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ABSTRACT

In *Ornament and Crime*, Adolf Loos stated, “Architecture arouses sentiments in man. The architect’s task therefore, is to make those sentiments more precise” (Tournikiotis, P., 1994, pg. 30; Loos, 1908/1998). Today, that sentiment can be described as place attachment, or feelings of bonding that occur between individuals and environments that are personally meaningful (Scannell and Gifford, 2010). For many, these special environments are historic urban areas, which over the past century have undergone tremendous change. However, as the pace of revitalization quickens, conflicts regarding adaptive use and new development have also increased due to the competing interests of heritage (historical and cultural importance), preservation (preserving, restoring, and adaptive use), and planning (economic development, revitalization). As regulatory processes have an immediate and profound effect on shaping development within historic districts, it will become essential to address how these regulations affect revitalization and development within historic areas.

Many locally designated historic districts rely on preservation experts, outside consultants, and government officials to develop design guidelines for locally designated districts. However, this is a process that can have limited public participation or coordination with a comprehensive preservation planning program (Lawson, 1993; Stipe, 2003). Lacking community input, the design guidelines can inadvertently overlook places or elements within the district that the community values. Instead, design guidelines often emphasize a particular era in that district’s history as the “period of significance” for structures within the historic district, in which the focus is placed on architectural
characteristics, elements, and aesthetics of the chosen period. This can result in regulatory bodies recommending the removal or alteration architectural elements deemed inappropriate for the original structure in favor of projects that conform to the aesthetics of the chosen era (Hurley, 2010). While these “inappropriate” elements could have been added decades after original construction and in a disparate style, the 50 year metric for defining “historic” means these additions have since become historic in their own right. The question then becomes which “historic” architecture is more significant and worthy of preservation? This contradiction can heighten tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning since the guidelines generally have no mechanism to incorporate deeper social significance or heritage concerns into the evaluation and regulation of historic resources.

Given the revitalization and redevelopment challenges that historic districts face, the purpose of this research is to explore the relationship between place attachment and the design regulatory process within locally designated historic districts. Through such an exploration, the research seeks to understand whether or not identifying the existing place attachments could ease tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning by helping communities develop consensus and support for redevelopment projects that are affected by the regulatory process. As part of the research purpose, the primary research objective is to develop a replicable methodology that communities can utilize in developing and updating their design guidelines. The research methodology will allow communities to identify architectural elements that capture the unique character of their historic districts and foster and strengthen place attachment among residents and visitors.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

“We shape our buildings, thereafter they shape us.”
Winston Churchill

1.1 Introduction to Research Study

1.1.1 Description of the Research Problem

In *Ornament and Crime*, Adolf Loos stated, “Architecture arouses sentiments in man. The architect’s task therefore, is to make those sentiments more precise” (Tournikiotis, P., 1994, pg. 30; Loos, 1908/1998). Today, that sentiment can be described as place attachment, or feelings of bonding that occur between individuals and environments that are personally meaningful (Scannell and Gifford, 2010). For many, these special environments are historic urban areas, which over the course of the past century have been affected by the introduction of the automobile, neglect resulting from the abandonment of the inner cities in favor of rapidly growing suburbs, urban renewal, and most recently revitalization and redevelopment. However, as the pace of revitalization increases, there are increasing conflicts due to the competing interests of heritage (historical and cultural importance), preservation (preserving, restoring, and adaptive use), and planning (economic development, revitalization).

The recent demolition of the Charleston County Library in the historic city center in Charleston, SC in August 2013 serves as a primary example of this disconnect. The Architectural Review Board approved plans for the demolition of one of “the few overtly modern buildings built in Charleston's historic district” to make way for a Neo-
Classically designed high-end hotel (Behre, 2013). While the building’s International Style design was controversial at the time of its construction, as the Charleston Preservation Society Director, Evan Thompson, discussed the historical and cultural significance (heritage) of the building goes beyond its architectural style. The library served as an important social justice landmark as the city’s first fully integrated public building. As Thompson noted, the approval of the demolition highlighted the need for objective standards that consider both aesthetics and cultural significance (Behre, 2013). While attitudes towards the preservation of later architectural styles have been adapting, design guidelines and regulatory processes that regulate development have been slower to respond. These design guidelines, developed to ensure compatibility and protect the integrity of the historic district, often have failed to integrate architectural elements that guide the proposed renovations, additions, or restorations of buildings constructed with a more modern aesthetic. As design guidelines and other regulatory processes, such as zoning, have an immediate and profound effect on shaping development within historic districts, it will become essential to address how these regulations affect revitalization and development within historic areas. Investigations into residents’ feelings of place attachment towards the historic district could offer insights into how one might reconcile such dissonance.

To develop the design guidelines for locally designated districts, city governments often rely on preservation experts, outside consultants, and government officials. Design guidelines were originally heavily influenced by the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, which served as model and guide. Design guidelines have since
evolved to tailor more specifically to the character of the historic district, utilizing historic surveys and inventories of the districts to focus on the different architectural styles and development patterns of the area. A public participation process to gain input and feedback from the community is an important component in developing design guidelines. However, the process can vary from very limited (informational hearing) to extensive (community visioning meetings, visual preference surveys, focus groups, etc.). (Lawson, 1993; Stipe, 2003). While input from the community can provide valuable information for developing the guidelines, even in robust community participation events, the emphasis is placed on aesthetics. This in turn results in design guidelines that will emphasize a particular era in that district’s history as the “period of significance”, in which the focus is placed on architectural characteristics, elements, and aesthetics of the chosen period. Design review boards and other regulatory bodies often then recommend the removal or alteration of structures or architectural elements deemed inappropriate for the original structure, such as the façade cladding of historic commercial storefronts that was common in the mid-century, in favor of renovation or adaptive use projects that conform to the aesthetics of the chosen era (Hurley, 2010). While these elements could have been added decades after original construction and in an disparate style, the 50 year metric for defining “historic” means these additions have since become historic in their own right. Some preservationists insist that these more modern buildings were inappropriate additions when they were initially built, and therefore the district would be best served by renovating the façade to be more contextual, or replacing the “incompatible”, and often “non-contributing” building entirely with a more appropriate
infill project. Others argue that these buildings should be protected and preserved to maintain their original design intent as examples of a specific era in architectural expression.

These differences in preservation theory have led to conflicting notions within the preservation profession. While the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation recommends that renovations and additions to historic structures be “sympathetic” to the surrounding structures, they also mandate that these renovations and/or additions are different enough as to be easily distinguished from adjacent historic buildings. It states that renovations should be “distinct from the architectural composition and must bear a contemporary stamp” (NPS, 2001). This recommendation is sufficiently vague as to create great contention between local governments, including design review boards, which often use the Standards as the basis for their design guidelines, as well as developers, architects, and the general public as they try to puzzle out the most “appropriate” way to handle such projects. In determining the “appropriateness” of projects, the question then becomes which “historic” architecture is more significant and worthy of preservation? This contradiction can heighten tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning since the guidelines generally have no mechanism to incorporate deeper social significance or heritage concerns into the evaluation and regulation of historic resources.

To further complicate the issue, many residents and tourists have expressed an aesthetic preference for “historic” architecture over later architectural styles (Levi, 2005). Due to the emphasis on aesthetics, the development of design guidelines for historic
overlay districts does not always consider factors such as place attachment, sense of place, or community heritage. The omission of these elements can undermine both residents’ and visitors’ ability to develop meaningful attachments to the place and its history (Hurley, 2010). If historic districts maintain structures from different eras as a visible reminder of the urban development and change that cities experience over time, residents can develop more profound feelings of place attachment to the area (Hurley, 2010). The developments that occurred throughout the city over a period of time can then be traced visually, and residents will be able to connect those changes with other historically significant events, or even a certain point in their own lives (Lynch, 1965; Alexander, 1977).

The emphasis on “period of significance” also has implications for place attachment and sense of place in the historic district. While place attachment and sense of place issues are related, the differences can result in conflicting strategies for the future development of historic districts. Place attachment, generally developed through longer exposure to a place, cultural or historic ties to the area, and memory association can benefit from the continued development and evolution of an area (Smaldone, Harris, and Sanyal, 2005). In this regard, the continued protection and integration of buildings that represent different periods of architectural development would foster stronger attachment and identification with a place. Sense of place, however, varies slightly from place attachment by incorporating the impact of “social and geographical context of place bonds and the sensing of places” into the development of the emotional value that a person places on a specific place (Hay, 1998). The stronger visual and experiential nature
of sense of place benefits from the theories in preservation that promote “intact” historic districts. As an intact historic downtown can serve as a tourist attraction and thus boost economic development, many communities develop design guidelines and other regulatory powers based on the trend towards developing a uniform and intact district. This focus will create what Hay describes as a “superficial” sense of place, in which tourists feelings of place were “of an aesthetic nature, appreciating the scenic qualities and amenities…with no rootedness or attachment to place” (Hay, 1998, pg. 9).

As historic districts continue to face mounting development pressures, it is essential to not only protect the architectural elements that define the area, but also the area’s heritage. Without a comprehensive understanding of the specific places and characteristics of the historic district that the community values, as well as the social and historical reasons why those attachments were developed, any revitalization efforts are at best creating places based on purely aesthetic considerations, or at worst destroying the characteristics of place that made them special.

1.2 Significance of the Research Study

This research aims to fill a gap in the design guideline process by identifying the physical characteristics (architectural features, environmental features, and urban features) that impact the process of place attachment, manifested in the three dimensions of place attachment (person, place, process) (Scannell and Gifford, 2010). As Lewicka explains, “we know relatively much about who are the attached people, how and how much they are attached, but relatively little about which places have the highest
‘attachment potential’ and through which processes the attachment is achieved” (Lewicka, 2011, pg. 223). This research seeks to address this research gap, and in doing so help to not only further inform and guide the design regulatory process, but help community planners and officials “understand the nature of people’s relationships to place and to develop a more holistic view of how such relationships influence our experiences of place and the success of our communities” (Manzo et. al., 2006, pg. 336).

1.3 Research Purpose and Objectives

Given the revitalization and redevelopment challenges that historic districts face, the purpose of this research is to explore the relationship between place attachment and the design regulatory process within locally designated historic districts in Savannah, Georgia. Through such an exploration, the research seeks to understand whether or not identifying the existing place attachments could ease tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning by helping communities develop consensus and support for redevelopment projects that are affected by the regulatory process. As part of the research purpose, the primary research objective is to develop a replicable methodology that communities can utilize in developing and updating their design guidelines. The research methodology will allow communities to identify architectural elements that capture the unique character of their historic districts as well as to foster and strengthen place attachment among residents and visitors.
1.4 Research Questions

1.4.1 Primary Research Question

The research questions will be organized into a primary research question, and two specific research questions that will guide the research methodology. Based on the stated research objectives, the main primary research question is as follows:

**Can identifying, prioritizing, and integrating residents’ feelings of place attachment into the design regulatory process ease the tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning by aiding communities in developing consensus?**

1.4.2 Secondary Research Questions

To more effectively answer the general research question, several more specific research questions will be examined in the research design. Part I of the research design will focus on examining the relationship between place attachment and adaptive use within historic districts. This will include overall feelings of place attachment, the affect of adaptive use on overall feelings of place attachment, and feelings about specific adaptive use projects within the historic district. Part II of the research design will focus on a more in-depth examination of resident feelings of place attachment, and will be used to uncover the points of convergence and dissonance between the elements of the design guidelines, including their boundaries and recommendations, and places identified as meaningful to the respondents. The specific research questions that will guide the research design are as follows:

**To what extent do buildings renovated under the existing design**
guidelines in Savannah’s locally designated historic districts preserve the key architectural characteristics of places with the highest reported levels of place attachment?

To what extent do individual architectural elements contribute to resident feelings of place attachment in Savannah’s locally designated historic district?

1.5 Foundational Theoretical Framework

The epistemological basis for this research study and its design are based on the constructionist perspective. For constructionists, “there is no objective truth waiting for us to discover it. Truth, or meaning, comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities in our world” (Crotty, 1998, pg. 8-9). The focus is on the creation of subjective meanings of experiences within the world, and in this study in particular, with the historic city fabric. A critical distinction to address regarding constructionist epistemology are the differences in ontological beliefs which in turn directly impact the epistemological positions. For example, some constructionist researchers (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Guba and Lincoln, 2005) utilize a relativist ontology in which “there are multiple realities” which are also socially constructed (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, pg. 24). However, as a researcher interested in the built environment, I agree instead with Michael Crotty’s description of constructionism, in which the ontology is based instead on realism, asserting that ‘reality’ exists outside of the mind (Crotty, 1998). This is to say that the meanings that individuals and a larger community or society assign to the built environment is socially constructed based on both personal and cultural experience.
However, the physical environment itself exists as an object separate from the meanings ascribed to it. As Crotty explicitly states, “realism in ontology and constructionism in epistemology turn out to be quite compatible” (Crotty, 1998, pg. 11). These distinctions will allow for the use of mixed methodology in the data collection strategies and analysis while maintaining a consistent epistemological viewpoint.

1.6 Chapter Overview and Organization

This research study is organized according to the generally accepted format of literature review, research methodology, data analysis, and discussion/conclusion. The review of the literature in Chapter 2 examines the theoretical foundations of preservation, planning, and heritage discourse, conflicts arising from different perspectives, and finally an analysis of place attachment theory and literature. Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology, including the research design, data collection strategies and methods, and data analysis strategies. Chapter 4 will provide the research findings, including statistical analysis of the survey data, as well as analysis and mapping of the qualitative data collected through the photo elicitation portion of the study. The final chapter will outline the study conclusions, including a discussion of the findings, their implications, and the limitations of the study, as well as future recommendations for research.
CHAPTER TWO

Theoretical Foundations and Review of the Literature

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of a literature review is to develop and formulate better research questions through the clarification of the existing literature and possible gaps in the research (Yin, 2009). As this research covers multiple areas, the literature review will be divided into several sections including preservation literature, heritage literature, and planning literature. The conflicts and overlaps in the foundational theories of these fields will also be discussed. Finally, a section covering place attachment literature and theory will be included. This section will discuss place attachment theory as a possible means of establishing consensus among the conflicting aspects of preservation, heritage, and planning.

2.2 Historic Preservation Theory and Practice

2.2.1 Theoretical Foundations in Historic Preservation

Many of the theoretical underpinnings that drove the development of the modern preservation movement were based on the ideas of two people, Viollet-le-Duc, and John Ruskin. Their opinions regarding preservation were polar opposites, and even today, preservation efforts fall within a spectrum based on these approaches. Many of Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc’s architectural theories served as the foundation for the development of the historic preservation movement. The level of adherence to or rejection of their incompatible viewpoints shaped the theoretical basis for preservation practice over the
past century. For each man, his beliefs regarding the importance of historic resources for future generations, as well as their appropriate uses, drove their different approaches to historic preservation. For Viollet-le-Duc, a French architect in the mid-nineteenth century, the focus of preservation should be on restoring and improving historic sites (Tyler 2009). Known for adding architectural embellishments and alterations that had no historical basis, Viollet-le-Duc believed that “to restore an edifice means neither to maintain it, nor to repair it, nor to rebuild it; it means to reestablish it in a finished state, which may in fact have never existed at any given time” (Viollet-le-Duc, 1990, pg. 195).

In contrast, John Ruskin, a contemporary of Viollet-le-Duc’s was an English art critic who believed that buildings should not be preserved at all, but allowed to succumb to the natural decay of time (Tyler 2009). Ruskin stated, “it is impossible, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture.” (Ruskin, 1998, pg. 184).

Ruskin’s writing focused on restoration issues primarily in the Lamp of Memory chapter of The Seven Lamps of Architecture. Within this chapter, Ruskin described architecture as the means by which man can remember history, stating “we may live without her, and worship without her, but we cannot remember without her” (Ruskin, 1998, pg. 131). However, Ruskin also emphasized his belief that architecture of the past did not belong to the current generation; therefore they had no right to alter such works. He stated, “They are not ours. They belong partly to those who built them, partly to all the generations of mankind who are to follow us” (Ruskin, 1998, pg. 137). Instead, historic structures could only serve as a means for remembering the past, and therefore
one should extend their life cycle through maintenance without replacing or altering the structure (Semes, 2009). In direct contrast to Ruskin’s romantic notion of the past, as Choay explained, “Viollet-le-Duc’s nostalgia is for the future, not for the past” (Choay, 2001, pg. 105). This attitude explains Viollet-le-Duc’s acceptance and focus on not only on utilizing new materials and building techniques, such as prefabrication, but also his belief in the need to improve upon existing structures. Viollet-le-Duc emphasized this belief in his statement that “It would be foolish to reproduce an obviously flawed arrangement” (Choay, 2001, pg. 105).

However, as the historic preservation movement has evolved there has also been a shift in the definition of certain terms, such as restoration, from their historical definitions to its modern application. The National Park Service’s (NPS) Department of the Interior has defined four different approaches to the utilization of historic resources: preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction (NPS, 2001). Restoration, as utilized by both Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc, represented a different approach to management of historic resources as the term now implies. In the 19th century, restoration referred to a process much more similar to the current use of the term rehabilitation, which is defined by the NPS’s Department of the Interior as “the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values” (NPS, 2001).

For Ruskin, restoration of historic architecture was impossible because the “spirit which is given only by the hand and eye of the workman, never can be recalled” (Ruskin,
1998, pg. 135). Instead, Ruskin’s viewpoint corresponded most closely with the Department of the Interior’s current use of the term preservation, which is defined as “the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property” (NPS, 2001). According to Ruskin, historic buildings could be maintained so as to increase their natural life span, but not “restored” in the sense that original materials or elements were replaced. He explained “watch an old building with anxious care; guard it as best you may, and at any cost, from every influence of dilapidation. Count its stones as you would jewels of a crown” (Ruskin, 1998, pg. 196). This viewpoint is consistent with current preservation practices regarding “preservation”, which discourages any “inauthentic” alterations. However, modern practices do allow for “the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project” (NPS, 2001). In addition, the idea that new materials, additions, or alterations should be “differentiated” from the original historic structure also originated with Ruskin (Semès, 2009). While this notion was not expressed in the Lamp of Architecture, Ruskin issued a doctrine in conjunction with William Morris and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings that expanded upon this view (Semès, 2009).

Viollet-le-Duc’s approach incorporated all of the approaches outlined by the Department of the Interior. However, his belief in improving upon the existing structure through the addition of new architectural elements surpassed the scope of current approaches by expanding upon the original design or intent of the historic building
(Pevsner, 1969). However, the adjustments were based upon Viollet-le-Duc’s assessment of individual sites including structural analysis and understanding of architectural language. While some interventions were fabricated by Viollet-le-Duc, in many projects his methods were compatible with current preservation practices. Viollet-le-Duc stated, “the best way to preserve a building is to find a use for it, and then to satisfy so well needs dictated by that use there will never be any further need to make any further changes in the building” (Viollet-le-Duc, 1990, pg. 256). This view regarding preservation is one that is gaining traction in preservation, as the need to find viable uses for deteriorating historic resources grows.

2.2.2 The Emergence of Modern Historic Preservation Practice

While preservation theory in Europe and then the United States was originally driven by the architectural theories of Viollet-le-Duc and John Ruskin, following fundamental shifts in design, planning, and building practices at the end of World War II, the theoretical foundations of the historic preservation movement have become vague and ambiguous (Tyler, 2009). While early preservation efforts in the United States focused on significance that was driven by cultural value and meaning, that emphasis has been replaced by an outlook governed by objective determinations of authenticity and significance (Glendinning, 2013). For many preservationists today, the value of a historic resource was “not determined by what happened there” or what that might symbolize or represent, “but by how authentic it is” (Milligan, 2007, pg. 115).

Cultural values and meanings are secondary to issues of “authenticity” determined
through a combination of material originality, structural integrity, and the extent of alterations. The structured and ordered approach to the National Register process and administrative aspects of the historic preservation movement are at odds with the context sensitive and interpretive approach used in practice. What results are essential conflicts within the historic preservation movement itself, especially when determining the theoretical foundations for historic preservation and how those should then guide its practice.

In 1966, the passing of the National Historic Preservation Act significantly changed historic preservation in the United States. One of the most important provisions of the Act was the creation of the National Register of Historic Places to identify and recognize “districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture” (National Park Service, 1997b, pg. i). The register also allowed nationally significant buildings to be recognized and protected without falling under the management of the NPS. This greatly reduced the financial burden on the federal government to maintain the properties (Sprinkle, 2007). This act also shifted the focus on individual sites of national importance to include sites and districts of broader levels of significance, from local to national (Sprinkle, 2007). However, as part of the nomination process, a protocol was established to distinguish “historic” and “significant” places from those less worthy. What resulted was a set of guidelines to determine the significance of a place based on four specific criterion; a) association with events, activities, or patterns b) association with important persons c) distinctive physical characteristics of design, construction, or form d) potential to yield
important information (National Park Service, 1997b, pg. 3).

Once significance was established, the integrity of the site could then be evaluated. Historic integrity, as defined by the National Register criteria, is the “authenticity of a property’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s prehistoric or historic period” (National Park Service, 1997b, pg. 4). This concept is also the “composite” of seven qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (National Park Service, 1997b, pg. 4). It is through the process of determining integrity that allows a site to properly convey its significance to the public. Following this line of thinking, under the protocol established by the National Park Service, without the ability to prove integrity based on the seven qualities, a place cannot be considered significant. This theoretical stance invariably links physical features with significance, thus eliminating intangible cultural or historical significance. While two of the qualities in establishing integrity are “feeling” and “association” meant to capture this idea, however, according to the National Register, these two qualities taken alone, without support from the other five criteria, are not sufficient to determine significance. They explain, “because feeling and association depend on individual perceptions, their retention alone is never sufficient to support eligibility of a property for the National Register” (National Park Service, 1997a, pg. 45).

The amount of resources that survive from the past is vast, and determining how those resources can be utilized is an ongoing debate in planning, architecture, and preservation. Historic preservation issues are invariably linked with legal issues related to property and land ownership, as well as regulation and management of the built
environment. Historic preservation is also a process that is mediated by regulation, through which interpretation and presentation of the site, structure, landscape, or district affects how the site is experienced (Barthel, 1996). This is especially true for areas that fall under design guidelines and design review, which is a very powerful policy mediator for historic preservation, affecting issues such as authenticity and significance.

As a means of standardizing historic preservation efforts, the National Park Service’s Department of the Interior developed the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Originally published in 1979, these standards provide guidance for each of the four approaches, however, the Standards for Rehabilitation include a set of ten items specifically related to rehabilitation and new construction within historic areas. While these ten standards outline best practices for rehabilitation, the language used is vague enough to create confusion. For example, standard nine outlined the need for additions, renovations, or new construction to “be differentiated from the old and will be compatible” with the remaining structure (National Park Service, 1997c, pg. vii). The standard stated,

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

However, the question then becomes, how to be both “differentiated” and “compatible”? According to the Department of the Interior, “compatible design” is defined as “capable of existing together in harmony” (NPS, 2001). As the definition of a vague concept is in and of itself vague, this leads to not only contradictions within the
standards, but also subjectivity and confusion in the development and implementation of design guidelines. It is important to recognize the influence of international historic preservation discourse on historic preservation theory in the United States following World War II, including the Venice Charter, held in 1964. “The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites” included best practices for historic preservation, promoting the use of modern building technologies and materials to differentiate historic structures from their modern counterparts (Murtagh, 2006, pg. 150). The language utilized in the Venice Charter is often echoed in the Secretary of the Interior Standards, drawing a clear line from global historic preservation discourse and practice to the United States.

While the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are recommendations and not regulatory in capacity, they often serve as the foundations of local regulations (Stipe, 2013). Additionally, in some cases, local design guidelines are developed from the Secretary of Interior Standards without much emphasis on tailoring those standards to better address specific local character or architectural expression. This then increases the degree of confusion due to a lack of specification and tailoring (Stipe, 2003). The importance of tailoring design guidelines is highlighted by the dramatic increase in local government involvement in historic preservation since the 1980s, specifically of local preservation commissions, which increased from approximately 500 in 1980 to well over 2,000 in the early 2000s (Stipe, 2003). The growth demonstrated in the past decades has also seen gains in the scope of preservation programs, as the design regulations overseen by preservation commissions have become more specific, encompassing a greater range
of “aesthetic” elements, such as landscaping and even paint color (Stipe, 2003).

2.2.3. The Preservation of Modern vs. Traditional Architecture

The vague language used in many of the guidelines promoted in the Secretary of Interior Standards can be seen as either exacerbating a growing rift in preservation regarding “modern” versus “traditional” architecture or a byproduct of this schism. While this might be a fundamental difference that has existed for the past several decades, the sheer volume of structures passing the 50 year mark indicating eligibility to the National Register has pushed the issue to the forefront of preservation. Planning researcher William Baer noted that from 2000 and on, three times the number of buildings will become available for preservation, or “ripen”, as were available between 1900-1950 (Baer, 1995). This will have tremendous impacts on issues such as significance, as planners and preservationist must begin to make critical decisions about the criteria used to not only designate historic structures, but to decide how these buildings should be utilized. Suggesting adopting a planning approach to historic preservation, Baer (1995) stated, “historic preservation should no longer be thought of as a piecemeal endeavor. It requires systematic forethought; its integration into our evolving cities requires long-range planning” (Baer, 1995). The changing architectural styles of these buildings must also be taken into account, as the vast majority of these structures will be International or Modern style buildings.

The continued preservation and adaptation of historic structures will inevitably raise “difficult questions about how to balance the integrity of the past with the utilitarian and
aesthetic needs of the present and future” (Domer, 2009, pg. 97). Debates regarding the appropriate style that adaptations should take, either modern or traditional design continues to dominate current discourse. These debates are most pronounced when addressing architecture of the “recent past” including Mid-Century Modern, International, and Brutalist styles, or even the more complex a problem of additions to historic structures that have become “historic” in their own right based on the accepted 50 year metric. However, for many rehabilitation projects, the generally accepted notion is to “freeze” buildings in time to highlight a particular period characteristic. By employing this strategy, these structures from the past become an easier commodity to market, utilize, and ultimately resell (Domer, 2009). The preservationist tendency to strip elements from historic buildings counter to the preferred period of significance, “can lead to the destruction of a great deal of important buildings and building history” (Domer, 2009, pg. 101). However, the economic viability of the historic district is dependent on private investment and development. As a result, the question of “investment payoff…determines which images and which pasts are preferred in the old building fabric,” over other considerations such as the building’s racial, cultural, or other significance (Domer, 2009, pg. 99). The integration and preservation of additions, alterations, and other expressions of the dynamic and changing utilization of structures highlights “the possibility of a deeper, more human, more poetic, and ultimately more interesting, living history” (Domer, 2009, pg. 98).

Preservation efforts in the United States are fundamentally tied to the “fifty-year rule”, which was originally created as a benchmark to ensure that national landmarks had
obtained a certain level of significance prior to inclusion. Established in 1948 by the National Park Service (NPS), this guideline was utilized in evaluating recommendations for national monument sites, that if designated would fall to the NPS to maintain and run (Sprinkle, 2007). Their advisory board was only concerned with individual sites and buildings of national significance, and the “fifty-year rule” helped to eliminate the designation of sites due to political pressures or personal interest from influential advocates. The NPS stated, “structures or sites of recent historical importance relating to events or persons within the last fifty years will not, as a rule, be eligible for consideration under the standards” (Sprinkle, 2007, pg. 84). In terms of designation of properties, this act shifted the focus from individual sites of national importance to include sites and districts of broader levels of significance, from local to national (Sprinkle, 2007). The Act states that the goal of the program was to foster public and private partnerships that “provided the means for harmoniously blending the old and the new of all levels of significance in modern, functional use” (Sprinkle, 2007, pg. 96). Despite these changes, the “fifty-year rule” remained the benchmark for eligibility for designation. While this rule is administratively important for managing the number of potential designation applications, the strict adherence to this benchmark can leave significant properties that fall above this threshold unprotected and vulnerable. Sprinkle states, “exceptions to the fifty year threshold are important because these historic places become a precedent for the types of properties that will be considered important - once the age of a building or an event is no longer an issue” (Sprinkle, 2007, pg. 103).

The National Park Service recognized this problem and created provisions for
exceptions to this rule. Under “Criteria Consideration G: Properties that have achieved significance within the last 50 years” nominations that have gained significance under any of the four criterion can become eligible for listing based upon their “exceptional importance” (National Park Service, 1997a, pg. 42). As the National Park Service explained, “the phrase ‘exceptional importance’ may be applied to the extraordinary importance of an event or to an entire category or resources so fragile that survivors of any age are unusual” (National Park Service, 1997a, pg. 42). However, as the only exceptions to this rule are structures of “exceptional importance” places that were constructed outside of the fifty year parameter are extremely vulnerable.

The vulnerability of Mid-Century architecture has been raised by preservationists who advocate for preservation of structures from the “recent past”. This has been a growing concern for many preservationists, even resulting in the formation of advocacy groups such as DOCOMOMO, to ensure the protection of Modern architecture (Semes, 2009). To address the gap in protection created by the 50 year rule, some advocates have proposed relaxation of the standard in lieu of stricter requirements for inclusion on the National Register when dealing with buildings from the recent past. This would ensure that only the most exemplary structures from the period would be included. Theoretical considerations and issues regarding the “recent past” also have implications for the practice of historic preservation. For example, building materials and construction methods were often experimental following World War II, resulting in unsuccessful structural systems or the use of materials now known to be hazardous, such as asbestos. Currently, the Standards would encourage preserving original systems or materials,
however, this begs the question, should they be preserved in the manner of the original structure knowing they will fail?

There are other challenges with preserving architecture from the recent past. More spirited public debates are likely, as people who were alive during to witness the construction of mid-century structures or significant events occurring at the time are still alive today. While an architect might view a building as a pristine example of the International style, for other members of the community the building could symbolize negative memories or cultural events. In addition, while specific structures might maintain cultural significance for older generations, younger generations might have a different perception of the same space. This can be seen in the debates surrounding Columbia University’s attempts to adaptively reuse the Audubon Ballroom in New York City where Malcolm X was assassinated (Kaufman, 2009). Preservation of the recent past therefore delves into broader heritage issues of whose past to preserve, and how to prioritize competing community interests (Kaufman, 2009). These challenges highlight the need to address multiple interpretations and significances as time goes on and changes to the built environment and utilization of resources progresses.

As the trend towards increased regulation of the historic built environment through local designation and design review continues, the need to address the contradictions within preservation theory that create the foundation for these regulatory frameworks becomes more imperative. In 1966, the first year of the National Register program, 868 properties were added to the newly established registry. However, by the early 2000s, a total of 77,000 nominations were accepted by the National Park Service,
representing almost 1.5 million properties in the United States (Murtagh, 2006). It is also significant that of those nominations, historic districts account for 12,000 nominations. These figures speak volumes about the influence of the National Park Service’s protocol and theoretical approach to historic preservation. The design guidelines that regulate such districts have a direct impact on not only the utilization of historic resources but also their style, form, and materiality.

As other researchers (Kaufman, 2009; Hurley, 2010) have suggested, the integration of multiple levels of meaning into the evaluation of significance for preservation designation and practice might serve to provide common ground. In addition, a return to the initial theoretical concepts that served as the foundation for the preservation movement might also provide clarity to some of the issues that cities face today. For example, incorporating some of Ruskin’s ideas about a building’s natural life cycle by allowing some structures to deteriorate could serve to alleviate the pressure on resources necessary to preserve and utilize these structures (Pevsner, 1969). In contrast, Viollet-le-Duc’s writings and work could be applicable to modern preservation practices, especially regarding infill construction and additions/renovations of historic structures. His progressive attitude towards new materials, adaptation, and continued use of structures is very relevant to current discourse. To successfully move forward, the widening gap between the administrative aspects and professional practice of historic preservation will need to be addressed through the identification of a more comprehensive and cohesive theoretical foundation.
2.3 Planning Theory and Practice

2.3.1 Planning and Historic Preservation

Following the end of World War II, development patterns in the United States began to change. Rather than the patterns of grid based growth seen in traditional urban and neighborhood design, curvilinear and sprawling suburban plans emerged. The work of two major Federal departments, the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), contributed greatly to this shift. The DOT’s development of the interstate highway system, in conjunction with HUD’s urban renewal program, resulted in the demolition of thousands of established neighborhoods and commercial areas, often in minority and low income areas (Barnett, 2003). These planning policies drew the attention of preservationists who criticized the widespread destruction of historic resources. The National Trust publication *With Heritage So Rich* released in 1966 discussed the rapid pace of redevelopment under HUD’s urban renewal program. They explained, “the pace of urbanization is acceleration and the threat to our environmental heritage is mounting; it will take more than the sounding of periodic alarms to stem the tide” (Murtagh, 2006, pg. 50). This publication, which became a cornerstone component of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966, also addressed other aspects of the preservation movement that were affected by the changing development and planning climate of the 1960s.

Following the widespread changes that urban renewal programs created in the urban fabric of cities across the United States, inner cities suffered as both residents and businesses moved further away from the city center in favor of neighboring suburbs.
However, planners soon began to utilize historic preservation as a strategy in the revitalization of inner cities. Given the inherently greater cost of rehabilitating existing historic buildings versus new construction, preservationists and planners recognized the need to provide incentives to spur revitalization within urban areas. The National Trust spoke to this point by stating, “intensive thought and study must be given to economic conditions and tax policies which will affect our efforts to preserve such areas as living parts of the community” (Murtagh, 2006, pg. 51). While the need for tax incentives was recognized during the height of urban renewal, it was another decade before such reforms were realized. The tax incentive programs of the 1976 Tax Reform Act provided much needed incentives for the rehabilitation of income producing properties. The Act was expanded upon in 1981 with the passing of the Economic Recovery Tax Act, which created a tiered incentive program (Murtagh, 2006). A 25 percent credit was offered for certified historic buildings, while buildings over forty years and over thirty year received 20 percent and 15 percent, respectively (Murtagh, 2006). While the percentage of tax credits offered was reduced in the Tax Reform Act of 1986 by 5 percent for both historic and non-historic structures, the economic impact of these programs was profound, resulting in almost $10 billion worth of investment in the rehabilitation of 13,000 buildings between 1981-1986 (Murtagh, 2006).

The increase in financial incentives was accompanied by the rise of a more comprehensive and planning based approach to preservation. As the National Trust explained, “the new preservation must look beyond the individual building and individual landmark and concern itself with the historic and architecturally valued areas and districts
that contain a special meaning for the community” (Murtagh, 2006, pg. 50-51).

Preservationists and planners took this sentiment to heart, as evidenced by a sharp increase in historic districts and other overlay zoning (Stipe, 2003). While historic districts and special zones are a successful example of the coordinated efforts of preservationists and planners, historic preservation is not an issue that has been fully integrated into planning. For example, federal comprehensive planning laws have no requirement or stipulation for preservation or conservation planning. Several states, however, have included mandates for historic preservation planning, including South Carolina, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island (Tyler, 2009). Conflicts between preservation and planning interests will be more difficult to address with this lack of continuity between preservation and planning objectives.

2.3.2 Participatory Strategies in Planning

Public participation in city planning and community development did not emerge until the mid-twentieth century, primarily as a reaction to the sweeping physical planning efforts were undertaken throughout the United States following the end of World War II (Barnett, 2003). The disapproval of these policies began in the early part of the 1960s, beginning with the publication of Jane Jacobs’ *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* in 1961, and two years later the demolition of Penn Station, which galvanized the historic preservation movement and brought it into the mainstream. Jane Jacobs’ work was related to historic preservation efforts in many ways. Jacobs advocated for the power of neighborhood associations to fight unwanted growth and development within their
communities, much in the same way as locally designated historic districts and design guidelines manage local growth (Jacobs, 1961). However, an unintended consequence of the severe criticism of planners of the era was that many planners began to avoid physical planning altogether, in favor of advocacy planning and public participation planning that would ensure greater community involvement in developing future plans for growth (Page & Mennel, 2011). This was an important shift in planning in that it began to involve the community in the decision making process to an extent never before considered, however, it also began to diminish the expertise and knowledge that planners had about the physical form and organization of the city.

The closely related advocacy and equity planning movements emerged in the late 1960s. Advocacy planning is particularly important for historic preservation as it often occurred at the neighborhood level, similar in scale to historic districts. Paul Davidoff, a primary proponent of advocacy planning, explained that it was “the responsibility of planners not only to identify and articulate the specific values underling planning prescriptions but also to affirm them” (Peterman, 2000, pg. 26). In this regard, planners were not neutral facilitators of community objectives or goals, but rather engaged activists on the behalf of the community. As advocacy planning methods became standard policy in many municipal planning offices it became known as equity planning, indicating the conscious effort to address inequities in the public participation process. This included paying particular attention to marginalized populations, such as minorities, the elderly, and those in poverty (Peterman, 2000).
While many planning agencies and municipal planning offices maintain and implement the strong public participation policies that began in the 1960s, in contrast, historic preservation efforts value the expert opinion much more in the plan development process. This is problematic for a number of reasons. First, many historic areas are concentrated in inner cities and urban cores, which also statistically have the highest concentrations of both poor and minority residents. Minorities are far more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods where poverty rates exceed 20 percent, denoting a poverty-impacted neighborhood (Barnett, 2003). Historic preservation efforts are therefore subject to, often justifiable criticisms of gentrification, the process by which neighborhood improvements displace low-income residents as a result of rising housing costs (Barnett, 2003). These criticisms are compounded by the fact that the low-income residents displaced by these efforts are often minorities and at risk populations.

A final consideration when striving to develop a meaningful public participation process is to address what planner Sherry Arnstein described as the ladder of citizen participation (Arnstein, 1969). For Arnstein, citizen participation is “the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future” (Arnstein, 1969, pg. 216). Organized into eight “rungs”, the ladder described different levels of citizen participation. The first two rungs, therapy and manipulation, represent nonparticipation, in which citizens are involved in the planning process, but not in any meaningful way. The next level is described as degrees of tokenism, in which citizens are more engaged in expressing their views to decision-makers, but ultimately have no power to ensure that
these views are addressed. It is only in the top three rungs, partnership, delegated power, and citizen control, in which meaningful discourse between citizens and policy and decision makers can occur (Arnstein, 1969). An active and meaningful public participation process that incorporates the viewpoints of multiple stakeholders will ultimately be more successful. As Jane Jacobs explained in *Death and Life*, “cities have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when, they are created by everybody” (Jacobs, 1961, pg. 238).

2.3.3 Legal Precedents for Design Regulation

As the cornerstone of many historic preservation efforts is the use of regulatory processes to protect historic resources, it is paramount that these regulations can withstand legal challenge and scrutiny. Over the past century, various legal precedents have been set, from zoning ordinances to Supreme Court cases, which have created the foundation for modern preservation practice. As most locally designated historic districts are established as a zoning overlay, the establishment of zoning regulations in the United States was an important event for historic preservation (Stipe, 2003). The first zoning ordinance, established in 1916 in New York City, resulted in the first comprehensive zoning act in the country (Peterson, 2003). This law, passed as a reaction to the construction of the Equitable building, aimed to regulate the height and setback of skyscrapers (Peterson, 2003). The ordinance’s primary concern was the access of light and air to the street, but also separated different land uses, such as commercial, residential, and industrial, which is common in many current zoning ordinances. Shortly
thereafter, many other communities followed suit and passed their own regulations. However, it was not long before the legality of such laws was challenged. In a 1922 Supreme Court case, Village of Euclid vs. Ambler Realty Co., the court upheld zoning ordinances as a valid use of a city’s police powers, and thus upheld the right of cities to zone (Peterson, 2003). One city took their zoning powers one step further, and in 1931, the City of Charleston, SC used their zoning powers to establish the first locally designated historic district. The regulations within the district exceeded normal zoning to protect the historic character of the city, which included a regulatory board that would review any proposed projects and issue “certificates of appropriateness” prior to construction (Tyler, 2009). However, it is important to note that the City created this historic district with no enabling legislation or legal precedent.

When establishing and administering regulatory zoning, including historic preservation ordinances, there are several important legal issues that can arise, including regulatory takings, procedural due process, equal protection, free speech (Tseng-yu Lai, 1994). The issue of regulatory takings is often the most controversial, especially the use of eminent domain, which is the right of a governmental agency to confiscate private property for public use, as long as the owner is provided “just compensation” for the property. If just compensation was not provided, then process is considered a taking, and is basis for many challenges to the use of eminent domain (Cullingworth, 1997). This is especially relevant for historic preservation, as most of the challenges to regulation within historic areas were centered on the issue of takings.

The first legal case significant to preservation that addressed takings was the
Berman vs. Parker case in 1954, in which the Supreme Court addressed the right of urban renewal planners to demolish historic structures based on their “aesthetics” or poor condition (Tyler, 2009). In this case, Berman, the owner of a blighted department store in Washington D.C., sued the city for seizing his property under eminent domain to execute the master plan that included the redevelopment of the area (Cullingworth, 1997). The City claimed this new development would improve the aesthetics of the city, while Berman countered that the seizure was not for a true public purpose, and therefore a taking. The Supreme Court, however, sided with the City of Washington D.C., solidifying the rights of governments to exercise eminent domain based on the aesthetics of the building (Tyler, 2009). While this could be viewed as a tremendous blow to preservation efforts to stop the demolition of historic structures during urban renewal, this case led to a fundamental shift in preservation. This case challenged the standing “aesthetics plus” stance, since prior to this ruling, aesthetics alone could not be sole reason for preservation or as a justification for regulation (Tyler, 2009, pg. 122). Following this case however, preservationists reinterpreted this ruling to save historic buildings, claiming that if aesthetics alone were enough to condemn a building, then the building’s aesthetics were also reason enough to preserve them (Tyler, 2009). The determination of which buildings should be preserved began to shift from their historical or cultural significance to their aesthetic and architectural value.

While the Berman vs. Parker case resulted in an altered the approach to preservation, it was the Penn Central Transportation Co. vs. City of New York (1978) case that was essential to providing the legal basis for the governmental regulation of
historic resources (Stipe, 2003). Based on the precedent set by the City of Charleston, many other municipalities established historic districts and design review commissions to oversee alterations to historic structures or new construction within their boundaries. However, it was not until this case that the legality of such regulations were challenged in court (Tyler, 2009). In this landmark case, Penn Central Transportation Co, which owned Grand Central Terminal proposed to build a 50+ story office building on top of the existing terminal. However, Grand Central had been designated as a landmark under NYC’s Landmark Law in 1965 (Tyler, 2009; Stipe, 2003). As a result, any alterations to the structure had to be approved by the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission. The Commission denied Penn Central’s proposal, claiming the addition was incompatible with the existing building. Penn Central then sued claiming the denial resulted in a taking due to loss of profit that could be made from the office building, and the severe limiting of the economic viability of the property. Ultimately, the Supreme Court upheld the NYC Landmarks Preservation Commission’s right to deny the proposed alterations to a historic structure, stating that the economic impact was not so severe as to constitute a taking. This one decision provided the legal basis for enabling legislation for communities to establish regulatory controls over historic properties, and that owners of historic properties would be subject to these regulations (Tyler, 2009).

2.3.4 Planning and Design Regulation

In most literature addressing the use of design guidelines in historic districts, the discourse is focused on several specific topics: compatibility of design, legal authority,
and most recently, preservation of structures from “the recent past” (Scheer & Preiser, 1994; Ames and Wagner, 2009). While the goal of the design regulatory process is to oversee the aesthetic quality of the built environment, what is often overlooked are the subjective meanings that the community places on the buildings regulated under the guidelines. For successful infill development and adaptive use within these areas, it will become important to not only address the symbolic meanings of buildings, but the multiple meanings expressed by various stakeholders throughout the community. To effectively interpret the multiple meanings, however, one must understand how they are developed. Abramson noted that to do this, “planners must engage community members on the level of symbolic and cultural meaning making, as well as personally and culturally-based attachments and identities” (Abramson et. al., 2006, pg. 353-354) and that any public participation process “should include careful consideration of the underlying place attachments and meanings that are at the root of people’s reactions” (Manzo et. al., 2006, pg. 341).

The National Preservation Act of 1966 changed preservation practice in the United States. Not only did the act create the National Register of Historic Places, it also bolstered the economic potential of historic resources. The law, for the first time, provided Federal funding to rehabilitate historic housing through the Department of Housing and Urban Development (Murtugh, 2006). The financial incentives for preservation efforts expanded in the late 1970s and twice again in the 1980s, tying Federal funding for preservation efforts to the processes and protocols sanctioned by the National Park Service, including the National Register process and the Secretary of the
Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (Murtagh, 2006). The economic viability of preservation vastly increased, and as a result, thrust issues related to determining the uses for historic resources into the forefront. In many ways, this also resulted in the growing importance of infill and adaptive use within historic areas.

In addition to the greater economic incentive to invest in historic urban cores, the demand for housing, entertainment, and amenities in these areas increased as well. Beginning in the early 1980s, cities began to experience growth as young professionals began moving back to cities from outlying suburban areas (Barnett, 2003). As development pressures in these areas increased, many communities also began to establish design review boards and historic preservation regulatory bodies to oversee and manage the growth. Since 1980, the number of such organizations in the United States has increased dramatically, nearly doubling each decade (Stipe, 2003). This trend continued and increased in the following two decades. However, with the insurgence of new residents into established, and often minority areas, cities had to deal with competing interests (Kaufman, 2009). Not only were heritage and cultural issues pitted against economic development benefits, but also multiple stakeholder groups voiced competing cultural identities. However, when one begins to investigate how multiple cultural identities and meanings can be incorporated into the design regulatory process, as Andrew Hurly noted, “the question of who gets to interpret local history invariably becomes intertwined with the question of who gets to direct the path of redevelopment” (Hurley, 2010, pg. 181).
In addition to addressing multiple symbolic meanings of structures within the historic districts, the design regulatory process must first and foremost address issues of aesthetics and style. Most guidelines include provisions requiring compatibility with the existing fabric while remaining “differentiated” per the Secretary of the Interior Standards (National Park Service, 1997). This results in infill and adaptive use projects that must navigate the need to respect the history of the place, while still remaining current and meeting the changing needs of today’s society. Steven Semes advocated in his book, *The Future of the Past*, that architectural forms are extremely influenced by the existing vocabulary and materiality of the district as the most effective way to redevelop historic districts without degrading their character or significance (Semes, 2009). While additions that are not responsive to the existing context can be as detrimental to the authenticity and unique identity that can make historic areas economically viable places for revitalization and future investment, the exact style of such additions is a topic of much contention and debate. It is here that further investigations into the relationship between the physical environment and place attachment might begin to clarify this issue.

### 2.4 Heritage Theory and Literature

A fundamental difference in the theoretical foundation of heritage theory as compared to preservation is the shift in attention from the tangible sites, structures, and buildings that define preservation to a focus on intangible social constructs and meaning (Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2005). While specific sites and places might be an identifier or indicator of heritage, it is not the complete product. Additionally, while value
in heritage is not “inherent”, preservationists often focus on the inherent value of architectural resources (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge, 2005). As a result of this different approach, heritage is also defined in more abstract terms. The National Heritage conference in 1983 defined heritage as “that which a past generation has preserved and handed onto the present and which a significant group of the population wishes to hand on to the future” (Hewison, 1989, pg. 16). Ashworth (1997) expanded upon this definition, describing heritage as a product of selectively chosen aspects of the past mediated through history, memory, and relics (See Figure 2.1) (Ashworth, 1997).

![Figure 2.1 The Past, History, and Heritage (Ashworth, 1997, pg. 93)](image-url)
2.4.1 Emergence of Heritage Discourse

The early twentieth century discourse surrounding conservation was foundational for both heritage and preservation theory and practice. Two prominent figures, Camillo Boito and later Alois Reigl, built upon and expanded the earlier work of John Ruskin and Eugène Viollet-le-Duc. These writings continued the discussion surrounding the restoration and conservation of existing historic resources, including monuments. Born in 1836, Camillo Boito was an Italian architect and professor whose writings focused on reconciling the conflicting viewpoints of Viollet-le-Duc and Ruskin. While his approach to Italian buildings and monuments was based more on Ruskin versus Viollet-le-Duc’s theory, he remained critical of both viewpoints. Boito maintained that while Viollet le Duc’s interventions often ignored history, Ruskin instead dismissed the importance of continued change (Glendinning, 2013). In 1893, Boito published a manuscript titled “Restoration in Architecture” outlining his conclusions and subsequent approach to conservation. This manuscript was organized as a hypothetical conversation between two conservationists who have rigidly adopted either Viollet-le-Duc or Ruskin’s theoretical approach. Boito’s manuscript highlights the inconsistencies and hypocrisies in maintaining an extreme dedication to either Viollet-le-Duc or Ruskin’s approach to conservation and restoration (Boito and Birignani, 1893/2009).

Through this ‘conversation’ Boito described three methodological strategies to restoration, stating,

“In architectural monuments one or the other of the following three qualities prevails: archeological importance, picturesque appearance, architectural beauty. Therefore it is legitimate to divide the art of restoration into
Archeological restoration (Antiquity), Picturesque (pittorico) restoration (Middle Ages), Architectural restoration (Renaissance, etc.)” (Boito, 1982, pg. 75).

He expanded upon these strategies by emphasizing the importance of differentiating any new additions or interventions from the original structure, claiming “one should not deceive either one’s neighbor or posterity” (Boito, 1982, pg. 75). Boito outlined eight ways to ensure that interventions or alterations were easily differentiated from the original structure, such as installing descriptive epitaphs, using different construction materials, and different styles between new and old (Boito, 1982). The primary conclusion of this publication was the assertion that any intervention strategy must be based on value judgments of the historic artifact that are both specific and based upon procedures laid out by experts (Starn, 2002).

Alois Riegl, like Boito, explored the concept of ascribing value judgments on both “intentional” and “unintentional” historic monuments in his seminal work, Der Moderne Denkmalkultus (The Modern Cult of Monuments), published in 1903 (Reigl, 1982). Rielg organized the types of values that monuments could possess into present day values (gegenwartswerte) and recollection or past values (erinnerungswerte) (Glendinning, 2013). Of the present day values were three specific types, practical use value, artistic value, and newness value, as opposed to the past values of intentional commemorative value, historical value, and age value. While specific monuments could possess multiple values, from both present day and past values, those values might also be in direct conflict. However, it is important to note that of all of the conflicts that might occur from the ascription of specific values, “a true conflict between newness-value and age-value
arises which surpasses all previous conflicts in sharpness and implacability” (Riegl, 1982, pg. 42).

While the writings that are foundational to both heritage and preservation theory are mutual, each discipline focused on divergent aspects of the work. Heritage discourse maintained the subjective and social/culturally based value judgments of Riegl and Boito, and later focused on the issue of “authenticity” introduced in the Venice Charter in 1964. While the debates surrounding the concept of authenticity were not introduced prior to the mid-twentieth century, “it is no exaggeration to say that that this concept lies at the base of all modern doctrine on the conservation and restoration of historical monuments” (Starn, 2002, pg. 2). What constitutes “authenticity” in heritage and preservation has continued to diverge, resulting in much of the conflict in theoretical stance between the two perspectives. Authenticity in heritage is predicated upon experiential authenticity, which can only be defined by the user. As such, there can be no standard measurements of authenticity, contradictory to the preservation approach. The preservation movement instead drew upon the methodological standards set out in first the Athens and later the Venice Charter when outlining standards for professional practice. In addition, the value judgments utilized in preservation were predicated upon the physical/historical integrity and significance of a resource, which in turn were used as determiners of “authenticity” (Starn, 2002).
2.4.2 Foundational Issues in Heritage

A primary issue in heritage theory and discourse is the concept of “official” versus “unofficial heritage” (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge, 2005). Discussions revolve around which aspects of the past to “embed” in officialdom, or as what Laurajane Smith (2006) described as “authorized heritage discourse” (AHD) to become officially, and often nationally, recognized heritage (Smith, 2006). Heritage can also be effective at two levels, nationally recognized and “official” heritage, and “unofficial” heritage that occurs at the local and familial level (Howard, 2003). Heritage also results in the differentiation between “high” and “low” culture, which is also mirrored in the duality of official and unofficial heritage (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge, 2005). Due to the possessive view of heritage, it is necessary to address the fact that “ownership” of heritage by one group precludes ownership by other groups, often resulting in dissonance (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge, 2005). The over-representation of specific heritages will then necessarily occur at the expense of other groups. This can be seen in the prioritization of “official” heritages, high culture, or nationalist heritages over the heritage of marginalized and minority groups (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge, 2005).

2.4.3 Collective Memory in Heritage and Preservation

As the preservation profession continues to evolve, contemporary heritage issues, such as dissonance, collective memory, and equity must be examined more thoroughly (Kaufman 2009). However, overlaps between heritage and preservation are beginning to emerge in these areas. Kaufman raised the issue of public history and collective memory
as it relates to preservation by drawing together different perspectives on issues that will continue to be important to the overall discussion of preservation. These issues are also discussed by Hurley (2010), who challenged some of the conventional thinking regarding preservation, most notably the trend towards favoring a “period of significance”. Hurley contended that this practice can undermine both residents’ and visitors’ ability to develop meaningful attachments to the place and its history (Hurley, 2010). Other researchers also investigated the relationship between collective memory and preservation. In Barthel’s work, the focus is on the idea that historic preservation is a mediated process, by which interpretation and presentation of the site or structure impacts the shaping of collective memories of the visitors to the site (Barthel, 1996). This is important because the governing bodies and investors responsible for shaping historic landscapes should be aware of how different interpretations or interventions might change visitor perceptions and development of meaning (Barthel, 1996). Milligan (2007) further examined the relationship between historic preservation and collective memory. The author aimed to focus on “how the historic preservation process sheds light on the tensions between individual, legal, and cultural meanings of and uses for the built environment” (Milligan, 2007, pg. 108). Many preservationists see the protection and preservation of the built environment as a physical and tangible manifestation of the past. By preserving these buildings, one can also honor and preserve history. Melligan (2007) examined preservationist imperative to preserve as much of the built environment as possible, without necessarily linking the structures to deeper levels of meaning from historical or cultural significance. Milligan contended that the preservation movement’s main purpose
is to support “the right of the historic built environment to exist in an intact, authentic state” (Milligan, 2007, pg. 105). Under this understanding of preservation, the cultural or historical significance is not of primary importance in the justification for preservation efforts.

The treatment of the past is an issue that will continue to move to the forefront, as well as the “ways in which cultural materials from the past can function as resources – that is – be of use and benefit – in the present and future” (Cleere, 1984, pg. 2). The reconstruction of the past and reinterpretation of history often result in the general preference to elements of the past over those of the present (Lowenthal 1975). As a result, communities will need to make a distinction between history and heritage. Heritage, viewed as a celebration of the past, “clarifies pasts so as to infuse them with present purposes” allowing them to be tailored to present day purposes (Lowenthal, 1998, pg. 15). Lowenthal also discussed the impact of nostalgia on society’s understanding and interpretation of the past. He states that nostalgia often leads to a romanticized view of the past. He goes on to discuss a society’s collective need for a past, “the physical legacy that embodies their communal spirit” to foster a sense of identity and attachment (Lowenthal, 1975, pg. 12). Lowenthal begins to discuss how this nostalgia for the past might begin to manifest in preservation of the present, and impact the decision making process. He noted, “preservation is fine for the past that is long past, but yesterday is thought of as something to dump” (Lowenthal, 1975, pg. 31).
2.5 Conflicting Theoretical Viewpoints

Conflicts arising between the competing interests of historic preservation, heritage, and planning materialize most obviously in the adaptive use of historic resources, new development that might threaten existing resources, or the interpretation of existing sites. For adaptive use, often the strategies are not consistent, and draw from a specific perspective, such as preservation, heritage, or architecture thus heightening tensions (Plevoets and Van Cleempoel, 2011). It will also be particularly important to understand the shifting interpretations and influences of the past on present culture, and how those interpretations of the past have been manipulated to serve current purposes (Lowenthal, 1985). Multiple interpretations of the same historic site can result in conflicts between preservation and heritage, especially if the site prioritizes a specific narrative.

While there are several different means of gaining knowledge about the past to create the narratives, there are always flaws with these methods, such as personal interpretation of artifacts and changing memories of events. (Lowenthal, 1985). Threatened historic resources also set the potential economic development gains in opposition against the cultural value of a resource. This process can be especially contentious if the cultural value of the resource, held by a marginalized or disadvantaged group, is dismissed in favor of economic development. In this regard, both heritage and preservation can face criticisms as a “conspiracy by the rich to acquire the property of the poor” (Howard, 2003, pg. 4).
2.5.1 Conflicts between Preservation and Heritage

The tensions that arise between heritage and preservation are often the result of fundamental differences in the theoretical belief in the uses of heritage, and how it should be conserved. The growing gap between theorists and practitioners often exacerbates these differences in paradigm. Many of these differences are outlined by Ashworth (2008) in terms of issues such as authenticity, views of the past, and goals. One can understand how these differences would result in conflict when creating strategies for the adaptive use of historic sites. As preservationists would focus on aspects such as material authenticity and intrinsic value, heritage advocates would instead focus on the experiential authenticity for present day users. Heritage, which is viewed by many as “a process rather than a product” conflicts with the preservation emphasis on physical artifacts (Howard, 2003, pg. 12). Additionally, the preservation emphasis on physical artifacts results in the view of historic resources as a finite, and unrecoverable once lost. This is completely contradictory to heritage theory, in which heritage can be continually “manufactured” to meet demand (Ashworth, 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Preserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Real</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creators</td>
<td>Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Immutable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted by the author from Ashworth, 2008)
2.5.2 Conflicts between Planning and Heritage

An intact historic downtown can serve as an attraction, and thus boost economic development through heritage tourism. Cities therefore have a vested interest in maintaining historic buildings while also capitalizing on the character and appeal they have for tourists. This can encourage the development of “fake” architecture to maintain the continuity between old and new buildings (Levi, 2005). The heritage emphasis on simulacrum and experiential authenticity would endorse this strategy, highlighting the importance of experiential continuity between historic structures and the surrounding built fabric.

However, as Ashworth noted, “those responsible for the broader aspects of place management and planning, whether urban or rural, are compelled to take a broader view that encompasses use, impact and synergy and thus tend towards a conservation paradigm” (Ashworth, 2008, pg. 26). As a result, the desire to create a uniform character conflicts with the planning impetus to develop a comprehensive strategy that encompasses more than tourism issues. This conflict is complicated by the fact that both residents and visitors have a preference for not only historic architecture, but also newer construction designed to mimic historic architecture (Levi, 2005). While residents and visitors can often discern historical structures from new construction, it is viewed as “more historical” than contemporary architecture within historic areas (Levi, 2005).

2.5.3 Conflicts between Preservation and Planning

Conflicts between preservation and planning are most acute in areas subject to
design regulation. Within historic areas, the primary goal for planners is to ensure the “highest and best use” of properties, and to focus on the revitalization of abandoned, or dilapidated structures. Though preservationists share a similar desire to see these structures restored and in use, the process and methods by which rehabilitations occur can be contested. As the preservation focus is on the authenticity, integrity, and significance of historic structures, many preservation advocates are very reluctant to support the demolition or significant alterations of structures.

This is compounded by the lack of integration of preservation planning into long-term comprehensive plans or revitalization strategies (Tyler, 2009). Public private partnerships between municipalities and private developers to realize such plan can then conflict with long-term preservation goals. However, staff recommendations to design regulatory boards can increase communication between the two entities. Additionally, clear and well-defined design guidelines can also reduce tensions, by eliminating confusion stemming from vague or subjective wording in the regulations. This will ensure that design decisions are standardized, rather than being the result of personal preference or external political considerations.

2.5.4 Valuation of Historic Resources

The amount of resources that survive from the past is vast, and determining how those resources can be utilized is an ongoing debate in planning, architecture, preservation, and archeology. An important factor in determining which of the many historic materials/structures available is most significant is value. Beginning with Reigl in
the early twentieth century, researchers have focused more closely on valuation methods used to place cultural value on these resources (Hubbard, 1993; Lipe, 1984). Utilizing such valuation methods can be beneficial for several reasons, such as fostering a positive public understanding and appreciation of the resources, as “these public attitudes feed back directly to the institutions that support cultural resource preservation, as well as more generally into the cultural contexts from which resource values emerge” (Lipe, 1984, pg. 4). As public support and appreciation of historic resources is a vital component to their preservation, the relationship between public perception and cultural resource valuation has strong implications for historic preservation, especially in terms of adaptive reuse and revitalization of underused resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Value Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Populism</td>
<td>The value of a resource is a result of the relationship between the object and the viewer, which should not be pressed upon by any market forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essentialism</td>
<td>The value of historic resources are inherent, and therefore valuation can not be subject to the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurialism</td>
<td>The value of a resource is dependent upon viewer, but this significance should be capitalized on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatism</td>
<td>The artifact has intrinsic value, but the owner should be able to utilize this value in the market place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted by the author from Koziol, 2008)

Evaluating the effects of market influence and valuation on historic and cultural resources, Koziol (2008) developed an organizational matrix to situate four distinct perspectives on the preservation and utilization of historic resources. Koziol has identified these four perspectives as populism, essentialism, entrepreneurialism, and privatism. These perspectives are based upon both the view of the “intrinsic value of the
object”, from a focus on solely physical characteristics to a social/cultural value, as well as the “market orientation” of resources from non-moneterized to moneterized (Koziol, 2008, pg. 42).

When the overlapping interests of preservation, heritage and planning are situated within this framework, it begins to provide clarity regarding the theoretical basis and goals of each. This clearer understanding of the objectives and motivations driving the differing interests could provide some insight into how the conflicts that arise between preservation, heritage, and planning might be ameliorated.

Figure 2.2 Preservation, Planning, and Heritage Discourse Matrix (adapted from the author from Koziol, 2008)
2.6 Place Attachment Theory and Literature

Place attachment is a complex and multidimensional concept, with two key components, the emotional and cultural “attachment” that one feels, and the environment or “place” that is the object of that attachment (Low and Altman, 1992). However, the types of attachment and the underlying causes of such feelings can be disparate. Researchers investigating place attachment have identified particular dimensions of the phenomenon, including place identity, place dependence, and the cognitive and emotional elements of attachment. Place identity refers to the degree to which one’s own identity is tied to a specific place (Proshansky, 1978; Hull, Lam, & Vigo, 1994), while place dependence represents the ability or importance of a place to provide the necessary resources or conditions to support one’s goals or activities (Stokols and Schumaker, 1981; Williams and Roggenbuck, 1989). The cognitive and emotional aspects of place attachment recognize the influence of one’s memories and personal experiences on the development of place attachment (Hidalgo and Hernandez, 2001; Manzo, 2005). While there is research on place attachment that focuses on the typology of the place that is the object of attachment (natural environments, particular neighborhoods, etc.) there is little research that investigates specific architectural and urban features in relation to feelings of attachment (Brown and Perkins, 2003; Hay, 1998). These different dimensions all contribute to the highly individualized and personal construction of place attachment, and as such will need to be incorporated into any comprehensive evaluatory framework (Scannell and Gifford, 2010).
In addition to the theoretical aspects of place attachment, it is necessary to develop a standard measure with which to evaluate the importance of each dimension in the formation of place attachment. The most recognized researcher to develop a quantitative method for measuring place attachment is Daniel Williams (for additional information see Chapter 3). In conjunction with other researchers, he established a set of sixty-one survey questions that could be used to quantitatively measure general place attachment as well as the place dependence and place identity dimensions of place attachment (Williams and Roggenbuck, 1989; Williams and Vaske, 2003). While other researchers such as Brown and Perkins (2003) have also established place attachment measures, these, as well as most other measures, are either modified or adapted from Williams (Brown and Perkins, 2003).

Researchers have begun to investigate how physical features of the built environment might influence place attachment. While some researchers (Fornara et. al., 2009) have attempted to measure the impact of specific architectural elements on levels of place attachment using the Perceived Residential Environment Quality (PREQ) scale, other researchers (Russell and Ward, 1982; Williams, 2013) maintain that individual elements are less significant if the overall feeling of the area is not disturbed (Lewicka, 2011). Easier to address is the effect of higher levels of place attachment on community engagement and behavior (Scannell and Gifford, 2010; Brown, Perkins, & Brown, 2003). Brown, Perkins, and Brown (2003) found that communities shown to have higher levels of place attachment to their neighborhoods also demonstrate higher levels of social cohesion and control. In addition, these communities are more likely to support and become
involved in neighborhood revitalization efforts (Brown, Perkins, & Brown, 2003).

Scannell and Gifford (2010) demonstrated that residents with higher levels of attachment are also more likely to engage in behavior to protect the places of attachment. These two studies could indicate the importance of cities identifying place attachment as a means to both encourage civic engagement and participation, but also to aid in consensus building within the community. An important case study that could serve as model for addressing place attachment issues in the public participation and planning process is the research study conducted by Abramson et. al. (2006). In this study, the planning process within Seattle’s Chinatown-International District was analyzed based on its ability to successfully incorporate a multitude of cultural identities, negotiate various stakeholder groups, and prioritize long-range design plans. The community established a representative stakeholder board that participated in a series of design workshops to address conflicts, negotiate differences, and develop consensus. This process was extremely successful in that it allowed “for multiple cultural identities to be acknowledged and represented without any one group’s history or identity being undermined or sacrificed” during the planning process (Abramson, 2006, pg. 341).

While there is a large body of place attachment research that investigates people’s relationships to place, and a similarly large body of planning research interested in issues such as community development and engagement, there are few researchers who have analyzed how place attachment might inform modern planning practice (Manzo et. al., 2006). Through research investigating place identity and urban areas, Hull et al (1994) recommend that communities seeking to strengthen attachment ought to “encourage
development practices that promote or exploit existing or potential place identity and hence encourage (or at least do not discourage) people’s psychological investment in their local, physical communities” (Hull, Lam, & Vigo, 1994, pg. 118). More importantly, their findings indicate that “place identity, although subjective and subtle, can be assessed and managed through sensitive land development efforts” (Hull, Lam, & Vigo, 1994, pg. 109). Continued investigations into the relationship between physical regulations on the built environment (design guidelines) and potential impacts on resident and visitor attachment could be very significant to the revitalization and development of historic areas in a sensitive and meaningful way. This type of research could help not only further inform and guide the design regulatory process but could help community planners and officials “understand the nature of people’s relationships to place and to develop a more holistic view of how such relationships influence our experiences of place and the success of our communities (Manzo et. al., 2006, pg. 336).

2.6.1 Predictors of Place Attachment and Public Participation

Place attachment is also an important concept for both community participation and planning, especially in understanding how place attachment affects people’s interaction with the community (Manzo and Douglas, 2006). As Manzo and Douglas explain, “place attachments, place identity, and sense of community can provide a greater understanding of how neighborhood spaces can motivate ordinary residents to act collectively to preserve, protect, or improve their community and participate in local planning processes” (Manzo and Douglas, 2006, pg. 347). By drawing a relationship
between place attachment and community engagement, this article is an intriguing resource in terms of exploring possible connections between attachment and the development of other community documents, such as design guidelines, intended to protect the places of attachment. In her article, “For better or worse. Exploring multiple dimensions of place meaning”, Manzo focused instead on how attachments to particular places are developed, and what role these places might play in their lives. This study found that place attachment is often developed through “an array of emotions and experiences, both positive and negative” (Manzo, 2005, pg. 67). The level of attachment was also influenced by broader external issues, such as race, gender, and sexuality (Manzo, 2005).

When evaluating ways to integrate feelings of place attachment into the design regulatory process, it is important to identify recognized predictors of place attachment, and which of those predictors will most affect marginalized populations within the community. This generally includes minorities and low-income residents, but could also include other important stakeholder groups such as the elderly or immigrant populations. By identifying which predictors do not effectively capture marginalized populations, those in charge of leading the design regulatory process, including preservation professionals, planners, and city officials will be able address these shortcomings in a specific and targeted public participation strategy.

Throughout the place attachment literature, there are several categories of predictors of place attachment (Lewicka, 2011). These predictors include both demographic and social categories, however, they should not be confused with
dimensions of place attachment. A dimension of place attachment refers to a “type of attachment or reason of attachment” rather than predictors which indicate a proclivity to form attachment (Lewicka, 2011, pg. 215). The two most recognized socio-demographic predictors of place attachment include length of residence and homeownership (Lewicka, 2011; Hay, 1998). Length of residence, “the most consistent positive predictor of place attachment” is not a predictor that would disproportionately impact marginalized populations, meaning minorities and low-income residents can are just as likely as other community members to develop attachment based upon this predictor (Lewicka, 2011, pg. 216). However, another demographic predictor, homeownership, is affected. As marginalized populations are statistically far less likely to be homeowners, policy makers should specifically reach out to non-homeowners. Other demographic variables, including educational attainment, employment status, age, and economic status, do not reveal a consistent relationship with place attachment. This would indicate that the relationship is “mediated or moderated by additional factors” (Lewicka, 2011, pg. 216).

There are also socially driven predictors of place attachment, which evaluate the “strength and extensiveness of neighborhood ties and involvement in informal social activities in the neighborhood” (Lewicka, 2011, pg. 217). As this is a strong predictor of attachment, city officials will need to ensure that a broad range of community groups are informed of the design regulatory process to effectively engage marginalized populations. Generally, research and investigations into place attachment discuss the positive relationship between a place and a person’s feelings of attachment. However, it would be negligent to omit the detrimental effects of disruption to place attachments, especially
since marginalized members of the community are more at risk to experience these disruptions. As Manzo (2013) discussed, marginalized populations often have complex feelings of attachment to their homes and neighborhoods that are little addressed in the literature. She expanded upon this idea noting, there exists “a ‘shadow side’ of place attachments that involves negative and ambivalent feelings and experiences of place” (Manzo, 2013, pg. 178). For example, residents of social housing might develop mixed feelings of attachment or even feelings of ambivalence to their homes and neighborhoods due to the social stigma often associated with government subsidized housing. In addition, the negative impacts of many adaptive use and revitalization projects, most notably displacement, should also be addressed. The detrimental effects of displacement on residents can include “feelings of loss or alienation” or “disturb a sense of continuity” (Manzo et. al., 2006, pg. 338), and for low-income neighborhoods, can include loss of feelings of stability, and very commonly the inability to return to the neighborhood despite affordable housing options that often accompany such projects (Manzo, 2013). These findings only emphasize the need to actively engage citizens who would be most affected by such proposals, and ensure that they are given a real voice in the process.

2.6.2 Place Attachment and Sense of Place

While place attachment and sense of place are closely aligned concepts, there are distinct differences between the two. Sense of place varies from place attachment by incorporating the impact of “social and geographical context of place bonds and the sensing of places” into the development of the emotional value that a person places on a
specific place (Hay, 1998). This highlights the experientially based aspect of sense of place, which often omits the dimensional components of place attachment and instead focuses on the affective qualities of the space. While sense of place can evoke and at times strengthen place attachment, it is more grounded in the physical characteristics of place and therefore discussed more frequently in the context of place making or physical planning.

In Kevin Lynch’s seminal work, *Image of the City*, he discussed cognitive mapping of the built environment based upon the recognition and legibility of five design elements; paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks (Lynch, 1960). Lynch explained that one should “consider the visual quality of the American city by studying the mental image of that city which is held by its citizens” (Lynch, 1960, pg. 2). Christopher Alexander’s work, *A Pattern Language*, touched upon many of the same issues, while delving further into the relationship between urban space and organization, and its ability to transform space into places of meaning (Alexander, 1977). Alexander’s work described the contribution that physical characteristics of place and quality design can make to its “genius loci”, or “spirit of place” and therefore foster people’s emotional connections and bonds with the space. This is a concept that is significant for research related to both place attachment and the built environment, as it begins to echo writings fundamental to phenomenology. Phenomenology emphasizes the importance of the relationship between object (the built environment) and meaning, as the object is critical to the construction of meaning (Seamon, 2014). As phenomenologist David Seamon explained, “people and their worlds are integrally intertwined” (Seamon, 2014, pg. 11).
With this in mind, research that strives to determine the importance of specific physical characteristics of the “objects” in the creation of meaning (either personally or socially constructed) could be very influential in further discourse related to urban design and city development.
3.1 Case Study Research Design

3.1.1 Introduction

The purpose of a case study is to “provide insight into an issue” which facilitates the understanding of a larger, external interest (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 2005, pg. 445). Yin expounds upon this definition, highlighting the importance of a case in investigating “a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (Yin, 2009, pg. 3). It is this multi-faceted and holistic approach to the research problem that most appropriately addresses the topic under investigation. Based on the “how” and “why” nature of the research questions, a case study design is the most appropriate (Yin, 2009). In addition, the lack of control over the behavioral actions combined with the focus on contemporary events further justifies the use of a case study methodology (Yin, 2009).

One strength of case study design, when compared to other types of research design, is that it allows the researcher to “retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” (Yin, 2009). In addition, while case study research is not generalizable to larger populations or samples, the findings can be abstracted to theoretical propositions (Yin, 2009). With this in mind, for many researchers, the goal of case study research is to “expand and generalize theories” (Yin 2009). The deeper understanding of the phenomenon under study can then be utilized to improve practice within a particular field (Creswell, 2007).
However, there are some critiques of case study design that should be addressed. Researchers must ensure that the data collection and analysis is rigorous, follow systematic procedures, and reduce researcher bias to dispel doubts as the reliability and validity of the research (Yin, 2009; Stake, 2005). In addition, questions often arise regarding the amount of time required to complete case studies. However, as Yin (2009) notes, this does not necessarily have to be true, as long narrative descriptions that defined early case study research can be replaced with more efficient methods of data collection.

3.1.2 Case Study Selection

As discussed previously, the main study was conducted as an embedded single case study design. The rationale for choosing a single case study design is due to the representative or typical nature of the following potential cases (Yin 2009). Each of the following cities represent conditions that are very typical of historic commercial areas not only across the Southeast, but throughout the United States. Since each of the following cities have many common characteristics to other historic cities, the findings from the study may therefore be abstracted to other similar contexts (Yin 2009). To narrow down and select the most appropriate case, the following were required criteria for case study selection:

1. An intact historic commercial core
2. Presence of locally designated historic districts
   a. Design Review Board
   b. Design Guidelines
3. Demographic considerations
   a. Moderately sized city (100,000-200,000 residents)
b. Economically and socially diverse
c. Similar demographic profiles based on median income, education, etc.

4. Accessibility and Cost Issues
   a. Professional connections
   b. Geographical proximity

5. Potential cases
   a. Birmingham, Alabama
   b. Mobile, Alabama
   c. Savannah, Georgia
   d. Charleston, South Carolina
   e. Greenville, South Carolina
   f. Chattanooga, Tennessee

Based on an evaluation of the above-mentioned cases, Savannah, GA was chosen as the most appropriate case based on several factors. Birmingham, AL was eliminated due to the lack of locally designated historic districts within the commercial core. Charleston, SC was dismissed due to the unique circumstances surrounding Charleston, including the growing emphasis on tourism both nationally and globally. The remaining cases were all viable study sites, however, Savannah, GA was chosen as the most appropriate case study site for several reasons. The pattern of growth, decline, and revitalization that has occurred in the historic core is typical of many other historic cities, making it easier to abstract the results gathered in Savannah to other locations. In addition, the city has a balanced mix of economic industries, including tourism, industrial activities, and education, without depending too heavily on one particular sector. The City of Savannah is also experiencing steady revitalization within the historic core, with a rising and diversifying population within the city center. These factors signify a reversal in the growth trends seen in the past two decades. This shift indicates that the City of
Savannah will continue to see increased redevelopment of historic structures that must be developed under the existing regulatory process, making this site particularly appropriate for this study. As Greenville, SC was also an appropriate study site, it was chosen as the location for the pilot study conducted to test the research methodology.

3.1.3 Savannah Background and Current Conditions

Savannah was founded as an English Colony in 1733 by James Oglethorpe, who also designed the urban plan for the new city (Historic Savannah Foundation, 1968). This plan, which placed a strong emphasis on central squares, has become one of the most defining and recognizable characteristics of the city. Oglethorpe’s plan was originally designed with four squares, Johnson, Wright, Telfair, and Ellis Square. The plan was established to allow for natural growth using the same pattern, and by the mid-nineteenth century, ...
century, Savannah had grown to include a total of 24 squares. Like most cities across the United States, Savannah’s historic center suffered decline in 1950s during the post-WWII housing boom as residential growth patterns shifted towards developing suburbs. In addition, many historic resources were demolished as a result of both small scale projects and city-wide urban renewal plans, and replaced with modern counterparts (Historic Savannah Foundation, 1968). This can be seen in the demolition of the City Market building in 1954 to make way for a parking garage, as well as the construction of the I-16 exit ramp, which resulted in the neighborhood scale clearing and demolition of the minority West Broad Street neighborhood. This project had such a detrimental impact on not only the historic fabric of the area, but the economic vitality of the neighborhood that the City of Savannah in conjunction with community groups such as the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority is still working to revitalize the neighborhood destroyed as a part of this urban renewal plan (City of Savannah, 2012).

As a result of these and other projects, three of the 24 squares were lost (City of Savannah, 2012). After twenty years of steady decline and abandonment, the City of Savannah began a slow move towards revitalization beginning in the late 1970s. The process was aided tremendously by the decision of the newly founded Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) to locate its campus in downtown rather than build a suburban complex. To do this, SCAD began occupying previously vacant buildings in the core historic district. The partnership between the City of Savannah and SCAD has been an important catalyst for a steady increase in redevelopment and tourism. In terms of economic development, the city still maintains a manufacturing and shipping emphasis as
major component of the local and regional economy. This portion of the economic sector will most likely continue to grow as a result of the deepening of the Panama Canal, and the development of the in-land port in Cordele, GA., which will increase the potential shipping capacity of the Port of Savannah.

3.1.4 Savannah Historic Districts

Currently, there are fourteen National Register Districts in Chatham County, GA. Of those fourteen districts, nine are located within the city center of Savannah. Additionally, four of the districts have also been designated at the local level. These districts, Savannah Historic District, Victorian District, Mid-City (Thomas Square)
District, and Cuyler-Brownsville District utilize a design regulatory process (design guidelines overseen by a design review board) to steer development within these areas.

Figure 3.4 Locally Designated Historic District in Savannah, GA

3.1.5 Case Study Propositions

Case study propositions are developed from the research questions and “direct attention to something that should be examined in the scope of the study” (Yin, 2009, pg. 29). The propositions were developed based on the current literature relating to place attachment, historic preservation, and design regulation. As this study is exploratory in nature, the propositions will be broader in nature, while still providing some measures as how to determine their accuracy (Yin, 2009). Scannell and Gifford’s tripartite model of place attachment, which utilized the components of person, place, and process in the
development of place attachment, was used in measuring levels of place attachment as they relate to both the design guidelines and architectural features. It is expected that while aesthetic elements will be a factor in feelings of place attachment (place), other factors such as individual experience (person) or community heritage (process) will also affect levels of place attachment (Scannell & Gifford, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Literature Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1</td>
<td>• The design guidelines will be very effective at protecting the ‘place’ dimensions of places that residents value, however, they will be less successful at preserving the characteristics that support the ‘person’ and ‘process’ dimensions of place attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashworth, 2008; Kaufman, 2009; Manzo, 2005; Prohansky, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2</td>
<td>• Some adaptively reused buildings will result in higher levels of place attachment by restoring memory based attachment (restoring to previous glory), however, this can be interrupted if key aesthetic elements (specific architectural features, patina) are destroyed during the adaptive reuse process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 3</td>
<td>• The individual architectural characteristics will be less significant if the overall character of place is preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russell and Ward, 1982; Manzo et. al., 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Data Collection Strategy

As part of the case study, multiple sources of data were collected to “allow an investigator to address a broader range of historical and behavioral issues” (Yin 2009, pg. 115). The data collected consisted of two main components, (1) archival research, which will include supporting documentation and archival data, and (2) participant data, including interviews and photo elicitation. The participant data was collected in two
parts. Part I included a web-based survey instrument, while Part II utilized photo elicitation. The archival data and documentation collected was compared to the participant data to ascertain how well equipped design guidelines are to result in adaptive use projects that elicit place attachment from residents.

Table 3.2 Data Collection Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Strategy</th>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Description of Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archival Research</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>National Register Nominations; Historic Surveys; Architectural Review Board meeting minutes/agendas News articles and press records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Research</td>
<td>Archival Records</td>
<td>Zoning Ordinances; Maps of study area (geographical and historic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Web Based Survey</td>
<td>Online Survey responses Face-to-face/telephone interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo-Elicitation</td>
<td>Interviews, Physical Artifacts</td>
<td>Photographs taken by survey participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Participant Sampling Design

The sampling design utilized the same pool of respondents for both Part I and Part II of the survey design. This allowed for cross comparison between the responses of both portions of the data. A stratified sampling method was used to increase efficiency of the sampling process as well as to ensure that a variety of groups will be included (Dillman, 2009). As the research questions of this project are focused on levels of place attachment within the historic district and perceptions regarding revitalization of those areas, two specific types of organizations were chosen to develop the sampling strata. The organizations were chosen to represent two specific interest groups within the study area (Savannah, GA) that could impact redevelopment efforts (see Table 3.3). The Savannah Downtown Business Association represented local business owners and investors, while
two neighborhood associations (Downtown and Victorian) represented the opinions of local residents. Utilizing multiple organizations as the strata increased heterogeneity within the sampled population and ensure that the sampled population is more representative of residents of Savannah by decreasing the probable sampling error (Dillman, 2009). The sampling frame was developed using the membership lists of each of the organizations listed in Table 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Interest Group</th>
<th>Membership Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Downtown Business Association</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>200 members*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah Downtown Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>340 members*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>100 members*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>30 members*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers are reported by the organizations and are approximate

3.2.2 Archival Data Collection

The archival data collection included both documentation such as National Register nominations for the four locally designated districts (Downtown, Victorian, Thomas Square and Cuyler-Brownsville) Historic Surveys; Architectural Review Board meeting minutes/agendas, News articles and press records. In addition, archival records were also collected, including zoning ordinances (overlay, etc.) and maps of the study area (geographical and historic).

3.3 Part I: Web Based Survey

For this case study, the participant data was collected using a cross-sectional,
contextual survey design (Dillman 2009). The survey was constructed and administered using Qualtrics survey software. The majority of the data collected in the survey was quantitative, and focused on five-point Likert scale questions. In addition, portions of the survey included visual preference and heat mapping questions to assess attitudes towards completed adaptive use projects within the study area. However some supporting qualitative data was gathered as well, in the form of open-ended responses to specific questions.

- **Part I: Online Survey**
  The web-based survey focused on measuring general place attachment, place identity, and place dependence related to the historic district. In addition, more specific questions assessed opinions relating to adaptive use projects within the study area. Part I will include three types of questions:

  - **General Place Attachment Questions**
    - These questions evaluated participants general place attachment to historic downtown Savannah, GA.
    - Question types: Visual Preference, Likert Scale, Open-ended questions

  - **Attachment to Architectural and Environmental Features Questions**
    - These questions focused on participant’s attitudes and feelings of place attachment towards existing, and newly renovated buildings in historic Savannah.
    - Question types: Visual Preference (Heat Mapping and Likert Scale) Open-ended Questions

  - **Demographic Questions**
    - These questions collected demographic information about the participants, such as race, gender, marital status, occupation, etc.
3.3.1 Survey Question Wording

Question wording for the survey instrument was adapted from items developed by Williams and Roggenbuck (1989) and Williams and Vaske (2003), to measure levels of place attachment. The categories of questions used are organized into three broad dimensions of place attachment; general attachment, place identity, and place dependence. Each of the questions included a five-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Table 3.4 below provides examples of the type of question wording that were in the survey instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Attachment Measures</th>
<th>Example Question Wording*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment</td>
<td>I am very attached to historic Savannah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Savannah is very special to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Savannah makes me feel like no other place can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>One of the major reasons I live in where I do is that Historic Savannah is nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel like historic Savannah is a part of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel no commitment to Historic Savannah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence</td>
<td>Historic Savannah is the best place for what I like to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The things I do in historic Savannah I would enjoy just as much somewhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I get more satisfaction out of spending time in Historic Savannah than from spending time someplace else.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*Question wording derived from Williams and Vaske, 2003; Williams and Roggenbuck, 1989; Williams, 2000)

3.3.2 Variables of Interest

Part I of the survey instrument gathered mostly quantitative data. As such, independent and dependent variables have been identified. The dependent variables were the place attachment measures, general attachment, place identity, and place dependence,
developed from Williams and Roggenbuck (1989) and Williams and Vaske (2003). The independent variables for the survey were the physical characteristics within historic Savannah, divided into three main groups, architectural features, environmental features, and urban features (see Table 3.5 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Features (AF)</th>
<th>Windows (1), Doors (2), Shutters (3), Balconies (4), Porches (5), Roofs (6), Ornamentation (7), Building materials (8), Store signs (9), Storefronts/Display windows (10), Awnings (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Features (EF)</td>
<td>Trees and Landscaping (1), Gardens (2), Container plantings (3), Lawns (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Features (UF)</td>
<td>Fountains (1), Statues (2), Sidewalks (3), Pavers (4), Historic markers (5), Benches (6), Streetlights (7), Bicycle racks (8), Park signs (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 The Use of Visual Images

There are many disciplines that rely upon still images in research practices, including psychology, education, healthcare, and most relevantly design professions, such as architecture and planning. In these disciplines, still images have been utilized in both qualitative and quantitative methods, both of which will be incorporated into the research design. Additionally, incorporating theory from environmental preference, place attachment, and urban design literature to inform the research related to visual images is critical. These theories will help operationalize important concepts and to develop a photo selection protocol. Integrating theory from multiple bodies of literature will also aid in the development of a coherent analytic strategy. In assessing preference, it is important to acknowledge the role that cultural background, geographic location, and
even demographics play in a person’s personal preferences and judgments.

### 3.4.1 Design Regulation and Visual Images

There is a large body of literature related to visual preference in landscape settings (Kaplan and Kaplan, 1989). Many of these early studies into preference focused on either the physical attributes of the scene, cognitive dimensions related to the viewers’ perceptions, or a combination of both. While many of these researchers, most notably Stephen and Rachel Kaplan, are predominant in fields outside of the design disciplines, their contributions are far reaching, and are foundational to visual preference research and include aspects particularly relevant to research into the built environment. According to the Kaplans environmental preference categories could be derived from two basic concepts, content or spatial configuration. This resulted in four categories, open-undefined, spacious-structured, enclosed, and blocked views (Herzog, 1992). They hypothesized that based upon evolutionary instincts, spacious-structured categories should have high preference ratings, while the open-undefined and blocked views categories would result in low ratings (Herzog, 1992). While these concepts focused

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coherence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Complexity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate: Orderly, “hangs together”, repeated elements, regions</td>
<td>Richness, intricate, no. of different elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferred: Legibility</td>
<td>Mystery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding one’s way there and back, distinctiveness</td>
<td>Promise of new but related information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6 Relationship between Factors Predicting Environmental Preference

Adapted from Kaplan and Kaplan, 1989, pg. 516
solely on physical aspects, the Kaplans also addressed the cognitive aspects of preference, proposing that environmental preferences were also predicated upon two specific cognitive processes: understanding and exploration (Kaplan and Kaplan, 1989). This model focused on factors that rely upon “both the environment and the perceiver” (Kaplan and Kaplan, 1989, pg. 514) (See Table 3.6).

These predictors of preference are especially relevant given their compatibility with literature related to the built environment and the quality of urban space. Two researchers in particular, Kevin Lynch (1960) and Christopher Alexander (1977), focused on the physical aspects of place. These early precedents in cognitive mapping and visualization within the built environment set the precedents for later studies utilizing visual imagery and the expanded use of graphics in design research. Building upon both the precedents set by both environmental landscape and urban design literature, several researchers have focused more specifically on visual imagery as it related to preference within urban contexts (Herzog, 1992; Nasar, 1998, 1994; Stamps, 1997, 1994).

While Herzog’s work provides valuable insights into the application of Kaplan and Kaplan’s (1989) predictors of preference to urban environments, both Stamps (1997, 1994) and Nasar (1998, 1994) discussed visual image research in the context of not only urban design, but design review and the regulatory process. Nasar, much in the vein of both Alexander (1977) and Lynch (1960) focused on legibility of the city and how it is evaluated and interpreted by the community (Nasar, 1998). Specifically, he focused on the impact that new construction and alterations to the streetscape affect its quality. In “Urban design aesthetics: The evaluative qualities of building exteriors”, Nasar first
proposed a model diagramming the process by which community members perceive, process, and develop an effective and/or behavioral response to building attributes (See Figure 3.5) (Nasar, 1994, pg. 381). Next, he described the two types of variables in relation to urban features: attributes related to formal aesthetics and attributes of symbolic aesthetics (Nasar, 1994).

![Diagram of aesthetic response model]

*Figure 3.5 A Probabilistic Model of Aesthetic Response (Adapted from Nasar, 1994)*

While Nasar’s work focused on the aesthetic basis of the design review, Stamps (1997, 1994) investigated the review process, and the effect that going through the design review process had on a building’s preference levels. His work revealed that there was little correlation between traditional design review methods and public preferences.
(Stamps, 1997). Additionally, his work suggested that compatibility with surrounding building scale and massing are more significant than compatibility of style specific design features (1994). If corroborated in this research, these findings could be very significant for design review boards in terms of addressing stylist compatibility of traditional and modern architectural aesthetics.

3.4.2 Visual Images in Quantitative Research

One of the most commonplace applications of visual images in quantitative research is the visual preference survey. In planning and design, this technique was pioneered by urban planner Anton Nelessen (Ewing, King, Raudenbush, & Clemente, 2005). Often associated with the growing New Urbanist movement and the associated Smart Growth movement, these surveys engage participants to rate scenes of different growth patterns, from small town mainstreets to more sprawling suburban patterns. As expected, people tend to prefer the small town scenes, which is often used as justification for changes to comprehensive plans, zoning ordinances, and the introduction of design standards. However, as Ewing et. al. (2005) emphasize, these surveys often lack methodological rigor, and as a result are not able to pinpoint which specific physical features or characteristics of the images are triggering preference. To begin to effectively measure and analyze preference through visual images, it is of paramount importance to begin to control for confounding variables through the use of more rigorous research methodologies (Ewing, King, Raudenbush, & Clemente, 2005).
One of the primary components of reliable research utilizing visual imagery is the establishment of a research protocol. By developing a protocol that is based on broader epistemological and theoretical perspectives and assumptions, a researcher will be able to not only address specific threats to validity, but to also ameliorate them through a removal of bias or confounding variables within the images (Ewing et. al., 2005; Gaber, J., & Gaber, S. L., 2004). As Prosser and Schwartz explain, “visual researchers generally take a more pragmatic stance than other fieldworkers, because we need to employ methods that enable use to produce images capable of generating useful data” (Prosser and Schwartz, 1998, pg. 104). There are also specific considerations regarding the use of images in research related to planning and the built environment. For example, John and Sharon Gaber highlight the distinctions between images used as “illustrations” in planning, designed for use as a metaphor or visualization tool, compared to images used in empirical research. Empirical images must first depict a “visually understandable image of the research subject to allow careful contemplation and analysis” and more importantly must be informed by theory (Gaber, J., & Gaber, S. L., 2007, pg. 45).

Grounding research using of visual images in a consistent theoretical framework is also critical, in that it informs the identification of visual variables as well as their relationship to other variables located within the image (Gaber, J., & Gaber, S. L., 2007).

3.4.3 Photo Sort and Rank Task

To select the images utilized in the visual preference portions of the survey, a photo sort and rank task was conducted. The photos that are ranked were taken by the
researcher, and divided into three overarching land use categories: commercial, residential, and parks/urban public space. These categories were chosen based on both place attachment and urban design literature. Place attachment literature suggests that people have highest levels of attachment towards their homes, followed by the abstract scale of ‘city’, and finally the “third places” that define life outside of work and the home (Lewicka, 2011). Additionally, as most zoning and regulatory codes focus on these three zones, it is logical to include them in the study. The definitions were adapted from language/definitions found in the City of Savannah zoning ordinance and design guidelines. The categories have been operationalized and defined as follows:

Commercial: A land use category that includes offices, hotels, shops, restaurants, and entertainment venues, such as movie theatres.

Residential: A land use category that includes single-family dwellings as well as multi-family structures, such as townhomes, duplexes, or condo buildings. This can also include mixed-use buildings if the primary use is for residences.

Parks/Urban Public Space: Designated green spaces or urban plazas that are open to the public.

An established photo selection criterion was created to reduce variability within the photo set. The photo selection criterion included six elements:

1. Color photographs shot in landscape orientation
2. Presence of pedestrians
   a. While some research in environmental preference has indicated that pedestrians can serve as distractors (Herzog, 1992), research of urban environments indicates that including pedestrians helps to provide scale to the urban features while increasing feelings of presence (city as active, vibrant area) (Ewing et. al., 2005).
3. Presence of greenery
4. Photographs shot from same distance and presented at the same scale (Gaber and Gaber, 2004, Ewing et. al., 2005)
(5) All locations in locally designated historic district

Once photographs were taken, they were sorted utilizing the focus group sorting task discussed previously to identify photographs that are most representative of each category, and therefore best suited for use in the final survey.

3.4.4. Final Image Selection

Following the sort and rank task, the following images were ranked the highest in each category, by a total of ten focus group participants.

**Highest Ranked Images by Category**

![Figure 3.6 Highest Ranked Commercial Images](image)

![Figure 3.7 Highest Ranked Residential Images](image)

![Figure 3.8 Highest Ranked Parks / Urban Space Images](image)
3.5 Part II: Photo Elicitation

While Part I of the research design is based on a quantitative approach to measuring place attachment and visual preference, the second portion of the research study focused on qualitative methods. For Part II of the survey design, photo elicitation was used to assess participant’s levels of place attachment to places and elements throughout the study area (Savannah, GA). The protocol for the photo elicitation portion of the study was developed based on previous research and literature regarding photo elicitation and the use of visual images in research, described below.

Photo elicitation is a qualitative research approach developed by John Collier in the mid-1950’s, and utilizes visual elements to aid in social research (Harper, 2002). A participant driven approach was used, in which the photographs were taken by the participants, rather than provided by the researcher (Moore et al., 2008). This is an important distinction because it provided the respondents the freedom to identify what is meaningful, rather than respond to images they are shown. As a result, the photographs became “evidence not only of what’s there, but also of what an individual sees; they are not just a record, but an evaluation of the world” (Moore et al., 2008, pg. 61). In addition, the participant driven approach is more consistent with an “inductive research approach for gaining insight into the personal realms of participants” (Moore et. al., 2008, pg. 51).

While photo elicitation has been used widely in social research, it is more rare in place attachment research (Stedman et. al., 2013). There are several researchers, however, who have utilized photo elicitation to evaluate place attachment in urban areas (Moore et. al., 2008) or related to specific environmental and/or physical feature
(Stedman et. al., 2004). There are also several recognized benefits of using photo elicitation. While photo elicitation might not necessarily garner more or less information that other research methods, as Harper noted, it “evokes a different kind of information” (Harper, 2002, pg. 13) and “its potential is nearly endless” (Harper, 1994, pg. 410). First, this method often has little need for participant training, making it a more accessible research methodology to a greater percentage of the population. In addition, photo elicitation puts the control in the hands of the participants, therefore empowering them to guide the research process. This method can also be effective as a means of revealing different perceptions of one’s environment based on demographic markers such as gender, age, and social standing, which might otherwise have gone unnoticed (Dodman, 2003). Collier (1957) described that one of the primary benefits of utilizing photo elicitation is the improved memory of interview participants, which in turn increases reliability of the data. This idea is echoed by Harper (2002) when he discussed the ability of using photo elicitation to allow for more comprehensive expressions of participants’ feelings and ideas, connecting those ideas to broader social and historical contexts, and reducing potential misunderstandings between participants and researchers.

However, every research methodology has its limitations, and photo elicitation is not an exception. It is extremely important for researchers using photo elicitation to include the contextual background of the photographs, such as the photographer, why the photo was taken, and the intended audience so as not to misconstrue the meanings or interpretations of the photo (Stewart and Floyd, 2004). It is also important to recognize the significance of what is excluded from the photograph, and how participants choose to
frame the photos. Without contextualizing this aspect as well, the photographs could
“reinforce predetermined or predominant values or modes of experience” (Stewart and
Floyd, 2004, pg. 453). Finally, participants will be far more likely to photograph places
that garner either extremely positive or negative feelings. However, given this method
will be used to measure place attachment, this could in fact highlight places that are most
significant in shaping feelings of attachment. There are also technical issues related to
photo elicitation, mainly regarding the use of cameras, their distribution and collection,
and finally processing of the photos. As the use of digital imagery has increased, it was
necessary to include digital photography as a more viable option for participants. If the
process is too cumbersome for participants, then response rates and therefore the validity
of the research itself could suffer.

Participants for Part II were drawn from those who also completed the online
survey, and who have consented to participate in additional research. These participants
were mailed a research packet, which included the following:

1. An introduction letter with instructions and contact information
2. A visual image consent form
3. A photo log to document the location of each photograph, a short description,
   and it’s importance (see Appendices)
4. A pre-paid return mailing envelope.
5. A 15 exposure disposable camera (if requested)

Participants were asked to personally take the photographs, and had the option of either
digital photos or using a disposable camera provided by the researcher (preference for
digital or disposable camera was indicated by the participant). Those choosing to take
digital photographs emailed the photos directly to the researcher. A disposable camera
was included in the mailing packets for participants that requested a camera. Once received, all images were processed, including a digital CD of the images and 4x6 prints. After the photos were developed, the researcher conducted a follow-up interview with the participants.

3.5.1 Interview Protocol

Interviews were conducted in a public location, such as a coffee shop or café, and were 30 minutes to 1 hour in duration. The interviews were recorded for transcription and analysis. The interviews followed a semi-structured format, so a set of guiding questions was asked during the course of the interview. However, questions were adapted based on the participant’s responses. The main objective of the interviews was to uncover the dimensions of place attachment that drove the participant’s choice in photographs and to “present the experience of the people he or she interviews in compelling enough detail and in sufficient depth that those who read the study can connect to that experience, learn how it is constituted, and deepen their understanding of the issue it reflects” (Seidman, 1991, pg. 51).

3.6 Data Analysis

For this study, the data analyzed included both quantitative data (survey responses, including Likert scale matrix questions) and qualitative data (interview transcripts, photo logs, open-ended survey responses, documentation). The quantitative data was collected using Qualtrics software (survey construction, distribution, and
collection), and analyzed with SPSS (statistical analysis). The qualitative analysis was conducted using MaxQDA software, and allowed for the use of different qualitative analysis techniques, such as content analysis (Silverman, 2011). Most importantly, all analysis focused on “relying on theoretical propositions” that the case study design has been based on (Yin, 2009, pg. 130). As discussed previously, the propositions for this study relied heavily on place attachment theory. As a result, the data analysis focused on measures and dimensions derived from place attachment theory and literature.

Researchers investigating place attachment have identified particular dimensions of the phenomenon, including place identity, place dependence, and the cognitive and emotional elements of attachment. Place identity refers to the degree to which one’s own identity is tied to a specific place (Proshansky, 1978; Hull, Lam, & Vigo, 1994), while place dependence represents the ability or importance of a place to provide the necessary resources or conditions to support one’s goals or activities (Stokols and Schumaker, 1981; Williams and Roggenbuck, 1989). The cognitive and emotional aspects of place attachment recognize the influence of one’s memories and personal experiences on the development of place attachment (Hidalgo and Hernandez, 2001; Manzo, 2005). These different dimensions of place attachment theory were used, specifically, Scannell and Gifford’s Tripartite Model of place attachment (See Figure 3.9), to construct consensus of place meaning created from the three disparate theoretical viewpoints of preservation, planning, and heritage (Scannell and Gifford, 2010). In Scannell and Gifford’s Tripartite Model, these dimensions were incorporated into three broader categories of person, place, and process (Scannell and Gifford, 2010).
This model was used to map quantitative measures of attachment as well as qualitative coding and analysis back to the primary concepts based on the following categories:

**Person Dimension**
- Places/specific buildings that respondents value as a result of personal experience.

**Place Dimension**
- Places/specific buildings that participants value for their aesthetic qualities.

**Process Dimension**
- Places/specific building that participants value for social and cognitive reasons.

Utilizing these dimensions was also helpful when examining rival explanations (Yin, 2009). The range of possible factors driving place attachment other than architectural features, such as environmental factors, or social factors, was identified in both the place, and process section of the analysis.

For the quantitative analysis portions of the research design (Part I), question wording and drew on measures of place attachment that focused on general attachment,
place identity and place dependence dimensions of place attachment (Williams and Vaske, 2003; Williams and Roggenbuck, 1989). These dimensions were incorporated into the tripartite model of place attachment to create continuity between the two portions of the study, as well as to include analysis of any open-ended questions included in Part II. The general attachment dimension is a comprehensive measure of all three of the Scannell and Gifford (2010) dimensions. As place dependence was defined by Williams and Vaske as, “embodied in the area’s physical characteristics” it was therefore included in the ‘place’ and ‘person’ dimensions of the tripartite model (Williams and Vaske, 2003, pg. 831). Additionally, place identity, or “the symbolic importance of a place as a repository for emotions and relationships that give meaning and purpose to life” was incorporated into the ‘process’ and ‘place’ dimensions (Williams and Vaske, 2003, pg. 831).

3.6.1 Units of Analysis

For this case, the overall unit of analysis was the historic city center in Savannah, Georgia. Within this overall unit of analysis, several embedded units of analysis were utilized. These embedded units included the design guidelines for the locally designated Landmark District, as well as the two adaptively used buildings included in the online survey.

3.6.2 Measures

As the research methodology is testing the relationship between place attachment
and architectural elements, it is critical to first evaluate the measures used in place attachment research. As Lewicka explained, “research in place attachment is split between two different theoretical and methodological traditions: qualitative, which has its roots in geographical analyses of sense of place, and psychometric, rooted in early community studies” (Lewicka, 2011, pg. 219).

Like other psychometric scales, which seek to objectively measure psychological characteristics, the first quantitative measures for place attachment emerged in the early 1980s and were refined over the next two decades. These early research efforts focused on indicators such as length of residence, homeownership, etc. and rather than focusing on place based emotions, provided insight into likely behavior patterns (Lewicka, 2011). However, the most commonly used scale for place attachment was developed by Daniel Williams, who in conjunction with other researchers established a set of 61 survey questions that could be used to quantitatively measure general place attachment, as well as the place dependence and place identity dimensions of place attachment (Williams and Roggenbuck, 1989; Williams and Vaske, 2003;). This tool has been extensively utilized and expanded upon using the same dimensions by other researcher such as Jorgensen and Stedman (2001) or modified to include other dimensions of attachment (Brown and Perkins, 2003; Hernandez et. al., 2007).

There are advantages of using such scales. For example, as a survey instrument, these scales can be not only easily adapted to suit a multitude of circumstances, but also administered fairly easily and quickly, and can be evaluated using standard statistical methods (Dillman, 2009). However, one of the primary weaknesses of such measures is
its low construct validity (Lewicka, 2011). Due to the complexity of the process and
development of place attachment, it is often difficult to pinpoint direct causal
relationships with certainty, especially without knowledge of the basis of attachment, or
“the meanings that people are attached to” (Stedman, 2004, pg. 680).

While quantitative measures of place attachment might “grasp the differentiation
among people with regard to subjective importance and strength of emotional bonds with
places” as Lewicka notes, they are “little-suited for measuring what the places mean”
(Lewicka, 2011, pg. 221). Instead, qualitative measures of place attachment are intended
to identify the meanings of places. Qualitative measures for place attachment include
“verbal” measures, such as interviews or reports and “pictorial” measures, which often
rely on either photo elicitation methods that are either participant or researcher driven
(Lewicka, 2011). The strengths of utilizing qualitative methods when studying place
attachment stem from their ability to allow for collection of data that is richer and based
on the participants’ own categories of meaning (Creswell, 2007). However, weaknesses
in these methods often relate to their execution, which is often more time consuming in
both the data collection and analysis phases of the research design. In addition, the
analysis is more susceptible to researcher bias, and as the data is highly individualized it
is also less generalizable to the larger population.

3.7 Threats to Validity

The threats to validity for the research study were addressed through proper
conceptualization and operationalization of the main concepts. The main concepts for the
research study were developed based on my primary research question:

*Can identifying, prioritizing, and integrating residents’ feelings of place attachment into the design regulatory process ease the tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning by aiding communities in developing consensus?*

As a result, the research study focused on two main concepts: place attachment and the design regulatory process. It is from these two concepts that dimensions were developed, as well operational definitions and measures that will map back to the original concepts.

However, there are specific threats to validity, including external and internal validity, and reliability, that will be discussed. For this research study, as is true with many place attachment studies, the greatest threat to validity is construct validity. In construct validity, the key consideration is if the study does in fact measure what it is intended to measure. As Yin (2009) stated, a test to ensure construct validity is by “identifying correct operational measures for the concepts being studied” (Yin, 2009, pg. 40). By utilizing tested and proved measures of place attachment in the construction of the survey instrument much of this threat was mitigated. This included utilizing questions from established survey instruments developed to measure specific dimensions of place attachment (Williams and Rogenbuck, 1989; Scannell and Gifford, 2010). The qualitative portions of the design faced slightly different threats to construct validity. Silverman (2011) described validity in qualitative research as “the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers” (as cited in Silverman, 2011, pg. 367). However, “accuracy” can come under question based on Type I error, or believing a false statement to be true and Type II error, rejecting a true statement as false (Silverman, 2011). Type 1 errors are often created in qualitative data analysis when
researchers specifically search through data for relationships. This problem was mitigated by developing a protocol for analyzing the data that is collected (Yin 2009). In addition, triangulation of the multiple sources of data (archival, documentation, and survey) increased construct validity. However, as Silverman discussed (2011) any use of triangulation should follow two basic principles: beginning from a theoretical perspective, and use data “which will give you an account of structure and meaning from within that perspective” to ensure its effectiveness (Silverman, 2009, pg. 370).

To increase internal validity, researchers aim to demonstrate a causal relationship exists between variables (Yin 2009). For example, in this study, the underlying causes of place attachment might not be related to specific physical characteristics, in which case the independent and dependent variables would not be causally linked. This was managed by measuring other causes of place attachment, based on Scannell and Gifford’s (2010) model of place attachment. In addition, having participants explain the cause of attachment in both portions of the research design identified any additional causal links. It was also important to distinguish between predictors of place attachment, such as length of residency or homeownership, from dimensions of place attachment (Lewicka, 2011).

External validity demonstrates the degree to which the findings of a study are generalizable to other locations and/or populations (Yin, 2009). In case studies, demonstrating external validity can be particularly challenging. As Yin (2009) explained, case studies are not attempting to make statistical generalizations, but rather analytic ones, in which the researcher is “striving to generalize a particular set of results to some
broader theory” (Yin, 2009, pg. 43). Therefore, the theoretical principals that guide the protocols for the case study could later be generalized to other study areas. As a result, the largest threat to external validity is lacking a solid theoretical footing to develop all of the case study protocols and guide analysis of the data. This particular threat was mitigated with a thorough and rigorous understanding of both place attachment theory and current preservation practice.

Reliability “refers to the degree to which the findings of a study are independent of accidental circumstances of their production” (Silverman, 2011, pg. 360). The goal of reliability in any research study is to minimize error and bias, so that the study findings could be replicated by another researcher (Yin, 2009). The most effective way to increase reliability in case study design is to develop both a case study protocol, and a case study database (Yin, 2009). For this study, the development of a protocol for case selection, and later on selection of photographs for the visual preference portion of the survey instrument was particularly important. For qualitative research and analysis, reliability can be ensured through a similar process, of ensuring transparency in the research process, including the theoretical stance taken during interpretation, as well as the data analysis techniques used (Silverman, 2009). As noted earlier, the use of photo elicitation also increased validity of the qualitative data collected through improved memory and recollection of the participants, as well as better clarification of intended meanings (Collier, 1957; Harper, 2002).
3.7.1 Validity in Visual Images

When researcher generated images are collected there are specific issues that need to be addressed to ensure validity of the images. Before any images can be taken, the researcher must first establish what is to be photographed, and the concept that the photo represents. This requires operationalized definitions of important theoretical concepts (Singleton and Straits, 2005). Once these definitions are established, the research must establish not only a set of best practices to take the photos, but also a set of criteria that each photograph must meet to be eligible for inclusion in the study (Gaber, J., & Gaber, S. L., 2007; Ewing, et. al., 2005). When taking photographs, best practices include controlling as much as possible for confounding variables, such as weather, photograph orientation, scale, pedestrians, cars, etc. (Ewing, et. al., 2005). Gaber and Gaber (2007) also suggest composing images based on the “rule of thirds” to ensure a balanced composition that is legible to viewers. Once the photographs have been taken, it is critical to sort the images using a preference based sorting task to reduce researcher bias and gain consensus regarding the most representative photographs (Groat, L. N., Wang, D., 2013). In this process, small focus groups were organized, and participants utilized operationalized definitions of the image categories to rank photos that are most representative of each category.

3.8 Pilot Testing

Pilot testing is a vital step in research as it allows the researcher to test, and if necessary, to modify data collection strategies and procedures (Yin, 2009). The pilot
study for this research was conducted in the historic districts located in Greenville, SC (See Figure 3.10). This particular study site was chosen based on two primary factors; first, the site’s comparability to the main study area in Savannah, GA and second, its geographic accessibility due to the nearby location (Yin, 2009). Participants were selected from the Upcountry History Museum membership list. A total of 66 members completed the survey, and 11 members signed up to complete the photo elicitation portion of the survey. Of those 11 participants, four completed the photo elicitation portion of the survey.

3.8.1 Adjustments to the Research Methodology

The participants of the pilot survey were asked to provide feedback on the survey instrument itself, to better identify potential problems and make any necessary adjustments prior to the primary study. Based on provided critiques and suggestions, several changes were made to the study. One of the primary critique of the on-line survey was that portions seemed repetitive. As a result, changes were made to the survey organization to streamline particular sections. Question wording was also adapted to more closely tie levels of place attachment to image preference. The pilot testing of the photo elicitation portion of the study revealed several issues that were addressed. During the pilot, all participants were mailed disposable cameras to use. However, after speaking with participants, many expressed a desire to have taken digital photos instead. As a result, in the final study, participants were given the option to choose between taking and submitting digital photography or requesting a disposable camera.
CHAPTER FOUR
Research Findings
Part I

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to address a primary research question supported by two secondary research questions. Specific methods and analysis strategies were utilized to best answer either the primary or secondary research questions posed in this study (see Table 4.1). As the participant data was divided into two parts (web-based survey and photo elicitation), the findings will be presented in two chapters as well. This chapter will discuss the results from Part I of the research, the web-based survey.

Table 4.1 Data Analysis Strategies Used to Address the Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection method</th>
<th>Data Analysis method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Research Question</strong></td>
<td>Web-based Survey (Parts I-IV)</td>
<td>Statistical analysis (SPSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can identifying, prioritizing, and integrating residents’ feelings of place attachment into the design regulatory process ease the tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning by aiding communities in developing consensus?</td>
<td>Photo Elicitation</td>
<td>GIS mapping and analysis (ArcGIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archival Research</td>
<td>Content analysis (MaxQDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Research Question</strong></td>
<td>Web-based Survey (Part I &amp; III)</td>
<td>Statistical analysis (SPSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent do buildings renovated under the existing design guidelines in Savannah’s locally designated historic districts preserve the key architectural characteristics of places with the highest reported levels of place attachment?</td>
<td>Archival Research</td>
<td>Theoretical Propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Research Question</strong></td>
<td>Web-based Survey (Part 1 &amp; II)</td>
<td>Statistical analysis (SPSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent do individual architectural elements contribute to resident feelings of place attachment in Savannah’s locally designated historic districts?</td>
<td>Photo Elicitation</td>
<td>GIS mapping and analysis (ArcGIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content analysis (MaxQDA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Part I: Web-based Survey

4.2.1 Survey Response Rate

The survey participants were sampled from members of three neighborhood associations located in historic Savannah, Georgia, including the Downtown Neighborhood Association, Victorian Neighborhood Association, and the Metropolitan Neighborhood Association. Additionally, members of the Savannah Downtown Business Association (SDBA) were also contacted (see Table 3.3 in Chapter 3). The survey was available from September 25th, 2014 through January 25th, 2015. During this time, a total of 133 surveys responses were collected from a pool of potential participants of approximately 670, representing a 19.85% response rate.

4.2.2 Participant Demographic Profile

The demographic information collected in the survey revealed a participant group that was primarily Caucasian (93%), highly educated (87% reported a BA or higher), employed (79% full or part time employment) and married or in a committed relationship (73%). The age distribution of participants was fairly even between the ranges of 31-45 years old (26%), 46-60 years old (30%), or 61-75 years old (23%). Additionally, 62% of respondents were female (see Table 4.2).

While many of the demographic findings were consistent with both historic Savannah and national trends, such as gender and overall age distribution, certain demographic minorities were underrepresented in the survey results. These gaps are most significant in for both young and minority participants. While Savannah’s percentage of
adults age 18-30 is over 20%, only 6% of the survey respondents were also in the same age group. Additionally, minority respondents (Hispanic, African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native) were underrepresented, comprising of only 10% of the participants. The lack of diversity of participants as well as the lack of younger participants (aged 18-30) could reveal issues with the sampling strategy. This would suggest the need in future studies for more active engagement with local community leaders to increase participation of a more diverse stakeholder group.
4.2.3 Statistical Analysis

The quantitative data for this study was collected using a web-based survey instrument. The survey was divided into four main sections designed to evaluate specific relationships between architectural, environmental, and urban features of the built environment and place attachment. The focus of each section, as well as the types of questions used and the statistical methods to analyze responses is described in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Section</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Types of Questions</th>
<th>Statistical Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section I: General Place Attachment</td>
<td>Relationship between predictors and dimensions of place attachment</td>
<td>Multiple choice, Likert Scale, Open-Ended</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, Correlation Coefficients, T-tests, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II &amp; III: Attachment to Architectural Features</td>
<td>Relationship between architectural features and place preference/meaning</td>
<td>Heat mapping, Likert Scale, Open-Ended</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics, Principal Components Analysis (PCA), Multiple Regression, T-Tests, ANOVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section IV: Renovations under Design Regulation</td>
<td>Changes in attitudes regarding building renovations</td>
<td>Likert Scale, Open-Ended</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics, Content Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section V: Demographics</td>
<td>Demographic characteristics</td>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Section I: General Place Attachment

The first section of the survey was designed to assess widely recognized predictors of place attachment, such as length of residence, homeownership status, childhood residence, and frequency of visits (Lewicka, 2011; Manzo, 2006). These predictors were then compared to the reported levels of place attachment. The place attachment questions measured three specific dimensions of place attachment: general attachment, place identity, and place dependence (Williams and Vaske, 2003). Statistical
analysis including descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients ($r$) were calculated (see Table 4.4). These statistical tests revealed a positive correlation, or measure of strength between two variables, between the three dimensions of place attachment. The highest correlation occurred between general attachment and place dependence, followed very closely by general attachment and place identity, while the weakest correlation occurred between the place identity and place dependence dimensions. The relationships between the previously discussed predictors of place attachment and the three dimensions of attachment (GA, PI, and PD) were also investigated. The first predictor evaluated was the effect of living within the historic district compared to respondents who lived outside of Historic Savannah, with a second predictor of homeownership status. To determine differences in levels of attachment resulting from these predictors, two independent sample t-tests were conducted using place of residence and homeownership as the independent variables (see Table 4.5). Corroborating additional studies on place attachment, (Hernandez et al, 2007) residents who lived within the historic district reported significantly higher levels of attachment in all three dimensions, compared to residents who lived outside the historic district. The greatest differences occurred in the place identity dimension, followed by place dependence and general attachment.

Additionally, homeownership did result in a slight increase in both general attachment and place identity, with a marginally lower level in place dependence, suggesting that in this case, living within historic Savannah was a much more meaningful predictor of attachment to historic Savannah. The affect of the length of residence on the three dimensions of attachment was also tested utilizing a one-way analysis of
variance (ANOVA) with the length of residence as the independent variable. The relationship between place attachment and length of residence is one that differs within the literature. While many researchers have reported a positive correlation (Hernandez et al., 2007; Hay, 1998), there is also research that suggests place attachment can decrease over time due to a number of factors such as social injustice and/or marginalization, or displacement (Manzo, 2013a). This research found a positive correlation between length of residence and increased levels of attachment for the general attachment and place

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics and Inter-correlations Among Place Attachment Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>GA</th>
<th>PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment (GA)</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity (PI)</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence (PD)</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 103

Table 4.5 Means and Standard Deviations of Attachment Dimensions based on Place of Residence and Homeownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Attachment</th>
<th>Lives in Historic Savannah (n=77)</th>
<th>Lives Outside Historic Savannah (n=34)</th>
<th>Owns a home (n=95)</th>
<th>Does not own a home (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Means and Standard Deviations of Attachment Dimensions based on Length of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Attachment</th>
<th>Under 5 years n=20</th>
<th>6-15 years n=28</th>
<th>16-25 years n=18</th>
<th>26-35 years n=7</th>
<th>35 years + n=17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identity dimensions (see Table 4.6). The place identity dimension was shown to decrease after 15 years of residence, before increasing. Place dependence, however, was found to decrease over longer lengths of residence, indicating that while the factors that support place dependence were important in the initial phases of bonding, this dimension is less significant as the length of residence increases. Childhood residence, another predictor of attachment, was also shown to have an effect on place attachment for respondents. Nineteen of respondents reported living in Savannah as child, resulting in higher reported levels of both general attachment (4.47) and place dependence (3.97) compared to those who did not (3.93, 3.81). Conversely, in the place identity dimension, those who grew up in Savannah reported slightly lower level (4.15) compared to those who grew up outside of Savannah (4.31). In addition to the predictors of length of residence and childhood experience, the number of visits per week also impacted levels of attachment. Results revealed that more visits per week lead to steadily increasing levels of attachment across all dimensions, with the highest levels reported by those who were in historic Savannah daily, representing 76% of respondents. These findings corroborate previous research studies (Hay, 1998) tying specific predictors to increased levels of attachment. When analyzing differences in levels of attachment, however, based on demographic factors such as race, gender, and education level, this study found no significant differences.

4.4 Section II: Attachment to Commercial, Residential, and Parks/Urban Public Spaces

This section of the survey was used to evaluate the relationship between
architectural features and the respondent’s place preference based on personal meaning. While visual images are a primary component of this portion of the survey, the questions are measuring more than visual preference. These questions aim to gauge the effect of place attachment on preference in images. Respondents were asked to rank not which image they prefer, but which image is most meaningful to them, mirroring the question wording from the first section of the survey (see Figure 4.1). Participants then responded to two follow-up statements about the importance of the architecture in creating and maintaining meaning. The follow-up questions measured the degree to which respondents agreed with the following statements, Question 1 (Q1) “The architecture of this place is

Which of these commercial places in historic Savannah is the most meaningful to you?

A commercial place is defined as a place whose primary function is for commercial activity, such as retail, office space, restaurant, entertainment venue, etc.

☐ Place 1
☐ Place 2

☐ Place 3
☐ None of these commercial places is meaningful to me

Figure 4.1 Commercial Preference Question
an important part of why it is meaningful to me” and Question 2 (Q2) “If the architecture of this place was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me” ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Additionally, this section incorporated open-ended responses for all categories to better gauge the reasons each photo was meaningful to the respondent. These open-ended questions included, “What other (commercial, residential, park/urban public space) place in Historic Savannah is most meaningful to you?” and “Why is this place most meaningful to you?” The questions in this section followed the same order and were repeated with three categories of place; commercial, residential, and parks/urban public space. The results for commercial, residential, and parks/urban spaces are presented in Tables 4.7-4.9 in order from highest to lowest preference. The heat map results are shown alongside the original image. In these maps, the participants chose which part of the image was the most meaningful by clicking on the image. The results are displayed by a color spectrum from blue indicating the fewer ‘clicks’ to red representing the most ‘clicks’. Tighter clusters would therefore indicate higher consensus and agreement as to which elements are most meaningful regardless of why they are meaningful. Lastly, the $n$ value, mean score (M), and standard deviation (SD) for the follow-up questions are also included.

4.4.1 Commercial

Of the commercial places listed in this portion of the survey, Place 1 ranked the highest, capturing 36% of respondents (see Table 4.7). The importance of architectural features is shown by the relatively high mean score of 4.17 for Q1. However, the heat
map results demonstrate high levels of variability among responses indicated by the dispersal pattern of the ‘clicks’, in which respondents identified a broad spectrum of architectural elements. The open-ended responses for this image were also evenly distributed between the three dimensions of attachment. However, it should be noted that for most respondents there was consensus that the architecture in this photo is still representative of Savannah while being less “touristy” than other parts of the city. As one participant noted, “it reflects real life – not tourism.”

Ranked second of the images, Place 3 represented a departure from the previously demonstrated importance of architectural features. Both follow-up questions (Q1 and Q2) resulted in lower mean scores of 3.70 and 3.41 respectively, which would indicate attachment based on the person and process dimensions of attachment. This was corroborated in the open-ended responses. What is interesting is that while meaning was not based on architectural features, the heat map results show very high levels of consensus. Given the person and process dimensions creating meaning, this demonstrates that participants chose the architectural element that was most symbolic or representative of those memories or personal meanings. Participants explained, “the combination of Leopold’s and SCAD is an interesting and meaningful juxtaposition of ‘old’ Savannah and new, dynamic Savannah” and that the “historic business, historic family, shows dedication of Savannians to their own city.” Finally, as one participant noted, “Leopold’s is a great tradition in Savannah, and the theater is a great cultural asset.”

While ranked the lowest of the three images (20% of respondents), Place 2 had the highest mean scores for Q1 (4.45) demonstrating the importance of architecture in
Table 4.7 Commercial Place Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Follow-Up Questions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 3</td>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 2</td>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
attachment and the greatest agreement among respondents (SD of .605). While the heat map reveals high levels of variability as to which architectural features are the most significant, the open-ended responses for this area indicate that attachment is created largely due to the process and person dimensions of attachment. In this regard, the architecture becomes representative of the history and tourist experience in Savannah. Participants explained, “it embodies what Savannah is to the tourists that visit” and “the beauty and history behind it are unparalleled.”

It is important to note that in the commercial category, 16% of respondents indicated that none of the listed places were meaningful to them. Participants were then given the opportunity to fill in other specific commercial places that they did find meaningful, ranging from the very general “Bull Street, Barnard Street” and “any mom and pop shop selling unique products” to the very specific, “Pinkie Master’s Lounge. It’s a seedy dump these days, but it was the hub of my social life for most of my twenties.” The greater variation in the responses for the commercial category could indicate that a more thorough and comprehensive investigation might be required for such an encompassing category, or that this category would need greater differentiation for future studies.

4.4.2 Residential

For the residential category, the results were more consistent between the images. Both Place 1 and Place 2 indicated the high levels of importance of the architecture in the creation of meaning with mean scores of 4.69 and 4.64 respectively for Q1 (see Table
Table 4.8 Residential Place Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Questions</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, both of these questions also had very low standard deviations highlighting the agreement among respondents. Place 1, representing 62% of responses, exhibited characteristics and an “urban yet gentle feel – like upper east side of NY” that respondents viewed as meaningful. However, there were slight differences resulting in the respondent’s preference. The most notable aspect in choosing Place 2 (18% of responses) was based the respondent’s preference for single family homes that maintain the urban characteristics also exhibited Place 1. Open-ended responses highlighted the attraction of “well kept single family dwellings with lots of charm” while the denser fabric resulted in “synergy between the buildings” with enough “space between these houses, but not so much space that it becomes separate.”

Place 3, representing 11% of the responses, deviated from the results from Place 1 and Place 2. This photo resulted in a relatively low mean score for Q1 (3.67) in which the architecture was not significant in the creation of meaning. Open-ended responses show that this image is most evocative of what represents a “great place to raise a family” and the similarity to their own homes resulted in greater personal meaning. However, it is interesting to note that this is the only image in which the mean score remains consistent from Q1 to Q2, suggesting that while the architecture was not important part in creating meaning, if the architecture was changed it would alter or disrupt attachment.

In the residential category, attachment was formed through a relatively equal distribution of the three dimensions. Despite the fact that all three dimensions contributed to attachment, the heat map results for all three images showed extremely high levels of consensus in terms of architectural features. In each of the images, the focus was on front
porches, entry spaces, and greenery. As discussed previously, this would suggest that the architectural features have become symbolic of home.

4.4.3 Parks/Urban Public Space

Overall, the Parks/Urban Public Spaces had the lowest reported mean scores for importance of architectural features in the creation of meaning (Q1). Of the three images, Place 1 was ranked highest, representing 58% of the responses. It also had the highest reported level of importance for architectural features in the category (see Table 4.8). However, a drop in the mean score for Q2 indicates that the architectural features are not the primary component in meaning. Open-ended responses verify this finding, highlighting the importance of all of Savannah’s squares compared to the pictured square in particular, as “the squares are what makes Savannah so unique”. This indicates that the square pictured in the image became symbolic of a much larger urban pattern. As respondents explained, “it preserves Oglethorpe’s plan” and “the older squares are closer to the original intent.”

Both Place 2 (34% of responses) and Place 3 (8% of responses) had much lower mean scores measuring architectural importance (Q1). It is also significant to note that there was also no significant change in results for the second follow-up question. This demonstrates that not only was architecture not an important component in the creation of meaning, it was not important in maintaining meaning either, as it was in other responses (residential Place 3). The heat map results for this category also demonstrate a fairly high level of consensus among respondents as to which features are the most meaningful. For
Table 4.9 Parks/Urban Public Space Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 2</td>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 3</td>
<td>The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Follow-Up Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place 1</td>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 2</td>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place 3</td>
<td>If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place 1, the primary focus was on the space’s centralized architectural feature, a statue, with the remaining responses highlighting environmental features (trees, landscaping), which is also seen in the heat map for Place 3. However, for this map, every response indicates the splash fountain as the most meaningful feature. The low importance of architectural features in creating meaning indicates that this feature is a symbolic representation of other dimensions of attachment. While the heat map for Place 2 highlighted more areas, the focus was on centers of social activity within the park and what the park represents to the community. It is also important to note, that of the three categories, this was the only section in which no respondents indicated, “none of these parks are meaningful to me.”

4.5 Section III: Attachment to Architectural, Urban, and Environmental Features

This section of the survey was used to evaluate the relationship between specific architectural features and place meaning. Additionally, this portion of the survey was used to test Proposition 3 (see Chapter 3 Methodology) which stated, “the individual architectural characteristics will be less significant if the overall character of place is preserved” (Russell and Ward, 1982; Manzo et. al., 2013). To test this proposition, participants were asked “Are there parts of the (streetscape, building) that seem more important to you than other parts?” This question had a yes or no response, but also included an option of “I’m not sure” to prevent a bias in the data. Participants that responded “yes” were then shown an image of a streetscape and asked to rank the importance of specific urban features (benches, streetlights, etc.) as well as environmental
features (trees, landscaping, planters) to the overall character of the place. This question was repeated using the façade of an individual building to test specific architectural features such as windows, roof, and ornamentation. This portion of the survey also utilized heat map imagery in which participants identified which part was most significant to corroborate earlier responses. A follow-up open-ended question allowed participants to then explain why that specific feature was the most important. These open-ended responses were coded using Scannell and Gifford’s dimensions of attachment used for the photo elicitation portion of the survey.

4.5.1 Architectural, Urban, and Environmental Features

A principal components analysis (PCA) was then used to create three new dependent variables to represent Architectural Features (AF), Urban Features (UF), and Environmental Features (EF). Similar to an exploratory factor analysis, a principal components analysis allows for multiple variables to be reduced into a several new variables, or principal components. The principal components variables can then account for the variance that existed in the original variable set. These principal components variables for Architectural Features (AF), Urban Features (UF), and Environmental Features (EF) were regressed on the three predictors (dimensions of attachment) general attachment, place identity, and place dependence to predict if specific features are more important based on reported levels of place attachment.

The Architectural Features (AF) variable compiled a total of 7 items to create the first principal component (see Table 4.10). The overall model for this regression included
53 cases \((n=53)\) with a confidence level of 95%, and was statistically significant \((p < .004)\), while the model explained 50.5% of the variance. These results demonstrated that the predictors general attachment \((p < .015)\) and place identity \((p < .001)\) were statistically significant, and therefore could predict the importance of specific architectural features. For general attachment, an inverse relationship existed between the levels of general attachment and the importance of specific architectural features, such that as a participant’s overall level of general attachment increased, the importance of specific architectural features decreased. While this is an unexpected finding, this would suggest that general attachment, formed by all sum of the place, person, and process dimensions, becomes more dependent upon the person and process dimensions over time, resulting in less significance placed on the architectural features of a building in creating attachment. Conversely, this analysis revealed that higher levels of place identity increased the participant’s view of the importance of specific architectural features in maintaining a building’s unique character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment</td>
<td>- .611</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td>-2.524</td>
<td>.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>3.827</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p < 0.05\)

Unlike Architectural Features (AF), the regression models for both Urban Features (UF) and Environmental Features (EF) were statistically insignificant.

112
Urban Features (UF) variable compiled six individual items to create the first principal component, and used a total of 61 cases (n=61) in the model. The insignificance of this model indicated that general attachment, place identity, and place dependence are not predictors of the importance of urban features. The Environmental Features (EF) variable compiled three items to create the first principal component and included 20 cases in the regression model (n=20). It should be noted that the reduced number of items, combined with the small sample size could interfere with the model’s ability to accurately measure the relationship between the three predictors and the importance of environmental factors in maintaining character. To verify these results, the average mean for Architectural Features, Urban Features, and Environmental Features was also regressed on the three dimensions of place attachment. These results were consistent with those found utilizing the principal components analysis, however, the results were slightly more significant with principal components analysis.

4.5.2 Specific Features of Commercial, Residential, and Parks/Urban Public Space

While the principal components analysis tested the overall architectural, urban, and environmental features, and independent two tailed sample t-test was conducted to determine if a relationship existed between the responses to the “Are there parts of the (streetscape, building) that seem more important to you than other parts?” question, and the reported levels of attachment based on the three dimensions, general attachment, place identity, and place dependence. The results revealed that for both the commercial and residential facades, the place dependence was significant.
For the Commercial façade, the t-test for the place dependence dimension was significant, \( t(84) = 1.72, p = .089 \) (see Table 4.11). The larger mean for the “yes” group (\( M=3.94 \)) compared to the mean of 3.61 of the “no” group would suggest that the “yes” group had a statistically significant greater mean. As a result, respondents that answered, “yes, some parts seem more important than other parts” also have higher overall levels of place dependence. For the residential façade, the t-test for the place dependence dimension was also significant, \( t(84) = 2.06, p = .042 \) (see Table 4.12). Again, the larger mean score (4.05) for the “yes” group when compared to the mean of the “no” group (3.67) would suggest the “yes” group had a statistically significant greater mean than the “no” group. This indicates that respondents that chose “yes, some parts seem more important than other parts” also had higher reported levels of place dependence. The parks/public urban space category showed no significant differences between groups.

Table 4.11 Independent T-Test for Importance of Commercial Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, some parts seem more important</th>
<th>No, no part seems more important</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < 0.05*, p < 0.10** \)

Table 4.12 Independent T-Test for Importance of Residential Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, some parts seem more important</th>
<th>No, no part seems more important</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < 0.05*, p < 0.10** \)
4.5.3 Commercial

Of the total of 93 responses for the commercial façade, 54% (50) of respondents responded that “yes, some parts seem more important than other parts” while 39% (36) responded that “no part feels more important than another part.” 8% (7) of respondents were “not sure.” The “yes” responses indicated that for the commercial façade, the most significant architectural features were the roofline (24), windows (9), detailing (8), and

Table 4.13 Commercial Façade Results

Please click on the part of the building that is most important to maintaining its unique character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Features</th>
<th>Coded Open-Ended Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storefront</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the storefront (2). When coded based on the three dimensions of attachment, the place dimension was the most influential, accounting for 75% of the responses.

The roofline was identified as the most defining element of the façade, and as respondents explained, it was the most appealing because of its “unique detailing” that was the “most historic” element. The storefront and windows were most associated with the process and person dimensions of attachment rather than the place dimension. The survey respondents noted the importance of these features in enhancing both social and community activities. One participant stated, “the most interaction is at street level, and the feel of the building is interpreted on the ground floor” while another highlighted the importance of the storefront as “it is street level and welcomes people.” Additionally, the uniqueness of the bay window served as a positive focal point and representation of introducing modern additions and renovations to compliment an existing historic façade. One enthusiastic participant claimed, “that bay window is badass”, while another described the window as “an unusual design with incredible views of the neighborhood” highlighting the way in which the window was used to capitalize on the surrounding urban context. There was one respondent, however, who was not impressed with the new feature, and stated, “that ginormous second story window detracts from the symmetry of the building in a PT Barnum kind of way. Es ist schade (It’s a pity).” It is also interesting to note that unlike the commercial preference façades from Place 1 and 2 (see Table 4.7), the heat map for this question indicated relatively high levels of consensus regarding which architectural features were most significant in maintaining its character.
4.5.4 Residential

Of the total of 87 responses, 38% (33) of respondents responded that “yes, some parts seem more important than other parts” while 61% (53) responded that “no part feels more important than another part” and 1% (1) of respondents were “not sure.” The “yes” responses indicated that for the residential façade, the most significant architectural features were the roofline (8), doors (6), fanlight (6), and windows (6). Unlike the commercial façade, there was a much more even distribution among the features. This

Table 4.14 Residential Façade Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architectural Features</th>
<th>Coded Open-Ended Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanlight</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
might be reflective of the fact that many of the respondents believed this to be a more visually cohesive façade (response to previous question). The place dimension was again the most dominant dimension of attachment, representing 77% of the responses. While the place dimension was relatively evenly distributed over the five architectural features, the person and process dimensions of attachment were concentrated on entryway elements, including the doorway and windows. These features were seen as “inviting and welcoming” while one respondent elaborated that “the doors themselves are so Savannah. You see the narrow doors everywhere, and I love them. Doors welcome people.” These finding further corroborate the residential preference findings from the previous section (see Table 4.8).

4.5.5 Parks/Urban Public Space

Of the total of 83 responses, 53% (44) of respondents responded “yes, some parts seem more important than other parts” while 47% (39) responded that “no part feels more important than another part.” None of the respondents reported being “not sure.” The “yes” responses indicated that for the features for the park were evenly distributed between the urban feature of the fountain, and the environmental features of the trees and landscaping. 54% of responses identified the trees and landscaping as slightly more significant to the overall character of the streetscape than the fountain or other features. Respondents described the live oaks as “VITAL to the Savannah “look” of our green spaces” and that “without our trees, our squares and community spaces do not exist.” Additionally, comments highlighted the importance of the trees in establishing context
One participant explained, “the fountain is the focus of Forsyth Park. However, without the magnificent trees, this would just be another lovely fountain.” For 44% of the respondents, the fountain was most significant, as “an architectural symbol of the unity of the city” that is “the obvious centerpiece of Forsythe Park and identifies the park.”

The results were also evenly distributed between the place dimension of attachment and the process/person dimensions. The fountain was the most likely to evoke the person dimension as a result of personal experiences and memories at that location. This also corroborates the findings that public spaces result in attachment based on the person and process dimensions of attachment versus the place dimension noted in the previous section (see Table 4.9). It is important to note that these findings could be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Features</th>
<th>Coded Open-Ended Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Greenery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
influenced by the greater familiarity with this site as compared to the commercial and residential facades. There were many descriptions of the space as “iconic” which could reflect expectations or preconceived notions of Forsyth Park due to its popularity and commodification through the tourism industry, rather than on personal experience (Urry, 2002). This possibility is demonstrated by the comment, “There’s something magical about the way those trees frame the fountain. There’s a reason that everyone who visits Savannah has taken this exact same photo.”

4.6 Section IV: Renovations under the Design Guidelines

This section of the online survey measured changes in the participants’ attitudes regarding renovation projects within the Savannah Historic District. To do this, participants were asked a series of questions regarding two specific renovations in historic Savannah. Both building renovations were full façade renovations that were approved by the Savannah Historic District Board of Review. To gauge potential disruptions to existing attachment or creation of attachment due to changes in architectural features, participants were first asked about his/her familiarity with each of the buildings both before and after the renovations. Subsequently, participants were asked their opinions about the aesthetic changes to the buildings as a result of the renovations.

Question 1 (Q1) measured the degree to which respondents agreed with the following statement, “The changes made to this building are an improvement” ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Open-ended follow-up questions allowed respondents to identify which aspects of the renovation they liked the most and the least,
and if there were specific architectural elements that should have been preserved. Question 2 (Q2) measured agreement with the statement, “My feelings about this building have changed since its renovation” to gauge possible disruptions or creation of attachment as a result of the renovation. The open-ended follow-up question “Please explain how/why your feelings about this building have changed or have not changed” was used to qualify if changes in feeling were positive or negative and how significantly architectural features contributed to the change in feeling.

4.6.1 301 West Broughton Street Renovation

The 301 West Broughton Street renovation occurred in the early 2000s. The original petition for a Certificate of Appropriateness was heard by the Savannah Historic District Board of Review on August 11, 1999, and was approved by the board at this meeting with requests to specifically “delineate which features remain and which will have to be duplicated, and to explain what was found in the exploratory demolition” and “provide a section through proposed storefront from brushed metal sign down to ground” (Savannah Board of Review, Aug. 11, 1999). However, amendments to the approved architectural plans required that a petition be resubmitted. This petition was approved by the board on December 8, 1999. A final petition was made to the Board of Review on April 12, 2000 to gain approval for final paint colors of the outer finishes, and was approved. Seventy-three percent of respondents reported being familiar with the building, while only 44% reported being familiar with the building prior to its renovation. This is significant as the remaining responses would then be based on image preference, or
experiences with the building in its current state. However, the mean score for Q1 was very high (4.48) with a very low standard deviation, demonstrating overall consensus that the renovation resulted in an improvement to the building (see Table 4.16).

When asked specifically which parts of the renovation the participant liked the most, the responses focused on several main features; the façade restoration, the windows, and the roofline. Of the 73 responses, 77% were related to the façade restoration of the upper stories, ensuring that “the REAL original building has been uncovered” by removing “the monolith façade” that existed previously. Respondents also focused on the exposed windows (38%), “opening up the ‘eyes’/windows of the upper floors” which are “much more attractive than a stucco block.” The pronounced cornice and bracketing that were exposed during the renovation were also a key feature (11%) providing “original details that give eyes and friendly feelings with the street.” Finally,
respondents discussed the improved pedestrian experience that resulted from the new storefront, explaining the importance of “bringing back the sidewalk experience of giving a glass window to look into – and out of” to make the building “more friendly to walkers.” A small group of respondents also discussed the benefits of the change in use of the building from commercial to mixed-use, allowing for office, retail, and living space within the building. One respondent noted, “the upstairs conversion to lofts is great. Bringing people to live in downtown Savannah is a wonderful idea.” For some participants, the return from modern style to the building’s original architectural style resulted in comments related to the heritage and historic character of Savannah (Person-Cultural dimension of attachment). Though a large majority of the comments mentioned a specific architectural feature, respondents also expressed the importance of the renovation that “brings the building back to the glory days of Savannah architecture.”

While there was an overwhelmingly positive reaction to the rehabilitation of the top two stories, respondents were less enthusiastic about the success of the new storefront design defined by the large two story commercial windows. Forty-nine of the 66 open-ended responses (74%) disliked the changes, especially regarding the disconnect in architectural styles between the two sections. One respondent explains, “the ground floor has a completely different style than the upper floors. I don't like all the large panes of glass even though the old building had a similar feel. That isn’t the traditional downtown Savannah look I think of when I think of the historic district.” Additionally, it was viewed that the materiality of the renovation contributed to the disconnect in style, and was described by respondents as looking “low-budget” and “really cheap.”
When asked to describe specific features that should have been preserved, 22 of the 40 relevant responses (55%) indicated that there were no architectural features from the original photo that should be preserved. Several respondents explained their preference for the renovated building because it revealed the architectural features of the original building. Additionally, some respondents commented that they would have liked to see photos of the original building prior to the midcentury additions to better gauge which features should have been preserved. Of the respondents that identified elements that should have been preserved, 25% discussed the lower façade and storefront, highlighting both the materiality and smaller scale display windows. Respondents explained, “I actually prefer the red brick that was there prior. It feels more… I don’t know… 20s to 40s in age” and it “looks like previous ground floor had quality tile material. If so, I wish they had retained that.”

Responses to Q2 “My feelings about this building have changed since it was renovated” had a lower mean score (3.90) than Q1 and a slightly larger standard deviation (.897). Only 4% of respondents disagreed with the statement, 30% were neutral, and the remainder of respondents (67%) agreed or strongly agreed. What is also interesting is that the overwhelming majority of respondents (92%) had a positive change in feelings toward the building following its renovation. The open-ended responses revealed that the change in feeling was due primarily to the place dimension of attachment, as the new façade was more aesthetically pleasing. However, while the response was in general positive, 20% of the participants indicated that even though the renovations are an improvement over the previous façade, there could still be
improvements. As one respondent stated, “it’s better than it was, but [I] think they could have done a much better job.” Several respondents focused on the social dimensions of attachment, highlighting the importance of the renovations in improving the pedestrian and interactive experience of the street as it “brings life to that corner.”

4.6.2 1 West Liberty Street Renovation

Renovations to 1 W. Liberty Street began in Fall 2011, following approval from the Savannah Historic District Board of Review on September 14, 2011 with the following conditions:

1. The doors be inset no less than three inches from the building façade,
2. The replacement windows on 3 West Liberty St, basement level, match the original double-hung windows and be inset no less than three inches from the building façade,
3. The canvas gutter on the awning is eliminated.

Ninety-eight percent of respondents reported being familiar with the building, while on 79% reported being familiar with the building prior to its renovation, indicating that reactions to the building’s changes would be based on personal familiarity with the area both before and after renovation. Like the renovation of 301 West Broughton Street, respondents believed that the changes made to 1 West Liberty Street were a great improvement with a mean score of 4.51 to Q1, with a standard deviation of .795. Participants were next asked to identify “Which parts of the building renovation do you like the most?” Comments focused on three main categories, architectural features (85%), social activity (18%), and the change in building use (10%). The specific architectural elements mentioned included the overall modern design (12%), building material and
The changes made to the building are an improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Follow-Up Questions</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The changes made to the building are an improvement.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My feelings about this building have changed since it was renovated.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

color (9%), storefront/windows and doors (9%), and the updated awnings (9%). For many respondents, the most successful aspect of the project was the rooftop seating area (13%) and the railing and greenery (11%) that defines the outdoor space. While this building is located in the heart of historic Savannah, very few respondents expressed distaste with the contemporary design. As one explained,

“In this case, the current presentation, though much more modern is a vast improvement over the bad exterior previous. I’m not opposed to modern elements in a predominantly historic area as long as the new presentation works with what’s around it. This does and is much more pleasing and functional to me.”

Others discussed the use of the new materials and dark color to give the building a modern feel that remained in keeping with the historic context. One participant noted, “With this building the design is modern, but they incorporated natural woods and dark colors to compliment and blend with the neighborhood. This to me is a great example of
modern fitting into a historic district."

The project was renovated from a long-standing tourist retail store to a local restaurant and bar. While Charlotte’s Corner had been a staple in downtown Savannah for some time, most were not sad to see it go. As one stated, “Charlotte was my mom’s best friend. But the building was a dump. Now it is an amazing center!” The retail space, which catered to tourists was rarely used by residents, highlighted in the statement, “Charlotte’s Corner was the pits of terribleness. I hated to walk by it because it was so trashy. Now it is posh.” Another stated, “I most appreciate the change in USE! I never set foot in the store that was there before, but I love having a corner restaurant and bar with outdoor seating near my home.” Such statements emphasized that while both businesses were commercial, the social aspect of a restaurant and bar whose “design brings people” was particularly appealing to local residents. Additionally, the Public is one of the few restaurants in historic Savannah with both outdoor sidewalk seating and a rooftop dining area, and as one participant plainly stated, “I love the outdoor seating of the restaurant and the rooftop plaza.” Another claimed that the outdoor seating “makes me want to eat there, drink there, socialize and watch people there.”

When asked which parts of the renovation respondent’s liked the least, 62% indicated that there were no parts of the renovation that he/she disliked, with respondents stating, “I like it all” and “I don’t dislike anything about this renovation.” Of the aspects that respondents disliked, 17% were focused on architectural features of the renovation, including the loss of the corner doors (7%), the aluminum casing of the windows (5%), the awnings (1%), and the building color (1%). An additional 10% of responses discussed
urban features of the renovation, such as the addition of outdoor seating, and signage. For one respondent the modern design was unsuccessful and “cold looking and not inviting even though it is a restaurant. I rather liked the funky little Charlotte’s corner.” This highlights not only disruptions in attachment due to the aesthetics of the structure, but also of the character and associations of the former retail shop.

To corroborate some of these findings, when asked if there were specific elements of the building that should have been preserved, 17% of participants identified the corner entry as the only aspect of the building that should have been preserved during the course of renovations. One participant explained, “I think the door way should have been preserved. Unless there is a compelling reason for the owner to change it.” The remainder of participants (83%) felt that there was nothing that should have been preserved. One explained,

“Nah. Trust me. Neither Charlotte’s Corner nor the building it was housed in were integral parts of the culture of downtown. Aside from Charlotte herself, I bet no one even remembers what was here before Public. So in cases like this, where progress is not hurting anyone, out with the old and in with the new.”

Others echoed this sentiment, highlighting the lack of historic significance of the original structure, stating “the prior building was nothing special. Ugly stucco again. At least this is modern and fresh looking – a good example of creating something modern that fits with the old.” This would suggest that, compared to the historic nature 301 W. Broughton Street, that residents are more accepting of a modern aesthetic when the building being renovated has little architectural significance.

Responses to Q2 “My feelings about this building have changed since it was
"renovated" had a lower mean score (4.23) than Q1 and a slightly larger standard deviation (.867). Only 4% of respondents disagreed with the statement, 17% were neutral, and the remainder (79%) agreed or strongly agreed. The open-ended responses indicated that 96% of participants had a positive change in feelings for the building following its renovation. These changes in feelings were attributed to several factors, improved aesthetic appearance (67%), increased social activity (29%), and the change in the building’s use (18%) clearly echoing statements made regarding the aspects of the renovations that participants liked the most.

Respondents also highlighted the importance of the renovation in changing the dynamics of the area, as “it brought the corner to life” and that “the addition of a people friendly area where dining and socialization happens gives a friendly and welcoming tone to the intersection.” As one participant elaborated, “the intersection is a very busy, historic area and the renovations/new look makes me proud of others to visit my city!” Others claimed that the renovation had a ripple effect, and has “encouraged other buildings along the Liberty Street corridor to make much needed improvements!” While the response to the renovation was overwhelmingly positive, there were those who had negative reactions. One explained, “I am always glad to see renovations that are done correctly and well. This one sort of missed the mark in my estimation.” Unfortunately this participant did not elaborate as to which elements “missed the mark” to evaluate in terms of the design regulations regarding that feature.
4.7 Summary of the Research Findings: Part I

The general analysis of place attachment for the survey respondents confirmed higher levels of attachment to historic Savannah based on the following predictors of place attachment; living in historic Savannah, length of residence, and homeownership.

4.7.1 Visual Preference Results

For each of these categories, the architectural features that were described as most meaningful by the survey respondents are listed below.

- Commercial Places – Architectural features were important, but had the highest variability of which features were significant. Commercial areas had strongest emphasis on place dimension of attachment. Commercial places that highlighted social activities resulted in lower scores for the importance of architectural features, but high consensus of which features were significant.

- Residential Places – Highest reported importance of architectural features, but an equal distribution dimensions of attachment. High levels of consensus regarding which features were significant, with a focus on entryways and front doors (symbolic of home).

- Parks / Urban Public Space – Lowest reported importance of architecture in creating meaning. Architectural features identified as important focused on centers of social activity and visual markers.

These findings would indicate that the more socially and community defined the space, the less significant individual architectural features become. However, if the space is defined by an architectural or urban element, that element becomes extremely significant, as a visual symbol of existing attachments.
4.7.2 Specific Architectural Features Results

Statistical analysis of the relationships between the place attachment dimensions (general attachment, place identity, and place dependence) and the importance of specific architectural features revealed the following:

- A principal components analysis revealed that higher reported levels of place identity predict correspond with more importance placed on individual architectural features. Conversely, as levels of general attachment increase, the importance of architectural features decreases.

- A independent t-test revealed that for commercial and residential facades, respondents that placed more importance on specific architectural features also had higher reported levels of place dependence.

The results for this section corroborate many of the findings from the previous section. The findings suggest that individual architectural features are very important in the foundational stages of attachment, however, as attachment deepens they become less significant. Additionally, the dimension of attachment making the architectural features significant shifts from the place dimension of attachment to the process and person dimensions.

4.7.3 Renovations under the Design Guidelines Results

301 West Broughton Street

While 77% of participants were familiar with the building, only 44% recalled the building from prior to the renovations. Most respondents agreed that the changes to the building were an improvement (M=4.48) with positive changes in feeling to the newly renovated building (M=3.90). The most liked elements of the renovation included the
façade restoration (77%) and newly exposed windows, while the overwhelmingly least liked element was the new storefront windows (74%). These results indicate a preference for traditional architecture if it is restored to the original design. However, integration of modern elements must be done with great care regarding massing, proportion, and materiality so as not to compete with the historic façade.

1 West Liberty Street

Ninety-eight percent of respondents were familiar with the building, while 79% reported being familiar with the building prior to its renovation. Most respondents agreed that the changes to the building were an improvement (M=4.51) with extremely positive changes in feeling to the newly renovated building (M=4.23). The most like features of the renovation were the architectural features (85%) such as the rooftop deck, modern design, and windows. In addition to the aesthetic elements, respondents identified the increase in social activity (18%) and change in use (10%). For many respondents (68%), there was nothing about the renovation that they disliked. The elements that were disliked included the loss of the corner entry door (7%) and urban features (10%) such as seating on the sidewalk. These results would indicate that respondents are more accepting of a modern aesthetic if the new space is cohesive and socially driven. Participants noted that the mix of materials and vegetation, as well as the scale allowed for a newly constructed building to be sensitive to the surrounding historic context.
CHAPTER FIVE

Research Findings
Part II

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the qualitative results of Part II of the research study are presented. These results were collected using a participant driven photo elicitation strategy (see Ch. 3), in which participants took photographs of meaningful places in historic Savannah that were then discussed in face to face interviews with the researcher. The data analysis strategies for this portion of the study included GIS mapping and analysis of the photo data (ArcMap), content analysis of the interview transcripts (MaxQDA), and archival research of the Savannah Historic District Design Guidelines, including documentation of the Downtown Historic Review Board meeting minutes, staff recommendations, and findings.

5.2 Part II: Photo Elicitation

5.2.1 Participant Interviews

This portion of the study used a participant driven photo elicitation method, in which participants were asked to photograph places in Savannah that were meaningful to them (refer to Chapter 3). The photographs then became the foundational component of the interviews. A total of 14 participants were interviewed between November 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2014 and November 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2014. All interviews were conducted in local coffee shops in downtown Savannah, and lasted approximately one hour. The interview participants
included eleven females and three males. One participant was under 30 years old, six were between 31-45 years, five were 46-60 years, and two were over 60. Of the participants, nine lived within historic Savannah, with seven owning homes in the historic district. The length of residence among participants was evenly distributed. Four participants have lived in Savannah less than five years, while six have been in Savannah 6-15 years. One participant has lived in Savannah for 16-25 years, while the remaining participants have lived in Savannah for over 35 years.

Due to the importance of understanding the formative basis for place attachment, the focus of the interviews was on the “subjective experience of the participant” (Seidman, 2006 pg. 85). The interview structure was modified from Seidman (2006), and therefore was divided into three main sections. The first section included questions regarding the participant’s “life history”, such as their profession, length of residence in Savannah, and background. The second section collected “concrete details of the participant’s present lived experience” and utilized the participant’s photographs and photo log as a facilitator in this process (Seidman, 2006 pg. 18). During this portion of the interview, participants discussed the meanings behind the photographs taken. These meanings were then reflected upon and clarified during the final section of the interview. Additionally, the discussion of the meaning of specific photographs was applied to general questions about current and future development in Savannah. This allowed the researcher to better situate the participant’s opinions regarding both specific and general development issues within a larger contextual framework.
5.3 Photographic Coding

The qualitative data collected in the portion of the research survey included the photographs taken by the participants, the corresponding photo log, and follow-up interviews. As discussed previously (see Chapter 3), the coding was based on Scannell and Gifford’s Tripartite Model of Place Attachment (Scannel and Gifford, 2010). This model includes three main categorical dimensions of attachment; person, place, and process, and each of these dimensions is further refined. The participant’s photographs were coded utilizing both the interview transcripts and the photo log as documentation to ensure that photos were coded correctly. As dimensions of place attachment can and necessarily overlap, some photographs were coded under more than one dimension.

5.3.1 Person Dimension

The person dimension of place attachment includes two distinct categories, individual and cultural. The Person-Individual (PI) category is based on a person’s personal connections to a place, life milestones, and experiences of personal growth. For example, this code would include photographs of one’s home or work, the site of a wedding, or time spent during formative years (college, first apartment, etc.). Examples of photographs coded under this heading are shown in Figures 5.1 and 5.2. Figure 5.1 was taken by participant Jane who described of the photo, “Wherever I live, I need an outdoor space to enjoy the sun. I like to have a drink here if I’m home in the early afternoon/evenings. I also like to watch people from my outdoor space.” (Jane, Nov. 20, 2014). Participant Nancy described Figure 5.2 stating, “This is our main (almost
Those are historic and meaningful to me personally because I am a Catholic…I don't know how old the church is but there is a building next to it, that was the parish house that was originally an orphanage and convent for some African American ladies, so that was Mother Matilda, who was the first African American nun in Georgia.”
- Nick, Nov. 20, 2014

Figure 5.3 Sacred Heart Church

only) outdoor space shot from the third floor bathroom. I love Savannah’s courtyards and am so happy we have one!” (Nancy, Nov. 2, 2014). The Person-Cultural (PeC) category still retains elements of personal meaning, but is more defined by the symbolic meaning
of a place to a larger group, including religious, cultural, or historical significance. This coding category could include churches, schools, important historic buildings, or community driven spaces such as schools or community centers. One participant’s description of his reason for taking a photo of Sacred Heart Church is representative of this dimension of attachment (see Figure 5.3).

5.3.2 Place Dimension

The place dimension of place attachment includes two distinct categories, physical and social. The Place-Physical (PP) category is based on physical and aesthetic considerations, when the attachment is related to the place itself. This dimension is of particular importance and interest for the study as it demonstrates level of importance of architectural, urban, and environmental features in the formation of attachment. This

*Figure 5.4 Duffy Street*

*Figure 5.5 Fish downspout*
was demonstrated by Jessica’s description of a photo she took of a Victorian home on Duffy Street (see Figure 5.4). She explained, “it is just so crazy. It’s not just one piece of trim, it is three pieces of trim, then there is the pointed roof and the detailing on the gable and then the columns on the porch that are not just square they are carved or turned wood. It’s like oh my.” (Jessica, Nov. 18, 2014).

The Place-Social (PS) dimension of attachment prioritizes attachment to *members* of a community over attachment to the physical place itself. Attachment to place is created by sense of community and social interaction, while architectural, environmental, and urban features were made meaningful by the way the community engaged with the area. The interaction between social interaction and iconic architectural features is explained by participant Meg of her photo of the Trustees Theatre (see Figure 5.6). She stated that the site, “breathes life into the city” and “the neon lights of the

*Figure 5.6 Trustees Theatre*
theatre and Leopold’s – color, dimension, makes one feel as if something is going on” (Meg, Nov. 18, 2014). Other participants echoed this same sentiment, as seen in Vince’s succinct description of Ellis Square (see Figure 5.7) as “community, enthusiasm, fun, character, family” (Vince, Nov. 3, 2014).

5.3.3 Process Dimension

The process dimension of place attachment includes three categories, affect, cognition, and behavior. The Process-Affect (PA) category is an emotionally based category, often created through either positive or negative experiences. Places become symbolic of personal experience, and evoke an emotional reaction. The importance of Figure 5.8, taken by Jane is described below,

“When I return from visiting family in NC, I come over this bridge, look at the Savannah skyline and feel happy to live in such a fun and beautiful city. I also will remember this bridge from all the 10K races I’ve run each
year in December in which we climb its hill twice (the South’s toughest bridge run)” (Jane, Nov. 20, 2014).

While this photo is representative of positive association, reactions and attachments can be more complex, and not necessarily positive. These can also be memories or personal experiences that are painful or bittersweet, as described by participant Debbie. Her photos often centered around places meaningful to her and her husband, who had recently passed away. Figure 5.9 is a photo of Goose Feathers Café, which she photographed “because my husband and I used to go in there every day for breakfast and play scrabble. That is how we started our day” (Debbie, Nov. 19, 2014).

In the Process-Cognition (PrC) category, attachment is developed through cognitive processes involving the memories, beliefs, meaning, and knowledge generated by the individual. The meaning generation component of this category will also include elements such as imagination and mystery, as elements of place become symbolic or
representative. Additionally, this category correlates with what is described as the “place identity” dimension of attachment by other researchers (Williams and Vaske, 2003). In this type of attachment, specific elements of place become part of the formation of identity. Figures 5.10 and 5.11 highlight the way in which architectural features can spark cognitive processes. Participant Simona explained this stating, “one of my favorite things about Savannah, and why I love walking around the city are the hidden gardens, wrought iron gates, spiral stairs. All so mysterious and sparks my imagination” (Simona, Nov. 2, 2014). For Eileen, rather than feeling unsettled by Colonial Cemetery, it instead took on a new meaning (see Figure 5.11). She described it as “gothic, almost macabre, and incredibly comforting for some reason I’ve never been able to put my finger on. I love the fences and the stones all around the cemetery as well as the beautiful old graves” (Eileen, Nov. 29, 2014, participant emphasis).

Figure 5.10 “Hidden yard”  
Figure 5.11 Colonial Park Cemetery
The Process-Behavior (PB) category of place attachment is based on patterns of behavior that enhance attachment to place. This can include elements such as proximity maintaining, by either choosing to remain or consciously returning to a specific place, finding “home” in new place after relocating through place reconstruction, seeking out specific places, and feelings of nostalgia. This category of attachment was seen most frequently in participants that had moved to Savannah, and sought out places and experiences to create feelings of “home” in their new city. Both participants Debbie and Joan photographed places that were reminiscent of their previous locations. As participant Debbie explained, “one of the other things that struck me, maybe because I’m a foreigner…I like Savannah, it reminds me of home. I like the city, the history” (Debbie, Nov. 19). While this was a more generalized statement, she also photographed the Owens-Thomas House for the same reason explaining that the building “reminds me of home - I lived in Bath, which was largely designed by Williams Jay, the architect of this house” (Debbie, Nov. 19, 2014).
In this case, while the city as a whole felt more “international” and thus made her feel more at home, specific structures heightened these feelings. Another participant, Joan, had a similar reaction to the splash fountain in Ellis Square (see Figure 5.13). She stated, “I will tell you they have a playground there that has showers, it is a very NYC memory; we used to go to Central Park and play in the showers. Over at Ellis Square they have these showers, and if there is one thing my grandchildren want to do…can we go play in the shower?” (Joan, Nov. 4, 2014).

5.4 Photographic Content

While previous analysis focused on why participants took photos, it is also important to address what was photographed. The photographs fell into four main categories; Public Spaces and Parks (64 photos), Commercial and Public Buildings (62 photos), Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation (51 photos), and Residential Buildings (30 photos).

Not surprisingly, buildings were the most photographed element, emphasizing the importance of commercial and residential spaces as primary hubs of activity. These photos were divided into two categories; Commercial and Public Buildings and Residential Buildings. The Commercial and Public Building category included a total of 62 photos, and was subdivided into commercial buildings (41 photos), churches (10 photos), public buildings (6 photos), and theatres (5 photos). These photos ranged from streetscapes of the commercial areas (Figure 5.14) to elements of the unexpected (Figure 5.15). The Residential Buildings category included a total of 30 photos. These photos included the participant’s personal residences, both past and present, as well as homes that were symbolic in nature. For example, participants took pictures of residences
that helped them to imagine what life might have been like in previous centuries, as well as homes that were appealing to the participant. This can be seen in Figure 4.17, taken by participant Jane, describing it as “my kind of house” (Jane, Nov. 20' 2014).
The second largest category of photos was of Public Spaces and Parks located in Savannah, with a total of 64 images. Given the unique nature of the Oglethorpe plan, it was not surprising that 13 images were of the city’s squares or parks, or features found in those spaces including fountains (15 photos) and other focal points at the center of the squares such as statues, sculptures, and pavilions (11 photos). Cemeteries were also public green spaces that were significant for participants, including seven photos of Colonial Cemetery. There were also four photos capturing the Savannah River.

Though the majority of photographs in this category place a very strong emphasis on the pedestrian experience, a group of photos highlighted the infrastructure and vehicular traffic within the historic downtown. These photos (14 total) of Savannah’s streets, alleys, medians, and bike lines highlight the combination of historic urban design features (wide tree medians) and modern additions (bike lanes) that have the added benefit of serving traffic calming elements, thus reducing the impact of vehicular traffic within the city. Additionally, the tree canopy in Savannah creates a sense of enclosure for vehicular traffic, naturally reducing driver speeds. The photos of alleyways represent spaces that are often overlooked, but can provide additional richness and layers of complexity to urban landscape.

In addition to the photographs of building facades, a total of 51 images were taken of close-ups of specific architectural features and elements, comprising the Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation category. These photos included front porches (9 photos), brickwork (7 photos), wrought iron railing/gates (6 photos), trim work and detailing (6 photos), greenery (15 photos), and other detail elements such as downspouts, lampposts,
Figure 5.18 Chippewa Square Lion

Figure 5.19 Colonial Cemetery

Figure 5.20 “Fly on the Wall”

Figure 5.21 Magnolia Hall
and sculptures (8 photos). This category is significant in that it highlights the importance of such detailing and architectural richness in the formation of attachment. For many participants, these elements were significant based on all three dimensions of attachment.

5.5 Photographic Content and Coding Interrelationships

While the content and coding of the participant photographs is discussed in Sections 5.3 and 5.4, additional statistical analysis was conducted to determine which types of photographs were taken due to the six categorical types of attachment (see Table 5.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Commercial and Public Buildings</th>
<th>Residential Buildings</th>
<th>Public Spaces and Parks</th>
<th>Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place/Process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Person</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place/Person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The place dimension of attachment is again the most significant, with 37% of photographs taken due to this dimension. The types of photos taken due to the place dimension were fairly evenly distributed between Commercial and Public Buildings, Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation, and Public Spaces and Parks. For the Commercial and Public Buildings, the place and person dimensions of attachment were
the most significant, suggesting that residents found these areas meaningful due to their physical beauty and characteristics or personal memories and associations. For the Residential category, the photographs were distributed evenly across the dimensions of attachment.

The results from the Public Spaces and Parks and Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation categories show a shift in the significant dimensions of attachment. For Parks and Public Space, photographs coded based on the place dimension of attachment, and those coded based on the process or person dimension of attachment are evenly split. Of all the content categories, in Parks and Public Spaces attachment is formed through person and process dimensions as often as place the based dimension. This shift signals not only the importance of the physical characteristics of place, but also of the individual and cognitive aspects of the place in the formation of attachment. For the Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation category the most significant dimensions of attachment were the place based, followed by place/process and place/person. As the place dimension of attachment occurs the most frequently, even in conjunction with the other dimensions, it indicates the importance of the place dimension in enhancing cognitively or personally driven attachments.

5.6 Spatial Mapping Analysis

In addition to the other analysis of the participant photographs, ArcGIS was utilized to conduct an analysis of the photos based on spatial and geographical relationships. Including a mapping analysis of the data also allowed the research to
address the potential effects of Savannah’s unique urban morphology on the results. The participants took a total of 207 photographs, ranging from participants that took four photos, to those that took over thirty, which were then coded using the coding categories discussed previously (see Section 5.3). While the participants were given no direction as to where within Savannah photographs should be taken, all photographs were located within the locally designated historic districts in Savannah, GA (see Figure 5.22). Both density mapping and hot spot analysis were used to identify clustering trends and patterns within the data. While the density tool is very helpful in visually expressing areas of

Figure 5.22 Participant Photographic Data Point Locations
concentrated data, the hot spot analysis tools is used to identify statistically significant clusters of both high and low values (Maantay and Ziegler, 2006). Utilizing $z$-scores and $p$-values for each feature, which in this case is the participant photo locations, and assesses their significance in relation to the features surrounding it. Statistically significant hot spots are the result of a feature with a high value that is also surrounded by other features with high values (Maantay and Ziegler, 2006). So for this research, the hot spot analysis tool identified areas that will have denser clustering of participant data. In effect, these hot spots identify areas within historic Savannah that are statistically shown to include more meaningful places to residents than would be found in a random distribution of data.

![Density Analysis of Participant Data](Image1.png)

![Density and Hot Spot Analysis of Participant Data](Image2.png)

*Figure 5.23 Density Analysis of Participant Data*

*Figure 5.24 Density and Hot Spot Analysis of Participant Data*
The areas identified as hot spots in the collected participant data were divided into primary, secondary, and tertiary levels of significance. The primary area includes the blocks surrounding Madison Square, including many of the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD) Buildings. The secondary areas were concentrated around Chippewa Square as well as the entrance to Forsyth Park. Finally, the tertiary areas included Colonial Cemetery, the area surrounding the Capitol Building on Bay Street, and Ellis Square.

The photographic coding based on the Scannell and Gifford (2010) dimensions of place attachment was analyzed spatially by organizing the categories into two larger groups prior to the density and hot spot analysis. These categories were those related to the place dimension of attachment (place, place/process, and place/person) totaling 138 photographs, and those relating exclusively to the person and process dimensions of

![Figure 5.25 Place Coding Map](image1)
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attachment (person, process, process/person), totaling 57 photographs. This step ensured a more significant and precise analysis of the density and hot spot results by creating categories with enough attributes to conduct a significant statistical analysis. However, the discrepancy in the size of the two data sets should be considered in the analysis of the findings. The location maps of the coding categories are shown in Figures 5.25 and 5.26.

The density and hot spot analysis of the dimensions of attachment revealed some differences in the areas that were viewed as meaningful to the residents based on different dimensions of place attachment. The place related dimension density and hot
spot analysis resulted in a fairly widespread and even distribution of the data points. It is significant to note that there is a North-South aligned concentration of the hot spots, with Bull Street serving as the primary axis. In this regard, the primary areas of concentration along Bull Street include the entrance to Forsyth Park, and the blocks surrounding Madison and Chippewa Squares. North of Oglethorpe Street, the pattern of distribution is much more even, indicating the importance of architectural features and aesthetic beauty in the oldest portion of the city.

While there are consistencies between the place dimension data and the process and person dimension data, several key differences in the focus of the identified hot spots are apparent. The density and hot spot analysis of the process and person dimensions of attachment revealed a more precise and concentrated distribution of the data. For the person and process dimension, the hot spots are concentrated on blocks surrounding squares in the city, in this case Orleans and Ellis Squares. This indicates that more socially driven and public spaces are more meaningful for these dimensions of attachment. In addition, the other primary area of concentration is distributed over an area that is primarily residential. This finding, while expected, further corroborates findings from other portions of the study, as residences held meaning due to their individual and memory based associations.

It is also interesting to note that the overlaps between the two sets, most notably in the concentration around Chippewa Square, also corresponds with the geographic center of the data set (indicated by the star in Figure 5.29).
5.7 Thematic Analysis

The previous sections (5.3-5.6) report the results of analysis of the content, place attachment dimensions, and spatial relationships of the photographs taken by study participants. The interviews with the participants provided an additional layer of meaning and depth to these results. The analysis of the interview transcripts utilized a phenomenological approach, in which the researcher reviewed both the interview recordings and transcripts multiple times in order to uncover underlying themes and “transform the lived experience into a textual expression of its essence” (Richards and Morse, 2007, pg. 171). The themes uncovered during this analysis are presented in two sections, including themes directly related to photographs taken by the participants, and
secondly, themes related to the participants’ opinions regarding future growth and development in Savannah, GA which are discussed in Section 5.7.

The themes directly related to participant photographs were often manifested through the process or person dimension of attachment, in which specific architectural features prompted emotions, imaginings, and introspection for the participants. These additional themes fell into three broad categories; imagination, passage of time/change, and “quirkiness” discussed below.

5.7.1 Imagination

The imagination theme focused on places and architectural elements that resulted imaginings or fantasies of other times and places spurred by viewing the surrounding urban environment. The images from this theme included architectural detailing such as wrought iron, architectural trimwork and details, and greenery. The wrought iron gates and fences served as an important feature in creating a layering of materials and spaces. These hidden spaces fueled the participants’ imaginations, creating speculation as to who might have used the space, what it was like in earlier centuries, and how it might have changed over time (see Figures 5.10 and 5.11). In addition to the materiality of the wrought iron, the greenery in Savannah became in important element in spurring the imagination. The greenery provided an atmospheric quality to many spaces in the city, particularly “the drapery of Spanish moss” which was “an important element in the (mysterious, secretive, spooky) look and feel of Savannah” (Jane, Nov. 20, 2015). Finally, very distinct or specific architectural styles often evoked life from previous eras
for the participants. As Jessica explained,

“There is something about a Victorian that is very fanciful and it provides fodder for your imagination. That is one of the reasons why I like them so much, and I love all the color stories. What is life like in that house now? So many fancy things could have happened there. At the time this wasn’t really fancy, it was the way that it was. It is fascinating to think that this was just a normal house in the early 1800’s” (Jessica, Nov. 18, 2014).

5.7.2 Change and the Passage of Time

In another theme focusing on change and the passage of time, participants related specific places with not only changes to the City of Savannah, but also changes in themselves. This theme was often manifested through the person dimension of place attachment, as the passage of time would harken back to specific personal memories or milestones. One participant, who spent her college years in Savannah, typifies this theme. When asked if she thought Savannah had changed much in her time living there, she responded, “in some ways, but at the same time I’ve changed a lot. I don't know if it is necessarily if the city has changed or if I’ve changed or both” (Eileen, Nov. 19, 2014). In addition to changes in the city marking personal growth, some participants took specific photographs as a way to identify and track changes to that have occurred to places that were personally significant and meaningful. As one participant explained,

“A lot of these pictures are about change. It is like there are a lot of things I took pictures of that I have a memory of in a certain way, but it’s not like that anymore. But the place still means a lot to me and is an important part of Savannah” (Simona, Nov. 2, 2014).

This comment highlights the important distinction between maintaining places of personal significance and those that are significant to the city as a whole. While places from Simona’s youth have evolved in the past decades, they have remained personally
meaningful despite the changes that occurred due to the city’s development.

5.7.3 Quirkiness

The final theme highlighted the concept of “quirkiness” for the City of Savannah, which sets it apart from other historic areas. This is a concept that was occurred for both residents and tourists. As Debbie explained, “if you’ve been there or if you’ve seen pictures then you get it. Just the quirkiness of it. Savannah is all about its quirkiness” (Debbie, Nov. 19, 2014). This theme was demonstrated most in the photos from the category of Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation, in which participants highlighted the details and fine grain elements that make Savannah unique (see Figure 5.30). In addition, this ‘quirkiness” is a concept that has become ingrained into the culture and identity of the City of Savannah. As Joan explained, the community in Savannah has “that feeling of it treasuring its eccentrics. I love that part. It’s true and it does, and we identify them after you have been here long enough. You say, let’s nurture this eccentric.” (Joan, Nov. 4, 2014). Participants also voiced concerns over a wide range of aspects occurring within the City of Savannah, from new development to commercialization in the tourism industry could jeopardize or threaten the “quirkiness” that is at the heart of Savannah’s identity. Participant Simona elaborated, “I wish they had an alternative tour to talk about all the crazy houses of ill-repute and the drugs, the rum running. I like that part of Savannah, and feel like it is being whitewashed over. Making it sterile” (Simona, Nov. 2, 2015).
“This summarizes Savannah some days. The people that choose to live downtown appreciate the historic nature of it. They don’t take it too seriously. Deadly serious protecting the buildings and things like that, but it’s where we live. It’s not a museum and that’s part of its feel”
- Cliff, Nov. 19, 2014

Figure 5.30 St. Patrick’s Day Statue

### 5.8 Attitudes towards Future Growth and Development

In addition to discussions regarding the photos and their meaning, participants were also asked questions concerning their opinion of development and growth in Savannah. These discussions included positive changes in the city, negative changes, and what the participants would like to see in the future. Using MaxQDA, the interview transcripts were coded into the following primary categories: Design Regulation, Economic Development, Transportation, Development, and Tourism. The primary topics of focus that emerged during these interviews were design regulation, new development and economic investment, and tourism (see Figure 5.31).
5.8.1 Design Regulation

The Historic Review Board is a fundamental part of redevelopment in downtown Savannah, shaping both new infill construction and historic rehabilitations. As these decisions can have profound economic implications, they can also cause polarization within the community as to what is best for Savannah’s future. Of particular concern is the perceived and actual loosening of standards and restrictions established in the design guidelines. An example of this can be seen in the recent amendments to the height restrictions for new hotel construction within the Landmark District. While the bulk of
downtown Savannah has a height restriction of between 3-6 stories, along the waterfront, heights are limited to 1-2 stories. However, two prominent hotel projects on both ends of River Street have obtained amendments to the height restrictions from both the City Council as well as the Metropolitan Planning Commission (see Figure 5.32). In the proposed development on West River Street, the approval went against the staff recommendation to reject the proposal due to incompatibility with the surrounding urban fabric (Curl, 2014). However, the project offers 800 permanent jobs to the Savannah area, as well as a millions of dollars in annual tax revenue for the city (Curl, 2014). For many participants, however, such an approval set a dangerous precedent for future growth. One participant explained her fears regarding setting such a precedent, stating,

“The zoning standards are getting less, and less, and less. All you have to do is look at the hotel down here that is blocking the river. They are exceeding the height limits and they are blocking off everything. It is a beautiful building and everybody’s going to go “this is going to be great”, but the point is, this is not Manhattan. But once you have lowered the standard then you can’t cut anything else off.” (Marty, Nov. 2, 2014).

Figure 5.32 Historic District Height Map (City of Savannah) with Locations of Hotel Variance Sites.
While the city offers height bonuses and other incentives to developers for things such as green roofs, these two examples far exceed the variances that could be achieved under normal circumstances, and in both cases double the allowable height restriction (Curl, 2014). While one participant noted the economic strain created by the restriction, stating, “I understand how a two story hotel on the river is not feasible” the question remains regarding the precedent set by such measures, in which “the height map isn’t going to mean anything anymore” (Jane, Nov. 20, 2014).

In addition to the exceptions to set height restrictions, other participants questioned the quality of infill residential and mixed-use construction that is approved by the Historic Review Board. One participant explained,

“There is a trend of finding a unimproved piece of dirt in the Historic District and building a residential structure on it that looks old. Prospectively, speculatively, and selling it. Most of it is junk, and it is just passing the review board because they are building it to look old. They are not putting any special craftsmanship into it…If you squint and look at them, they look historic, if you don’t they look like they are going to rot in another fifteen years. They are just not special. They will never be special, they will never last, and I think that is a mistake. I think they are ruining the last of the bits of land and I think if you talk with people at HSF, important architecture is more important than something looking like the stuff around it” (Anonymous).

Another participant expanded upon this concern, noting the lack of detailing that often accompanies new construction. When discussing new residential construction in her neighborhood, participant Nancy stated,

“Everything has to go through the Historic Review Board, and there are some things that get approved, that I look at and wanna go up and go ‘oh really? You could have held them to a higher standard.’ (Our developer) did a particularly good job of making it blend in, and some of these newer ones are just like, ‘well we’re just going to do brick. Brick will make it look old.’ But they don’t have any of the detail on the brick or shutters, or any of the things that make it look like it has been here for a while” (Nancy, Nov. 2, 2014).
Additionally, several participants also discussed the integration of modern design into the historic context. One noted she would like to see more “Things like the Louvre...amazing example of the modern and the old together. I am curious to see that” (Debbie, Nov. 19, 2014). Another participant discussed the Design Review Board’s role in shaping the type of design that is used in new construction, stating, “I would like to see how the Historic Review Board can encourage architects and homeowners who want to build downtown to create something that is the same size and scope but of a modern or contemporary feel” (Jessica, Nov. 18, 2014). She went on to explain her view on the importance of including more modern architectural styles,

“We don’t need to emulate things that are actually historic to make it fit in with in our city. I would love to see Brutalist architecture mixed with Victorian homes. I would love to see crazy light filled homes, glass exteriors next to my house for example that was built in 1904. That’s what a city is, what an urban area is. Incorporating these amazing buildings that need to be restored need to be kept in prime condition with the idea that this is a place that is still being lived in. It isn’t an Epcot center of historic downtown. It is a real life place that has life and breath” (Jessica, Nov. 18, 2014).

While Jessica has a more positive opinion of modern architecture, participants were also protective of the historic fabric of the city. As Vince noted, “I would definitely like to see the architecture remain the way that it has been. To go from this beautiful architecture like this to a big square of concrete...if I want that, I’ll move back north, Philadelphia or Baltimore or to New York” (Vince, Nov. 3, 2014).

These comments address the issues of the compatibility of new construction within the historic context that all design review boards must face. However, these comments also suggest that a greater focus on the quality of construction, as well as
compatibility relating to massing, proportion, and materiality might be more effective than the replication of traditional architectural features. Additionally, as seen in the results from Chapter 4, greater detailing and articulation of modern facades could also increase their compatibility with the historic fabric.

5.8.2 New Development and Economic Investment

Savannah’s growth in the historic city center has started to see a rapid increase in the past two to three years. Ben Carter Enterprise’s proposed $75 million development plans along Broughton Street have generated much speculation about the implications of the proposed development (Curl and Ritchey, 2014). This project was mentioned frequently during the interviews. For many participants, the largest concern was the introduction of large, national retailers as a key component of the development. It was feared that the higher rents would invariably force out local, unique retailers along the street, resulting in losing the essential character and “vibe” of downtown. However, as one participant noted, “there is always an opposite and equal reaction and downside to that. A lot of local smaller traders are going to get forced out of that core area. But I think that will work itself out” (Anonymous). This attitude suggests that while there will be changes to the retail make up of the area, the change and economic investment to the area is not unwelcome. Another participant continued,

“the developers are moving this thing forward, but…also making investment where necessary. If you walked up and down Broughton Street they are taking some of these 1950s and 1960s facades off of the 1850s and 1860s facades and bringing them back. I think that’s fantastic. Then you put the modern component of a relevant retailer, not that these retailers aren’t relevant, that’s—something people are going to come and do that’s
completely modern and practical and useful and so this thing has been brought back” (Anonymous).

The investment seen along the Broughton Street corridor creates a sharp contrast to other areas of the city that are also in need of revitalization and redevelopment. For some participants, specific buildings were photographed because of the potential they have to be a beautiful and contributing structure in the city. Lisa noted, “I want to see this property turn into something beautiful. It is so close to Forsyth and should look like it belongs instead of an eyesore” (Lisa, Nov. 17, 2014) (see Figure 5.33). She continued, “I drive by this every week in the hopes it will one day look pretty again. So many homes have so much character but need to be renovated” (Lisa, Nov. 17, 2014) (see Figure 5.34).

Participants also photographed buildings that represented positive changes that were occurring within the city. Participant Meg took the photograph shown in Figure 5.35 because she “love(s) watching the beautiful facades come back to life” (Meg, Nov. 18, 2014). In this same respect, participant Nancy photographed a building under
construction near her home that she passes frequently. She explained, “I’ve enjoyed watching the progress of this restoration” as a visual reminder of the progress and development that is occurring throughout Savannah (see Figure 5.36).

Additionally, a general agreement existed among participants with development that brings more vibrancy and active businesses downtown, particularly locally owned businesses. As Jane noted, “I think it’s good that in general, that people seem to be interested in downtown, instead of building out other places now” (Jane, Nov. 20, 2014). However, as a caveat to this assessment, the preservation of historic buildings was of utmost importance, and that “whatever happens in the future, it is really important they don’t demolish” (Vince, Nov. 3, 2014). For one participant, the growing development pressures in the city have put Savannah, “on the periphery”. She explained,

“I lived in Atlanta for thirty-five years and I didn’t like the preservation movement there. And what I see happening here is what happened there. The preservationist became less and less interested and also didn’t have the clout. Instead of saving the building, they would go to the lot where it had been razed and have a cocktail party and wear black arm bands. They would have wine and brie and wear black arm bands in salute to what had been demolished the day before. I see this is where we are going.” (Marty, Nov. 2, 2014).
5.8.3 Tourism

As with other historic cities such as Charleston, SC and New Orleans, LA, the City of Savannah relies heavily on the heritage tourism industry as part of their economy. Discussions with the study participants highlighted some of the ongoing tensions between the tourism industry, other economic development ventures, and the rights of residents of the historic district. This can be seen in comments related to the relationship between development in the downtown district and the growing tourism industry. When discussing the need for the city to capture a greater percentage of tourism dollars, one participant explained, “we had to have a more affluent tourist come in. We are behind Charleston in revenue dollars per visit, and so what’s lacking is better shopping” (Anonymous). In this regard, the high-end retail shops proposed as part of Ben Carter Enterprises’ proposal would be a welcome addition to the city.

While most residents have embraced tourism as an essential part of Savannah’s economy, a dichotomy still exists between accommodating tourism activities and respecting the rights of permanent residents within the historic district. The balance between the rights of local residents and the economic benefit of the tourism industry is one that is precarious, and as one participant explained, “You either buy into it (tourism) or you don’t…I think it’s great having the tourists around is what makes it what it is. I’m all for the tourists” (Cliff, Nov. 19, 2014). While many of the tourist driven activities within the city, such as trolley and ghost tours, are fairly non-invasive, controversial tourism proposals such as docking cruise ships in the Savannah River, introducing double decker tour buses, and even the construction of a casino on Tybee Island, have caused
concern among residents. These issues, among others, result in the need for local advocacy groups to fight to protect the rights of residents. As one participant noted,

“What I’m scared of is that the city will lose sight of the nucleus of what is so important to live in a historic landmark district. You have to be extremely careful in allowing the people who live and pay taxes here to feel comfortable in their own environment. You have to fight for that, it doesn’t just happen” (Joan, Nov. 4, 2014).

She also described the importance of residents in the historic district in maintaining the character and authenticity of the area, and that “without the residents you have a Disney World” (Joan, Nov. 4, 2014). Other participants also expressed concerns regarding the long-term affects of the tourism industry on the city, stating,

“I understand the tourist economy, but I don’t think it is sustainable. I don’t think it is good for the people that live here; not good for the place. When I think of tourist economies, I think of the souls been sucked out and replaced with Disney World, I worry about that. I hear people talking about that and it concerns me” (Simona, Nov. 2, 2014).

These comments emphasize the importance of authenticity in the historic district to the success of the heritage tourism industry within the city. As the city develops, it might become more necessary to establish a “point of diminishing returns” for tourism related strategies, in which only strategies that can enhance the profitability of tourism ventures within the district without negatively affecting the quality of life for local residents are promoted. This could mean that a long-term economic development strategy should look to a greater diversification as suggested by another participant who stated, “We have to look at it in a different way, not just tourism and manufacturing...it is the middle piece we need to be fostering and encouraging.” (Meg, Nov. 18, 2014).
5.9 Summary of the Research Findings: Part II

5.9.1 Photographic Coding and Content Findings

The findings and analysis of the participant photographs are summarized in the following tables.

Table 5.2 Photo Coding Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Person / Place</th>
<th>Person / Process</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Process / Place</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Photos in Category</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The highest reported number of photographs were taken due to the place dimension of attachment (78) with another 67 photos taken in which the place dimension enhanced attachment of the person (33 photos) or process (34 photos) dimensions (see Table 5.1).

- These findings indicate the importance of physical places in creating attachments, but also strengthening attachments based on the other dimensions.

Table 5.3 Photo Content Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Commercial and Public Buildings</th>
<th>Residential Buildings</th>
<th>Public Spaces and Parks</th>
<th>Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Photos in Category</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The content of most frequently taken photographs was evenly split between Commercial and Public Buildings and Public Spaces and Parks. This would indicate that for Savannah residents, each category is equally significant in the formation of attachment.

- The number of photographs focusing on Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation was an unexpected finding, which demonstrates the importance of
such detailing in enhancing resident levels of attachment through architectural and urban features (see Table 5.2).

5.9.2 Photographic Content and Coding Interrelationship Findings

The findings of the statistical relationship between the photographic coding and content are summarized below. Please refer to Table 5.1 for full results.

- Commercial and Public Buildings - the place and person dimensions of attachment were the most significant, suggesting that residents found these areas meaningful due to their physical beauty and characteristics or personal memories and associations.

- Residential Buildings - photographs were distributed evenly across the dimensions of attachment.

- Public Spaces and Parks – place and process/person dimension of attachment split between the importance of the physical characteristics of place, and the individual and cognitive aspects of attachment. Of all the categories, attachment is formed through person and process dimensions as often as place based.

- Architectural Detailing and Ornamentation – place based dimensions of attachment were the most significant, followed by place/process and place/person. The occurrence of the place dimension coupled with the other dimensions indicates the importance of the place dimension in enhancing cognitively or personally driven attachments.

5.9.3 Spatial Mapping Analysis Findings

The spatial analysis of the photographic data revealed several significant differences between photographs taken due to the place dimension of attachment, and those taken due to the process or person dimensions of attachment. First, the place dimension data was axially oriented along Bull Street, with a majority of the photographs taken within 2-3 blocks of the primary corridor. In the process and person dimensions, the participant data was not clustered axially, but rather in concentrically with social
spaces, such as the squares, at the center. There was also a higher grouping of data in the primarily residential portions of the city.

5.9.4 Thematic Analysis Findings

The qualitative analysis of the follow up interviews revealed additional thematic categories related to the photographic portion of the study. These themes were Imagination, Change/Passage of Time, and Quirkiness. In these categories, the process and person dimensions of attachment were particularly meaningful, as specific architectural or urban features spurred personally emotional and imaginative responses from the residents. When discussing the future growth and development of the City of Savannah, discussion focused on the following main themes, Design Regulation, New Development and Economic Investment, and Tourism.

5.9.5 Addressing the Case Study Propositions

The case study methodology was organized around a series of propositions that served as hypotheses to help guide the data collection and analysis process (Yin, 2009). These propositions originated and were developed from the research questions utilizing current literature relating to place attachment, historic preservation, and design regulation. While these propositions were used to help guide the research, due to the exploratory nature of the study, it was unknown if the propositions would be supported by the research findings. The degree to which the research findings supported the case study propositions is presented in Table 5.4 below.
Table 5.4 Addressing the Case Study Propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Supported by the Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposition 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design guidelines will be very effective at protecting the ‘place’ dimensions of places that residents value, however, they will be less successful at preserving the characteristics that support the ‘person’ and ‘process’ dimensions of place attachment.</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design guidelines would be effective at preserving characteristics that support ‘person’ and ‘process’ dimension only when elements are symbolic of attachment, such as iconic features for commercial spaces, or entry spaces for residential buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Proposition 2** |  |
| Some adaptively reused buildings will result in higher levels of place attachment by restoring memory based attachment (restoring to previous glory), however, this can be interrupted if key aesthetic elements (specific architectural features, patina) are destroyed during the adaptive reuse process. | Yes |
| **Explanation** |  |
| Restoration of upper façade of 301 W. Broughton Street were found to increase attachment primarily through the process dimension of attachment. However, the materiality and massing of the new storefront potentially diminished the attachment process due to its incompatibility. Retaining elements of the original lower level (Carrera glass tiling) might have been more effective. |  |

| **Proposition 3** |  |
| The individual architectural characteristics will be less significant if the overall character of place is preserved. | No |
| **Explanation** |  |
| Importance of architectural features was found to vary depending on the typology (commercial, residential) and more significantly, based on the participant’s levels of general attachment and place identity. |  |
CHAPTER SIX
Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

A primary goal of research on the built environment often revolves around the betterment of these environments through spatial, social, and economic analysis. The goal of this research in particular was to investigate if identifying the physical characteristics that influence the process of place attachment, manifested in three specific dimensions, and integrating the features into the design regulatory process could foster stronger attachment to place. To best achieve this goal, a primary research question and two secondary research questions were established to guide and organize the research study.

Primary Research Question
Can identifying, prioritizing, and integrating residents’ feelings of place attachment into the design regulatory process ease the tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning by aiding communities in developing consensus?

Secondary Research Questions
To what extent do buildings renovated under the existing design guidelines in Savannah’s locally designated historic districts preserve the key architectural characteristics of places with the highest reported levels of place attachment?

To what extent do individual architectural elements contribute to resident feelings of place attachment in Savannah’s locally designated historic district?

In this chapter, the research study findings will be interpreted within the context of the research questions. Recommendations for the design regulatory process based on the research findings will be presented, and implications for professional practice in the
areas of historic preservation, planning and development, and heritage will also be addressed. Finally, the chapter will conclude with a discussion of the limitations of the research study, its methodological contributions to the field, and opportunities for future research.

6.2 Interpretation of the Research Findings

The importance of specific architectural features in creating, fostering, and enhancing place attachment among residents was a primary focus of this research. The participant data in this study was collected in two distinct phases, with each phase collecting differing types of data in order to create a comprehensive picture of the phenomena under study. While both Part I and Part II collected data that was unique to that phase, there are also areas of corresponding and overlapping data. In addition to the interpretation of the unique data uncovered in each phase of the research study, the corresponding results from each phase will be also be compared to uncover overlaps, discrepancies, and gaps to ensure an accurate interpretation of the findings. Though some of the research findings regarding the architectural and urban features were either expected or predicted, there were also some unexpected findings revealed by the study. The primary findings of the research are summarized and discussed below.

6.2.1 Primary Finding I

- **Individual architectural features are important in the foundational stages of attachment, however, as attachment deepens they become less significant.**

  The importance of specific architectural features in creating meaning and
attachment in residents was found to diminish over time, as attachment shifted from the place dimension to the person and process dimensions. This is especially true for the highest trafficked commercial and tourist destinations within Savannah. Commercial areas were shown to have a relatively high importance placed on architectural features, coupled with extremely high variability as to which of the features were most significant. In addition, the residents were most often attached to these areas as a result of their aesthetic beauty and character. However, when levels of attachment were studied based on the resident’s length of residence in Savannah, general attachment was found to steadily increase over time.

This finding was corroborated by the principal components analysis gauging the direct relationship between reported levels of attachment (general attachment, place identity, and place dependence) and the importance that participant’s placed on specific architectural features. The analysis revealed an inverse relationship between higher levels of general attachment and the importance of architectural features, indicating that as a participant’s general attachment to historic Savannah increased, the importance placed on individual architectural features diminished. Since general attachment measures the sum of the place, person, and process dimensions, it can be inferred from this finding that a resident becomes more dependent upon the person and process dimensions over time, resulting in less significance placed on the architectural features of a building in creating attachment.

Other aspects of the principal components analysis further supported this finding. For residents with higher reported levels of place identity, a greater importance was
placed on individual architectural features. This is significant as respondents who had lived in Savannah for shorter periods of time also had higher levels of place identity, demonstrating the importance of architectural features in the early stages of attachment. Additionally, place identity was found to decrease over the length of residence, highlighting the shift from an emphasis on architectural features in attachment, to attachment based on the person and process dimensions.

6.2.2 Primary Finding II

- **The more socially and community defined the space, the less significant individual architectural features become.**

  As one would expect, this finding was most profound in the highest community oriented typology of place, the Parks and Urban Public Space category. This category also resulted in the lowest ranking of the importance of architectural features in the creation of meaning. For participants, the architectural features were not an essential component to creating meaning and attachment. However, there was found to be a high consensus regarding which features were the most significant. Important features were those that were the centers of social activity, such as soccer fields or playgrounds, and visual markers, which served to delineate and organize the space. The visual markers were most often found in the center of the squares, including fountains and statues, or were urban features of the space, such as pedestrian benches. Despite the consensus on which architectural, environmental, or urban features were most significant, the low ranking for their importance signifies the greater emphasis placed on the person and process dimensions in creating and maintaining place attachment. For commercial areas,
the social spaces were those that drew large numbers of community members or hosted community events, such as theatres and museums, or places that were important to the local community by hosting community events such as farmer’s markets and festivals. The qualification for this finding is listed below.

6.2.1 Primary Finding III

♦ **If the space is defined by an architectural or urban element, that element becomes extremely significant, as a visual symbol of existing attachments.**

   For highly social and community driven spaces, iconic or distinct architectural features took on very high levels of significance based on the person and process dimensions of attachment. In this regard, specific architectural features became representative, and therefore a symbol of the personal and cognitive meanings associated with those places. In commercial areas, this phenomenon occurred in features such as theatre marquee signs, iconic advertising, or other highly recognizable features. In residential areas, which had the highest reported importance placed on architectural features, this same phenomenon was manifested through the entry spaces and front doors of homes, as the entry became symbolic of the home itself.

   The results from the principal components analysis support this finding as well, in which higher reported levels of place identity were found to be a predictor of the importance placed on individual architectural features. As place identity is the degree to which one’s own identity is tied to a specific place, this relationship could suggest that specific architectural features become an important visual representation of self-identity (Proshansky, 1978).
6.3 Recommendations based on the Research Findings

As a primary goal of the research was to evaluate the design regulatory process within the context of attachment to place, it was fundamental to evaluate the existing standards and requirements within the historic preservation ordinances adopted by the locally designated districts in the City of Savannah: the Landmark, Victorian, Mid-City, and Cuyler-Brownsville districts. It was expected that there would be a fairly even distribution of data within these districts, however, 95% of the participant data collected in the photo elicitation portion of the study was concentrated in the Landmark District. Additionally, the images used in the web-based survey were also located within the Landmark District. As a result, the discussion regarding the elements of the design guidelines that support the research findings, those that contradict the results, and recommended changes will be centered on the design guidelines for the Savannah Landmark District, the Design Manual for the Savannah Historic District.

The Design Manual was adopted in 2011 and was created to replace the Manual for Development in the Savannah Historic District, which was published in 1997. It was developed using multiple and various resources, including the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, which focused on the approaches in Preservation and Rehabilitation (City of Savannah, 2011). The manual is organized into thirteen sections, with Sections 7 through 13 addressing the design standards and recommendations. These sections are Visual Compatibility, Design Standards, Large Scale Development, Monumental Buildings, Character Areas, Signs, and Demolition and Relocation. For the Visual Compatibility, Design Standards, Large Scale Development,
and Character Areas sections, sub-sections are included to address specific issues. An appendices addresses frequently asked questions, defines terms, and provides additional resources.

This research study focused on specific architectural features, environmental, and urban features, as a result, certain standards within the design guidelines were not addressed, most notably the standards relating to urban design principals. However, standards within the Design Manual that do pertain to the research findings were evaluated in terms of their compatibility with the findings, potential areas for amendments, and areas of conflict. Based upon this analysis, the following recommended changes to the Design Manual for the Savannah Historic District are proposed. These changes are proposed in order to enhance the design guidelines’ ability to foster place attachment among residents, and thus reduce the tensions between preservation, heritage, and planning.

6.3.1 Recommendation 1

♦ Place a more targeted focus on architectural features, ornamentation, and detailing that is shown to enhance attachment to place.

The Design Manual should strive to capitalize on the specific architectural features found to foster place attachment among residents. In commercial areas, this focus should include iconic or defining architectural features, such as signage. A potential amendment or expansion of the Signs Section of the Design Manual could address this recommendation. An increased flexibility in terms of the materiality, lighting, and shape of the signs allowed could support the creation of iconic or highly recognizable
architectural features. As these types of features were shown to foster place attachment, this adjustment could be a relatively easy way to increase attachment to the Landmark District among residents (for further information refer to Section 6.2.1).

Additionally, attention should be paid to the entry spaces of both commercial and residential areas. In commercial areas, the storefronts are crucial to enhancing the pedestrian experience, while for residential areas the entry spaces were shown to be symbolic of home. Standards regulating the design of entry spaces are included in multiple areas within the Design Manual, addressing issues such as the pattern of solids to voids, ratio of glazing to other materials, and proportion of the elements of the façade. It is recommended that the Board of Review prioritize these areas in future restoration or renovation proposals.

In addition to the specific architectural features, more abstract concepts were also shown to enhance attachment to place. The first concept, change and the passage of time, is a concept that is visually manifested in historic architecture though the patina of specific surfaces, as well as natural decay due to weathering and age. Other researchers (Wells, and Baldwin, 2012) have found similar results, however, as too much decay was shown to decrease attachment, careful attention should be paid to ongoing maintenance of historic resources throughout the district. This aged quality of historic architecture can serve as a reminder of how the world has changed around them, thus allowing the residents to visibly trace changes in architectural styles and urban development. This is abstractly referenced in the Design Manual in the Exterior Walls standard by requiring that “original materials should be retained to preserve the integrity of the district. Where
repairs or replacement is warranted, it should match the original as closely as possible and not be constituted with a new modern material” (City of Savannah, 2011). However, a more direct standard to protect patina and weathered architectural features is warranted.

In the theme of imagination, specific architectural features spurred imaginings, fantasies, or daydreams within the participants. In this regard, residents could imagine life in a previous century or wonder who might have lived in specific places before them. The most notable architectural features to enhance this process were wrought iron fences and gates, and greenery, such as ivy and window boxes. Additionally, the atmospheric quality provided by Savannah’s abundant live oaks, and the “spooky” Spanish moss that drapes off their branches also enhanced attachment. In particular, the layering of spaces through differentiated materiality or vegetative screening, was particularly effective at spurring the imagination by revealing “hidden” gardens, patios, or other “discovered” spaces. Several of the standards in the Design Manual encourage these elements, particularly the Balconies, Stairs, Stoops, Porticos, and Side Porches, and the Fences, Trellises and Walls standards. However, the City of Savannah should also consider increasing the scope of the design guidelines to encourage the protection and/or addition of the environmental aspects of this recommendation. This might be incorporated into the Exterior Walls standard, the Fences, Trellises, and Walls standard, or Balconies, Stairs, Stoops, Porticos, and Porches standard. While the Principal Components Analysis conducted in Part I of the study was insignificant for both urban and environmental features, the qualitative data collected in Part II revealed the importance of these features. The findings from the interviews and photo elicitation analysis emphasized the
importance of the relationship between buildings and the surrounding environment in fostering place attachment. As a result of these findings, a joint venture with other departments in the City of Savannah to protect these features found on public right of ways and park spaces should also be considered.

The final theme “quirkiness” was the result of finding elements of the humorous and unexpected in the everyday. As this theme is seen by the participants as a fundamental quality to the character of the City of Savannah, the Review Board should seek to embrace proposals that embody this concept. While some standards in the Design Manual hint at this by referencing a “quirky wooden fence” in the Fences, Trellises, and Walls standard, this unique quality should be encouraged whenever possible and/or feasible (City of Savannah, 2011).

6.3.2 Recommendation II

♦ Create a clear differentiation between commercial and residential areas, as well as areas targeted for future growth and development.

The research findings revealed a differentiation in architectural features that supported the various dimensions of place attachment based on their typology. As a result of this finding, it is recommended that the City considered developing more targeted standards for commercial and residential spaces to capitalize on these differences. There are several standards in particular that might be either better informed or amended based on these research findings. First, the Character Areas standard could be further refined utilizing the results from the spatial analysis of participant data. This information could identify additional character areas that should be incorporated into the standard.
Currently, the identified character areas are Factors Walk and River Street, Beach Institute, City Market, and Forsyth Park. The overall spatial analysis of the participant photo locations confirms the significance of all of these character areas, save for Beach Institute. The spatial analysis findings suggest that the immediate blocks surrounding Madison Square should be investigated to include as a potential Character Area. This process could be further refined to differentiate character areas that support the multiple dimensions of attachment. For example, the spatial analysis based on the place dimension versus the person/process dimensions of attachment revealed different areas of significance, which could be addressed in the Design Manual (see Chapter 5, Section 5.6).

Differentiating between identified typological and character areas will allow for adjustments in the strictness or flexibility of the standards based on the primary users of the areas, either residents, businesses, or tourists and visitors. In this capacity, the design standards would be better equipped to protect areas that will be subject to the highest levels of development pressure in the future, such as the tourist driven areas and the waterfront. It should be noted that the recommendations for the Height Standards, in the Visual Compatibility section, were directly corroborated by the qualitative research findings (for additional information refer to Chapter 5, Section 5.8.1).

6.3.3 Recommendation III

♦ Encourage high quality infill development and restorations, which clearly differentiate between historic architecture and modern additions.
There are multiple standards within the Design Manual that address appropriate materials for infill construction, additions, and repairs, as well as architectural compatibility guidelines to ensure continuity within the district. The results from the survey indicated that a more targeted strategy, allowing for greater flexibility in architectural styles and accepted materiality within the Landmark District should be considered. The participant opinions regarding the renovations at 301 W. Broughton and 1 W. Liberty Street were analyzed in the context of the design standards, revealing several areas in which the data directly contradicts the standards.

The Large Scale Development standard, which applied to the renovation at 301 W. Broughton Street, highlighted an area in which the intent of the standard and the resulting effect on resident levels of attachment were incongruent. In many regards, this renovation was highly successful in terms of both conforming to the standards and fostering attachment. As framed in Proposition 2, the renovation increased attachment based on the person and process dimensions, highlighting the importance of a renovation that “brings the building back to the glory days of Savannah architecture.” However, while the restoration of the upper floors was very successful, the addition of the modern storefront windows was not, due to proportioning that overwhelmed the traditional façade. As a result, the alterations were described as both incongruous and distracting from the historic architecture.

The Materials sub-section of the Large Scale Developments standard recommends that the lower levels of large developments “incorporate modular masonry materials in the form of brick, cast stone, stone, concrete formed or assembled as stone to achieve a
human scale over a minimum of 75% of surface area (excluding windows, doors, and curtain walls)” (City of Savannah, 2011). If utilizing windows on the ground floor, the Windows standard encourages, “a high-level of transparency at the street level should be incorporated into commercial and mixed-use buildings” (City of Savannah, 2011). In this particular case, the use of the windows negated the intent of the Materials standard, which ensures a level of detail and complexity at the pedestrian scale in developments that are larger in scope than the surrounding urban context. What is interesting is that the lower portion of the building, prior to its renovation, more closely met the recommended design standards in terms proportioning, patterning of openings, materiality, etc. than the renovation. Additionally, for many participants, this original storefront was preferred to the renovated façade for the above mentioned reasons, as well as the belief that the original storefront utilized higher quality materials.

Given the lack of positive response to the modern transformation of the lower portion of 301 W. Broughton Street, it was expected that the modern design of the infill project at 1 W. Liberty Street would have a similar reaction. However, this was not the case. The response to the alterations made at this location was overwhelmingly positive, despite the contemporary design. The change in use in the building – from a tourist souvenir shop to restaurant – was viewed as one of the most positive changes resulting from the renovation. This could suggest that the acceptance of the design and materiality of adaptive use and infill projects could be influenced by the intended use. This project, designed to enhance social interaction and engagement, took advantage of the social aspects of space through outdoor seating and a rooftop bar, while softening the sharp
lines of the structure though a vegetative screen that served to afford privacy to the rooftop space. The Design Manual might benefit from addressing similar urban design features utilized to enhance the social qualities of shared public space.

The shift in attitudes found from 301 W. Broughton Street to 1 W. Liberty Street, supports the recommendation that a clear differentiation be made between historic architecture and contemporary construction. These differences should be translated into the review process of new development proposals. However, a distinction should be made between additions and infill development, and restorations or adaptive use projects. For infill and additions to existing historic structures, it is recommended that the Design Manual encourage compatible but distinguishable designs. For restorations and adaptive use projects, however, the data supported proposals that remained true to the original architectural style, with new elements that were highly compatible, rather than modern or contrasting elements. While the use of high-quality modern materials were accepted in additions and infill projects, a high contrast between architectural styles within a singular façade was rejected.

6.4 Implications for Professional Practice

The information gathered during the research study is anticipated to be broadly applicable to both public and private sector entities. One of the main goals of this research was to investigate if the conflict arising due to the continued revitalization and development of historic areas could be mitigated through a more comprehensive and precise design regulatory process. The implications of the study results focus on the areas
of preservation, planning, and heritage, identified as the highest areas of conflict through a review of the literature (see Chapter 2).

6.4.1 Implications for Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation theory and practice has traditionally prioritized expert opinion in the determination of significance and authenticity in historic resources. The findings from this research suggest not a total disregard of expert opinions in the valuation and importance placed on historic sites, but rather enriching those opinions with resident experience and attachment. At the national level, this type of research could be used to better inform the National Register of Historic Places nomination process. As discussed in Chapter 2, seven qualities are used to determine the significance of a historic resource, without which a property is ineligible for nomination. The expansion of the *feeling* and *association* qualities in the determination of significance could ensure that properties that might otherwise be overlooked or rejected could be registered, thus gaining the protection and incentives offered by the National Registry. This research would provide empirically based evidence to lend credibility to these qualities, which hold little sway over the determination of significance.

At the local level, the implications of the research are more pronounced. One of the intents of this research was to develop a methodology that could be used to provide greater depth to the design regulatory process. The introduction of attachment based criteria into design standards could reduce the emphasis placed on the Secretary of Interior Standards, and result in more tailored and place specific guidelines. Through a
more place specific regulatory process, new development and adaptive use projects would be designed to enhance and highlight the unique character of place, rather than rely on strategies seen in other communities. While guides provided by the National Parks Service to aid cities in developing preservation programs and ordinances are a valuable tool, the overwhelming amount of information can also be detrimental. As a result of the plethora of standardized publications, cities use the information, “not to make better decisions based on the intrinsic characteristics of a situation but rather to imitate others – and their mistakes” (Bonabeau, 2004).

Finally, while the results from this study found corroboration between the places that participants valued, and places that were protected through local preservation ordinances, this might not be the case in other future study areas. This methodology would be extremely beneficial in determining boundaries for new historic districts, as well as adjusting the areas for previously established districts. Additionally, the public participation and visual preference aspects of the methodology could also be applied to other development documents such as the Comprehensive Plan, or economic development strategies that could affect development within the Landmark district, thus ensuring compatibility and continuity with the design guidelines.

6.4.2 Implications for Planning and Development

The main directive of planners is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents by promoting growth and development to enhance the overall quality of life. As part of this objective, planners focus on long-term development goals, strategies for
economic development, and revitalization. A fundamental component of developing these plans is soliciting the participation and input from local and community stakeholders. The primary contribution of this research to planning practice is to increase community involvement through the development of a more robust and integrated public participation process (Arnstein, 1969). While public participation is often a component of developing historic preservation ordinances, the degree to which the comments and opinions solicited from the community is integrated into the design guidelines is highly variable. This can be due to several factors, such as a lack of participation from the community, or a participation process that is not representative of the community as a whole. The photo elicitation method used in this research could be used to foster a more meaningful public participation process. While not used frequently by planners, this method has distinct advantages over other participation methods. Local community members can photograph places on their own time, allowing for greater participation by members of the community that might otherwise be excluded. This method also allows for an expression of opinions without voicing those opinions in a public forum. Through this approach, those reluctant to provide feedback in a public setting can contribute to the development of the ordinance. Finally, if the photographs are used in later open forum meetings, they can encourage more meaningful discussion between community members and local planning staff, much in the same way the photographs impart a greater depth of meaning to interviews with a researcher (Harper, 2002).

Planners should have a vested interest in enhancing place attachment among residents, as this has been shown to also increase levels of community engagement and
participation (Brown, Perkins, and Brown, 2003). In this way, planners can garner more public participation in other aspects of planning as well. Additionally, higher levels of attachment also result in greater effort from residents to protect the places of attachment (Scannell and Gifford, 2010), which could result in greater community advocacy at the grassroots level, and higher levels of investment in these areas.

Another implication of the research for planning and development is the potential for greater collaboration between different entities within the city, including various departments within city government, private developers, and businesses. Private sector real estate developers could use the results to conduct market analyses and economic feasibility studies when developing project proposals, or to collaborate with architects and planning staff in designing infill or adaptive use projects that would foster place attachment among residents and visitors.

6.4.3 Implications for Heritage

Heritage issues are often the most difficult to voice and to address in the growth and development of cities. A fundamental component of this research was a shift from the reliance on the expert opinion, prioritized in historic preservation practice, to a more user-based approach commonly found in heritage (Ashworth, 2008). This shift is an important implication for heritage, and could allow for greater influence of heritage issues in the growth of urban environments. Through this research, it is hoped that there will be a greater convergence between what constitutes “authenticity” in preservation practice, and its definition in heritage discourse. The emphasis placed on the socio-
cultural aspects of significance and meaning in this research will begin to address
conflicts occurring between preservation and heritage by breaching this gap.

In cities rich in historic architectural fabric, heritage issues are often manifested
through the tourism industry, in which visitors seek the experiential qualities of the
heritage presented. By identifying places that residents find meaningful, this research can
be used in the development of heritage trails and/or marketing campaigns to bolster this
industry. The contributions of heritage discourse can help to address conflicts arising
from the marginalization of disadvantaged populations through a heritage tourism focus
that highlights these issues. A growing trend in preservation to also address populations
that were historically omitted from the National Registry process could be integrated into
aspects of dark heritage that often highlight the unsavory aspects of a community’s
history. For the City of Savannah, tours or areas within the city that address issues such
as the slave trade, rum-running through the port, and the historical red-light districts in
the city could bring greater depth to the tourist experience.

6.5 Limitations of the Research Study

In any research study, there are invariably limitations that exist (Yin, 2009;
Creswell, 2003). First, it is important to address that the theoretical assumptions of the
study, founded in constructivist and phenomenological approaches, could influence the
interpretation of the data, and therefore the study findings and conclusions. If the study
was conducted using a different theoretical approach, the analysis and therefore the
interpretation of the data could yield differing results. While the researcher is confident
that the theoretical assumptions used in this research are the most appropriate, one must acknowledge the possibility of variance in interpretations due to differing theoretical approaches.

Though the known threats to validity were identified and addressed through specific methodological strategies (see Chapter 3), particular attention must be paid to limitations to the research study that can effect the internal and external validity. One of the primary issues in research validity is ensuring that the survey instrument accurately measured concepts that were under study. While utilizing tested measures of attachment (Williams and Vaske, 2003) largely addressed this concern, there still exists the possibility that question wording of certain portions of the survey measured concepts that were divergent from the intended concepts. For the qualitative portions of the study, protocols were established to ensure consistency in the coding and analysis of the data. However, for future studies, additional researchers could also code the data to verify coding accuracy (Creswell, 2003), while the introduction of standardized responses based on coding categories into the survey instrument could further reduce variance in the results (discussed in more detail in Section 6.6).

There are several limitations that could affect the external validity of the study. First, the relatively low response rate (19.85%), could result in data that is not representative of the overall population of City of Savannah, and could therefore have omitted potentially relevant findings. The demographic characteristics of the study participants were consistent with both historic Savannah and national trends, with the exception of young and minority participants. While Savannah’s percentage of adults age
18-30 is over 20%, only 6% of the survey respondents were also in the same age group. This could result in generational differences in resident attachment that was not uncovered through the course of the research. Additionally, the low level of participation within minority groups (Hispanic, African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native), comprising of only 10% of the participants, could bias the data if culturally disparate differences in attachment were not gathered in the data collection phase. This suggests a needed change to the methodology of the survey collection strategy in which a public participation advocate from the local community could vouch for the study to increase trust with potential participants, and thus increase response rates. Finally, self-selection response bias could exist due to the fact that participants might be predisposed to participate in research related to the historic district, due to their involvement with the neighborhood associations or the Savannah Downtown Business Association.

6.6 Methodological Contributions to the Field

The primary methodological contributions of this research study are in the areas of visual preference and place attachment research. While there is currently a large body of research focusing these subject areas, this research draws connections and significance between architectural, urban, and environmental features to the meanings and reasons for attachment to a specific place. The expansion of the use and scope of visual preference research to introduce meaning as a driving variable, allowed the researcher to identify attachment based meaning that drives visual preference to differing architectural styles. Furthermore, the combination of both quantitative and qualitative data allowed for
probing of greater depth of meaning uncovered in the quantitative section of the data through the in-depth phenomenological based interviews.

As discussed previously, one of the primary objectives of this research was to create and test a replicable methodology that can be implemented by other communities in developing and updating their design guidelines, or other redevelopment and revitalization strategies. Through the course of conducting the research study, several adjustments were identified that would enhance its effectiveness in future iterations. These recommended changes are discussed below.

### 6.6.1 Recommended Adjustments to the Methodological Approach

Several key alterations to the survey instrument are recommended to not only increase its reliability and accuracy of analysis, but also to increase completion rates. First, statistical analysis of the survey results revealed lower Cronbach’s Alpha scores for the place dependence and place identity dimensions used to gauge participants’ levels of attachment to Historic Savannah (see Table 6.2). The Cronbach’s Alpha score is an internal reliability index, with an optimal score of .70 or higher, as lower scores indicate questions that are less reliable in accurately measuring the desired factor (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The lower scores for place identity and place dependence indicate that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Place Attachment</th>
<th>Items in Survey</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>5 items</th>
<th>10 items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Attachment (GA)</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>GA .77</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Identity (PI)</td>
<td>3 items</td>
<td>PI .58</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Dependence (PD)</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>PD .48</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 Spearman Brown Prophecy Reliability Formula
additional items should be added to the survey questionnaire to increase their reliability in measuring these dimensions. Utilizing the Spearman Brown Prophesy Reliability Formula, it was found that increasing the number of items included in the survey to a total of 5 items increases their internal reliability nearly to the .70 recommended level, while increasing the number of items to 10, substantially increases the reliability score (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). This will be a critical change in the survey moving forward, as other items in the survey are analyzed using these variables.

Secondly, changes should also be made to the survey structure to allow for more precise and efficient statistical analysis. For example, introducing more variables for the Architectural Features (AF), Urban Features (UF), and Environmental Features (EF), will strengthen the accuracy of the principal components analysis. Combined with the higher internal reliability of the place attachment dimensions, the researcher would be able to more accurately predict the importance of specific architectural features identified by participants. It is also recommended that the open-ended responses collected in Section II of the survey, which were coded by hand after using the Scannell and Gifford (2010) dimensions, be converted to a multiple choice item. High levels of consensus for many of these responses suggests that these responses could be effectively quantified, allowing for more statistical comparisons to the Williams and Vaske (2003) place attachment dimensions used in Section I of the survey. This strategy will also increase the validity of results through greater verification and triangulation of the responses. Finally, the survey instrument should be strategically shortened to capture the necessary data, while eliminating redundant survey items. This will reduce participant fatigue, and thus
increase survey completion rates.

For the photo elicitation portion of the research methodology, there is one primary recommended adjustment. This recommendation is to develop and launch a smart phone application that participants could download and utilize. This change would effectively streamline this portion of the research to increase efficiency and accuracy of the data analysis. Through a smart phone app, participants would be able to upload photographs, note their exact geographic location, and identify the photographs content and meaning. Such an application would substantially reduce the time needed to input data into spatial analysis programs such as ArcGIS to conduct the analysis. This adjustment would also allow researchers to gather and effectively analyze a much larger sample size of participant data, which would increase the validity of the findings through a more thorough identification of meaningful places throughout the study area. It should be acknowledged that this might be more costly upfront, however, the time saved in the analysis phase makes this expense justifiable. The smart phone application could also be utilized (with modifications) in other study areas, thus enhancing the study’s overall methodological replicability.

6.7 Recommendations for Future Research

As the research approach for this study was multifaceted and interdisciplinary, it will allow for future projects focused on several different subject areas, including urban design and planning, historic preservation, and real estate development. The possible areas of future research related to each of these disciplinary areas will be discussed. Since
this research was a case study of a singular site in Savannah, Georgia, the natural next step in future research is to conduct additional case studies in other comparable locations. Conducting multiple case studies will allow for the identification of aspects of the research that are consistent across cases versus results that are site specific. In this same regard, conducting case studies of more recent urban morphologies such as mid-century neighborhoods, recent planned developments, and New Urbanist communities could uncover additional differences in results from historic sites that are directly related to the physical nature of the built environment as opposed to social contributors. While replicating the case study in different morphological conditions could reveal inherent built environment characteristics, a longitudinal study of a particular study area could track long-term development changes versus the snapshot in time that is revealed during a case study analysis. This shift in the methodological approach would be particularly effective if conducted as a city developed, adopted, and began to implement design guidelines to analyze the effect of the development regulations on place attachment.

Another area of future research that might be beneficial is a targeted financial analysis of redevelopment projects that underwent the design regulatory process. An analysis of the cost of redevelopment and construction and subsequent return on investment, combined with an assessment of resident levels of attachment could yield developer specific recommendations. This type of research could be profound in increasing the fiscal and physical feasibility of historic adaptive developments. This type of study might also more fully address the secondary research question, “To what extent do buildings renovated under the existing design guidelines in Savannah’s locally
designated historic districts preserve the key architectural characteristics of places with the highest reported levels of place attachment?” Through this type of research study, the specific ways in which adaptive use projects and infill development within the historic district affect place attachment can be more fully understood.

Finally, while the focus of this research was on resident attachment to place, as many historic city centers depend upon the tourism industry to varying degrees, a study that gauged tourist and visitor levels of place attachment could then be compared to local residents to add an additional layer of depth and meaning. The points of intersection and convergence of the two participant groups could then be integrated into economic development and tourism strategies, as well as help to inform long term development plans and objectives.

6.8 Conclusion

Due to the exploratory nature of this research, not only were unexpected data and findings collected, but as a corollary, expected results were not always supported by the research findings. The degree to which this research study was able to address the research questions was found to be variable. The secondary research questions were established to better inform the primary research question. In this capacity, the secondary questions were informative and key to understanding the relationship between place attachment and the design regulatory process.

It was found that there was not enough data collected to definitively address the secondary research question, To what extent do buildings renovated under the existing
design guidelines in Savannah’s locally designated historic districts preserve the key architectural characteristics of places with the highest reported levels of place attachment? While results from Chapter 4, Section 4.6 report the findings from two renovations and their effect on resident attachment, the author feels that further research in this area is required to fully investigate this line of inquiry. The study findings did, however, address the question, To what extent do individual architectural elements contribute to resident feelings of place attachment in Savannah’s locally designated historic district? Both the quantitative and qualitative portions of the study revealed that specific architectural features supported different dimensions of attachment based on various factors, including building typology and type of attachment. Additionally, through the qualitative portions of the study, the underlying connectedness and interdependence between architecture and the surrounding environment in enhancing and fostering place attachment was uncovered. This relationship was especially significant for the cognitively based dimensions of attachment, in which the qualities of the surrounding environment contributed to the imagination and quirkiness themes.

The secondary research questions, in conjunction with the case study propositions, have guided this research with the objective of informing the primary research question, Can identifying, prioritizing, and integrating residents’ feelings of place attachment into the design regulatory process ease the tensions between heritage, preservation, and planning by aiding communities in developing consensus? As discussed previously, the degree to with the findings supported the secondary questions and the case study propositions was variable. However, when these questions were
examined comprehensively, the data collected through the course of this research study was able to address the primary research question.

There are key areas that create the inherent conflict between the interests of heritage, preservation, and planning (for more detail, see Chapter 2, Section 2.5). The research methodology used in this study has begun to bridge these gaps, demonstrating that integrating strategies that enhance attachment among residents into the design regulatory process can ameliorate some of the foundational conflicts between these three disparate interests. The primary conflict between preservation and heritage can be reduced by incorporating socio-cultural importance into the determination of significance in preservation, thus creating a more harmonious understanding of what constitutes “authenticity” in historic resources. The preservation emphasis on the physical structure and integrity of historic resources should be expanded in the implementation of the design guidelines to consider the cultural importance of historic resources when determining significance (see Section 2.5.1). A broader understanding and interpretation of heritage within the design guidelines will allow the City of Savannah to develop stronger and more precise character areas, as well as to more clearly define distinctive character differences between commercial and residential areas. This strategy will increase the City’s ability to effectively implement Recommendation II from the research discussion (see Section 6.3.2).

Allowing greater flexibility and expression within the design guidelines can reduce conflict between preservation and planning objectives, by focusing on high priority areas for preservation, while still encouraging economic development and growth
within the historic district.

While the goal for preservationists is often to save as many historic buildings as possible, for planning, the focus is to see those buildings become useful and contribute to the current urban environment. In this regard, the goals of heritage and planning are aligned, focusing on the present and future use of the historic resource. By increasing the flexibility of how buildings are adaptively used, preservationists will increase the likelihood that the historic building stock will remain part of the evolving urban landscape, while heritage and planning advocates will ensure that they are actively contributing to the public good. To integrate this approach into the design regulatory process, the Architectural Review Board can actively promote elements and features that enhance attachment while allowing for continued architectural expression, as discussed in Recommendation 1 (see Section 6.3.1).

Additionally, broadening the scope of heritage issues within the city can diminish points of contention between planning and heritage through a richer, and more authentic tourist experience not dependent upon the concept of simulacrum. Drawing upon all aspects of the City of Savannah’s history, including the more controversial aspects is an avenue to integrate the heritage of typically underrepresented groups into the “authorized heritage discourse” of the city (for additional information see Section 6.4.3), (Smith, 2006). Broadening public participation to develop a better understanding of the heritage of specific parts of the city is a way to also clarify contemporary goals and objectives of neighborhoods and historic districts (Hurley, 2009). In the design guidelines, the City should promote architecture that while sensitive to the existing vocabulary, seeks to in
some way move forward, without detracting from or diminishing the surrounding urban fabric (Solà-Morales, 1998). This concept is discussed in Recommendation III (see Section 6.3.3) in which new and infill development is clearly differentiated from restorations. This strategy will result in a complex and diverse architecture, utilizing elements of ambiguity and richness to create an authenticity of place that will preserve Savannah’s heritage will bolstering economic development (Laurence, 2006).

This research sought to explore the feasibility of integrating intangible aspects of heritage, memory, and experience into the physical planning and development of cities. Using a constructionist theoretical foundation, the focus was the phenomenological
nature of attachment and on the creation of subjective meanings of experiences within the world, and in this study in particular, within the historic city fabric. Through these investigations, the places within the urban landscape with the highest potential for fostering attachment were identified, and can be utilized to increase the City of Savannah’s ability to protect the heritage and character of their Landmark historic district.
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**IRB Approval**

**Protocol IRB2014-137**

---

**IRB2014-137 Amendment #2 Approval: "Beyond Aesthetics: Fostering Place Attachment through the Design Regulatory Process"**
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Nalinee Patin <NPATIN@clemson.edu>  
To: Robert Benedict <benedic@clemson.edu>  
Cc: "Courtney Grunninger (cgrunni@g.clemson.edu)" <cgrunni@g.clemson.edu>

**Wed, Sep 24, 2014 at 2:57 PM**

Dear Dr. Benedict,

Your amendment to extend the study to associations in Savannah, GA has been approved. You may begin to implement this amendment.

No change in this approved research protocol can be initiated without the IRB’s approval. This includes any proposed revisions or amendments to the protocol or consent form. Any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects, any complications, and/or any adverse events must be reported to the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) immediately. All team members are required to review the "Responsibilities of Principal Investigators" and the "Responsibilities of Research Team Members" available at [http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/regulations.html](http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/regulations.html).

The Clemson University IRB is committed to facilitating ethical research and protecting the rights of human subjects. Please contact us if you have any questions and use the IRB number and title in all communications regarding this study.

All the best,

Nalinee

---

**Nalinee D. Patin**

IRB Coordinator  
Clemson University  
Office of Research Compliance  
Institutional Review Board (IRB)  
Voice: (864) 656-0636  
Fax: (864) 656-4475  
E-mail: npatin@clemson.edu  
Web site: [http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/](http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/)  
IRB E-mail: irb@clemson.edu
Appendix B

Photo Release Consent Form

Clemson University
Beyond Aesthetics: Fostering Place Attachment through the Design Regulatory Process

Photo Release Form

I, __________________________ give permission for Dr. Robert Benedict and Courtney Grunninger Bonney to use and publish my photographs developed during the “Beyond Aesthetics: Fostering Place Attachment through the Design Regulatory Process” study. They are free to use the photographs for presentations and publications about this project.

Contact Information.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Courtney Grunninger Bonney at cgrunni@clemson.edu or 904.233.5564 (c).

Participant’s signature: ______________________________ Date: ________________

Participant’s name: ________________________________
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Appendix C

Participant Photo Log

# Historic Savannah Photo Survey

**Instructions:**
Please take photographs of places, elements, or features of historic Savannah that are meaningful to you. These could be things that are important to you for any reason. There are no right or wrong answers. Please include the date the photo was taken, a short description of the photo, and why the photo is important to you. There are two examples listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Date and Time photo was taken</th>
<th>Places, Things, or Features</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex. 1</td>
<td>5/12/2014 at 2:00 pm</td>
<td>Forsyth Park</td>
<td>901 Drayton St.</td>
<td>This place is important to me because it is where my husband proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. 2</td>
<td>5/13/2014 at 2:45 pm</td>
<td>wrought iron railing on a front porch</td>
<td>103 Ogletree Rd.</td>
<td>These types of railings give character to the houses in historic Savannah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo #</th>
<th>Date and Time</th>
<th>Places, Things, or Features</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Survey Instrument

Savannah Study Survey

You are invited to assist a Clemson graduate student, Courtney Grunninger Bonney by completing an academic research study. The purpose of this study is to learn more about resident opinions of development in downtown Savannah, GA. Results of the survey will be used to help planners, economic development officials, and academic professionals to gain a better understanding of how to improve and better serve you and your community.

Your participation will involve completion of an electronic survey (Qualtrics). The amount of time required for your participation will be approximately 15 minutes. An additional portion of the research study will include taking photographs of downtown Savannah, and then discussing those photos with the researcher. If you would be interested in participating in this portion of the research, please include your name and email address at the end of the survey.

There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts associated with this research. Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any time. You will not be penalized in any way should you decide not to participate or to withdraw from this study. We will do everything we can to protect your privacy. Your survey answers will be strictly confidential. All research data will be retained in a secure location during collection and analysis of the data. Following completion of the study, all survey responses shall be destroyed. Your identity will not be revealed in any publication that might result from this study.

If you have any questions or concerns about your rights in this research study, please contact the Clemson University Office of Research Compliance (ORC) at 864-656-6460 or irb@clemson.edu. If you are outside of the Upstate South Carolina area, please use the ORC’s toll-free number, 866-297-3071. If you have any additional questions regarding this survey, please contact Courtney Grunninger Bonney at cgrunni@clemson.edu. Thank you again for your time and consideration.
Clicking on the "agree" button indicates that:
• You have read the above information
• You voluntarily agree to participate
• You are at least 18 years of age

You may print a copy of this informational letter for your files.
☑ Agree
☑ Disagree

For this survey, Historic Savannah will refer to the nine highlighted areas on the map below.
Q1 Do you live in Savannah, GA?
- Yes, in historic Savannah
- Yes, in the City of Savannah, but not in historic Savannah
- No, but in Chatham County
- No, but I own property in the City of Savannah
- No

Q2 In which historic district (shown on the map) do you live? Click on the area of the map shown below.
Q3 How many years total have you lived in Savannah, GA (historic Savannah or City of Savannah)?
- under 5 years
- 6-15 years
- 16-25 years
- 26-35 years
- over 35 years

Q4 Did you live in Savannah, GA during any part of your childhood?
- Yes, in historic Savannah
- Yes, in the City of Savannah, but not in historic Savannah
- No, but in Chatham County
- No

Q5 What part of your childhood was spent in Savannah, GA? Select all that apply.
- Early childhood (until age 5)
- Childhood (6-9)
- Early adolescence (10-13)
- Adolescence (14-18)

Q6 Where do you currently live?
- In historic Savannah
- In the City of Savannah, but not in historic Savannah
- In Chatham County
- Outside Chatham County

Q7 What type of home do you currently live in?
- A single family home
- A townhouse or duplex
- A condo or loft
- An apartment
- A mobile home
- Other

Q8 Do you own or rent your home?
- Own
- Rent
- Other ____________________
Q9 How many times per week / per month do you spend time in historic Savannah?
- Never
- Less than once a month
- 1-3 times per month
- 1-3 times per week
- 4-6 times per week
- Daily

Q10 How many times per week / per month do you spend time in historic Savannah for the following activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Less than once a month</th>
<th>1-3 times per month</th>
<th>1-3 times per week</th>
<th>4-6 times per week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work or other business</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errands</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment such as dining or shopping</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events such as concerts or festivals</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 What are other reasons that you spend time in historic Savannah?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q12 Historic Savannah is very special to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q13 One of the major reasons I live where I do is that historic Savannah is nearby.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q14 Historic Savannah is the best place for what I like to do.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q15 Historic Savannah makes me feel like no other place can.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q16 I feel like historic Savannah is a part of me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q17 The things I do in historic Savannah I would enjoy just as much someplace else.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q18 No other place can compare to historic Savannah.
   □ Strongly Disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly Agree

Q19 I feel no commitment to historic Savannah.
   □ Strongly Disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly Agree

Q20 I get more satisfaction out of spending time in historic Savannah than from spending time someplace else.
   □ Strongly Disagree
   □ Disagree
   □ Neither Agree nor Disagree
   □ Agree
   □ Strongly Agree

Q21 Which of these commercial places in historic Savannah is the most meaningful to you?
A commercial place is defined as a place whose primary function is for commercial activity, such as retail, office space, restaurant, entertainment venue, etc.
   □ Place 1
   □ Place 2
   □ Place 3
   □ None of these commercial places is meaningful to me

Q22 What other commercial place in historic Savannah is most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q23 Why is this commercial place most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Q29 Click on the part of the photo that is most meaningful to you.

Q24 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q25 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
Q26 Why is this commercial place most meaningful to you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q27 Click on the part of the photo that is most meaningful to you.

Q28 The architecture of this place is an important part of why it is meaningful to me.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q29 If the architecture of this place was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree
Q30 Why is this commercial place most meaningful to you?

________________________________________________________________________

Q31 Click on the part of photo that is most meaningful to you.

Q32 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
 Oval   Strongly Disagree
 Oval   Disagree
 Oval   Neither Agree nor Disagree
 Oval   Agree
 Oval   Strongly Agree

Q33 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
 Oval   Strongly Disagree
 Oval   Disagree
 Oval   Neither Agree nor Disagree
 Oval   Agree
 Oval   Strongly Agree
Q34 Are there parts of this streetscape that seem more important to you than other parts?

○ Yes, some parts seem more important than other parts
○ No, all the parts blend together, no part feels more important than another part
○ I'm not sure
Q35 How important are the following individual parts to give the streetscape its unique character?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store Signs</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storefronts</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Landscaping</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetlights</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Racks</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
<td>⊘</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q36 Are there parts of this building that seem more important to you than other parts?

☑ Yes, some parts seem more important than other parts
☑ No, all the parts blend together, no part feels more important than another part
☑ I'm not sure
Q37 How important are the individual exterior elements (doors, windows, etc.) to maintaining its unique character?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building materials</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roofline</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storefront display windows</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awnings</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamentation and detailing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q38 Please click on the part of the building that is the most important to maintaining its unique character.

Q39 Why is this part the most important?

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
Q40 Which of these residential places is the most meaningful to you?
A residential place is defined as a place whose primary function is as a residence, such as a single family home, duplex, row house, apartment/condominium building, etc.
- Place 1
- Place 2
- Place 3
- None of these residential places is meaningful to me.

Q41 What other residential place in historic Savannah is most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q42 Why is this residential place the most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q43 Click on the part of photo that is most meaningful to you.
Q44 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q45 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q46 Why is this residential place most meaningful to you?
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Q47 Click on the part of photo that is most meaningful to you.
Q48 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q49 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q50 Why is this residential place most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q51 Click on the part of photo that is most meaningful to you.
Q52 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q53 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neither Agree nor Disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

Q54 Are there parts of this streetscape that seem more important to you than other parts?
○ Yes, some parts seem more important than other parts
○ No, all the parts blend together, no part feels more important than another part
○ I’m not sure
Q55 How important are the following individual parts to give the streetscape its unique character?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building materials</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetlights</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Landscaping</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porches</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balconies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q56 Are there parts of this building that seem more important to you than other parts?

- Yes, some parts seem more important than other parts
- No, all the parts blend together, no part feels more important than another part
- I’m not sure
Q57 How important are the individual exterior elements (doors, windows, etc.) to maintaining its unique character?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building materials</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofline</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balconies</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porches</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamentation and detailing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q58 Please click on the part of the building that is most important to maintaining its unique character.

Q59 Why is this part the most important?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Q60 Which of these park/urban places is the most meaningful to you?
A park/urban place is defined as a public or privately owned place that is accessible to the
classic and whose primary function is recreational, such as a park, greenspace, plaza,
courtyard, amphitheatre, etc.
☐ Place 1
☐ Place 2
☐ Place 3
☐ None of these park/urban places is meaningful to me

Q61 What other park/urban place in historic Savannah is the most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q62 Why is this park/urban place the most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q63 Click on the part of the photo that is the most meaningful to you.
Q64 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
● Strongly Disagree
● Disagree
● Neither Agree nor Disagree
● Agree
● Strongly Agree

Q65 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
● Strongly Disagree
● Disagree
● Neither Agree nor Disagree
● Agree
● Strongly Agree

Q66 Why is this park/urban place the most meaningful to you?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q67 Click on the part of the photo that is the most meaningful to you.
Q68 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q69 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q70 Why is this park/urban place the most meaningful to you?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Q71 Click on the part of the photo that is the most meaningful to you.
Q72 The architecture is an important part of why this place is meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q73 If the architecture was different, this place would not be as meaningful to me.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q74 Are there parts of this streetscape that seem more important to you than other parts?
- Yes, some parts seem more important than other parts
- No, all the parts blend together, no part feels more important than another part
- I’m not sure
Q75 How important are the following individual parts to give the streetscape its unique character?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Benches</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetlights</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Landscaping</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Features (Fountains, Statues, etc.)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Signs</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q76 Please click on the part of the streetscape that is most important to maintaining its unique character.

Q77 Why is this the most important part?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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Q78 Are you familiar with this building?

- Yes
- No
- I’m not sure

Q79 Were you familiar with this building prior to its renovation?

- Yes
- No
- I’m not sure

Q80 The changes made to the building are an improvement.

Before
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

After
Q81 Which parts of the renovation do you like the most? Please explain.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Q82 Which parts of the renovation do you like the least? Please explain.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Q83 Are there specific parts of the building that you think should have been preserved? If so, please explain.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Q84 My feelings about this building have changed since it was renovated.
☐ Strongly Disagree
☐ Disagree
☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree
☐ Agree
☐ Strongly Agree

Q85 Please explain how / why your feelings about this building have changed or have not changed.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
Q86 Are you familiar with this building?

- Yes
- No
- I’m not sure

Q87 Were you familiar with this building prior to its renovation?

- Yes
- No
- I’m not sure

Q88 The changes made to this building are an improvement.

Before

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

After
Q89 What parts of the renovation do you like the most? Please explain.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q90 What parts of the renovation do you like the least? Please explain.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q91 Are there specific parts of the building that you think should have been preserved? If so, please explain.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q92 My feelings about this building have changed since it was renovated.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Q93 Please explain how / why your feelings about this building have changed or have not changed.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Q94 Are you male or female?
- Male
- Female

Q95 Which best describes your age?
- 18-30
- 31-45
- 46-60
- 61-75
- Over 75
Q96 Which best describes your ethnicity?
- Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino
- Not Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino

Q97 Which best describes your race? Choose all that apply.
- Caucasian
- African American
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Some other race ________________

Q98 Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?
- Single
- Single, but cohabiting with significant other
- In a domestic partnership or civil union
- Married
- Divorced
- Separated
- Widowed

Q99 What is the highest level of education you have completed or the highest degree you have earned?
- Some grade school
- Some high school
- High school graduate or equivalent (GED)
- Some college
- Associate's degree (AA, AS, etc.)
- Bachelor's degree (BA, BS, etc.)
- Master's degree (MA, MS, MEd, MBA, etc.)
- Professional degree (MD, DDS, etc.)
- Doctoral degree (PhD, EdD, etc.)
Q100 What is your current employment status?
- Employed Full-time
- Employed Part-time
- Self-employed
- Unemployed
- Retired
- Student
- Other ____________________

Q101 If you are would be willing to participate in a follow up study for this research, please provide your name and mailing address below before completing the survey. If not, please click the forward arrow to complete the survey and submit your responses.

Follow up Survey Information
In this follow up survey you will be asked to take photographs of places in historic Savannah that are important to you (You can take your own digital photos with a digital camera or smart phone, or the researcher can mail you a disposable camera). A photo log will be sent so you can record where the photo was taken and why you took the photo. A prepaid return mailing label will be included so that you can return the materials to the researcher.

This part of the research will also include a short interview (30 minutes to 1 hour) with the researcher so that you can discuss the photographs in more detail. All information will be kept confidential.

Name _____________________________________________
Street Address__________________________________________
City____________________________________________________
State____________________________________________________
Zip Code______________________________________________
E-mail address__________________________________________
Preference for photos (digital or disposable camera) ________________
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This design manual was prepared to provide a user-friendly guide on applying the standards from the Savannah Historic Overlay District of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance (Figure ii.1). It should be used in accordance with the Historic Overlay District of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance (Sec. 8-3030) and the Material Treatment Guidelines for Rehabilitation in Savannah’s Historic District. Sections of the Ordinance appear throughout this text, highlighted in gray boxes, however it does not replace any regulation or law.

A compilation of resources was used to gather and collect data provided in this manual to better communicate the intent and application of the ordinance. These include the Chatham County-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission; the City of Savannah; the Savannah Development and Renewal Authority; the Historic Preservation Plan produced by the City of Savannah and Housing Authority in 1966; the Historic District Report prepared by Christopher Chadbourne and Associates in 1990; consultants Sottile & Sottile and their work with the Historic District Revisions Committee in 2001, 2008-2009, including the Height Development Map Report produced in 2003, and the Savannah Historic District Resources Manual produced in June 2009.

This manual was developed to replace the ‘Manual for Development in the Savannah Historic District’ produced in 1997. This document was needed as the ordinance has evolved significantly since 1997 and technological advancements have allowed for enhanced graphics and mapping to assist in communicating the intent and application of the standards in the revised ordinance.

This manual is intended to provide a greater understanding of the Historic District Ordinance (Sec. 8-3030). Within this manual the terms “structures” and “buildings” are used interchangeably.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Section One: Introduction

The Savannah Historic Overlay District is a component of the zoning ordinance which acts to preserve the city's historic character, create a climate for continued investment and development, and assure that such development recognizes, protects and enhances Savannah's historic architectural heritage and city plan which are recognized worldwide as civic treasures (Figure 1.1).

The Historic District Board of Review applies standards that are adopted by the Mayor and Aldermen as a part of the zoning ordinance. Periodically, these standards are revised in order to keep the ordinance current.

This manual seeks to provide property owner and the development community with a greater understanding of the standards in the ordinance to bring predictability to the District. The standards are not copied in full but can be found on our website, www.thempc.org. Excerpts of standards are included, where appropriate, and italicized within grey boxes.

Savannah has always been architecturally heterogeneous and the standards are not prescriptive with respect to historic styles. The standards recognize buildings designed in the existing historic styles of the city are likely to be compatible, but so too may buildings articulated in a contemporary or modern idiom. Rather than addressing specific architectural styles, these standards seek to facilitate buildings which are designed, detailed and constructed with care and consistency in accord with a material palette, compositional principles, and use of architectural elements consistent with the tradition of building in Savannah. Most important, its intent is to encourage private sector investment while protecting the unique and extraordinary qualities of one of the world's great cities.

Figure 1.1: Peter Gordon Map- Savannah, 1734.
The character of Savannah is a direct result of its extraordinarily unique urban plan. The rhythm and scale of its small blocks are the primary influence on the built form. Laid out by James Edward Oglethorpe, the basic unit of the plan is the ward (Figure 2.1). The wards serve as a module that can be repeated to connect one another, forming a basic grid pattern. Wards are typically 675 feet in the north-south direction, and 555 to 675 feet in the east-west direction.

The Historic District is comprised of a series of wards interconnected by boulevards, streets, and lanes (Figure 2.2). The central component of circulation is the public square. The wards are subdivided into eight blocks. The larger four blocks, located north and south of the square, are termed Tithing Blocks. The smaller four blocks, located east and west of the square are termed Trust Blocks and are bound on all sides by city streets.

The Trust and Tithing blocks dictated the development pattern within the city. Trust Blocks were historically used for civic buildings and later prominent homes, Tithing blocks were meant for residential development, generally with a 60 foot lot width. Structures located on Tithing blocks were serviced by east-west lanes from the rear. The 60 foot width lot became the standard building unit in the city (Figure 2.3). Trust buildings were built out to the width of the 60 feet and Tithing blocks were divided into variations of 60 and 30 feet; sometimes 15, 20, and 40 feet, or 60 and 120 feet depending upon the ward. The lot divisions resulted in a pattern of building types, most commonly the side hall plan or, on larger lots, the central hall plan. Buildings 30 feet or less in width almost always were divided into three bays and the masses of larger buildings were broken into 60 feet or less increments. Supremacy was given to facing onto the square, however on bounding streets, to the north and south of each ward (Bay, Broughton, Oglethorpe, Liberty, Jones and Gaston—termed east-west through streets) development occurred facing both sides of the street.
Section Three: Building Character and Architectural Elements

The genius of the Oglethorpe Plan lies not only in the grid, but also in its dimensions. The 90 foot deep lot emerged as ideal for nineteenth and twentieth century commercial and residential uses. It provided room for a 45 to 50 foot deep house, a 20 foot carriage house and a 20 to 25 foot courtyard (400 to 600 square feet in total area) between the two. Because the courtyard was such a desirable feature, buildings pushed forward to their property line to maximize space, creating a phenomenon in Savannah where private property encroaches upon the public space, resulting in entry stoops forward of the front property line (Figure 3.1).

Savannah differs from other historic cities, which often rely on a small palette of development patterns and street elevation types, because the power of Savannah’s grid, its system of subdivision, its courtyards, and the lushness of vegetation on its streets and squares, both encourages and tolerates significant architectural diversity and richness. Each ward and square has an individual character established by its pattern of street elevations and continuity of materials (Figures 3.2 and 3.3).

The combination of the development pattern and dwelling type establishes the rhythm and proportion of buildings and are incorporated into the standards to assure continuity and diversity. Once building placement and height are established, the public face that a building presents to the street defines its architectural character -- the materials; applications and composition of building walls; wall openings (doors and windows); roofs; attached structures such as exterior stairs, porches, bay windows and balconies; and fences (Figure 3.4).
The Historic District has several building characteristics and architectural styles that contribute to the overall integrity of the district. Preserving the building characteristics and architectural character of a façade is of upmost importance as it frames the building’s context and time. The pattern of development, dwelling type, composition, materials, and application have established a broad but clear set of characteristics which define the Historic District. It is a premise of these standards that historic precedent on any specific site can be used to allow for the reconstruction or alteration of a historic building. Additionally, the Secretary of the Interiors Standards have been incorporated to provide for the preservation of the exterior fabric within the district.

It is understood that the standards cannot consider or anticipate all of the possible circumstances that may arise. There might be buildings appropriate to Savannah’s Historic District that do not conform to the standards. The Historic District ordinance sets forth a procedure for granting variances from the standards through the Zoning Board of Appeals, provided the variance is also reviewed by the Historic District Board of Review for compliance with the Visual Compatibility Factors.

Residential dwellings of the Historic District are either row houses (Figure 3.5), semi-attached dwellings (Figure 3.6), detached homes, or apartment complexes (Figure 3.7). These dwellings can come in all different types ranging from a one-story structure to a six-story mixed-use development.
Section Four: History of Design Review

Savannah adopted land use zoning in 1960, however there was no legal protection in place to guarantee property owners that their rehabilitation investment would be protected from incompatible neighboring development. The zoning code was largely suburban in character with setback, lot area and density requirements that were out-of-character with the urban row house development of downtown. In addition, most of the buildings were unrestored and their historic character was not immediately recognized. People had a hard time seeing the potential of a derelict structure as a restored historic site and many important buildings were lost to accommodate automobile uses (Figure 4.1).

Several important events helped change this alarming trend. In 1966, pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act, the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, designated the Oglethorpe Plan area of Savannah as a National Historic Landmark District. In 1968, Historic Savannah Foundation published its inventory of architecturally significant structures within the Historic District. That same year, a referendum was held to amend the Georgia Constitution to enable Savannah to adopt historic zoning and a review process whereby changes to historic structures and new development would be reviewed for compatibility under a set of standards.

The prototype for the standards was developed by the architectural firm of Muldawer and Patterson for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and was published as the Historic Preservation Plan in 1966. The following year, the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC), The American Institute of Architects (AIA), and Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) recommended an overlay district that would allow higher densities, no setbacks, and mixed-use development typical of an urban environment. Subsequently, in 1973, the Historic District ordinance, which included the Visual Compatibility Factors from the 1966 Preservation Plan, was adopted and the Historic District Board of Review was established to review projects within the district bounded by the Savannah River, Gwinnett Street, East Broad and Randolph Streets and West Boundary Street (Figure 4.2).
Over the years, the ordinance and the Historic Building Map, a supplemental document that identifies all building designated as historic in a single document, are amended to remain current. Procedures have also been reviewed and changed as needed. By 1990, continued demolition and inappropriate new construction prompted Historic Savannah Foundation to contract Christopher Chadbourne, a Boston-based consultant, to prepare new design standards for the City of Savannah. These were presented to the City in 1992 and the most extensive revisions to the Historic District ordinance were adopted in 1997. By 2001, a broad-based committee of citizens and MPC and City staff met to consider additional revisions to the ordinance including a more finely refined height map. The Mayor and Aldermen adopted these revisions in 2003. They incorporated a historic district height map and specific design standards for new construction.
From 2003 to 2007, the City of Savannah, like much of the United States, experienced unprecedented growth and development in its downtown area. Large-scale development proposals continuously sought and were granted relief from the ordinance requirements to build taller and bigger buildings than the standards would allow, often resulting in buildings that were out of character with the historic context. In February 2008, the Historic District Revisions Committee with the assistance of Urban Design consultant Sottile & Sottile and staff convened to develop standards for compatible large-scale buildings. Resources included the Chadbourne Report and the Downtown Master Plan as well as data collection and analysis through the use of Savannah Area Geographic Information System (SAGIS), historic building surveys, and research. The result of this effort was an extensive set of standards for large-scale development and preservation of the Oglethorpe Plan Area that were adopted by the Mayor and Aldermen in December 2009 and incorporated into the zoning ordinance.

Just as the City has evolved (Figures 4.3, 4.4, & 4.5), the ordinance has been amended a number of times in response to the conditions of that time. Most ordinances, and in particular the zoning ordinance, are not static documents. They need, from time to time, to be amended to reflect changing community values, changing development trends, or to remove or clarify provisions which are ambiguous, unclear, or confusing.
Section Five: Historic District Board of Review Process

STEP 1: Consultation with Historic Preservation Staff

Prior to making application for a formal review, we encourage you to schedule an appointment with Historic Preservation staff for an informal discussion of your proposed work. Contact the Historic Preservation Department at 912-651-1440 or visit our website at www.thempc.org to find staff contact information and to download an application.

STEP 2: Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA)

In order to receive a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) an application for work to be completed must be submitted for review by the Historic District Board of Review. The Board meets on the second Wednesday of every month and applications for review must be submitted no less than 20 days prior to the meeting to provide public notice as required by the ordinance (Figure 5.2). Minor alterations, including paint color change, awnings, shutters, roof replacement, repointing, stucco repair, and repair to existing windows and doors may be reviewed by the Historic Preservation staff and can be submitted by the applicant at any time for review.

In addition to the application, supporting documentation as outlined on the application checklist must be submitted to provide the Board and staff with a complete understanding of the proposed project. This may include the following materials but will vary depending on the scope of work:

- Description of proposed work
- Photographs of existing conditions
- Site Plan
- Elevations, sections and floor plans
- Materials and specifications including product and color samples for brick, mortar, roofing, brochures and specifications for windows and doors, paint color samples, awning fabric samples.

Historic Preservation staff can assist you with the details of these submissions. The completed application and supplemental materials required for a Certificate of Appropriateness must be submitted to:

Savannah Historic District Board of Review
Chatham County-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC)
110 East State Street
Savannah, Georgia 31401

Figure 5.2: Proper sign posting.
HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW PROCESS

STEP 3: Evaluation by the Historic District Board of Review and/or Historic Preservation Staff

For projects requiring review by the Board, Historic Preservation staff prepares a report of the project based on information submitted by the applicant and makes a recommendation to the Board based on the standards in the ordinance. The report and application including supporting documentation are posted on the MPC’s website in advance of the meeting for review by the Board members, petitioner, and public.

The Board conducts a review of the proposed work, applying the standards provided in the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance.

For minor repairs, including paint color, roof repair, awnings, stucco repairs, repointing, and shutters the Board, through the bylaws, has delegated to staff the authority to review the proposed work to staff and issue a COA.

STEP 4: Rendering a Decision

For projects that are reviewed by Historic Preservation staff, a decision is rendered within ten days of submittal of a completed application. Applications submitted that do not meet the ordinance or are determined not to be visually compatible with the district will be placed on the next HDBR agenda for review by the Board.

The Board may:

- Approve your proposed work and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness (Figure 5.3); or
- Deny the proposed work because it is not consistent with the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance, or
- Continue the petition at the request of the applicant for revisions.

The Board is obligated to render a decision within forty-five (45) calendar days of receipt of a completed application, unless an extension or continuance has been agreed upon with the applicant.

STEP 5: Decision

If the proposed work is approved, the Board or staff issues a Certificate of Appropriateness to the applicant and provides a copy to the City’s Development Services Department.
The Certificate of Appropriateness is effective for one year. Upon written request by the applicant, the Board or staff may grant a one-time 12-month extension provided that the original Certificate of Appropriateness has not expired at the time of the request, the site or building conditions have not changed on the subject property and/or adjacent properties and the ordinance has not changed.

**Denial**

A denial shall be binding upon the Development Services Department, and no permit (where applicable) shall be issued. The denial will contain a written explanation by the HDBR of the reasons for denial and explain the applicant's right of resubmission or appeal.

In the case of a denial, the applicant may do the following:

- Make modifications to the plans and submit a new application; or
- Appeal the decision to the Zoning Board of Appeals or Mayor and Aldermen in the case of demolition (appeal to be filed within 30 days after the decision is provided to the applicant); and
- If sustained by the Zoning Board of Appeals, appeal the decision to the Circuit Court having jurisdiction.

**Work Conducted Without Permit**

When work has been conducted without a Certificate of Appropriateness, the property owner must submit an after-the-fact application for review. The property owner may be issued a Stop Work Order from the City’s Development Services Department and may be subject to further litigation. If the work is not consistent with the Historic District standards, the HDRB may require the owner to restore the property to the prior condition before the inappropriate work was conducted, or to modify the work so that it qualifies for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
Section Six: Preservation of Historic Structures

In order to preserve the integrity of the Historic District, widely accepted best preservation practices must be followed. In terms of historic preservation, integrity means how much of the original fabric of the structure still exists and the ability of a property to convey its significance. There are seven aspects of integrity: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association that determine a property's ability to convey its historical significance. It is ideal to preserve or restore as much of the original material as possible; therefore, a series of standards and guidelines were developed to ensure the best possible methods are followed in preservation efforts. There are four categories of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties: Preservation, Restoration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (Figure 6.1). The two most typically followed in Savannah are Preservation and Rehabilitation, the links of which are found below.

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation
http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/index.htm

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Preservation
http://www.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/preserve/preserve_index.htm

The ordinance requires that any historic structure, and any outbuildings, or any related auxiliary structure, visible from a public street or lane, including but not limited to walls, fences, light fixtures, steps, paving, sidewalks, and signs, may only be moved, reconstructed, altered, or maintained in a manner that will preserve the historical and exterior architectural features of these structures in a manner consistent with the current edition of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation published by the U.S. Department of the Interior. The visual compatibility factors and the design standards from the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning ordinance also apply.

Exterior architectural features may include the architectural style, scale, general design, and general arrangement of the exterior of the structure, including the kind and texture of the building material, the type and style of all roofs, windows, doors and signs. In considering proposals for the exterior alterations of historic structures in the historic district, the documented original design of the structure may be considered.

Figure 6.1 Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.
Section Seven: Visual Compatibility Factors

Visual compatibility creates harmony between infill and existing structures within the Historic District.

New construction and existing buildings and structures and appurtenances in the historic district which are moved, reconstructed, materially altered, repaired or changed in color shall be visually compatible with structures, squares, and places to which they are visually related.

Eleven factors determine whether a structure is visually compatible with its surrounding structures:

1. **Height.** The Historic District has a variety of building heights. To determine proper height for a new building the Historic District Height Map (Figure 8.3) was developed. New construction will be permitted to build the indicated number of stories on the map, provided the dimensional height is compatible. The height of the building’s individual components must be visually compatible with the building height and with surrounding contributing structures (Figure 7.1).

2. **Proportions of structures front façade.** To create a harmonious façade, building width and height should be proportional to one another and to contributing structures (Figure 7.2).

3. **Proportion of openings.** Window opening should be proportionally related to and visually compatible with surrounding contributing structures. The openings of a structure should match in width and height with the portions of the building (Figure 7.3).
4. **Rhythm of solids to voids in front façades.** An evenly balanced amount of solid massing and open space on the façade of a structure should be visually compatible with the contributing structures within the block or ward (Figure 7.4).

5. **Rhythm of structures on streets.** An equal amount of space should be given to building mass and open space between adjacent structures that has historically existed. This means row houses shall be constructed on blocks with existing row houses, semi-attached dwellings with existing semi-attached dwellings and so forth (Figure 7.5).

6. **Rhythm of entrance and/or porch projection.** The type of entry should be visually compatible with contributing structures. If contributing porches project into the public right-of-way, new construction on the same block may have a porch that acts in a similar fashion. Walkways should remain how they were historically and the type of entry and porch projection should be influenced by the existing streetscape (Figure 7.6).

7. **Relationship of material, texture and color.** Materials, textures, and color of the façade of a structure should relate to the surrounding context. Wood clad structures are visually related to similar wood clad structures. Brick structures are visually related to other masonry structures, such as stucco (Figure 7.7).
8. **Roof shapes.** The shape of a roof should be visually compatible with contributing structures. Historic buildings should determine the predominate roof shape, such as hipped, gable, shed, gambrel, or mansard, on a block or ward, and new construction should provide a roof line and shape that is compatible with the historic roof line of the block or ward (Figure 7.8).

9. **Walls of continuity.** Walls and fences should create a consistent enclosure along the street and should be consistent with the historic precedent of the ward or block (Figure 7.9).

10. **Scale of a building.** The mass of the overall building and its individual components, columns, stairs, balconies, and additions, should be visually compatible with contributing structures to which it is visually related (Figure 7.10).

11. **Directional expression of the front elevation.** The directional expression; vertical, horizontal or nondirectional; should be visually compatible with contributing structures within the block or ward. In blocks and wards, where buildings read horizontally in character, new construction will also read horizontally in character (Figure 7.11).
Section Eight: Design Standards

This section discusses specific aspects of the Oglethorpe Plan, buildings, materials and character. The following design standards apply to new construction, additions, and alterations to buildings and structures. To the maximum extent possible, these standards seek to retain the rhythm and scale of the district while taking into account the impacts of varying densities resulting from smaller unit sizes, varying floor heights resulting from contemporary construction practices, energy saving considerations, and the impact of the automobile. The requirements governing building placement, entrances and orientation, and on-site parking are intended to achieve compatible patterns of rhythm and scale.

The Historic District Board of Review may approve alternate materials if by the applicant demonstrates that the product is visually compatible with historic district building materials and has performed satisfactorily in the local climate.

(1) Streets and Lanes

The character of Savannah is a direct result of its extraordinarily unique urban plan. The rhythm and scale of its small blocks are the primary influences on its built form. In areas where the street plan has been preserved, the quality of human scale and economic diversity is greatest. In areas where streets and lanes have been closed, the scale and character of the City has been diminished (Figure 8.1). Patterns of small blocks and connected streets enhance pedestrian access, sight lines, traffic calming, on-street parking, mixed-uses and enhance economic vitality.

Savannah streets have a rhythm and scale derived from the original Oglethorpe subdivision of lots and blocks into 60 by 90 feet Titling lots (arranged 4 or 5 to a block) and 60 x 180 feet Trust blocks (Figure 8.2). These original lots were further subdivided into 15, 20, 24, and 30 feet widths, and each lot size gave rise to the development of certain building plan and street elevation types. Blocks often contained more than one subdivided lot width, and thus more than one plan or street elevation type, thereby contributing to the diversity of the city.

Development shall preserve or reconstruct the historic ward pattern of street and lanes within the Oglethorpe Plan Area bounded by the centerline of the following streets: Gaston Street on the South, Bay Street on the North, Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard on the West, and East Broad Street on the East (Figure 8.3).

Street and lanes shall not be bridged by development, except on Factor’s Walk. Such bridges shall be for pedestrian use only. Factor’s Walk bridges shall not be covered by a roof, awning or any other type of extension from a building.
DESIGN STANDARDS

Figure 8.3: Oglethorpe Plan Area outlined in green.

1. Bay Lane, between Houston and East Broad
2. St. Julian Street, between Lincoln and Habersham
3. St. Julian Street, between Jefferson and Barnard
4. St. Julian Street, between Montgomery and Jefferson
5. President Street, between Whitaker and Bull
6. President Street, between Barnard and Whitaker
7. York Lane, between Barnard and Whitaker
8. President Street, between Jefferson and Montgomery
9. Montgomery Street, east side of former full Liberty Square
10. Broughton Lane, between MLK and Montgomery
11. State Street, between MLK and Montgomery
12. President Street, between MLK and Montgomery
13. York Street, between MLK and Montgomery
14. York Lane, between MLK and Montgomery
15. Oglethorpe Avenue re-route between Montgomery & MLK
16. Oglethorpe Lane, between Houston and Price
17. Oglethorpe Lane, between Price and Habersham
18. Oglethorpe Lane, between Barnard and Jefferson
19. Oglethorpe Lane, between Jefferson and Montgomery
20. Oglethorpe Lane, between MLK and Montgomery
21. Hull Street, between Montgomery and Jefferson
22. Montgomery Street, east side of former full Elbert Square
23. McDonough Street, between Montgomery and Jefferson
24. McDonough Street, between Jefferson and Barnard
25. Perry Street, between Montgomery and Jefferson
26. Perry Street, between Jefferson and Barnard
27. Jefferson Street, between Liberty and Hull
28. Perry Lane, between Montgomery and Jefferson
29. Perry Lane, between Jefferson and Barnard
30. Liberty Street re-route between Jefferson and MLK
31. Stone Street, (aligned with Liberty Lane), between Jefferson and MLK
32. Liberty Lane, between Lincoln and Abercorn
33. Macon Street, between Bull and Whitaker
34. Macon Street, between Whitaker and Barnard
35. Charlton Street, between Montgomery and MLK
36. Jones Street, between Whitaker and Barnard
37. Berrien Street, between Montgomery and MLK
38. Wayne Street, between Abercorn and Drayton
There is a subtle hierarchy of appropriate locations for different building forms within the Oglethorpe Plan area. The Trust blocks were established as places for public buildings and are the most important building sites within a ward. Buildings that front the square on corners or are on corners that serve as gateways to a ward also demand a higher architectural expression than those which assume a tertiary position mid-block or along north-south service streets. These subtle design demands define the character of the Historic District.

Building forms are used as a means of assuring visual harmony on a block. Multiple variables -- Trust or Tithing block location, courtyard, setbacks and lot coverage, height and street elevation -- establish the bulk, mass, and the placement of buildings within the district (Figure 8.4).

**Tithing Blocks:** A variety of dwelling types may exist within any given Tithing block in the Historic District. As long as the rules for height, setback, lot coverage and street elevation are met, any of the historic building dwelling types within that block may be used (Figure 8.5).

**Trust Lots:** Any dwelling unit type may be used on Trust lots, which front onto squares. If the lot fronts onto an east-west street, a detached building is permitted, but only on a lot 50 feet or wider and with a garden of at least 20 feet depth fronting the square (Figure 8.6).
Dwelling Type: Five different dwelling type exist based predominantly on the side hall (Figure 8.7) and central hall (Figure 8.8) models. These residential structures have different configurations: one, two and three stories; two or three stories plus a raised basement and exterior stairway to a parlor entry; or with a stoop (or, in Victorian houses, a porch), which lifted the entry 20 to 42 inches from the ground. While certain architectural styles generally correspond to a particular form (for example, most Victorian era structures are two-stories over a crawl space), there is almost always an exception. Contrarily, certain types, most notably two-story attached dwellings can be found in almost every architectural style.

The residential architecture of the Historic District is comprised of different building types, as follows:

- Row Houses have party or lot line walls on two sides (Figure 8.9).
Semi-attached dwellings have a party or lot-line wall on one side (Figure 8.10).

Detached homes do not share party or lot-line wall with any adjacent buildings (Figures 8.11 and 8.12).

Apartment buildings are rare in the district. Most date from the first quarter of the 20th century. The contributing examples such as the Henrietta Apartments (307-311 Abercorn Street) and the DeRenne Apartments (24 East Liberty Street) understood the 60-foot rhythm or the plan (Figure 8.13 and 8.15).
(3) Height

The importance of height limits is to bring predictability to the development community, surety to the city neighborhoods and visual continuity to the Historic District that is at the root of the city’s tourist economy. Within the Historic District, the allowable height for new construction is measured in stories not feet. This allows for diversity in the skyline and within the block face while providing for compatibility with neighboring historic structures.

The Historic District Height Map (Figure 8.16) prescribes the height limits for the Historic District. The numbers within each height zone denote the maximum number of stories permitted for new construction, provided that [stories are further clarified in the below] the dimensional height is compatible with the historic context. The stipulated heights are consistent with the historic patterns within the core area of the Historic District while allowing considerable development opportunity within the edge districts.
A. Stories

Stories can be measured and interpreted through a variety of exterior expressions (Figures 8.17 & 8.18). Maximum and minimum floor heights for stories may prevail in certain character areas. Standards from the Historic District Ordinances that further clarify building stories throughout the Historic District state:

Buildings throughout the Historic District, which front a street, shall be at least two stories, except in the Beach Institute Character Area or for accessory buildings which front a lane.

Accessory buildings that front a lane shall be no taller than two stories.

A mezzanine shall not count as a story. Mezzanines [an intermediate level between the floor and ceiling of a story. Its aggregate floor area is not more than one-third of the area of the room or space in which it is located] are limited in area.

A basement that is entirely underground shall not count as a story.

A crawl space or partial basement that is four feet or less above grade shall not count as a story.

Non-habitable rooftop structures such as church spires; cupolas; chimneys; tanks and supports; parapet walls not over 4 feet high; and Mechanical or Access Structures [An enclosed, non-habitable structure above the roof of a building, other than a tank, tower, spire, dome cupola or bulkhead, occupying not more than one-third of the roof area. Mechanical access structures used solely to enclose stairways or elevator machinery, ventilation or air conditioning apparatus shall not count as a story] shall not be considered a story.
B. Residential Building Height

Within the Historic District, 82 percent of the residential housing stock is three-stories or less. Of those, one-story structures make up only five percent of the residential housing stock. 18 percent of the housing stock is taller than three stories. In analyzing the distribution of the various residential building heights the following observations can be made:

- **One-story buildings (Figure 8.19), with a few exceptions, can be found only north of Oglethorpe Avenue and in the Beach Institute neighborhood.**

- **Two-story structures (Figure 8.20) are found in every ward in the district.**

- **Two-story high stoop townhouses are found in every ward; however, in Davis Ward in the Beach Institute neighborhood, there is only one example.**

- **Three-story dwellings are found in every ward outside of the Beach Institute neighborhood.**

- **Three-story high stoop townhouses (Figure 8.21) are rarely found north of Oglethorpe Area with the exception of Anson Ward, and are most prevalent in Chatham, Monterey and Calhoun Wards north of Gaston Street. They are not found in the Beach Institute neighborhood.**

The exterior expression of the height of raised basements shall be not less than 6’-6” and not higher than 9’-6”.

The exterior expression of the height of the first story, or the second story in the case of a raised basement shall be not less than 11 feet.

The exterior expression of the height of each story above the second shall not be less than 10 feet.
C. Commercial Building Height

Commercial buildings in the Historic District come in a variety of heights and styles, depending upon their location and construction date. Typically they range from one-story to four-stories in height and occupy the full width of the lot. This section of the manual deals with height articulation between the floors, the height of each floor, the architectural articulation of height, and the visual expression of height on the building. Later sections of this manual expresses the appropriate design standards for storefronts.

Commercial buildings within the district share a number of commonalities which form the basis of architecture subdivision on commercial facades (Figure 8.22).

![Figure 8.22: Commercial building, Bay Street.](image)

The first story of a retail building shall be designed as a storefront.

Subdivide the façade horizontally into base, middle, and top. The first story shall be separated from the upper stories by an architectural feature such as a string course (i.e. projecting horizontal band) or change in material. Such feature may be placed at the top of the second story when the first and second stories have the visual appearance of a unified exterior expression.

The height of the first story shall not be less than the exterior visual expression of the height of any single story above the first.

The exterior visual expression of the top story of buildings over three stories shall be distinctive from the stories below the top story.
(4) Setbacks

Dwellings in the Historic District, with the exception of detached houses on lots greater than 40 feet (generally south of Gaston Street) tend to be closely spaced. In order to maintain this spacing on which much of the character of the district rests, new or expanded dwelling structures should occupy the following minimum percentage (Figure 8.23) of lot width along the front setback line as measured from side lot-line to side lot-line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Dwelling</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Row Dwellings</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Attached Dwellings</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached dwellings on lots equal to or less than 40 ft.</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached dwellings on lots greater than 40 ft.</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment buildings</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.23: Minimum percentage of lot width along the front setback line.

Maximum building lot coverage permitted in most sections of the Historic District is 75 percent of the parcel. Within the predominately commercial areas of the district, 100 percent building lot coverage is permitted. Maximum building lot coverage is determined by the base zoning of the specific property and is identified within the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance Development Standards.
A front setback respectful of established patterns along a block front is one of the strongest ways to provide a sense of unity and harmony to a street. It is, therefore, a general provision of these standards that where there is an established front yard setback along a block front, it should be maintained. However, buildings in the district are commonly built to the lot line and encroach onto the public right-of-way (Figure 8.24).

The limited 60 foot width of Trust blocks combined with the need for a 20 foot deep parking space and a typical unit depth of 40 to 50 feet makes it impractical and undesirable to provide front setbacks where lots front east-west streets. Where lots front the squares or the north-south service streets, the setbacks should reflect adjacent historic development patterns.

Front yards. There shall be no front yard setbacks except as follows:

i. On tithing lots where there is a historic setback along a particular block front, such setback shall be provided.

ii. On a trust lot fronting a square, proposed buildings may establish a front yard setback not to exceed 20 feet (Figure 8.25).

Side yards. A side yard setback shall not be required.
(5) Entrances and Doors

The number of addresses within a block is a direct measure of its vitality, human scale and pedestrian activity. Savannah’s most walkable blocks feature multiple street addresses along their sidewalks. Streets in the Historic District should be animated with the presence of dwellings and shops and not lifeless processions of blank walls (Figure 8.26), parking lots, driveways and garage doors. Thus, entries should open directly onto streets.

Trust Lots facing squares play a pivotal role in defining the character of the squares. They must lend prestige to the square. While there are a handful of historic buildings on squares orienting to east-west streets (Figure 8.27), 95 percent front onto the square.

![Figure 8.26: A building with no entrances along Bay Street, not a recommended treatment. Sottile & Sottile.](image)

A building on a trust lot facing a square shall locate its primary entrance to front the square. A building on a trust lot not facing a square shall located is primary entrance so that it fronts the same street as the other historic buildings on the same block. A building on a tithing block shall locate its primary entrance to front the east-west street.

Placement. Door frames shall be inset not less than three inches from the exterior surface of the façade of a building, excluding façades with wood siding.

Materials. Doors shall be made of wood (Figure 8.28), clad wood, glass, or steel.
(6) Exterior Treatment

Exterior materials are important in defining the overall character of the district. Original materials should be retained to preserve the integrity of the district. Where repairs or replacement is warranted, it should match the original as closely as possible and not be substituted with a new modern material (i.e. dryvit, EIFS, or cementious siding).

Typically, residential structures within the district are brick (Figure 8.29), true stucco (Figure 8.30), or wood clad (Figure 8.31). Commercial structures and monumental buildings are clad in brick, polished stone, glazed tile, terra cotta, and, in more modern examples, concrete. Use of these materials maintains the historic integrity of the district and helps provide compatible infill. A number of exterior surface materials are considered incompatible within the district, including: glass fiber reinforced concrete, Thinset imitation masonry, particle board, asphalt or wood shingles, vertical siding, aluminum or vinyl siding, fiber cement panels, or any similar flush mounted surface material.

Within each ward, different material treatments became the predominate and favored material depending upon the ward’s date of development. For example, wood siding is common in the older ward and towards the south in the newer wards, masonry structures dominate.
(7) Windows, Shutters and Commercial Storefronts

A. Windows

Historic windows are important architectural elements of a building façade. Original windows should be retained to preserve the historic integrity of the building as they reflect original design intent, a period or style, and may reflect evolutions to the building.

Windows on new construction should be visually compatible with historic windows to which they are visually related. Within the Historic District, windows have the following characteristics:

- recessed from the exterior wall; they are not flush with the surface of the building (Figure 8.32);
- tend to align vertically on the front façade (Figure 8.33);
- tend to be arranged in a three or six bay rhythm (Figure 8.33);
- are taller than they are wide (Figure 8.33);
- are mostly double or triple hung (Figure 8.34);
- divided light sashes have true divided lights (Figure 8.35) and;
- mostly made of wood with some metal examples.
B. Shutters

Shutters were traditionally part of the window composition and performed important functions. They provided additional privacy and security along the street, protection from the environment and natural disasters such as heavy storms and hurricanes, shade in the warm summer months, and operable louvers to allow for ventilation while protecting the interior from the solar heat and harmful rays.

Louvered shutters are recommended for use in most instances in the Historic District (Figure 8.36). Originally, slats were movable to allow for ventilation and shade in the warm local climate. In many cases today, shutters are used only for decorative purposes, and as such, fixed slats may be approved if the proportions and detailing are correct and panels align with window sashes. In all cases the shutters must be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening in the closed position.

Solid paneled and board and batten shutters are only appropriate in certain instances (Figures 8.37 & 8.38). Colonial cottages are one example. Paneled shutters should not be substituted for louvered shutters on residential buildings.

Figure 8.36: Louvered shutters.

Figure 8.37: Solid panel shutters.

Figure 8.38: Board and batten shutters.

Figure 8.39: Shutter sized to fit the arched window.

Shutters shall be hinged and operable and sized to fit the window opening (Figure 8.39) The placement of the horizontal rail shall correspond to the location of the meeting rail of the window.

Shutters shall be constructed of durable wood. [PVC composite shutters have been approved by the board provided they meet the other standards]
C. Commercial Storefronts

The principal commercial corridor or “main street” in Savannah has historically been located on Broughton Street (Figure 8.40). However, commercial structures also are located along primary corridors such as Bay Street, Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd, and Bull Street and dotted throughout the rest of the district. Savannah’s Historic District is unique in that residential and commercial buildings live in harmony with one another, while they maintain a visual distinction from one another through varying uses of materials and application of architectural elements.

Masonry commercial structures in the Historic District date from three periods in the city’s commercial growth: early nineteenth-century, mid-nineteenth-century, and early twentieth-century. Each period addresses the following features uniquely: horizontal articulation -- the demarcation of base (storefront), middle, and top (cornice); vertical articulation -- the treatment of entries and corners and the introduction, or lack thereof, of bays; and architectural detail. While each period can be identified by the distinctive way in which it dealt with these attributes, the periods also share common characteristics. It is these commonalities that should be shared by new structures. They form the basis of the commercial design standards. Within that framework structures remain free to explore their own distinctive characteristics.

Retail storefront area glazing shall be not less than 55 percent. Such glazing shall be transparent; provided however, black glass may be used in the sign area above the storefront window transoms. Storefront glazing shall extend from the sill or from an 18 to 24 inch base of contrasting material, to the lintel.

Storefronts shall be constructed of wood, cast iron, Carrera glass, aluminum, steel or copper as part of a glazed storefront system; bronze, wood, masonry, glazed brick or tile as a base for the storefront (Figure 8.41).
Early Nineteenth-Century Buildings

Constructed for the most part between 1820 to 1855, these buildings feature regularly spaced structural masonry piers supporting a stone lintel upon which sits the upper floors (Figure 8.42). At the ground level or base, infill between the piers is recessed from the surface plane and is generally comprised of glass over an 18 to 24 inch tall wooden base. Windows in the upper floors are regularly spaced and modest in size with multiple panes of glass. Bases are the same height or taller than floors in the middle. Parapets are elaborated with stepped or decorative coursing. Piers, generally, but not always, are interrupted by the lintel and do not extend to the upper floors. One interesting and elegant exception is the Gibbons Block where the piers are expressed through to the top of the parapet, creating a repetitive pattern of 32 foot bays, thus assuring the vertical and incremental quality of the block in a fashion similar to that achieved by attached exterior stairs and wooden canopies on residential row house blocks.

Mid-Nineteenth Century and Victorian Structures

The Romantic tradition was reintroduced to American architecture during the Victorian period commencing in the 1840s. It began to appear in Savannah in the mid-1850s. Sophisticated machine technology permitted the manufacture and distribution of a diverse palate of mass-produced parts including cast iron and large sheets of plate glass. The storefront was transformed. Sheet metal was pressed into elaborate cornices. Windows became larger. Two-over-two and four-over-four sashes replaced the previous six-over-six form. Glazing represented as much as 30% of the upper floor’s exterior appearance. The ground floor got taller, generally by two feet but occasionally more, and was taller than the upper floors. Windows took on ornamental moldings or lintels and often a curved top. The Germania Fire Company Building of 1871 bridges the styles of the latter part of the century. It reestablishes the pier and extends it to the upper floors, holds the spandrels flush with the piers, and recesses the glazing in the elaborated rectangles thus created. (Figure 8.43).
Early Twentieth-Century Structures

Following the influential 1893 Chicago Exposition, the nation underwent a strong shift to the Classical Revival style. This shift in style was accompanied by corresponding advances in technology, primarily in the use of steel construction. The spans it permitted were reflected in the recessed windows and panels bridging between masonry piers which gave the buildings of the period both a sense of heightened verticality and a sense that the upper floor facade was now a collection of parts as opposed to the flat, planar surfaces of earlier nineteenth-century buildings (Figure 8.44). The verticality was heightened by the fact that between each pier the window bays were divided by vertical mullions that were wider than their horizontal counterparts. The horizontal lintel above storefronts remains an important part of the design, and in taller buildings stone was introduced as a base for brick buildings.

For the most part, this later period is represented in the classical institutions of Savannah and in taller buildings.

As storefront styles became increasingly modern, glass as a percentage of total facade increased markedly (Figures 8.45 & 8.46). In Savannah it did so less than in many other American cities. However, the use of glass and horizontal spans remain a commonality in Savannah’s storefront architecture.
Storefront Entrances

The location of storefront entrances is equally important as the design. In the nineteenth-century corner cut entries became extremely popular (Figure 8.47). The vast majority of storefronts on Broughton Street feature a recessed entry (Figure 8.48). Often decorative floor tiles or terrazzo signs were installed within these recesses. These elements are integral to the storefronts along Broughton Street and should be retained and encouraged on new infill.

A building on Broughton Street shall locate its entrances at no greater intervals than 50 feet; provided, however, that for a corner entrance the interval to the next entrance may be increased to 60 feet.

Entrances fronting Broughton Street shall be recessed and centered within the storefront.

Figure 8.47: Corner entry on Broughton and Whitaker Streets.

Figure 8.48: Recessed entry of Globe Shoe Company with terrazzo sign inlay.
(8) Awnings

Awnings are commonly used throughout the Historic District to provide shade and shelter at window and storefront openings. Correct placement of awnings, within architectural bays and not over character defining features, can help to enhance the openings (Figure 8.49) within a façade and reinforce the location of the vertical columns and horizontal cornice (Figure 8.50). Historically, almost all awnings were retractable so that they could be easily maintained and used only when needed.

Often commercial awnings can indicate the use of a building by featuring logos, the name of business, or the address.

In City Market, large metal awnings extended (Figure 8.51) into the public right-of-way to provide shade for merchants and traders who historically sold their goods in the market.

Figure 8.49: Awning over the principal entry.

Figure 8.50: Awnings between window bays.

Figure 8.51: Awnings in City Market.

Awnings extending above the public right-of-way shall have a minimum vertical clearance of eight feet above the sidewalk.

Residential awnings shall be constructed of canvas, cloth or equivalent. Non-residential awnings shall be constructed of canvas, other equivalent cloth, metal, or glass.

Awnings shall be integrated structurally and architecturally into the design of the façade and not obscure the character-defining features of historic facade.

The following are prohibited: a single continuous awning that connects two buildings and back-lit or internally lit awnings.
(9) Roofs

Roofs in the Historic District tend to be simple. The majority of commercial and residential masonry buildings have flat roofs hidden behind simple parapets and cornices (Figure 8.52) or have modestly pitched and bracketed hip roofs (Figure 8.53). Gables exist primarily on wood clad residential buildings and run parallel to the street (Figure 8.54). Some roofs have dormers. Mansard roofs are confined to Victorian residential structures (Figure 8.55).
(10) Balconies, Stairs, Stoops, Porticos, and Side Porches

Structures attached to the primary mass of a building, such as porticos, stoops, exterior stairs to parlor level entrances, porches, bays, etc. are an integral part of the richness of Savannah’s residential and civic buildings. They provide depth, shadow, and human activity on the street.

Entrances to structures in the Historic District are predominantly approached via low stoops or exterior stairs leading to parlor level entrances. They are frequently covered by bracketed or column supported canopies. Row houses are encouraged to use canopied stoops or exterior stairs to break up their massing. The space under these stairs may or may not be filled in. Likewise, side porches, when utilized, contain most of the decorative features found on the front stoops (Figure 8.56).

Use of these elements is encouraged. Furthermore, railings provide an opportunity for the application of decorative contemporary craftwork in the Historic District.

Decorative Details

Additionally, Savannah’s architecture is rich in carefully crafted details, often integral to the overall design of the building. Contemporary artistic craftsmanship can enrich the visual texture of the city. Incorporation of the following kinds of details is encouraged:

- Cast iron decorative railings
- Downspouts such as the dolphin downspout (Figure 8.57)
- Etched and stained glass
- Moulded terracotta
- Lamp brackets
- Decorative vent covers
- Decorative tiles
- Corner quoining (Figure 8.58)
(11) Additions

Additions to historic buildings allow the current occupant to accommodate their needs that might not otherwise be met within the existing building. Additions help to show the evolution of structures over time (Figure 8.59) and can sometimes gain historical significance in their own right (Figure 8.60). It is important that additions be subordinate to the principal building and not obscure or remove significant character defining features.

Additions on the front of historic buildings shall not be permitted.

Additions to historic buildings shall be located to the rear of the structure or the most inconspicuous side of the building. Additions to roofs shall not be visible from the front elevation. The addition shall be sited such that it is clearly an appendage and distinguishable from the existing main building.

Designs for additions may be either contemporary or reference design motifs of the historic building.

Figure 8.59: Compatible modern rear addition, York Street.

Figure 8.60: Tomochichi Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse, an example where an addition has acquired historical significance. The southern end, constructed ca. 1895 was originally the U.S. Post Office. In 1930 the building was expanded north, across President Street to encompass the northern trust lot.
(12) Fences, Trellises, and Walls

Fences and walls, and the gates that lead to the gardens beyond, play an important role in the Historic District. Fences may allow the viewer to see in, while establishing boundaries. Walls contribute to street front continuity, provide privacy in side or rear yards, and screen cars and other utilitarian uses by creating walls of continuity along the streetscape (Figure 8.61).

Fences within the Historic District are usually built along the lot line and are generally brick or a combination of brick and iron. On wooden structures, wood or dowel picket fences are common (Figure 8.62). As the City expanded, the later Victorian areas of the District have low copings often capped with decorative iron fencing (Figures 8.63 & 8.64). Fences within the Historic District do not extend beyond the front elevation of a building, except in the rare exception of buildings on Trust lots facing a square and the southern Victorian end of the district.

The height of any fence, trellis, or wall shall not exceed 11 feet.

Walls and fences facing a public street shall be constructed of the material and color of the primary building; provided; however, iron fencing may be used with a masonry structure.

A masonry base shall be used with iron fencing.

Wood fences shall be painted or stained.
(13) Lanes and Carriage Houses

One of the features of the Oglethorpe Plan which has enabled it to gracefully adapt to the modern era of the automobile, is the system of lanes between the Tithing Blocks. Traditionally, carriage houses, servants quarters, and ancillary structures were located along lanes (Figure 8.65). These buildings have often been adaptively reused into garages on the first floor and apartments above to meet the current needs of the twenty-first century (Figure 8.66).

The Lanes are part of the scale and rhythm of the Historic District. Lanes are also the service alleys of the city providing areas for refuse and recycling pick up, utility access and fire equipment access, thus removing these visually incompatible services from the front face of the buildings and streets. Loss of lanes to land assemblage for large-scale development destroys the scale of the Historic District and thereby destroys its landmark character (Figure 8.67).

Likewise, the introduction of large-scale garage door openings or the loss of a carriage house altogether for a carport or surface parking destroys the scale and character of the lane. Structured parking on lanes should occur in the lower level of an existing carriage house or in a structure which maintains a two-story appearance.

Carriage houses were traditionally accessory to a main house in mass and scale. They were secondary to the main structure. They should not be subdivided from the main lot of record.

Figure 8.65: Historic lane with carriage houses.

Figure 8.66: Carriage house, adaptive reuse.

Figure 8.67: Chatham County Jail and Courthouse, encroachment into the lane and trust street.
(14) Parking

Parking within the Historic District should respect the Oglethorpe Plan. Within the Historic District parking should be designed to create a minimal visual impact on the district while servicing the established automobile culture (Figure 8.68).

Access to parking shall be from lanes or north-south service streets. When a property does not front a lane or north-south service street, parking may be accessed from east-west connecting streets or trust streets.

Structured parking (Figure 8.69) within the first story of a building shall be setback a minimum of 30 feet from property lines along all public right-of-way (not including lanes).

Curb cuts shall be permitted only where access to a lane doesn’t exist.

Curb cuts shall not exceed 20 feet in width.

Where intersected by a new driveway, the sidewalk shall serve as a continuous uninterrupted pathway across the driveway in materials, configuration, and height.

Asphalt strips or tabs shall not be permitted. Loose paving materials, such as crushed shell or gravel, shall not be permitted with 18 inches of the public-right-of-way.

Figure 8.68: Screened surface parking within the Historic District.

Figure 8.69: Structured parking with active uses on principal streets and parking and service access from the rear. Sottile & Sottile.
(15) Service Areas, Utilities and Mechanical Systems

Mechanical services, utility boxes, and trash and recycle bins are a reality of modern living and must be accommodated within the historic district. Service areas should be located within the building or on secondary facades; often the lane is the best location for these services (Figure 8.70). Consideration for these services should be part of the design process and can be an opportunity for creative screening techniques. Recesses in fences, with or without doors, have proven a satisfactory way to screen the City’s large green trash containers along the lanes (Figure 8.71). Meter boxes do not need to be exposed as long as they are readily accessible to meter readers (Figures 8.72 & 8.73).

Figure 8.70: Service located in the lane and screened from view. Sottile & Sottile.

Figure 8.71: Screened trash receptacles.

Figure 8.72: Hidden meter with accessible screen.

Figure 8.73: Meter located in a fence recess.
9. LARGE-SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Section Nine: Large-Scale Development

Large-scale development has the potential to have the greatest impact to the character of the Historic District because of its size and scale. When done appropriately, these buildings become landmarks and can be a catalyst for revitalization. When done inappropriately they can stagnate development and create dead-zones of inactivity, consuming entire blocks within the district. The standards seek to restore traditional massing to large-scale developments and tall buildings by subdividing those buildings horizontally into bases, middles and tops, and vertically into differentiated massing, while accentuating corners and entries.

The Primacy of 60-Foot Lot

A major intent of these provisions is to maintain the primacy of the 60-foot lot. Where development exceeds the 9,000 square foot threshold it must be broken into legible pieces through one of several devices. These devices include breaking the volume into multiple pieces (such as Massie School on Calhoun Square; Figure 9.7), the use of significantly different incremental façades on the same building, or creating asymmetrical volumetric compositions (such as the Chatham County Courthouse on Wright Square; Figure 9.1).

The 60-foot dimension of Trust and Tithing lots is reflected throughout the history of the City in its architecture. Civic institutions and Trust lot homes took on the 60-foot width of the Trust Blocks while Tithing blocks were subdivided into 30 and sometimes 15, 20, 40 or other divisors of 60 or 120-feet. Buildings 30-feet or less in width almost always were divided into three bays. Larger footprint buildings, like the old DeSoto Hotel and the Chatham County Courthouse on Wright Square, understood the primacy of this pattern and broke their massing into increments of 60-feet or less. All but one of the historic tall buildings of the city occupied either a single Tithing or Trust lot or broke their massing into multiple pieces as in the DeRenne Apartments. This unwritten rule was sacred.

Large-Scale Development is defined as development whose combined ground floor footprint is equal to or greater than 9,000 square feet (Figure 9.2) within a single parcel and/or is greater than four-stories in residential zoning districts or is five-stories or greater in all other zoning districts. In the case of an addition to an existing building, the combined footprint and height of both the existing building and the addition located on the same parcel apply.

Figure 9.1: Chatham County Courthouse, ca. 1889.

Figure 9.2: Threshold for large-scale development. Sottile & Sottile.
(1) Footprint

It is a premise of these guidelines that new buildings should likewise respect the primacy of the historic lot subdivisions and the Oglethorpe Plan.

Today's office buildings, hotels, retail centers and apartment buildings often seek larger footprints. The consequence is that assemblage, not subdivision, is the rule and recent of buildings have been built that ignored the 60-foot module and are changing the scale of the City. At issue is not whether assemblage is allowed but whether buildings can be made that are good neighbors - that conform to the scale of their predecessors.

With the exception of 5 East Congress Street on Johnson Square (Figure 9.6), taller historic structures in the Historic District reflected the 60-foot tithing lot subdivision of the Oglethorpe grid plan. They did so primarily by building within the 5,400 square foot floor plates prescribed by a tithing lot. When they exceeded that lot area they resorted either to multiple volumes, distinct volumetric compositions or by presenting themselves as a collection of smaller buildings.

Some buildings are out of scale with the Historic District simply due to their size (Figure 9.3). An analysis of building footprints was undertaken to determine when buildings could no longer be compatible with the Oglethorpe Plan Area because of their size (Figure 9.4). This Study determined that half of a typical tithing block, or 13,500 square feet, was the maximum footprint for new infill to remain in scale and harmony in the Oglethorpe Plan (Figure 9.5).
(2) Massing

Large-scale development can be visually compatible within the historic district if its massing is designed to create a sense of variation within the building form. Refining the mass of a building prevents it from becoming too bulky and out of scale with the historic context. Historically, large-scale development in Savannah responded to its site by incorporating different massing techniques. These techniques have been analyzed and incorporated into the ordinance to achieve more compatible massing and scale. To comply with the ordinance, two of the following devices must be incorporated into any new large-scale development:

1. Subdivide the façade horizontally into a base, middle, and top using architectural features to create a sense of division (Figure 9.6).

![Figure 9.6: Sottile & Sottile.](image)

2. Using multiple detached volumes to break the building into separate structures, reducing the overall building footprint (Figure 9.7).

![Figure 9.7: Sottile & Sottile.](image)
3. Variation in the roofline through change in volumetric forms, different shape of varying heights (Figure 9.8).

4. Incorporation of setbacks within the façade (Figure 9.9).

5. Incorporation of recesses within the wall plane (Figure 9.9).
(3) **Height**

There is not a long history of tall buildings in Savannah and not enough from any one period of history to establish a distinctive Savannah style. Savannah’s stock of tall buildings maintain the horizontal articulation of base, intervening floors, and cornice and make some effort to celebrate the entrance (Figure 9.10). In addition, scale is adapted to the Savannah plan through division into multiple volumes distinctive bays and/or strong horizontal layering and asymmetrical massing.

With the exception of a very few tall buildings and a very few lower buildings, the Historic District is an area of two-to four-story buildings. The insertion of taller buildings into this broad, regularized, and internationally recognized framework is an act of great significance and one that should be both minimized and carefully considered. They should not “pop-up” here and there, whatever the social or economic rationale for their existence. Most of these uses can be accommodated in lower rise high-density schemes. Those uses that cannot, may locate in areas adjacent to or outside of the National Historic Landmark District or in specified locations. Additionally, high-rise apartment buildings are not a predominant building type in Savannah, although they do occur (Figures 9.11 & 9.12).
Large-scale development must consider the height of neighboring historic structures and be within the number of stories indicated on the Historic District Height Map (see, Figure 8.7). Additionally, they must follow the following provisions below to ensure visual compatibility within the Historic District:

A. Residential Standards

In areas of the district that are more residential in nature, greater consistency in height is established by the existing historic structures. Preservation of this consistency in new development is vital to maintain the scale and integrity of these wards and the height provisions should be strictly adhered to. The height of large-scale development in residential zoning districts (districts with the letter “R” in the nomenclature) should be subordinate to the historic context and not exceed one-story above adjacent principal historic buildings. Roof line variations should occur every 60-feet to break the massing and reinforce the 60-foot lot premise. Within the more residential areas of the district, lanes are characterized by one-and two-story carriage houses and/or ancillary structures. To preserve this character defining element, the maximum height along the lane cannot exceed two stories within 20 feet of the lane and must occupy at least 50 percent of the lot width along the lane (Figure 9.13).

B. Commercial Standards

In more commercial areas of the district a greater variation in height is established through historic development pattern. While the commercial areas of the district have greater variation in heights with two-story buildings next to eleven-story buildings (Figure 9.14), historically when buildings maintained long frontages along the street, variation was provided in the roofline through towers, cupolas, different shaped bays, variation in roofline, and dormers. As such, the height of a structure must adhere to the limits on the Historic District Height Map and roof line variation should occur every 120 feet to break-up the massing and add architectural interest where the building meets the sky.
C. Additional Stories

In the downtown core because there are variations in height, it is possible to exceed the Historic District Height Map by one-story provided that the building provides an additional benefit to those who experience it (Figure 9.15). This also applies to sites along major boulevards, and Trust lots that front onto large open spaces and can absorb greater height and be compatible with the context. These provisions are provided below.

---

i. An historic street or lane is restored and dedicated back to the City of Savannah as public right-of-way;

ii. Affordable Housing, as defined and quantified by the City of Savannah, is provided within the development and so certified by the City Manager;

iii. Multiple ground floor active uses (Figure 9.16); permitted in the base zoning district (including but not limited to retail, office, lobby, restaurant) span the length of the façade on all streets fronting elevations (not including lanes) and maintain individual primary exterior entrances.

iv. Exterior building walls incorporate 100 percent modular masonry materials on all sides with the use of granite, marble, or other natural quarried stone over a minimum of 30 percent of all street fronting facades and roofs incorporate sustainable technologies such as green roofs, rooftop gardens, and solar roofs (including solar shingles, roof tiles, or membranes) over a minimum of 50 percent of roof area and so certified by the City Manager.

---

Figure 9.15: 102 W. Bay Street, new large-scale development with an additional story. Granted an additional story for restoring Factor’s Walk.

Figure 9.16: 102 E. Liberty Street, multiple ground floor active uses on large-scale development. Sottile & Sottile.
Building walls on street fronting façades shall incorporate modular masonry materials in the form of brick, cast stone, stone, concrete formed or assembled as stone to achieve a human scale over a minimum of 75% of surface area (excluding windows, doors, and curtain walls). The remainder of wall surfaces may incorporate other materials.

Figure 9.16: Scottish Rite Temple, 1912.

Figure 9.17: Window groups modular masonry along the base of 125 Bull Street, illus. in Figure 8.60.

Figure 9.18: Architectural ornament on 15 Drayton Street, illus. in Figure 9.10.

(4) Materials

The exterior materials of large-scale development can further break the massing and create a sense of human scale and belonging within the district. Historically, large-scale development used a variety of materials to create visual interest along the façade and provide human scale to large buildings (Figure 9.16). Noble materials such as limestone, granite, marble, and brick were often used to stand the test of time with details in the same material or with accents in sandstone, brownstone, metal (iron), or terracotta. Window groups, columns, and pilasters further accentuated the architectural character of a building (Figure 9.17). Ornamentation should be used to embellish the design of a building integral to the overall design (Figure 9.18), applied ornamentation and false decorative motifs should be avoided.
(5) Entrances

In Savannah, the most walkable and enjoyable blocks feature a number of primary entrances along the sidewalk (Figure 9.19). A primary entrance of a building is defined as having an individual street address, and they are important because primary entrances are a measure of a block’s vitality, human scale, and pedestrian activity. In large-scale development, multiple primary entrances have the opportunity to engage the street and create a sense of human scale, typically found on blocks comprised of many smaller buildings (Figure 9.20). Large-scale development with few or no entrances on primary frontages diminishes the vitality and pedestrian activity of a block. By providing multiple individual addresses that engage the street in large-scale development, larger buildings can contribute to the activity on the sidewalk and can evolve to support different uses over time (Figure 9.21).

Figure 9.19: Gordon Row, 300 feet of continuous wall with 15 entrances on the second level and 15 entrance at the garden level. Sottile & Sottile.

Figure 9.20: Large-scale development with numerous primary entrances along the sidewalk.

Figure 9.21: No street level entrances vs. street level entrances. Sottile & Sottile.

A minimum of one primary entrance shall be provided for every 60 feet of street frontage, excluding lanes. Intervals between entrances shall not be less than 15 feet nor exceed 90 feet. On Trust Blocks, a minimum of one primary entrance shall be provided for every 100 feet of street frontage.

Buildings greater than four stories and less than 60 feet wide located on a corner tithing lot abutting a north-south connecting street shall locate primary entrances on both the east-west and north-south streets unless a corner entrance is utilized. Buildings greater than 60 feet in width shall have an entrance located on the east-west street regardless of the location of any other entrances.
(6) Windows

The incorporation of windows on large-scale development communicates the building’s interior activities with the street, enhancing pedestrian activity. A high-level of transparency at the street level should be incorporated into commercial and mixed-use buildings. Furthermore, the inset depth of a window contributes to the visual thickness of the wall and enhances the character of the building’s materials (Figure 9.22).

Figure 9.22: Before and after photographs showing the importance and benefits of windows on large-scale development along Broughton Street.
Section Ten: Monumental Buildings

Historically, monumental buildings have a special or unique form because of the nature of their use. Design standards may be too prescriptive and may not allow for the architectural nuances that give these landmark buildings their monumental quality. As such, these structures are reviewed on a case-by-case basis and should be visually compatible with the district. Examples include church sanctuaries and temples (Figures 10.1 & 10.2), governmental buildings schools or institutions of higher learning, theatres and museums (Figure 10.3).

Figure 10.1: B’nai Birth Synagogue, historic monumental construction.

Figure 10.2: St. John’s the Baptist, historic monumental construction.

Figure 10.3: Jepson Center, Telfair Museums, new monumental construction.
Section Eleven: Character Areas

Within the Historic District there are several geographical areas that have unique and special qualities that contribute to the overall integrity of the Historic District. In addition to the Visual Compatibility Factors and Design Standards, special standards may apply to these areas to ensure preservation of the these unique pockets within the District.

1. Factors Walk & River Street

The boundaries of the Factors Walk Character Area and River Street are the Savannah River on the north, Bay Street on the south, West Boundary Street extended on the west and Randolph Street extended on the east.

Factors Walk and River Street (Figure 11.1) presents a building typology even more tightly defined (Figures 11.3 & 11.4) by precedent than does the Oglethorpe Plan area. There is no other interface between city and river like it in America, if not the world. Nothing should threaten its integrity. Any demolition would be a significant loss. Likewise, the insertion of tall and or out-of-scale development in this area threatens its integrity both by singular action and by precedent for future actions.

Parcels between River Street and the Savannah River should not be developed so as to obscure the consistent and legible edge to the city made by buildings fronting the south side of the street. If structures are deemed necessary, such development should be consistent with historic precedents such as the eighteenth-century warehouses stood west of City Hall and for which historic photographs exist. No fences or walls other than those screening refuse and utilities should occur. A public walkway should exist along the river’s edge.
2. Beach Institute

The Beach Institute Character Area is comprised of three wards bounded by Liberty, Gwinnett, East Broad and Price Streets. Originally, this land was a part of the privately owned garden lots of the Oglethorpe Plan. The hierarchical relationships of the lots around the squares, does not apply here. A series of small neighborhoods were developed by several owners and were named them Waynesville, Lewisville, Turnerville, Bryanville and the Mercer lands (now Bartow, Davis and Mercer Wards.) Long blocks of continuous east-west streets without the center open space of the squares were laid out. South of Jones Street, there are short one block north-south streets that further differ from the grid pattern of the Oglethorpe Plan.

The predominant residential street elevation type is the one-story cottage (Figure 11.4) over a crawl space (on piers) or a two-story house over a crawl space.

Building typology differs from the Historic District across Price Street in that instead of two-story carriage houses on lanes, the lane lots in the Beach Institute were often separate lots of record with one-story dwellings facing the lanes (Figure 11.5). The fact that some yards were cut off from the lanes led to the use of ground floor center pas sageways through paired buildings, an unusual feature found almost exclusively in the Beach Institute. Roofs are either gable running parallel to the street or have a low hip behind a cornice or parapet.

Historically, there was a strong African-American homeowner presence in this area. A large population of German immigrants were also represented. These families often owned the corner groceries with living quarters above, which represents another building type that is more common in Beach Institute than in the other areas the Historic District.

An institutional presence is found along East Broad and Price Streets with brick as a building material along these north-south rights-of-way.
3. City Market

The boundaries of City Market are the parcels fronting St. Julian Street (Figure 11.6) from Montgomery Street on the west to Barnard Street on the east. Located on the former market site, the warehouses of City Market developed a unique character, a pedestrian walkway (Figure 11.7) housed between warehouses covered by long continuous awnings that provided shade for farmers and traders to shell their goods and wares (Figure 11.8). Today, City Market has become an entertainment and art epicenter for the City of Savannah.
4. Forsyth Park

This district, bounding Forsyth Park (Figure 11.8) between Gaston and Gwinnett Streets, is comprised neither of Tithing nor Trust lots. It is an area of Victorian-era structures (Figure 11.9) developed from former garden lots in the late nineteenth-century. It is characterized by front garden setbacks (Figure 11.10), copings, and a richness of decorative detail atypical of town lots north of Gaston.

Barnard, Abercorn, and Habersham Street should be considered north-south connecting streets which preclude curb cuts, garages and surface parking lots greater than 60-feet in width. However, parcels without access to lanes or side streets may have curb cuts not to exceed 12-feet in width. Garages and parking spaces should occur, nevertheless, in the rear 25-five feet of the lot. Whitaker (Figure 11.11), Drayton and Gaston Streets, where they bound Forsyth Park, should preclude parking lots and parking structures altogether except between Gaston, Huntingdon, Drayton and Abercorn Streets, where existing lots could be converted to structured parking.
Section Twelve: Signs

Signs are an important element in identifying a business; they direct, promote, and advertise the social activity of a building. Signage is often personal and a reflection of a business or trademark (Figure 12.1). Signage is transitory in nature and throughout history a variety of signage types and styles have been popular. The quality of the visual environment in Historic District should not be eroded by inappropriate franchise designs and signage. It has been demonstrated in historic and design conscious communities around the world that franchises can maintain their identity while working in a distinct context.

Three types of signs are generally found in Savannah:
1. Projecting Signs (Figure 12.2);
2. Fascia Signs (Figure 12.3);
3. Awning Signs, including under awning signs (Figure 12.4).
Section Thirteen: Demolition & Relocation

(1) Demolition

Demolition of historic structures is detrimental to the public interest and every alternative should be pursued prior to demolition (Figure 13.1). All requests for demolition within the Historic District must be submitted to the Board for review. The application for a Certificate of Appropriateness provides a checklist for all of the supplemental information required for the Board to make a decision regarding demolition. The Board cannot issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of a structure rated as historic until a Certificate of Appropriateness has been issued approving the replacement structure, except in the case of emergency demolition. A vacant lot is not preferable to a historic structure.

(2) Relocation in the Historic District

Relocation of historic structures should be considered a remedy of last resort. Relocation alters the historic context to which the building was originally sited and can destroy the historic integrity of a contributing property's location, setting, feeling, and historical association(s). However, there may be instances when relocation becomes preferred to demolition (Figure 13.2).

Figure 13.1: Demolition by neglect in the Historic District.

Figure 13.2: Relocation within the Historic District.
I. Frequently Asked Question

What is a Certificate of Appropriateness?
A Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) is a permit that states that the proposed work meets the Criteria and Standards in the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance and is appropriate for the building and the Historic District. A COA is required for all requests for demolition, relocation, material change (including additions and alterations), new construction, awnings, signs, walls, fences or sidewalks within the historic district boundaries. The COA is required before construction can begin, even in cases where a building permit is not required.

What can I do to the inside of my house?
The Board does not regulate changes to the interior of a house or structure, unless the interior changes affect the exterior appearance. If the work you are doing on the interior will affect the exterior of the resource, such as closing up or removing a window or moving a doorway, you will have to apply for a COA and explain why the changes are being made to the exterior.

Does the Board review what I do to the back of my house?
The Board is required to review all exterior changes visible from public rights-of-way, including streets and lanes. The entire house, garage, any other structures on the property, contribute to the historic character of the District.

How does the Board decide whether to approve my project?
The Board is required to apply the Visual Compatibility Criteria and Design Standards from the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance. When reviewing projects that directly impact a historic structure, the Board is required to apply “The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation” to determine if the proposed project is appropriate in the Historic District.

The Historic District Ordinance can be accessed from our website at:
http://www.thempc.org

The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards can be found at:
http://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/index.htm

Are site or landscape features reviewed by the Board?
Yes, by Ordinance, a Certificate of Appropriateness is required for fences, drive and walk ways. The Board does not review plants, gardens, or landscaping.

Is my property designated as historic?
All buildings within the Historic District boundaries as defined in the previous section are subject to review by the Historic District Board of Review; however, not all properties contribute to the historic integrity or period of significance of the District. There are over 1,300 contributing buildings in the Savannah Historic District. The Historic Building Map and list of those buildings can be accessed from the MPC website at www.thempc.org and is also available at our office (110 East State Street, Savannah, Georgia 31401).

How old does my property have to be to be considered historic?
Age is just one consideration when determining if a property is historic. Criteria are provided in the Historic District Section (8-3030) of the City of Savannah Zoning Ordinance are used for evaluating properties in the Historic District. These criteria are based upon the National Park Service criteria for designating properties to the National Register of Historic Places. The ordinance requires that a historic resource be 50 years old or older. However, properties that have not reached fifty years of age may be eligible for designation if they are of exceptional importance as defined by the National Park Service. A historic resource should also retain historic integrity, which is conveyed through materials, design, workmanship, location, setting, feeling, and historical association(s).
II. Glossary of Terms

Abutting Building. A building on a parcel which shares a parcel line with the subject parcel, or is located on the same parcel.

Accessory Building. A detached building or structure which may include, but is not limited to, a garage, storage building, carriage house.

Active Use. For the purposes of this subsection, an active use is considered to be an allowed use under the zoning ordinance for a property that is open to and provides an activity or service for the public (i.e. restaurant, retail, office, gallery, lobby, etc...).

Adjacency. Abutting parcels, buildings, or buildings within the same parcel.

Adverse Effect. An effect on a historic property that diminishes the historic integrity of the property’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, or association.

Appurtenance. Accessory object including, but not limited to, fences, light fixtures, signs, brackets, downspouts, and trellises.

Apron. A ramp providing access to a parking pad or building.

Awning. A lightweight, exterior roof-like shade that typically projects over a window or door, usually made of canvas or similar fabric on a metal frame, also may be wood, plastic or metal.

Baluster. One of several small columns or rods that supports a railing or balustrade.

Base Zoning District Development Standards. The development standards associated with the base zoning district which includes lot coverage percentage and setbacks (front, rear and side).

Beach Institute Character Area. A unique area within the Savannah National Historic Landmark district distinguished by its plan, architecture and historic ethnic diversity containing the greatest concentration of remaining one-story cottages. Originally part of privately owned garden lots, the area developed as a series of small neighborhood villages in the mid-19th century. The area is used for recreational purposes including, but not limited to viewing or enjoying historic, archaeological, and scenic sites.

Block. A block is a rectangular space bounded on three sides by a street and on the forth by a street or lane and occupied by or intended for buildings.

Block front. A block front is the street fronting a block, excluding the lane frontage.

Building Form. The physical shape of a building resulting from its mass, height, and envelope.

Carrera Glass. A trade name for thick, solid-color structural glass cast in panels and used as a wall veneer. Vitrolite® is a name brand for this product.

Central of Georgia National Historic Landmark District. A 33.2 acre historic industrial site originally operated by the Central of Georgia Railroad, consisting of the motive power, cotton yard and industrial warehouses, passenger facilities and two brick viaducts. The district is bounded by Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard on the east, Jones Street on the south, West Boundary Street on the west, and Turner Street on the north. The area is used for recreational purposes including, but not limited to viewing or enjoying historic, archaeological, and scenic sites.

Character Area. Predefined areas with special character-defining features.

Character-Defining Feature. An element or elements of a building which convey its historical or architectural significance. These may include, but are not limited to, windows, window casings, doors, porch columns, handrails, scroll brackets, corner boards, roofline, cornices, eaves, brackets, setbacks, height, form, and similar features.

City Market Character Area. A unique area within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District distinguished by commercial buildings associated with historical market functions. The area is used for recreational purposes including but not
Commercial building. A building whose primary function is for business or retail use.

Compatibility. The positive relationship of alterations to existing buildings and designs for new construction to their environs; compatibility is measured by consistent application of accepted guidelines and standards defining the individual visual character of a specific area.

Deck. A structure without a roof directly attached to a principal building, which has an average elevation of 30 inches or greater from finished grade.

Demolition by Neglect. The consistent failure to maintain a structure that causes, or is a substantial contributing factor of, the deterioration of building materials to such an extent that the structure is no longer safe or renovation/restoration is no longer feasible, that ultimately leads to the need for physical demolition.

Directional Character. Structural shape, placement of openings, and architectural details that give a predominantly vertical, horizontal, or a non-directional character to the building’s front façade. For example, a skyscraper would have a vertical character and a one-story ranch house would have a horizontal character.

EIFS. Exterior Insulation Finishing System.

Economic Hardship. The denial of all reasonable use or return on a piece of property by the application of regulation.

Elevation. An exterior façade of a building.

Entrance. See Primary Entrances.

Exceptional Importance. Structures of extraordinary importance because of an event or an entire category of resources so fragile that survivors of any age are unusual. The property is not required to be of national significance; the measure of a property’s importance is within the historic context, whether the scale of that context is local, state, or national (National Park Service, National Register Bulletin).

Executive Director. The Executive Director of the Chatham County-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Exterior Eexpression. Exterior building design features that visually define the number of stories.

Façade. Any exterior face of a building.

Factors Walk Character Area. A unique historic area within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District distinguished by its access to the Savannah River, parks and green space, proximity to commercial and shipping industry structures, historical structures, cobblestone rights-of-way, and pedestrian bridges. The area is used for recreational purposes including, but not limited to, fishing, boating, picnicking, nature study, and viewing or enjoying historic, archaeological, and scenic sites.

Fronting. Facing.

Glazing. The clear or translucent material through which light passes into a building; most often glass.

Green Roof. Also known as a roof garden. Vegetated roof surfaces that capture rainwater and return a portion of it back to the atmosphere via evaporation (U.S. Green Building Council).

Height of building. The vertical distance measured from the mean finished ground level adjoining the building to the highest point of the roof.

Historic building. Structures which possess identified historical or architectural merit of a degree warranting their preservation. A building which is classified as historic is identified on the City of Savannah’s Historic Building Map, defined below.

Historic Building Map. A catalog of Historic Buildings in map form; a copy is attached to this ordinance and bearing the designation “Historic Building Map” with the signature and seal of the Clerk of Council, adopted and approved by the Mayor and Aldermen and made a part of the zoning map of the City of Savannah as an “overlay” thereon.
Historic District Height Map. A map of the Historic District showing the maximum number permissible stories up to which buildings may be constructed in defined areas; a copy is attached to this ordinance and bearing the designation “Historic District Height Map” with the signature and seal of the Clerk of Council, adopted and approved by the Mayor and Aldermen and made a part of the zoning map of the City of Savannah as an “overlay” thereon.

High Stoop. An elevated entrance landing, typically nine feet (9’) tall, accessed by stairs.


Historic Setback. The average setback of a group of historic buildings along a block front.

Individual Buildings. A building that meets the requirements for a stand-alone building by the building code. May be denoted by a fire wall, setback, and/or property line.

In-kind Repairs. Minor repairs that do not involve a change in material, placement, or design.

Lane. The service corridor subdividing a tithing block in Oglethorpe’s original ward plan. See Street Types.

Large scale development. Development whose combined ground floor footprint is equal to or greater than 9,000 square feet within a single parcel and/or is greater than four-stories in ‘R’ zoning districts or is five-stories or greater in all other zoning districts. In the case of an addition to an existing building, the combined footprint and height of both the existing building and the addition located on the same parcel apply.

Material Change. A change that will affect the exterior architectural or environmental features of a building and may include any one or more of the following: A reconstruction or alteration of a size, shape or façade of a building including any of its architectural elements or details; Demolition of a building or portion of a building; Commencement of excavation for construction purposes; The introduction or change of signage on any building; The erection, alteration, restoration, or removal of any building or structure including walls, fences, steps, pavement or appurtenances.

Mechanical or Access Structure. An enclosed, non-habitable structure above the roof of a building, other than a tank, tower, spire, dome cupola or bulkhead, occupying not more than one-third of the roof area. Mechanical or access structures used solely to enclose stairways or elevator machinery, ventilation or air conditioning apparatus shall not count as a story.

Meeting rail. The horizontal portion of a double hung window where the upper and lower sash meet.

Mezzanine. An intermediate level between the floor and ceiling of a story. Its aggregate floor area is not more than one-third of the area of the room or space in which it is located.

Monumental Building. An institutional building such as a church, sanctuary, governmental building, school or institution of higher learning with the primary use as education, theater or museum, having special or unique form because of the nature of its use.

Mullion. The bar or divider that separates individual window frames within a series of paired (two) or grouped (three or more) window openings.

Muntin. The molding or bar that separates the individual panes of a multi-paned window sash.

Non-historic. A building or structure that does not add to the historic associations, historic architectural qualities, or archaeological values for which a property or area is significant because: it was not present during the period of significance; or does not relate to the documented significance of the property or area; due to alterations, disturbances, additions, or other changes, it no longer possesses historic integrity or is no longer capable of yielding important information about the period of significance; or it does not independently meet the National Register criteria for a contributing building.

Oglethorpe Plan Area. The original ward pattern of streets and lanes between Bay Street to the north, Gaston Street to the south, Martin Luther King, Jr., Boulevard to the west, and East Broad Street to the east.

Oglethorpe Plan Ward. A component of Oglethorpe’s Plan for Savannah consisting of four tithing blocks (each containing ten tithing lots) and four trust blocks around a central square, with blocks divided by a series of streets and lanes. See Street Types for illustration.
Appendices

Oriel. A projection from the main wall of a building in the form of a bay window that starts above the ground level; may be supported by corbels, brackets, or an engaged column.

Penthouse. See Mechanical or Access Structure and/or Story.

Portico. A columned porch or stoop, especially at the main entrance to a building.

Primary Entrance. An entrance to a use that has or could have an individual street address. Service doors and emergency exits are not primary entrances.

Pergola. An arbor with a latticework roof.

Raised basement. The lowest story of a building raised an entire story above ground level.

Retail structure. A building housing a use engaged in retail trade and/or services.

Roofline. The exterior form created where the building meets the sky, generally at the roof.

Roofline Variation. A significant change in the upper outline of buildings indicated by dormers, towers, bays, or roof shape. A change in the parapet height alone does not constitute a roofline variation.

Rooftop Garden. See Green Roof.

Savannah National Historic Landmark District (NHLD). The Savannah NHLD includes General Oglethorpe’s plan of wards, squares and garden lots. The boundaries are the Savannah River to the north, Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard to the west, Gwinnett Street to the south, and East Broad Street on the east, including the area in the northeast quadrant known as Trustees Garden.

Scale. The relationship of the size of units of construction and architectural detail to the size of a human, and the relationship of building mass to adjacent buildings and open spaces. Scale refers both to the overall building form and individual components of the building.

Secondary Façades. Façades that do not front the primary street.

Service Street. The north-south street bounding the east and west edges of a ward, usually a one-way street. See Street Types.

Shutter. A hinged panel that covers a window or door opening in addition to the standard window or door; may be solid panels, louvers, or cutouts or slats for ventilation; located on the exterior or interior; and sized to fit the opening when closed.

Sill. The horizontal section that forms the base of a storefront. Also the projecting horizontal base of a window or door.

Square. Common public open space in the center of a ward, typically one acre in size.

Steeple. A tall structure usually having a small spire at the top and surmounting a church tower.

Storefront. The ground floor area of a retail building featuring large glass windows.

Story. That portion of a building, other than the basement, included between the surface of any floor and the surface of the next floor above it, or if there is no floor above it, then the space between the floor and the ceiling above the floor of such story.

A basement that is entirely underground; a crawl space or partial basement that is four feet or less above grade; and non-habitable rooftop structures such as church spires, cupolas, chimneys, tanks and supports, mechanical or access structures shall not count as a story.
Street Types. See illustration below.

Stucco. A type of exterior plaster; see True Stucco.

Through Street. See Street Types.

Tithing block. A component of Oglethorpe’s Plan for Savannah. Tithing blocks are located on the north and south sides of a square and usually consist of two rows of five 60- by 90-foot lots, subdivided by a lane.

Trellis. Any screening device that has a foundation or is mounted to a wall, fence, building or structure.

True Stucco. Exterior plaster applied as a two- or three-part coating directly onto masonry. Historic stucco consisted primarily of hydrated or slaked lime, water and sand with straw or animal hair as a binder.

Trust block. A component of Oglethorpe’s Plan for Savannah. Trust blocks are located on the east and west sides of a square. There are four trust blocks in each ward.

Trust street. A component of Oglethorpe’s Plan for Savannah. Trust streets are the streets that separate the trust blocks. See Street Types.

Visually Compatible. See Compatibility.

Visually Related. The relationship between buildings, structures, squares and places within view of the subject property. Greater weight is placed upon adjacent historic buildings and structures.
III. Additional Resources

National Organizations

National Trust for Historic Preservation
1785 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel. 800.944.6487
http://www.nationaltrust.org

National Park Service
1849 C Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20240
Tel. 202.208.6843
http://www.nps.gov

Local Organizations

The Chatham County-Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission
110 East State Street
Savannah, GA 31401
Tel. 912.651.1453 & 912.651.1456
http://www.thempc.org/

Historic Savannah Foundation
321 East York Street
Savannah, GA 31401
Tel. 912.233.7787
http://www.myhsf.org/

Georgia Historical Society
501 Whitaker Street
Savannah, GA 31401
Tel. 912.651.2125
http://www.georgiahistory.com/

Useful Websites

Historic Preservation Division of the GA Department of Natural Resources
http://gashpo.org/

Savannah Development & Renewal Authority
www.sdra.net

Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation
The Georgia Trust - The Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation

Savannah Area Geographic Information System
www.sagis.org

Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps
http://dlg.galileo.usg.edu/sanborn/?Welcome

City of Savannah
http://www.savannahga.gov/
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