ³ Any newer sites, such as shopping malls and the Internet, are free from these constraints.⁴ This validates Sorkin’s argument that privately owned and maintained public forum can be limited and be made exclusionary with limited accountability. So if an agency finds it more valuable to sell communal public spaces, like a park, for a more profitable use, like a sports arena, then there is nothing that can be done to protect and individual’s ability to speak freely in this new use (Tushnet, 2010).

Democracies are noted as exercises in participatory political processes, with an individual’s rights stemming from the right to be heard. The urban city was created and designed to facilitate this process and serve as a beacon/symbol of democratic excellence. The importance of these spatial rights have been made clear through contemporary social justice movements where spaces have been reclaimed in order force government action. As a model function, the Occupy Movement serves the people as an alternative democracy as the system in which they currently operate has failed to protect their most basic rights; the pursuit of

³ The debate about what free speech includes, and where a person’s speech is protected has exposed the complex nature of public place and public space. The Miller Test was developed in California based on Miller v. California 1973 deals with the regulation of expression, stating anything without “serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value” is an obscenity, and is not protected by the First Amendment and can be regulated (Miller v. California. United States Supreme Court. 7 Nov., 1972.).

⁴ The US Constitution allows states to allow citizens more rights as long as they do not infringe on federal rights. With this power, New Jersey and California have become exceptions to the limitation of speech and public demonstration in privately owned places. In Schneider v. State of New Jersey, (1939), allows citizens to exercise freedom of speech in public areas and streets. In California, which allows citizens the right to exercise free speech in privately owned shopping centers that are open to the general public (Pruneyard Shopping Center v. Robins. United States Supreme Court., 1980).
happiness\textsuperscript{5}. This gives the people, for which the democracy stands, a means in which to organize and peacefully assemble. This organization is social and political as well as providing a physical means in which to do so. From this very basic right to occupying physical space, togetherness, self-help, and mutual support was facilitated through the democratic process our forefathers once envisioned (Marcuse, 2011). This fundamental principle is also noted as a facilitator of social life, but is limited in its definition of public life and its interaction with physical space. While speech, protest, and peaceful assembly are important, there are additional needs of the public needed to create social environments, despite private ownership and management.

**B. The Social Need for Public Space**

In Jane Jacobs’ *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1969), the city is illustrated as a complex organism, where public and private life becomes increasingly connected. In fact public life and space, help to define private space. While there is no explicit description on what is private outside of the individual dwelling unit, every space in the city becomes an opportunity for spontaneous interaction, yet it still gives a sense of safety and liveliness. Here, the city is given to the public. The concept of a defined public and private life is carried throughout Jane Jacobs’ writing, saying that cities must have a clear demarcation between public and private spaces. There is a much more fluid dynamic where privacy still exists, but with the added

\textsuperscript{5} The Occupy Movement revolves around exposing what they defined as the increasing gap in power and wealth of the elite 1% of wealthy individuals as compared to the 99% struggling majority. Through these protests, the public made their complaints known with a goal of holding those who are deemed responsible, Wall Street/Big Business/ Greedy Corporations, accountable for the unfair distribution wealth and access to resources (Marcuse, 2011).
benefits of safety and economic security due to the social interaction and equally created by design. She uses public parks and sidewalks to illustrate that all spaces are not created equally. Sidewalks offer movement, and act as a collector of the various social interactions that occur throughout the day with the benefit of safety that someone is always watching from a nearby shop, stoop, or apartment window. Parks, on the other hand, were considered to be wasted lands, away from the public eye, allowing delinquency to remain unsupervised. It is not enough to provide large public open spaces, additional amenities should be included. This dynamic forces urban designers to see public space beyond the physical area, but through use and user experience. The use and end user become important characteristics that vibrant cities depend upon.

*The Social Value of Public Space* (2007) summary report conducted by the Joseph Rountree Foundation, explores how both traditional and new public spaces can be used to create valuable social resources. Many Town Centers use policing and policy to design out undesirable uses, but often design out people as well. This report examines how public spaces function with the evidence of successful regeneration policies to create sustainable communities. The challenge of this evaluation is the concepts of public space depend on the anticipated use, but with changes in society, needs can change, and some uses can become obsolete.

Public telephones and telephone booths, for example, were seen as an important amenity in public spaces until the invention and popularization of the mobile phone. Designers used to plan for telephone booths in and around buildings. Many young people in today’s
culture have never seen a telephone booth, but are more concerned with free wifi connections and power outlets to charge mobile devices. While a much smaller scale use, it is cultural shifts that have spurred the re-examination of public space function. This study looked at traditional forms of public space, high streets (Main Streets), street markets, parks, playgrounds, and allotments, and the increasingly more common, private public spaces like shopping precincts, arts districts, and other public fora where people may convene to get a better grasp of how people use space.

This approach is very much rooted in Everyday Urbanism where the designer’s role is believed to be flexible and observant, finding ways to incorporate contemporary features into the existing city fabric, as determined by present use and users (Kelbaugh, 2001). The four findings of this exploration are 1. Public spaces play a vital role in the social life of communities 2. Public spaces facilitate the exchange of ideas, friendships, goods, and skills 3. Good design and management are important and 4. Regeneration should be about long-term livability and creating sustainable communities. These basic rules have been examined and redefined in ways that better explain the contemporary city; 1. Public spaces play a vital role in the social life of communities, 2. Not only public spaces facilitate the exchange of ideas, friendships, goods, and skills, 3. “Public Space” is Social Spaces, 4. Good Design and Management are important, and 5. Regeneration through retrofitting as a remedy to sprawl.

**Public spaces play a vital role in the social life of communities**

Through this evaluation, public spaces help develop the community through place making and identity creation. Whether through active use or passive activity, the public space
facilitates “the people’s attachment to their locality” offer opportunity for social interaction and mixing, and social inclusion (Dines, 2006). Of particular note, street markets, local high streets (main streets), and neighborhood spaces are of varying importance. Each space has loosely defined criteria, offers spontaneous and unplanned interaction, and offers users of all ages and backgrounds their own stake in the community function. This building of social capital benefits all people within the communal network through friendships and creating acquaintance with potential influencers. This capital is built through business transactions, neighborhood events, or chance meetings (Rabinowitz, 2015). Social hubs offer communal spaces that help to enable this building of capital and define place, including those necessary for democratic process, but not limited only to those spaces; just because consumption occurs, a space is no less public in function.

**Not only public spaces facilitate the exchange of ideas, friendships, goods, and skills**

Mean et. al (2005) stated that “At their best, public spaces act like a self-organizing public service; just as hospitals and schools provide a shared resource to improve people’s quality of life, public spaces form a shared spatial resource for which experiences and values are created…”. Everyday exchanges are still valuable to healthy community function, but it is the education, sharing of ideas, and ability to create “play” (reality escapes) space (Worpole, 2007). While it is believed that public spaces facilitate the exchange of ideas, friendships, goods, and skills, these functions are not limited solely to publically owned spaces. Privately owned establishments and spaces also offer communal functions. Whether publically or privately owned, these spaces can be in the form of plazas and squares, buildings and their surroundings,
pedestrian streets, streets and boulevards, bridges, markets, theaters, parks, libraries, museums, and public transportation (Rabinowitz, 2015). It is the type of establishment that reflects the community. A strip club and bar, within a neighborhood, have different effects on identity than a shopping mall or salon might affect a person’s desire to go to that space. While there is a demand for bars and strip clubs, there are places that are deemed acceptable for them to be located. This concept is the same for physical space within the city. Whether public or private, spatial type determines how people socialize.

“Public Space” is Social Space

It is important to first note the two types of social space; obligatory social space, allowing virtually no choice in social interaction, and voluntary social space, allowing people options to interact or not. Confined spaces, densely populated spaces like a metro rail car or crowded street, offer no choice in interaction; something typical in dense, urban settings. Voluntary spaces allow openness to interaction, without forcing encounters. A public park or hiking path would typify this type of space, and act as a balance to for the various obligatory areas within a city. New York, New York is described as a example of favorable balance, and the typical sprawling American suburb as the antithesis (Kresl, 2012).

The perception of a space can mean the success or failure of a public space. A place with too little signage and maintenance can allude that little interest is paid to the area making it unsafe or confusing to navigate. If the space is a town center with various events and attractions, then some assets may go unutilized. Effective programming will draw site movement, enhancing the perceived safety from site familiarity. But success is more than
creating attractive spaces; spaces must also function well. Public space is well understood as streets, alleys, buildings, squares, and parks. Jane Jacobs pointed out that just because a space exists for these purposes it does not guarantee that this is how public life will utilize the space. Public life is seen as every complex happening within these spaces; there is no formula for outsiders of a space to apply in various contexts. It is the intersection of space and public life that creates a social space (Gehl, 1936; Britton, 2011). The concern becomes designing usable social space that is more connected and able to facilitate meaningful interaction. These are the spaces that help identify the character of the community, making their design and management increasingly important.

**Good design and management are important**

The documentary, *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*, found that the sociability of a space determined its use; meaning, the more social a space is the more use it received (Whyte, 2005). This furthers the notion that creating social spaces with public functions are more important than actual public ownership. Both Whyte and Worpole found that poor access to transport and public amenities and spaces can cause it to appear to be “dead” outside of specialized programming of events. This emptiness can dissuade use/users and can often be seen in American downtowns where business and trade are the main functions during the day. In a commuter city such as Atlanta, this is especially true. Noted Architect Rem Koolhaas described the city as “post urban, center less city” during his visit in the mid 90s (Koolhaas, 1995). Koolhaas’ painted this as both an opportunity and a constraint.
Atlanta is the prototypical commuter, suburb for the South. With the direction of a single manager, developer and architect, John Portman, the opportunity to drive commerce in Atlanta was gained at the cost of the interface between the public and private realms that Jane Jacobs championed. His atrium hotels, marts, and elevated walkways, turn their backs to the city, focusing instead on the creation of fantastic interiors. Visitors to the city can drive into downtown, into his parking garages and up the elevator into the hotel atrium without ever having to step into public space. Suburbanites who commute to the city for work or entertainment depend on the automobile for transportation and never experiencing Atlanta outside of built interiors and roadways.

This suburban growth pattern has only been exacerbated over time with a growing population and increased dependence on the automobile (Dobbins, 2015). While the affordability of the suburbs is attractive, there are hidden costs of sprawl. Local governments and the tax payers living within the municipality bear the burden of infrastructure. Because of the distance from the city center, much of the cost for roads, sidewalks, parks, and other public amenities are paid for by the local government. Despite receiving property tax revenues, liabilities like maintenance are paid for out of local money. A large issue with this is that costs tend to rise over time, but revenues from property taxes remain the same (Thompson, 2013). Compact developments cost, on average, 38% less in upfront costs, and 10% less in on going costs (Badger, 2013). These costs tend to leave local governments struggling to provide the services necessary for healthy communities that do not translate back into revenues for the municipality. This leaves communities lacking adequate social space that help to strengthen community ties to physical location.
While there is no “one size fits all” solution to social space design, there are some basic features that have been found in more successful spaces. Watson and Studdert’s (2006) study of markets as social space list this criteria as follows:

- Having features to attract visitors to the site
- An active and engaged community of traders (local business) to provide goods for sale and contribute to the social scene
- Opportunities to linger through the provision of cafes and food vans (trucks) or ‘comfort zones’ where sitting and people watching can occur

These concepts, while vague, help to establish familiarity within the community and are directly in line with Whyte’s previous analysis of small urban plazas. He describes four basic ideas of social space that promote use among users: 1. There has to be a reason for people to go there 2. There has to be a reason for people to want to stay once they’ve arrived 3. People in the space have to feel safe and comfortable, and 4. The space has to be welcoming and accessible to everyone. But how can this happen in cities that have developed most areas within their valuable central core? Regeneration, through retrofitting is the key to improved social space.

**Regeneration through retrofitting as a remedy to sprawl**

The regeneration of social spaces will provide sustainable communal spaces that meet the current social demands. This method of transformation allows incremental changes to the underutilized strip mall, office, and industrial parks that have become characteristic of the suburban landscape (Dunham-Jones, 2009). Some of the most obvious benefits of retrofitting
lie in adaptive reuse; changing the function, identity, and overall marketability of public space.

The goal of regeneration is typically to solve poor community function. The stigma of
gentrification that accompanies regeneration has caused mass displacement in areas of
marginalized people. It should be remembered that public spaces have roles to connect people
while serving as a needed community amenity. This, in turn, raises land values, and, thus, the
cost of living in these areas. More thought and consideration of the social needs of the area
should accompany any physical design. The following questions should all be considered in any
regeneration strategy: What improvements should be made? Who will be living here in the
future? “How will those living here now, be able to benefit from future improvements?”

C. Rethinking How the Public is Defined

Much of the issue with identifying social space function is rooted in the concept that
public functions can only happen on publically owned lands. With suburban sprawl becoming
the main prototype of American growth patterns, much of the cost of development cannot be
covered by municipalities. Local governments look to private investors to finance spaces that
add social value to the public. The fear is related to access to areas where people may exercise
their rights to speech and expression, something that private land can limit through rules and
security measures. Scholars have asserted that while public lands have diminished, public
function has expanded into other forms of expressions. To identify a solution, one must begin
to reimage how the public is defined.
Contesting Public Space

The argument against privately managed and owned spaces is that these are restrictive spaces, employing the activities envisioned by the owner. While behavior within a space can be shaped through design, contested spaces serve as illustrations of the public’s ability to determine use in or to fulfill social, political, economic, or environmental needs. In Detroit, the Detroit Land Bank has facilitated the sale of thousands of vacant “side lots.” Individuals began converting these spaces into uses like community gardens, so the land bank began a program that would allow local citizens the use of these spaces. The new end uses were not designed, but contested by the community, providing the community a chance to design and improve the conditions of their community (Ferretti, 2015). Here, the notion that space is not static. Planned uses and actual uses/meanings compete with each other, causing that space to evolve (Reiff, 2004).

Contested spaces represent competition of spatial interpretation of meaning and function of public spaces, but can be seen as a threat in public space. In a privatized public spaces like a shopping mall, it is the manager that asserts and controls behavior through rules and guidelines. The mall user can transform mall spaces into more than simply shopping, like an indoor walking path or resting spot to people watch. But there is a fine line between loitering and people watching. Subjective rules placed within private spaces limit the users freedom to be social in ways that may be deemed normal. If contestations within private spaces arise, the management asserts its power to define the acceptable use/user, thus making the need for public spaces essential. The law has shown that public spaces may be designed or designated through policy, thus expanding the definition of public space.
The Public Sphere

There is the strong contention that social interaction is much more complex than free speech and protest, having moved beyond connection to a single type of physical space. Nancy Frasier (1991) asserts that the conceptual “public sphere,” first introduced by Habermas, is the way to circumvent the traditional public realm. Frasier offers the idea of “multiple and counter-publics,” as no traditional public space has truly been open to everyone, allowing those who have been traditionally excluded from certain public spaces, access (i.e. women, minorities, homosexuals, etc.). Margret Crawford goes on to say that through Frasier’s redefined public sphere, it also possible to rethink public space as alternative sites may also offer space for certain forms of public expression; various types of spaces can facilitate public use.

There is a very strong assertion that the loss of public space is an intrusion into private life, leading to an end of public spaces (Sennett, 1977; Sorkin, 1992). But just how is “the public” defined? Nemeth believes that it is the owners/managers of space that define “the public” through design and program. A place that is more open will have amenities such as benches or other areas for seating, clearly and simply defined access routes, shade cover, while less inviting spaces will be fenced in, provide little known areas for seating, or design features that discourage certain types of use (Nemeth, 2009). Following this line of thought, the publicness, as determined by accessibility, is constantly developed and redeveloped contextually, and change based on management style and approach. With this notion, public spaces hinge on them being publically accessible, deemphasizing the requirement that true public spaces must be publically owned to serve a public function (Reyes, 2016). Privately
owned public space, then, is evaluated by the degree of access created, with publicness being identified through observation and experience. The issue for planners is that defining a “public space” is much more complex than labeling areas as public and private. An understanding of the offerings of a privately owned public areas might better employ these types of development within a community.

II. The Privatization of Public Space

A. What Constitutes a Public, Private, or Quasi/Semi-Private Space?

While scholars have varying opinions of the form, function, and goals of truly public spaces, in order to measure this complex concept, publicness should be measured beyond lists, desired features, or any single measure. The main criticism with privately owned spaces are outlined as 1. Complex ownership patterns 2. Large public/private expense, and 3. General concern over how “public” the spaces actually are in comparison to publically owned public space (Gehl, 2013; Britton, 2011). It is a large concern that private provisions can release control to private parties that may have no vested public interest due to a lack of accountability and “checks and balances” in examining private rules and regulations. Even more concerning is that private spaces are extension of the owner’s public image; providing the owner incentive to cater to certain uses and users, with economic profitability the main focus.

Trump Tower, for example, was given close to a 20-floor bonus for providing a plaza, worth nearly $500 million. Currently that plaza does not facilitate public interaction as benches have been removed to accommodate areas to sell “Make America Great Again” hats and T-
shirts, a phrase championed by owner, Donald Trump’s presidential campaign (Chaban, 2015). Lastly, these private investments prioritize security over inclusion or publicness. In Whyte’s documentary, *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*, underuse of public areas was identified as more of an issue than overuse; a deserted space serves no real purpose, yet privatized public spaces are increasingly beginning to promote emptiness. While new spaces are created through incentives, there is nothing that promotes these developments to become more than a utilitarian feature, geared towards public enjoyment and use. In suburban developments, these additional parks and public use spaces become degraded due to the cost of up keep and maintenance overtime (Fesler, 2014).

Traditional public spaces are identified as city streets, sidewalks, and parks and are accessible to the entire population (Franck, 1989). Privately owned spaces are largely corporate controlled plazas, parks, and atriums, available to public use during certain hours. Issues with freedom of speech and assembly do not necessarily extend to these quasi-public spaces, limiting the entire idea of public space (e.g. Zucotti Park during the Occupy Wall Street protests). In this way, the value of public space can be reduced to the ability to build taller buildings. The 1961 Zoning Resolution in New York, the privatization of public space became increasingly tied to urban development and corporate owners, allowing hundreds of public spaces to be built throughout the city. Because of this, mixed ownership/operation spaces are very popular throughout New York, making this city the origination of many terms associated with quasi-public spaces. The quality of space varies from site to site, but the overall opportunity to create these places within the urban environment is a very beneficial tool to be considered in all urban planning.
Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPs)

As a result of years of New York City’s incentivized zoning program, hundreds of public spaces were created in exchange for denser buildings in the urban core (Felt, 1961). From its inception in 1961 to early 2000, over 3.5 million square feet of Privately Owned Public Space (POPs) was created in the City of New York. The results of this resolution have been mixed as the qualities of spaces vary in degrees of usefulness despite the prevalence of public areas. Strides towards redefining these spaces have yielded New York City an immense amount of social capital for its general public (Kayden, 2000). In his review of the New York 1961 Zoning Resolution, Harvard Professor James Kayden, created a database of POPs and classifications of various types in hopes to better understand these spaces and garner support for new regulations to improve their quality. Classifications are as follows:

Destination spaces a high-quality public space that attracts employees, residents, and visitors from outside, as well as from, the space’s immediate neighborhood. Users socialize, eat, shop, view art, or attend a programmed event, although they may also visit the space for sedentary, individual activities of reading and relaxing. The design supports a broad audience: spaces are usually sizable, well proportioned, brightly lit, if indoors, aesthetically interesting, and constructed with first-class materials. Amenities are varied and frequently include some combination of food service, artwork, programmatic activities, restrooms, retail frontage, and water features, as well as seating, tables, trees, and other plantings. From time to time, a single amenity like a museum will be so compelling that it alone transforms the space into a destination space.
**Neighborhood space** high-quality public space that draws residents and employees from the immediate neighborhood, including the host building and surrounding buildings within a three-block radius. Users go to neighborhood space for such activities as group socializing, taking care of children, and individual reading and relaxing. Neighborhood spaces are generally: smaller than destination spaces; are strongly linked with the adjacent street and host buildings; are oriented toward sunlight; are made with good construction materials; and are carefully maintained. Amenities typically include seating, tables, drinking fountains, water features, planting, and trees, but not food service and programmatic uses sometimes found at destination spaces.

**Hiatus space** public space that accommodates the passing user for a brief stop, but never attracts neighborhood or destination space use. Usually next to the public sidewalk and small in size, such spaces are characterized by design attributes geared to their modest function, and include such basic functional amenities as seating. Hiatus spaces range from high to low quality in terms of design, amenities, and/or aesthetic appeal.

**Circulation space** public space that materially improves the pedestrian’s experience of moving through the city. Its principal purpose is to enable pedestrians to move faster from point A to point B, and/or to make the journey more comfortable by providing weather protection for a significant stretch. Circulation space is sometimes uncovered, sometimes covered, and sometimes fully enclosed. It is often one link in a multi-block chain of spaces. Size, location, and proportion all support its principal mission. Functional amenities that provide a reason to linger are not taken into account when classifying a space as a circulation space.
Marginal space public space that, lacking satisfactory levels of design, amenities, or aesthetic appeal, deters members of the public from using the space for any purpose. Such spaces usually have one or more of the following characteristics: barren expanses or strips of concrete or terrazzo, elevations above or below the public sidewalk, inhospitable microclimates, characterized by shade or wind, no functional amenities, spiked railings on otherwise suitable surfaces, dead or dying landscaping, poor maintenance, drop-off driveways, and no measurable public use.

These spaces can take a variety of shapes, but allow for more publically accessible space within the city’s urban fabric. The context and desired function of space will determine the classification of space employed. Just as Jane Jacobs describes successful city neighborhoods, spatial types should work in relation to one another, with a clear demarcation of public and private so that the user can understand appropriate behaviors. Circulation spaces help to beautify the city, offer relief space for high-density environments, and help to facilitate circulation. They are necessary, but not an ideal area if the user is looking to go somewhere to be entertained or have prolonged interaction with others, a destination or neighborhood space would be better suited. Hiatus spaces serves users well near mass transportation or bus stops, but are not recommended for areas where lingering is not desired. Even marginal spaces help discourage users, and would be suggested near areas where public safety is concerned. By ranking the desired uses and comparing them to the classification areas can help guide and facilitate access to public, semi-, and quasi- public/private spaces. It is the diversity of space where the balance between democracy and the ability to provide quality social spaces that meet a variety of needs.
Public Private Partnerships (PPPs/P3s)

Public Private Partnerships (PPP/P3s) represent agreements between the federal government and private companies that have helped close the funding gap for public infrastructure improvements. These spaces are owned by the public, through government ownership, and operated by a private entity. This funding mechanism allows public uses made possible by private investment (Figure 1), and is very typical in today’s urban redevelopments (Public-Private, 2015). On a large scale, the benefit of these projects is that Public Private Partnerships allow infrastructure services to put in place more rapidly and at a lower cost than government projects. By using private funds to provide major amenities that benefit the public, governments with smaller means can still afford to function while its citizens receive a better quality of life (Caribbean Development Bank). While P3s serve as way to improve areas, poor negotiation of these deals might leave the real costs of the projects on the community through taxes/tolls. A major benefit for governments is being able to issue bonds to pay for initial costs, and then paying off the bond with revenues. With a majority of potential revenues often given to the developer, the only means for the local government to recover funds is through money saved during construction. In many cases, governments have found that non-

---

6 Washington D.C. was able use private firms to build the Virginia High Occupancy Toll Lanes. In exchange, the private company operates and receives the toll revenues. Projects of this nature represent the benefits of using private funds to provide public amenities, but are too many of the benefits being lost by governments allowing private agencies to be the recipients of their benefits? (Holeywell, 2013).
compete, compensation, or stabilization clauses have created additional costs, which have outpaced revenues\(^7\) (Holeywell, 2013).

While the negotiation of PPPs can be difficult to arrange, the goals of Private Public Partnerships are to leverage targeted support from private stakeholders in a sustainable way. This concept is illustrated in **Figure 1**.

---

**Figure 1. Public Private Partnership Pros and Cons (Caribbean Development Bank, 2016)**

\(^7\) The California Department of Transportation used a P3 to operate and build express lanes on Route 91 in 1995. The contract had a 35 year, “non-compete” clause that would not allow the state to build additional lanes for congestion relief. The private company had to be bought out, making the cost of the, initial, $130 million project to total over $200 million (Holeywell, 2013).
Very close attention should be paid in the deals made between governments and the private sector. In general, some basic principles that have been established by the Caribbean Development Bank to ensure better, more successful PPPs are as follows (Caribbean, 2016):

(a) **Develop PPP policies and processes:** Set the rules, define the priorities and establish the processes for the development and implementation of PPPs.

(b) **Create legal environments:** Enabling environments that allow PPPs to be implemented.

(c) **Build institutional capacity:** Allocate responsibility for implementation of the PPP policy.

(d) **Develop human capacity:** Ensure that CDB staff members have the skills needed to carry out institutional responsibilities.

(e) **Create fiscal management and accounting frameworks:** Create processes and define methods for defining and managing fiscal costs in PPPs, thereby helping governments achieve true VFM.

In addition to financing and public function, some of the best examples of Public Private Partnerships provide additional benefits to the community. While relatively new, the country of Peru has strong legislation and regulation for PPPs in place. The results of the extensive use of PPPs appear to have major social benefits, improving the quality of life for the public, while maintaining public amenities. Legislation was created based on the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s (OECD) *Principles for Public Governance of Public-Private Partnerships* (2012) Guide to minimize financial risks and establishing a clear framework for how these spaces work institutionally. In addition to legislation, various agencies exist to regulate PPPs in Peru. The law works to encourage the collaboration of specialized sectors in a
way that is most efficient and makes the most sense; there are no agencies where decisions are being made by political figures who may not have the specialized knowledge base.

The advantage of this system is that each agency consists of experts who help to minimize financial risk, as well as, limiting direct government intervention. While this comprehensive approach seems to be very affective, its ability to work successfully is attributed to the political structure allowing autonomy over each sector. In the US, legislation and regulation face heavy public scrutiny and cannot be applied autonomously, as in Peru, however, this concept for regulation and legislation is very inspiring for creating a framework for government-sponsored initiatives use of private finance to facilitate the provision of services to the public and/or the delivery of social infrastructure assets (Virginia, 2012). These examples make it clear that P3s can provide major benefits for communities on large scales, but there is a very complex and intricate framework that is necessary to ensure the maximum community benefit.

**Business Improvement Districts (BIDs)**

A Business Improvement District (BID) is a form of quasi-public partnership, created by private property owners. This collective that contributes to the development, maintenance, and promotion of a commercial district that can be used to provide community and economic development for neighborhoods and districts. This model is derived from suburban strip malls, where tenants/stakeholders pay a maintenance fee for common areas that all individual owners benefit from having near their businesses. Business Improvement Districts work in coordination with municipalities in order to supplement service needed for long-term economic
development, providing well maintained social spaces from the public. There are several advantages to this arrangement, including (New York City, 2015):

- A cleaner, safer and more attractive business district
- A steady and reliable funding source for supplemental services and programs
- The ability to respond quickly to changing needs of the business community
- The potential to increase property values, improve sales and decrease commercial vacancy rates
- A district that is better able to compete with nearby retail and business centers BIDS

These districts serve a social function and are open to the public, but cause a blurring of the lines between public and private space. These districts operate in addition to services provided within the municipality, at the cost of landowners and business owners inside the BID area. The BID is run by an appointed Board of Directors, who assess the property and determine the assessment fees and develop the rules that users are required to follow in order to access and use those social spaces. For the US, New York City and Los Angeles are the cities with the most BIDs, with 45 and 30, respectively (New York City, 2015). As noted global cities, each city attracts business from around the world, however, the cost of living is so high, that the average resident struggles to maintain basic necessities. The use of BID programs, as economic development must carefully be planned in connection to communities and the larger city context.

In Atlanta, the BID model has been formatted to a more community focus, through Community Improvement Districts (CID). Since this legislation was passed in the 1980s, 20 CID
have been established in metro Atlanta. These areas are funded through commercial property owners to tax themselves and invest in CIDs services that directly improve surrounding communities. Street and road construction and maintenance, parks and recreation, and public transportation systems are funded through voluntary non-residential property taxes. These districts have been implemented throughout metropolitan Atlanta to raise the profile of the communities in ways that both benefit business owners and provide amenities for those living within the district. Because the capital is raised in lieu of public funding, the benefits of faster and more focused development still stand. Working with government agencies for transportation planning is necessary to ensure that these new social spaces are connected to the larger metropolitan framework (Kendall, 2015).

Residential and multi-family properties are not taxable by a CID, so it is the public-private partnership working together to create an identity and future vision for the community. These districts have been seen as very successful at improving quality of life by focusing on transportation and connectivity. Perhaps the greatest function of this tool has been the ability to improve development coordination between communities. The Perimeter Community Improvement Districts (PCIDs), composed of both Fulton and DeKalb Perimeter CIDs, worked together to improve highway access, directly resulting in thousands of new jobs due to major company relocations. Additionally, the PCIDs partnered with the City of Dunwoody and Metropolitan Area Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) to improve pedestrian safety to destination spaces (Hudson, 2015). While geared to improve the economic functions of business, the money is spent directly for community improvement.
III. Research Proposal

A. Approach

While the work of Jane Jacob’s was revolutionary, it lacked a substantial amount of credibility. Her visceral approach limits the successes of her concepts by professionals to a specific example, yet her work was widely understood and influential through the planning community. Her approach was largely based on observation with a focus on preserving the vibrancy and diversity of city life. In William H. Whyte’s documentary, he highlights and inventories the most common uses of successful public areas. He found that the sociability of a space determined its use (i.e. the more social a space is the more use it received). With this, it can be said that a public space can be defined as an area that allows the general public access to space for diverse activities. Whyte’s study was revolutionary as it extensively involved direct observations backed by a range of data points that reaffirmed many of the notions Jane Jacobs introduced; it becomes a great method in which functional public spaces can be evaluated.

What makes up a “good” space? Can public space ever truly be totally inclusive/accessable to all? How can these normative goals be measured? These questions relate to the subjectivity connected to the public/private debate. Nemeth (2010) offers a more understandable conceptual model, defining publicness as Ownership, Management, and Use/Users in order to objectively and empirically quantify this concept (Figure 2).
Ownership

The first consideration in determining publicness involves understanding if a government body of a private individual or corporation owns a space. This is based on the notion that ownership relates to operation with publicly owned spaces being public and privately owned spaces being private. To illustrate this, Nemeth developed a prototypical matrix of Owner and Operation combinations (Figure 3). This matrix is very helpful representing quasi-public spaces like Bryant Park Business Improvement District (BID).
Figure 3. Potential Owner/Operation Combinations (Nemeth, 2010)

Management

Management relates to the methods of how owners control and maintain a space. This is important because the management has the ability to define acceptable use, users, and behaviors, which, in turn, can control access and accessibility. In this dimension, “who controls a public space, how they do so, and how they attempt to make space and secure” the degree of “publicness” comes into question (Franck, 1989). This dimension examines the physical features provided in a space and any barriers to accessibility, including surveillance/policing.
Use/Users

With very different trains of thought on this topic, it is, first, important to present these notions in their own right, to give a better explanation of how Nemeth’s approach for evaluation is adequate. By the very definition of “freedom” and “democracy,” simply providing large, open green spaces open to anyone, anytime of day would make this concept very logical, however, an argument that no public space actually is completely open to any use/user. For instance, open alcohol consumption, murder, and drug use are all things explicitly prohibited in all spaces by law (Dunham-Jones, 2016). Choudhury (1996) makes the argument that instead, publicness more directly relates to the “social acceptability of...space to different cultural groups” and Fernando (2006) explains that “open-ended” spaces are what are truly valuable to the user. The literature goes on without end, and it is because of varying of opinions, the question of Use/User interaction in space is vital to the proposed research. The author notes that the model is not yet complete, but is hypothetical, multi-stage operationalized model (Figure 4).

B. Critique

The strength of this model is in its ability to model the degrees of intersection between these measures. But the research falls short as the uses/users portion of the model is unaccounted for in lieu of being able to observe use and user. This makes this study short of being comprehensive; however, direct observation would address any shortcomings. This theoretical model quickly falls short when applied to actual locations, as the use/user
dimension cannot be related back to the matrix in a meaningful way (Figure 4). This dimension is subject to design intent, but is hard to value objectively in application.

Figure 4. Ownership, Management, and Use/User Matrix (Nemeth, 2010)

When analyzing the recommendations, there is a very limited scope a vague nature does not appear to facilitate the actual desired change. The framework and conclusions are set up to be used for further evaluation. This provides a starting point for use/user analysis. The author’s conclusion is that privately owned public spaces control use, behavior, and access, and are “less public” than publically owned spaces. There is no indication of a limit of public use or enjoyment. While these limitations are true, there is not a true idea of whether or not this is
desirable or not for the public. As it has been previously discussed that private spaces can facilitate social interaction in the same way that public spaces do. In fact, national parks can exhibit some of the same limitations as private space, such as curfews and restrictions on use and access, despite being publicly owned land. Many of the existing approaches in public space management can also be limited by politics, and, because of this, the social and democratic uses of space are thought to be significantly limited. Some argue that an ideal public space is universally inclusive with its greatest strength being that its function can change depending on the time and group using the space (Jacobs, 1969).

Nemeth alludes to the answer by saying, “Furthermore, while both publicly and privately owned spaces tend to encourage public use and access equally, managers of privately owned spaces tend to employ additional features that control behavior within those spaces. More specifically, this spatial control is achieved through the use of surveillance, policing, and design features that control how a space is used. These results not only contribute to the wider debate about the creation, use, and management of publicly accessible spaces, but also have specific implications for planners and policy makers concerned with this issue (2010).” The idea is that the private or public classification, alone, is not enough to limit accessibility. In Nemeth’s 2009 exploration of this question, the management/ownership dimensions of public space, as much of development is fiscally driven, were found to be the largest contributing factors affecting publicness.

While privately owned public spaces the have potential to add publicly assessable land in places where they did not previously exist, through his is empirical study of POPs in New York
City, Nemeth developed an index to measure the publicness of smaller scaled social spaces; managers/owners control the function and use of public spaces. Despite the potential, tight private ownership and management often contributed to the loss of inclusive public spaces. This, however, does not insure the absolute destruction of inclusiveness of the public in a space and only dealt with these spaces on a small scale. The questions then become, “How can privately owned space include features that encourage use and control behavior in a way that make it a useful public amenity”? and “Can this be done on a larger scale”?

**The Need**

Following the Great Recession, all cities saw major economic growth, but the top 5% of income earners saw a much greater growth than the bottom 20%, creating more inequity in all major cities across the nation in 2012 and 2013\(^8\) (Berube, 2015). Atlanta ranked as the city with the highest income inequity of all major cities in the United States (Figure 5) (Berube, 2015). What is most alarming about this data is that in Atlanta, the top 5% of income earners earn almost 20 times that of the bottom 20%. Even in the face of economic downturn, trends indicate that an overall increase in inequity will continue if all factors remain equal in the future. Urban fabric and the lack of local industries appear to be quite significant to the overall opportunity and access to resources of the bottom 20%.

---

\(^8\) The ratio is called the 95/20 Ratio comparing those incomes in the 95\(^{th}\) percentile with those falling in the 20\(^{th}\) percentile (Misra, 2016). The cities with the most equal distribution of incomes also remained largely the same from 2012 to 2013, incorporating expansive suburban typologies. In addition, these cities do not have large technology or financial/professional service industries that typically bring in higher wages on average. While these trends in inequity are not new post-Great Recession, they have increased in prevalence, with Atlanta and San Francisco showing the largest increases since 2007.
During 2012 and 2013, Atlanta was also the 6th fastest growing metro area in the nation (WPR, 2015). The City of Atlanta is predicted to grow to a population of 8 million by 2040 according to a report done by the Atlanta Regional Commission (Khan, 2015) and has expanded efforts to improve entertainment, technology based services, and the film industry. With the relocation of several business headquarters and a growing movie industry, there is an increased demand for infrastructure to accommodate this growth; there is a growing desire for people to live near jobs or transit and within communities that are walkable (Williams, 2015). With this growth, there is an increased demand for infrastructure. Programs such as the Atlanta Regional Commission’s Livable Cities Initiative seek to improve traditionally marginalized communities to provide greater accessibility, better communities, and resources within metro Atlanta.

Projects like Ponce City Market and the Atlanta Beltline and have begun around Atlanta to make use of disused spaces, but Atlantic Station serves as a notable and long standing, large-scale infill project. The Urban Land Institute’s 2015 Technical Assistance Panel Report for the Oakland City/Fort McPherson LCI study area also cited this project as the recommended model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>20th percentile ($)</th>
<th>95th percentile ($)</th>
<th>95/20 Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,988</td>
<td>288,159</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24,815</td>
<td>423,171</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,952</td>
<td>239,837</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,497</td>
<td>169,855</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21,036</td>
<td>302,265</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17,759</td>
<td>243,529</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17,823</td>
<td>227,015</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16,706</td>
<td>209,574</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18,332</td>
<td>229,310</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17,159</td>
<td>214,629</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. Top 10 Most Inequitable US Cities (Berube, 2015)**
By using this model, it is believed that a mixed-use commercial center will spur economic development throughout the Southwest corridor; an area of high vacancy and minimal commercial activity. It is important to note that the needs of these two locations were different prior to proposed development. Atlantic Station was needed for environmental remediation of a brownfield while the Oakland City/Fort McPherson redevelopment is needed to make use of a decommissioned military base, in a marginalized community. Though this high-end, mixed-use model has worked in West Midtown, can it work for the needs of the community in Southwest Atlanta?

Research Proposal

The proposal of this research is to build from Nemeth’s research by applying his public management index on a larger scale. With this, comparative case studies will be used to assess the contextual demands for large scale social spaces. This index will be used within Atlantic Station to assess how the publicness of the “high-end, mixed-use” model of Public Private Partnership is affected by management and design. By scoring the established case of Atlantic Station, (Figure 7) understanding of the index variables will be gained within context. An analysis of the current conditions for Fort McPherson and surrounding communities (Figure 8) will be done in order to check this index as an indicator of publicness, and help determine if publicness is a good indicator of desirable social spaces.
Figure 6. Atlantic Station Site Situation (Google Maps 2016)

Figure 8. Fort McPherson/ Oakland City LCI Study Area (MILRA, 2016)
IV. Case Studies

A. Site Selection

Within the Atlanta context, the Atlantic Station case study illustrates how public private partnerships have utilized this urban planning tool to create publically accessible space in areas where they did not formerly exist for public use. Atlantic Station serves as a successful and established case, having been in existence for 11 years, and creating new uses on a completely private space. The intent is to observe behavior and use as an indicator of management control within Atlantic Station to analyze the degree of “publicness” this space employs to make recommendations for the ongoing Oakland City/ Fort McPherson LCI study site. This is an ideal comparison as Atlantic Station is the same approximate size and was the suggested model for any future development plans made as found in the Urban Land Institute’s 2015 Technical Assistance Panel Report. The LCI study area includes the Fort McPherson redevelopment and the Oakland City TOD projects. This project has recently gone through its community outreach and initial design phases, however, the Oakland City TOD project has recently been suspended due to lack of qualifying proposals (Ghani, 2016). Each site offers approximately 140 acres of development space on formerly private use spaces, with the situation of Atlantic Station in the late 90s being similar to the situation of the LCI study. This comparison will provide better understanding of potential successes/failures of the Atlantic Station redevelopment to provide alternative recommendations to the planned Oakland City/ Fort McPherson LCI study area.

---

9 Fort McPherson was technically public space, but being a military base, use was restricted. Private, in this instance, refers to the use/user and accessibility to the general public.
B. Atlantic Station

Atlantic Station is a 138-acre, mixed-used commercial, residential, office, retail, and entertainment development located between Northside Drive and the Atlanta Downtown Connector (Figure 5). The site began as the Atlantic Steel Mill in 1901 when construction began. This mill operated from 1920s to 1980s, with peak production in the 1950s reaching 750,000 tons of steel annually, before closing in 1998. Jacoby Development Inc. and AIG REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION acquired the property in 1999 for redevelopment in light of the EPAs (Worpole, 2007).

Figure 9. Atlantic Station Site Situation (Mundy, 2005)
The Atlantic Station design vision was to create a “high-end mixed use development” that included residential, retail, office, hospitality, and entertainment to be integrated with mass transit. Figure 9 illustrates the 2003-2005 site plan, with the site as an environment where people can “Live, Work, Play,” in addition to the added clean up of a contaminated site. This design aimed to create a dense, walkable environment, which serves to connect neighborhoods and lessen urban sprawl (Mundy, 2005).

The Home Park neighborhood was developed in relation to the Atlantic Steel Mill as a place for the Mill’s workers to live. Incorporated into the City of Atlanta in 1909, Home Park thrived due to its accessibility to major employment and the city center. The neighborhood’s relative decline happened in the 1970’s, around the same time the mill’s production decreased, with many residents leaving for the suburbs. This coincided with the Georgia Institute of Technology expanding, and many students being the target demographic for dilapidated homes turned rental properties. By the early 90’s, the owner-occupancy rate fell to 35%, with the Virginia-Highlands and Central Midtown neighborhoods seeing increases in occupancy (Home Park, 2016).

It was not until the 2002 redevelopment plan, timed around the Atlantic Station Development, that this area began to see increased occupancy. Today’s Home Park community has a residential district, a mixed-use district, as well as a “work-play” area. While these projects were happening around the same, the residents of Home Park pushed back from any developer attempts to connect the two areas. The two thriving areas sit adjacent to one
another in isolation, with auto transport the only safe and efficient method of access between the two (EDAW, 2002).

C. Fort McPherson/Oakland City LCI Area

Figure 10. LCI Context Diagram (Heath, 2015)
This LCI study development can be seen as radiating from two major development areas: The Fort McPherson military base and the Oakland City MARTA station. This redevelopment serves as a major repurposing of public land in an area void of commercial space and quality social space. Each of these areas has been of concern to the City of Atlanta, but Fort McPherson has had several studies and plans for development in the past. The McPherson Implementing Local Redevelopment Authority (MILRA) initially closed on Fort McPherson in September 2011; a year after the former bases decommissioning. The state agency planned to redevelop the base into a mixed-used community development and bioscience hub, but during the Great-Recession funding fell through. With recommendations made by the Urban and Institute’s Technical Assistance Panel Report, and study funding from the Atlanta Regional Commission’s LCI study, recommendations for land use on the remaining MILRA property, the bulk of it being pinned as retail, office/medical, residential, and historic. This property will cater to those who travel on Lee Street, as most of it is on the eastern side of Fort McPherson (Blau). With various engagement meetings with the community, MILRA hopes to act as the master developer for the project, bidding out various phases identified through the process as suggested by the ULI Technical Assistance Report (Sizemore Group, 2015).

A major advantage that the Fort McPherson/Oakland City LCI study area has over Atlantic Station is that it is near two MARTA metro stations, with the Oakland City Station along one of the busiest bus corridors in metropolitan Atlanta. An RFP was issued in September 2015 for a transit-oriented development at the Oakland City MARTA Station to improve the areas surrounding this station through higher density, mixed-use developments. Proposals were due October 30, 2015 and were under review until early spring 2016.
Prior to the issuance of the RFP, MARTA created the Oakland City Station Engagement Report through which they worked with community stakeholders to determine the best future for the area surrounding the Oakland City MARTA station. The process consisted of three meetings, surveys, a market study and renderings. The RFP calls for development around the MARTA station that will increase ridership and revenue, and promote a more sustainable Metropolitan Atlanta. The following TOD guidelines provide a framework for designing and constructing successful TOD projects, according to MARTA:

- Station-area development that is compact and dense relative to its surroundings
- A rich mix of land uses
- A great public realm
- A new approach to parking (less parking)

Firms and contractors who submitted proposals for the RFP utilized these guidelines. The southern parking lot at the Oakland City MARTA Station is pinned to be the first area for development. Although these proposals have not yet been released, the most likely scenario will involve the development of a tax credit property with 100 to 150 units of affordable or age-restricted housing. MARTA consistently monitors parking lot usage and the Oakland City lot has been historically underutilized, and is therefore ripe for development. As shown in Figure 10, the RFP site covers the large parking lots surrounding the MARTA station, as well as a small area across Lee Street, where an alternate entrance is provided for pedestrians (Ward). Recently this TOD project was placed on hold, as the RFP response did not
yield enough qualified applications. The future of this is uncertain, but still a very valuable opportunity for the community.

**C. Observations and Analysis: Atlantic Station**

Atlantic Station was designed as “A city within the city,” broken into three main areas: The District, The Commons, and The Village (Figure 11). The District serves as the main commercial and entertainment area of Atlantic Station with shopping, dining, hotels, banks, and entertainment facilities located here. The Commons serves as the major mixed residential development, adjacent to the commercial space. In this space, a park with a lake and museum are located in the middle of apartment residences with some street level commercial services. The Village is on the most western edge of the development with student housing and an IKEA store. In order to observe the publicness of these spaces, Nemeth’s Public Space Management Index (2007; 2009) was used to score each. The ownership dimension will be discussed in terms of Atlantic Station as a whole, but the management and use/user dimensions will be broken down by location since their management and uses vary. While all areas were evaluated, The District will be used as an in depth example because its intent is to provide more services to the general public. Brief explanations of the scoring of The Commons and The Village will be given. An example of this index with the scoring criteria can be found in Appendix A, along with variable definitions. The 20 variable index is scored on a scale of 1 to 10 and -1 to -10, and divided into positive and negative features that either encourage freedom of use (+) or control users (-). A space that scores 20 correlates to space that is the most public, while a space scoring -20 is the least public.
Atlantic Station: A city within the city

Atlantic Station will formally take its place among Atlanta landmarks Thursday. The multi-use project is on land reclaimed from the old Atlantic Steel site and is intended to be a place where Atlantans can live, shop, work and play. Along with the Georgia Aquarium and the expansion of the High Museum, it is one of three major projects to come to fruition at 2000 comes to a close.

Figure 11. 3D Rendering of Atlantic Station (Atlantic Station, 2004)
The ownership of Atlantic Station is completely private, but received a lot of public funding for access. It was the coordination between private owners and the local government that made this project feasible by the creation of a Tax Allocation District (TAD)\(^\text{10}\). Of the $250 million dollars needed, TADs raised $167 million. In the case of Atlantic Station, there was a significant urgency for site remediation due to the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Out of Compliance status placed on the City of Atlanta for being above federal air quality regulations. Because of this, Atlanta could no longer receiving federal funds for highway

\(^{10}\) In addition to being able to raise large amounts of capital, these tools are attractive to cities and local governments that largely rely on property taxes for funding public services (Evans, 2013).
projects or be able to proceed working on any project requiring federal approval even if no federal money was required.

Developers were able to leverage taking control of 17th Street as a part of the EPAs Project XL, that would consider its improvement as a Transportation Control Measure (TCM) (EPA, 2002). The city’s need would give the development greater accessibility, and help ensure prolonged success. The 17th Street Bridge was a key to providing connectivity, but neighborhood resistance and restrictions of MARTA’s ability to expand direct access is limited to automobiles (Dunham-Jones, 2016). Regardless, 17th Street Bridge is designed to accommodate a future MARTA expansion, and circulation through the site is walkable/bikeable according to Smart Growth strategies, with a shuttle bringing visitors to and from MARTA. This expansion has yet to be seen, though the owners sought to improve this feature by design. The development of the hotel, office, retail and residential places found in Atlantic Station was paid for by the private sector. The benefits that Atlantic Station have provided are not limited to only the environmental aspect since the development also improves neighborhood amenities, creates new housing and new economic properties. A closer look at each area in the site in terms of management and use/users will provide a better idea of how this might affect the publicness within the site.
### The Village

**Table 1. The Village Score Card**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features encouraging freedom of use</th>
<th>$\text{Score (+)}$</th>
<th>Features that control users</th>
<th>$\text{Score (-)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sign announcing 'public space'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1. Visible sets of rules posted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At a commercial building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2. Subjective rules posted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restroom Available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3. In BID</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diversity of seating types</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4. Security cameras</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Various microclimates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5. Security personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lighting to encourage night use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6. Secondary security personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Small-scale food consumption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7. Design implying appropriate use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Art/visual enhancement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8. Presence of sponsorship</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Entrance accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9. Areas of restricted use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Orientation accessibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10. Constrained hours of operation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management**

The vision for this portion of the site is to provide pleasant student housing near Georgia Tech, Georgia State, SCAD, Morehouse, Spelman, Clark Atlanta, among other universities.

Amenities are designed for the community residents with facilities behind gates, with relative location being one of the prime selling points. Shuttle service is provided to MARTA, and commercial and entertainment is within a short walk or drive from the property (JMG Realty, 2016). Because of this, few public resources are available, and direct accessibility is only provided to the Ikea store. Additional social spaces are provided through connectivity to The District. The management of this space effectively works to portray that this portion of Atlantic Station as a predominantly private residential space.
Use/User

The Village offers the least to the general public with IKEA and some student housing. **Table 1 and Figure 12** illustrate how this basic design only allows visitors to access IKEA and residents to access their homes. For any additional needs, a car is needed to travel to the rest of the site. It is the lack of features that make this space less public which is directly related to the management intent. This portion of the site is strictly functional due to its form, offering only shopping as a destination space. Despite having sidewalks near residential areas, any social space present can only be accessed by residents for safety. If the bottom level of residential builds was used to provide open commercial and retail space, publicness could be activated and encourage more social interaction with people throughout the site.

**Figure 12. The Village**
The Commons

Table 2. The Commons Score Card

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features encouraging freedom of use</th>
<th>Score (+)</th>
<th>Features that control users</th>
<th>Score (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sign announcing 'public space'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1. Visible sets of rules posted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At a commercial building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2. Subjective rules posted</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restroom Available</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3. In BID</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diversity of seating types</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4. Security cameras</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Various microclimates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5. Security personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lighting to encourage night use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6. Secondary security personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Small-scale food consumption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7. Design implying appropriate use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Art/visual enhancement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8. Presence of sponsorship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Entrance accessibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9. Areas of restricted use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Orientation accessibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10. Constrained hours of operation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub Total 7

Sub Total 6

Total 1

Management

The Commons is the major residential area within Atlantic Station. Table 2 shows this place to be more public than the Village and District, despite being an area that accommodates largely private functions, there are less restrictive measures made. This is a logical design because residential public spaces typically benefit from the added safety of “eyes on the street” from the local residential populations. The predominant feature within this area is the lake and park in the center of the site that serves as storm water retention, but provides an attractive focal point that is accessible to the general public. The social spaces provided are within interior spaces, for those living in the community. A few ground floors of the lofts are activated by uses
like salons, but the major commercial and retail functions are located a short walk away in The District.

*Use/User*

Benches, shaded walking paths, and a bridge across the lake help to facilitate circulation through the area, but the location of the lake and park are difficult, and somewhat dangerous to access on foot from outside the site. While the goal may have been to limit access, public funding helped to make this feature a reality. This highlights the issues of circulation by non-motorized vehicles throughout the site. One must compete with up to 6 lanes of cars and busses, with the park entrance in the middle of an approximately 90-foot crossing point from Target to the condos (Figure 13). In addition, this area is one of the only social spaces with an openly public “feel” within the entire Atlantic Station development. It is technically an open space, but designed in a way that it is only convenient to be used by residents (Figure 14). If a user from outside of the community does venture into this area, there is no limitation of use. There is an additional green outside of the privately owned Millennium Gate museum. This space is open, with seating available, except when private events are being held (The National Monuments Foundation, 2016). Its serves to create a peaceful microclimate, allowing an escape from the noise of the surrounding roadways.
Figure 13. Park Access within The Commons
Figure 14. True Public Space in Atlantic Station
The District

Table 3. The District Score Card

Management

The first area observed was The District, as it offers the most public services and amenities within Atlantic Station. The data in Table 3 confirms that this area of Atlantic Station is not a true public area, scoring only 50% of the possible points for Features that encourage freedom of use but receiving 75% of the points for Features that control users. The total score of a -5 indicates that The District is a more controlled space than a public space. Despite being controlled, Atlantic Station is a very popular place due to the public amenities available. However, the lack of the diversity of seating types and various microclimates and the presence of visible sets of rules posted and security variables significantly limit the publicness of this space.
Use/User

Lack of Diversity of Seating Types

One of the most popular activities in public spaces is people watching; the ability to sit in public and observe behavior (Whyte, 2005). In order for this to occur, seating should be available in various forms to allow for desired interaction, or solitude. While Atlantic Station does offer public seating, it is very limited in availability and form (Figure 15). Much of the available seating can be found surrounded by chains outside of restaurants and cafes. The design of the seating encourages social interaction as it can be picked up and rearranged, but the chains and limited space discourage use. Stationary benches are the only other type of seating found within The District, and can be found in a few areas outside of stores, facing store windows or walls; the only real reason for sitting in these areas would be necessity or waiting for someone who is shopping. This also links the use of seating to one’s willingness/ability to pay; one must buy something in order to sit comfortably and casually outside.
Creating microclimates are very important in outdoor public spaces to shield visitors from intense sun shine and wind or provide shelter from rain. While there were some microclimates available, they are, once again, tied to restaurant/café seating. **Figure 16** illustrates these spaces that provide covered seating with some limited vegetation to serve as buffers and create outdoor “rooms.” The central green space has wall seating on the periphery with a completely uncovered turf green where various activities might take place.
Signage and Security

The clearest indicator that The District is not a public space relates to signage and surveillance. Figure 17 shows the rules posted throughout The District. Some rules are very viable and clearly state the types of behavior allowed within the space. It is of note that demonstrations are not allowed, a key indicator that this space is not public. Additional signs indicated more subjective rules that include: “No gang-related attire, offensive clothing, or visible undergarments” and “No clothing or apparel that obscure the face unless worn for cultural, religious reasons or medical conditions.” What makes this subjective is that “gang-related attire” and “non-cultural apparel” is decided by the enforcement body. Security

Gangs often associate by colors, not by style of clothing. So simply wearing a shirt of a certain color could be considered “gang attire.” How does one enforce a rule that is based on perception? This type of rule can lead to unfair treatment of users due to bias.
comes in the form of cameras and actual police and security guard patrol. While extremely intimidating, the signage in particular is posted many places throughout the site.

![Image of signage promoting social interactions and requiring a purchase](image)

**Figure 17. Posted Rules**

Some of the signage found clearly promotes social interactions and, some events simply encourage outsiders to come to Atlantic Station to interact by requiring a purchase (**Figure 18**).
Atlantic Station serves as the premier case study of PPPs in Atlanta, Georgia. This area has been the topic of many articles for being able to improve the environment, improve the economic condition of the area, and provide more residential space through high-density, mixed-use development. Though it is very much a private space, Atlantic Station provides much needed public functions. While this development has been successful, there are certain aspects of this development that would not be desirable for the Fort McPherson/Oakland City LCI Study area. This area is already at a high risk of gentrification that would displace and disenfranchise many people who have already been living in declining communities. While the goal is to
improve the quality of life and the economic power of this area, the focus should be to do this in a way that does not force people out of their homes due to high property values without the opportunity to benefit from this growth. A look into the current situation, based on Nemeth’s 3 dimensions, the overall need of this space identifies additional community needs that should be included into the final plans.

**D. Observations and Analysis: The Current Conditions of the Oakland City/Fort McPherson LCI Study Area**

*Ownership*

Midway through 2015, after funding fell through for MILRA’s bioscience development, Tyler Perry purchased 330 acres of the 488 acre Fort McPherson property for a movie studio and MILRA was left with the remaining acres. Tyler Perry will pay $30 million to MILRA, who will then pay the U.S. Army $26 million for the entire base. The first $13 million of the payment will be paid up front, with the rest being paid over a period of seven years. After MILRA oversaw this transaction, they requested assistance of the Atlanta Council of the Urban Land Institute (ULI, 2015) to advise and make recommendations concerning the development opportunities for their portion of the site. Through this study, active community engagement was facilitated to inform potential design solution.

*Management*
While MILRA controls ownership of about 1/3 of this site, it is acting as the community representation within the design process for only that portion. Because it is an agency created through legislation to oversee the public’s role in development, decisions are informed through community meetings and design sessions, but made by the agency’s executive board. The goal has been stated as improving community function that compliments the new function of Tyler Perry’s film studio, while creating new social spaces (ARC, 2016).

Because of the complexity of ownership, management decision must go through a public planning process.

_Use/Users_

Social spaces are what connect communities, without them, publicness is lost. While there are public parks, MARTA metro stations, and a shopping mall with local businesses serving as destination and neighborhood spaces, accessibility to these locations is limited as a result of roadways and railways bisecting the community. The lack of infrastructure is one of the most salient issues in the community. This condition seems absurd considering the presence of MARTA rail stops along the Murphy Avenue/Lee Street Corridor. In addition, Campbellton Road, just north of the Oakland City station, is one of the busiest bus corridors in metro Atlanta (Ward, 2015). This alone should make this area one of the most connected and accessible areas within the metro region; however, basic infrastructure is nonexistent in many areas. **Figures 21 and 22** illustrate typical scenarios throughout the entire study area.
In the Figure 21, the pedestrian is forced to cross active railways and multiple lanes of traffic, while avoiding automobiles due to the lack of sidewalks. It is notable that Lee Street has recently been repaved, but no sidewalk improvements were made, reinforcing the focus on travel by automobiles, and discouraging pedestrian activity. This circumstance is even more unacceptable considering that these areas connect residential areas to major mass transit stations.

![Figure 21. Pedestrians Compete with Cars for Access (Risher, 2015)](image)

The following image (Figure 22) shows a newly paved Lee Street with crosswalk leading to dangerous situations, or literally, nowhere. Footpaths that end abruptly are common sights immediately adjacent to MARTA transit stations, forcing pedestrians to walk through weeds, grasses or along the street.
Figure 22. Infrastructure Leading to Nowhere (Risher, 2015)

Applying Nemeth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oakland City/Fort McPherson LCI Area</th>
<th>Features encouraging freedom of use</th>
<th>Score (+)</th>
<th>Features that control users</th>
<th>Score (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sign announcing 'public space'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Visible sets of rules posted</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At a commercial building</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Subjective rules posted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restroom Available</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. In BID</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diversity of seating types</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Security cameras</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Various microclimates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5. Security personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lighting to encourage night use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6. Secondary security personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Small-scale food consumption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7. Design implying appropriate use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Art/visual enhancement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. Presence of sponsorship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Entrance accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9. Areas of restricted use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Orientation accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10. Constrained hours of operation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub Total                          | 12                                | Sub Total | 6 |
| Total                               | 12                                | Sub Total | 6 |

Table 4. The Oakland City/Fort McPherson LCI Area Score Card
Using Nemeth’s index, the LCI study area actually score’s higher than all of Atlantic Station. The above observations make it clear that this area has some major issues, but when scoring it based on the 3 dimensions of ownership, management, and use/users we see this area with the most publicness. This result, at face value, can be thought to be accurate, but dismal for Atlanta; the most public social spaces are that way because they are simply neglected by owners/managers. Looking deeper into result, the conclusion is that there are some dimensions of publicness that are not being considered.

V. Conclusion

The intent of Atlantic Station as a repurposing of a contaminated site to create a high-end, mixed-used development has been found to be an important asset to neighboring communities. This spaces has become a valuable public amenity, despite having much of its total site limited to private use by residents. Atlantic Station’s publicness is severely limited, but the additions of retail, commercial, residential, and business uses on this site have successfully turned a disused space into a valuable social space. While this improvement was necessary, its overall effectiveness was limited, as a result of connectivity to the larger network of social spaces within Atlanta. These issues stem from problems beyond the control of the owner, management, and use/users dimensions.

The comparative scoring of Atlantic Station and the LCI study and indicate that the 3 dimensional model for publicness does not necessarily yield desirable social spaces. This is believed to be a result of scale. Circulation within a contained site is easier to balance social needs, but on a larger scale, more of public life is contained and affected. It is proposed that for
large-scale social spaces, quality of life should be an added variable as management decisions affect the daily life of the user.

**Improved Quality of Life**

In addition to Nemeth’s proposed variables of publicness, quality of life is a major factor that is not considered. Quality of life is believed to be a reflection of the success and health of the community. Social spaces serve as connection points for circulation, just as social spaces should not be defined solely on aesthetics or ownership, its success should not only judge whether or not use/users are present. Social spaces, whether publicly or privately owned, should serve as a valuable asset to the community. The Oakland City/Fort McPherson LCI study area illustrates the need for users to safely and comfortably access social spaces; this lack of access serves as an indicator of lack in the community, despite being open to public use. Lack of connectivity can serve as a proxy for the quality of social space, and, thus, the quality of life in a community. Typically value is assessed with economics and feasibility, but here it is believed to better assessed by planning process and improved quality of life through connectivity within the larger system of spaces. The Atlantic Station case proves that safe access to the larger regional system of social spaces, the public can be better served. All social needs and interactions can be accommodated through ease of accessibility, but in creating communities, there must be an interactive relationship between the community, the government, and the private sector.

*Figure 19* illustrates the ideal interactivity of community development. There are three main sectors that are involved, whether directly or indirectly, in the design and shaping of
cities. Ideally, citizens, government, and the private sector work together to define, envision, and produce places that improve and sustain livable communities. In this scenario, the Government Sector provides the basic framework for regulation, capital, and infrastructure to facilitate community growth and development (Dobbins, 2016). This role is filled by Redevelopment Plans and Infrastructure Bonds and through agencies like the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) and the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC). The Community Sector is comprised of local residents, civic leaders, and businesses. They serve as the deciding factor of the viability and vitality of a community, and, ultimately, can make or break a project. The Private Sector, comprised of developers, planners, contractors, architects, etc., is responsible for planning, developing, and implementing design solutions. In theory, each sector should interact and work together towards a common goal of improving place, but in practice this is often not the case.

Figure 19. Illustration of Michael Dobbins’ Planning Interactivity Theory (2009)
The diagram on the right illustrates the actual interactivity that tends to take place between the three sectors. The real process happens between the government and private sectors, while the community is only very loosely associated with the development process. The neighborhoods surrounding Fort McPherson face many challenges, including high housing vacancy, high unemployment rates, and poor connectivity, among other issues.

To begin to define the quality of life dimension, variables that consider policies and zoning should be included to help leverage existing assets, while improving the quality of everyday life for existing and future residents. Zoning and policy become just as important as the owners and managers, as it allows the community to be able set standards for developers and investors. If an amendment is needed then the developer must work with the city and provide some benefit to the community to gain approval; a very powerful means to improve social conditions in addition to the physical changes needed. Planning tools should be amended to better suit the needs of the community, even if those needs are not drivers of economy. When private interests are involved, this equitable, community based development can only happen if it becomes the standard, not an option. Special zoning overlays would allow for policy to create consistency, shape that character, organize various forms of transportation, and provide for public safety (Figure 24).
Figure 24. Example SPI-16 Guidelines (Midtown Alliance, 2013)
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### Table A1. Index Variables (Nemeth and Schmidt, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features encouraging freedom of use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign announcing ‘public space’</td>
<td>Laws/rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = none present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = one small sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = one large sign or two or more signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a commercial building</td>
<td>Surveillance/policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = no office/commercial component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = mixed use - residential/commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = office/commercial component only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Available</td>
<td>Design/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = none present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = available for customers only or difficult to access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = readily available to all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of seating types</td>
<td>Design/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = no seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = only one type of stationary seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = two or more types of seating or substantial moveable seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various microclimates</td>
<td>Design/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = no sun or no shade or fully exposed to wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = some sun/shade, overhangs/shielding from wind and rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = several distinct microclimates, extensive overhangs, trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting to encourage night use</td>
<td>Design/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = none present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = one type or style of lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = several lighting types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale food consumption</td>
<td>Design/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = none present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = one basic kiosk or stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = two or more kiosk/stands or one larger take-out stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/visual enhancement</td>
<td>Design/image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = none present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = one or two minor installations; statues or fountains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = one major interactive installation; free performances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A1. Index Variables Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance accessibility</td>
<td>Design/image&lt;br&gt;0 = gated or key access only at all times&lt;br&gt;1 = one constricted entry; several entries through doors/gates&lt;br&gt;2 = more than one entrance without gates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation accessibility</td>
<td>Access/territoriality&lt;br&gt;0 = not on street level or blocked off from public sidewalk&lt;br&gt;1 = street-level but oriented away from public sidewalk&lt;br&gt;2 = visible with access off sidewalk (fewer than five steps)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Features that control users**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible sets of rules posted</td>
<td>Laws/rules&lt;br&gt;0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = one sign or posting&lt;br&gt;2 = two or more signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective rules posted</td>
<td>Laws/rules&lt;br&gt;0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = one rule visibly posted&lt;br&gt;2 = two or more rules visibly posted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In BID</td>
<td>Surveillance/policing&lt;br&gt;0 = not in BID&lt;br&gt;1 = in a BID with maintenance duties only&lt;br&gt;2 = in a BID with maintenance and security duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security cameras</td>
<td>Surveillance/policing&lt;br&gt;0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = one stationary camera&lt;br&gt;2 = two or more stationary cameras or any panning/moving camera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security personnel</td>
<td>Surveillance/policing&lt;br&gt;0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = one private security guard or up to two public security personnel&lt;br&gt;2 = two or more private security or more than two public personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Scoring criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary security personnel</td>
<td>0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = one person or space oriented towards reception&lt;br&gt;2 = two or more persons or one person with space oriented at reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design implying appropriate use</td>
<td>0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = only one or more major examples&lt;br&gt;2 = several examples throughout space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of sponsorship</td>
<td>0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = one medium sign or several small signs&lt;br&gt;2 = larger sign or two or more signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of restricted use</td>
<td>0 = none present&lt;br&gt;1 = one small area restricted to certain members of public&lt;br&gt;2 = larger area for consumers; several small restricted areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained hours of operation</td>
<td>0 = open 24 hours/day, 7 days/week, most days of the year&lt;br&gt;1 = part of space open past business hours or at weekends&lt;br&gt;2 = open business hours only; portions permanently closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2. Variable definitions: features encouraging freedom of use (Nemeth and Schmidt, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laws/rules</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign announcing ‘public space’</td>
<td>Most zoning codes require publicly accessible spaces exhibit plaques indicating such. Some spaces are clearly marked with signs denoting their public nature (for example, New York’s Sony Plaza), but when a sign or plaques is hidden by trees/shrubs or has graffiti covering it, its intent becomes null.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a commercial building</td>
<td>Spaces located outside office buildings often allow use by public after business hours or at weekends. Spaces at residential buildings more likely to be open to residents only (often with key access). As most residences employ door persons/reception, after-hours surveillance is likely to be greater than at an office/commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveillance/policing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design/image</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Available</td>
<td>Clearly, some spaces are not large enough to merit a public restroom. Realizing that free public restrooms often attract homeless persons, managers often remove them all together or locate them in on-site cafes or galleries available to paying customers only (or providing keyed access for ‘desirable’ patrons).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of seating types</td>
<td>Amount of seating is often most important factor for encouraging use of public space. Users often evaluate entry to space based on amount of available seating and ability to create varying ‘social distances.’ Moveable chairs allow maximum flexibility and personal control in seating choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various microclimates</td>
<td>Spaces with various microclimates enclaves enlarge choice and personal control for users. Potential features might include: shielding from wind; overhangs to protect from rain; areas receiving both sun and shade during day; or trees/shrubs/grass to provide connections with natural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting to encourage night use</td>
<td>Studies indicate that vulnerable populations often avoid public spaces at night if not if well-lit. Lighting spaces encourages 24-hour use, which has been shown to make visitors feel safer/more secure. However, critics argue that night lighting aids surveillance efforts and implies authoritative control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale food consumption</td>
<td>Most agree that food vendors enhance activity and vitality. This variable only includes small cafes, kiosks, carts or stand selling food, drinks, or simple convenience items. Sit-downs restaurants, clothing stores, and other full-scale retail establishments are not described by this variable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/cultural/visual enhancement</td>
<td>Art and aesthetic attraction can encourage use. Variable can include stationary visual enhancements like statures, fountains, or sculptures. Also rotating art exhibits, public performances, farmers’ markets, or street fairs. Interactive features encourage use and personal control by curious patrons (often children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/territoriality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance accessibility</td>
<td>If a space has locked doors or gates, requires a key to enter, or has only one constricted entry, it often feels more controlled or private than one with several non-gated entrances. In indoor spaces, where users must enter through doors or past checkpoints, symbolic access and freedom of use are diminished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation accessibility</td>
<td>Spaces must be well integrated with sidewalk and street, as those oriented away from surrounding sidewalk or located several feet above or below street level, make space less inviting. Well-used spaces are clearly visible from sidewalk and users should be able to view surrounding public activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3. Variable definitions: features that control users (Nemeth and Schmidt, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laws/rules</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible sets of rules posted</td>
<td>Official, visible signs listing sets of rules and regulations (not individual rules) on permanent plaques or ‘table tenets’. Listed rules should generally be objective and easily enforceable, like prohibitions against smoking, sitting on ledges, passing out flyers without permission, or drinking alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective/judgement rules posted</td>
<td>Official, visible signs listing individual rules describing activities prohibited after personal evaluations and judgements of desirability by owners, managers, or security guards. Such rules include: no disorderly behavior, no disturbing other users, no loitering, no oversized baggage, or appropriate attire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveillance/policing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Business Improvement District (BID)</td>
<td>Spaces located in business improvement districts (BIDs) are more likely to have electronic surveillance and private security guards and less likely to include public input into decisions regarding park management. BIDs can employ roving guards to patrol especially problematic neighborhood spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security cameras</td>
<td>Although cameras must visible to the observer to counted, many cameras are hidden from view. Cameras are often located inside buildings or on surrounding buildings but are oriented toward spaces. Stationary cameras are more common, often less intimidating than moving/panning cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security personnel</td>
<td>Scoring dependant on time of visit. Publicly funded police, park rangers, private security guards. For index, score only when security is dedicated to space. Since private security only directed by property owner, often more controlling (and score higher on index) since police trained more uniformly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary security personnel</td>
<td>Scoring dependant on time of visit. Includes maintenance staff, door persons, reception, cafe or restaurants employees, and bathroom attendants. Also, spaces often oriented directly toward windowed reception or information area to ensure constant employee supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design/image</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design implying appropriate use</td>
<td>Small design to control user behavior or imply appropriate use. Examples might include: metal spikes on ledges; walls, barriers, bollards, to constrict circulation or to direct pedestrian flow; rolled, canted, or overly narrow and unsittable ledges; or crossbars on benches to deter reclining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A3. Variable definitions: features that control users (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of sponsor/advertisement</td>
<td>Signs, symbols, banners, umbrellas, plaques tied to space's infrastructure, not to immediate services provided (for example, cafes, kiosks). While non-advertised space is important for seeking diversion from city life, sponsored signs/plaques can push sponsors to dedicated resources for upkeep since company name is visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access/territoriality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of restricted/conditional use</td>
<td>Portions of space off-limits during certain times of day, days of week, or portions of the year. Can also refer to seating/tables only open to cafe patrons, bars open only to adults, dog parks, playgrounds, corporate events open to shareholders only, and spaces for employees of surrounding buildings only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrained hours of operation</td>
<td>While some spaces are permitted to close certain hours of day, spaces not open 24 hours inherently restrict usage to particular populations. Also, while usually due to lack of adequate supervision, spaces open only during weekday business hours clearly prioritize employee use over general public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>