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With the expansions of United States roadways following World War II, Americans flocked to the suburbs for what they thought would be a better quality of life. Many years later, these same suburbs are in decline as people move even farther away from central cities, again in search of the “American dream,” complete with an extensive lawn and two car garage. As a result of this movement pockets of blight are marring suburbs including suburban shopping centers. Competition from newer, bigger and brighter malls has resulted in declining sales and high store vacancy rates in first ring suburban shopping centers. Communities are left with decaying sites known as “greyfields,” a name befitting their vast empty asphalt parking lots.

However, planners and developers have embraced these greyfield sites as opportunities for urban infill redevelopment and community revitalization. This thesis
examines two greyfield redevelopment case studies, Mizner Park, located in Boca Raton, Florida, and Mashpee Commons, in Mashpee, Massachusetts. The sites were chosen because they have completed the majority of their redevelopment, have greatly impacted community revitalization efforts in their towns, and their ten-year duration suggests proven methods were applied. The two primary case studies are evaluated according to their plan development and implementation, community impact, physical design, mixed-uses, and long term viability.

It was found that greyfield redevelopment acts as a catalyst for community revitalization. Mizner Park sparked widespread redevelopment in the city’s blighted downtown; the project reenergized the city, and property values increased significantly. Mashpee Commons was redeveloped to act as a downtown for a town that had none. Since its inception in 1986, the greyfield site has been transformed from an aging strip mall to a vibrant downtown complete with civic uses.

Based on this case study analysis, communities should consider the following when planning for greyfield redevelopment: investing in community and civic uses; integrating a variety of retail; using regional architecture; fostering a sense of place; recognizing residents’ concerns; establishing connections to the surrounding environment; and remaining flexible and creative throughout the redevelopment process. Further, this study concludes that greyfield redevelopment provides planners with an effective tool for community revitalization.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

As first ring suburbs begin to decline physically and economically, communities are faced with questions of how to revitalize their towns and cities. As people move even farther away from central cities, population in the suburbs falls. As a result, suburbs have been left with decaying remnants of the past, which have wide-reaching negative effects on the community. The declining or abandoned shopping center has come to be known as a “greyfield,” a comment on the bleak color and vast empty space of parking lots that often surround the once vibrant, now moribund center.

However, greyfields are found not only in suburban communities, but also in downtowns and cities across the country. Following the movement to revitalize Main Streets and downtowns, greyfields are the next tier of redevelopment to improve communities. A greyfield is just one illustration of blight that plagues many landscapes today and are not being seen are opportunities for renewal.

In the past ten years, greyfields have begun to attract the attention of planners and developers who see these sites as potential centers for renewal. Although greyfield redevelopment comes in many forms, the most common strategy is to redevelop an aged shopping center as a mixed-use community village. This redevelopment technique has been influenced by the Congress for the New Urbanism, a nonprofit organization that promotes neo-traditional town planning. New Urbanists have taken an interest in greyfield redevelopment as a method of curtailing sprawl and refocusing interest on existing cities and towns.
Municipalities, planners, and developers seeking to improve their communities can use greyfields as catalysts for revitalization. Despite their successes, greyfield redevelopment techniques for community revitalization remain relatively unevaluated and sorely under appreciated, particularly in the context of downtown redevelopment. This thesis explores greyfield redevelopment practices as a means of community revitalization and illustrates that it is an outstanding and greatly successful strategy for renewal.

Two case studies were selected to examine the research topic. Mizner Park, located in Boca Raton, Florida, and Mashpee Commons, in Mashpee, Massachusetts were chosen because they have completed the majority of their redevelopment, have greatly impacted community revitalization efforts in their towns, and their ten-year-old duration suggests proven methods were applied. The cases were evaluated according to the following categories:

- Plan development and implementation
- Design
- Community impact
- Long term viability

These topics guided the research and provided insight into redevelopment techniques that apply to other communities undergoing such projects. Additional research for this thesis involved reviewing literature, photographs, and plans and interviewing public and private sector primary stakeholders involved in the greyfield redevelopment process.

The thesis is divided into five chapters. The next chapter includes a review of literature related to the development of suburbia, the evolution of malls and shopping centers, the involvement of the Congress for the New Urbanism in urban infill redevelopment, the history of greyfields, and community revitalization practices.
Chapter 3 reviews the case study research approach used to compile information for analysis. Chapter 4 includes an overview of several greyfield redevelopments that were considered as potential case studies, and then focuses on the detailed analysis of the two primary cases. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses redevelopment strategies that other communities can apply to guide their own greyfield redevelopment projects and concludes with recommendations for future research and the final summary of research findings.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History

Suburbia

The history of the retail shopping center in the United States is closely related to the history of the suburb. In the 1920’s, as reliance on the automobile increased, highways were rapidly constructed, the population increased, and people moved further and further away from the urban core (Lucy and Phillips, 2000; Jackson, 1985). Over the subsequent decades, the urban fringe increased, and people chose to relocate to the suburbs, farther away from centers of employment and high-density living conditions, in search of what many believed was a better quality of life (Lucy and Phillips, 2000: 4).

Suburbs can be defined as urbanized areas outside central cities (Lucy and Phillips, 2000: 5). However, such a definition is far too simplistic for all that the suburb represents in today’s society. In a more comprehensive view, Dolores Hayden (2000: 1) writes:

Suburbia is, first of all, where most Americans now live. It is the dominant American cultural landscape, combining cherished natural and built environment, yards, and single-family houses. Second, suburbia is where millions of square feet of commercial and residential real estate are financed and built. Third, suburbia is the location of most of the unpaid labor of nurturing and parenting, reflecting both the social and environmental practices. Fourth, suburbia is where the majority of American voters now live. Understanding how existing suburbs have been organized, financed, designed, constructed, marketed and inhabited is central to calculating the prospects of ending sprawl.
Hayden’s definition summarizes the importance in evaluating the condition of the suburbs, and in this case the status of the suburban retail sector, because it plays a role in the daily lives of the majority of citizens.

**Sprawl and the Mall**

In order to meet the needs of the middle class population in the suburbs, large-scale retail that had previously been located in central business districts, began to move away from the cities between the World Wars (Jackson, 1985). In the 1920’s, what are now considered strip malls began to dominate the suburban street fabric, placing the emphasis on the automobile and less on the pedestrian (Jackson, 1985: 258). “The multiple-store shopping center with free, off street parking represented the ultimate retail adaptation to the requirements of automobility.” (Jackson, 1985:258). Shopping centers and malls began to locate further away from the dense urban core as an increase in automobiles allowed consumers to travel even greater distances to purchase goods. In addition, following World War II, suburban population increased markedly as a result of an economic boom, the federal highway construction programs, and government support for housing in new outlying developments.

In many cases, the land on the outskirts of such suburban towns located along the main traffic corridors was the most affordable, and as a result commercial uses often located there (Hall and Porterfield, 2001:168). Large tracts of available land accommodated great parking lots, and rows of stores of varying size and scale, which led to its development name, “the miracle mile” (Hall and Porterfield, 2001: 168). Strip malls and rows of stores of various sizes and configurations evolved in relation to the size of the existing customer base.
After growth slowed first ring suburbs began to decline, which led to the loss of population and commerce in the areas (Kalinosky, 2002). Growth has continued past the first ring suburbs, thus, the older shopping centers, which are often too small and outmoded by today’s standards, end up vacant (Homsy, 1999:20). The sprawl that led to the construction of the numerous shopping centers has also contributed to their decline.

Americans are learning that sprawl kills. …Sprawl kills downtowns and rural towns. Sprawl kills farmland and places with environmental importance. Sprawl also kills many older shopping centers, regional malls, strip malls and big-box stores. These leftover dead or dying places are called greyfields, mainly because of the large expanses of gray asphalt parking lots. (Hirschorn, 2002:1)

Older shopping centers are being left behind, as tenants leave to follow the population to the newest area. Frequently, shopping centers are anchored by one or two large stores, which aid smaller stores in drawing in foot traffic (Phillips, 2000). If the large tenant chooses to relocate, many of the smaller tenants suffer as a result, and are often forced out of business, which results in even more empty retail space, having an additional negative impact on the surrounding environment (Valenti, 2002). As a real estate developer noted, “You know as soon as one of these one million square foot or two million square foot malls gets built, the smaller guys will wither and die and start to lose some of their anchor tenants.” (Valley, 2002:4) As a result of this chain of events, shopping centers of every size are facing decline and, even more are threatened to reach greyfield status in the near future (PwC, 2001).

Big-box retailers, such as Wal-Mart, Home Depot, and Target have also affected the viability of suburban shopping centers. Although it is well known that such stores take business away from the smaller retailer, they also compete with smaller shopping centers that do not have such retail anchors. According to retail analyst Tom Maddux, big-box retailers have changed the market because they are destination stores that
continue to push further and further into the suburbs, often occupying the last few vacant parcel available (Fickes, 2000). Such movement into the suburbs contributes to sprawl and older shopping center decline.

“[A]ccording to recent market research, most ordinary Americans, though still favoring detached, single-family homes, are increasingly fed up with the congestion and sprawling commercial development that too often come with part of the package.” (Longman, 1998:22). Americans want a better solution to the traffic congestion and the increased social and community isolation that has come with the advent of the new neighborhoods.

**New Urbanism**

The Congress for the New Urbanism (CNU) has played a key role in urban design and development. The CNU first met in October 1993 to discuss,

> [T]he placelessness of modern suburbs, the decline of central cities, the growing separation in communities by race and income, the challenges of raising children in an economy that requires two incomes for every family, and the environmental damage brought on by development that requires us to depend on the automobile for all daily activities (Poticha, in Leccese and McCormick eds., 1999).

As a result of the first meeting, a nonprofit organization was established by six key architects in the movement, Peter Calthorpe, Andres Duany, Elizabeth Moule, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Stefanos Polyzoides, and Daniel Solomon, to advocate CNU design principles and theory (Poticha, in Leccese and McCormick eds., 1999:2). The *Charter of the New Urbanism* defines the New Urbanism theory and consists of twenty-seven principles, which are organized in the following manner: the region: metropolis, city, and town; neighborhood, district, and corridor; and block, street and building (Leccese and

New Urbanism design principles have been applied to numerous residential development projects such as Seaside, Florida and I’On, in Beauford, South Carolina. According to Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck (2000:189), leaders in the New Urbanism field,

Ideally every neighborhood should be designed with an even balance of residents and jobs. While this flies in the face of convention, it is not impossible to implement. All that is needed is for the housing and commercial developers to agree to work in the same location with a coordinated plan.

A comprehensive development strategy that coordinates the efforts of all involved parties contributes to a project that meets the various economic and residential needs of a community. New Urbanism theory can lend itself to a successful project that respects the needs of the community, while supporting the financial motivation of a developer to become involved in such a redevelopment.

New Urbanism designs are often applied to greenfield sites, leading to criticisms that the movement simply contributes to additional sprawl. In response, recent attention has been given to urban redevelopment, and the design principles are being implemented in projects such as Park DuValle in Louisville, Kentucky, a Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE) VI affordable housing redevelopment project. Additional attention has been given to redevelopment possibilities in previously developed sites such as shopping centers.

1 The principles from the Charter of the New Urbanism are listed in Appendix A.
New Urbanism presents an appealing option in designing retail centers. Recent redevelopment trends favor establishing a “town center” atmosphere to meet consumers desire for a location that affords a variety of uses, which embody a distinct character.

According to Victor Dover of Dover Kohl Associates, New Urbanist mall reconstruction is a matter of ‘turning the mall inside out.’ The goal is to give buildings and storefronts street facades with actual addresses. The mall should connect with its surroundings, rather than isolating itself behind a parking lot.” (Bodzin and Greenberg, 2001:76)

Transforming a dilapidated shopping center to a thriving town center that promotes pedestrian accessibility, undoubtedly improves the overall community.

New Urbanism design guidelines are fundamental to consider in greyfield redevelopment, as they have been the driving force behind the research on greyfields and projects that have been completed thus far. Theories related to traffic (both pedestrian and automobile), circulation, scale, architecture, and land-uses can be applied to strengthen the long-term viability of a greyfield, while remaining sensitive to each communities’ unique needs.

**The Emergence of “Greyfields”**

The term greyfield was popularized as a result of the involvement of the Congress for the New Urbanism’s (CNU) involvement in stemming urban decline. In early 2000, several projects were initiated to analyze the topics. A Harvard University design seminar led by two architecture professors, one of who was also a CNU member, explored potential conversions of greyfield malls and the economic feasibility of new urbanism style redevelopments (CNU and CNU and Sobel, 2001). Simultaneously PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC), sponsored by the Congress for the New Urbanism, conducted a study to assess older, economically obsolete regional retail malls across the
United States (CNU).² The regional malls were assessed to learn their characteristics, how many exist, and the type of environment that surrounds them (PwC, 1991:3). Regional malls are specifically chosen because their size (350,000 square feet of leasable space and a minimum of 35 store spaces) provides the greatest opportunity for reuse, and greatly impacts the surrounding area while in a state of decline (CNU and CNU and Sobel, 2001)

First, greyfields were identified by the amount of sales per square foot. PwC (2001:4) determined that $150 (or less) per square foot sales adequately identified greyfield malls, although it was later determined that sales of up to $174 a square foot also could be used to identify the sites. Of the 1,689 to 2,076 regional malls counted in 2000, the study found that 114 to 140 could be considered greyfields, and between 203 and 249 were susceptible to becoming greyfield malls in the next five years. After analyzing the centers, PwC determined that the following characteristics typically pertain to the greyfields:

- The majority of greyfield mall sites are privately owned.
- Greyfield malls have significantly lower occupancy that non-greyfield malls.
- The average greyfield mall gross leaseable area (GLA) is under 0.5 million square feet (msf), significantly smaller than non-greyfield malls (averages for viable and healthy regional malls are 0.650 msf and 0.906 msf respectively).
- Greyfield malls are, on average, 8 to 10 years older than non-greyfield malls.

² Shopping centers are generally characterized in three categories: neighborhood centers (30,000 to 150,000 square feet to meet the needs of 2,500 to 40,000 people), community centers (1000,000 to 350,000 square feet to serve an area of 40,000 to 150,000 people), and regional centers (450,000 to over one million square feet to serve a trade area of over 150,000 people within a 10 to 15 mile radius) (Hall and Porterfield, 2001; Phillips, 2000).
• Greyfield malls compete with an average of 22 other retail centers, i.e., neighborhood and community centers, other regional malls, within five miles (2.33 msf of competing space).

• Greyfield malls are more often located in moderate and low-income neighborhoods than non-greyfield malls.” (PwC, 2000: 5)

Based on the study’s findings, a greyfield can be defined as an underused, economically obsolete, retail tract located in an inner ring suburb that requires significant public and private sector involvement to curtail decline (CNU and Sobel, 2001; PwC, 2001:6; Hirschorn, 2002).

Following the PwC study, the International Council of Shopping Centers reviewed the data, which led to contributions to the study’s methodology, such as classifications of the different types of shopping centers (CNU and Sobel, 2001). CNU continued their involvement in the publication of the book Greyfields to Goldfields in February 2001, which included a catalog of greyfield revitalization success stories.

The Urban Land Institute published the booklet Ten Principles for Reinventing America’s Suburban Strips that identifies critical issues strip malls face in today’s market. The ten principles in accordance with smart growth for developing financially successful strip malls that have long-term viability are:

1. Ignite Leadership and Nurture Partnership: Form public/private partnerships to develop strategies and implement change.


4. Prune Back Retail-Zoned Land: Develop zoning strategies that improve the quality of strips by limiting the amount of retail –zoned land.

5. Establish Pulse Nodes of Development: Restructure strips to create high-intensity development interspersed with stretches of low intensity land use or open space.
6. Tame the Traffic: Craft traffic patterns and parking to provide convenient access to retail stores and also serve through-traffic.

7. Create the Place: Create suburban “places” that attract people and encourage them to visit often.

8. Diversify the Character: Diversify the development of strips as development pressures increase and land values rise.

9. Eradicate the Ugliness: Enhance the physical design of strips to attract new and repeat customers.

10. Put your Money (and Regulations) where your Policy Is: Understand the importance of implementing and funding plans.

(Urban Land Institute, 2001: 1, 25)

Although the guidelines are limited to strip mall development and redevelopment, they are applicable to greyfield redevelopment because they focus on creating a sustainable project that is a community asset.

Societal, demographic, and economic changes have all resulted in an increase in greyfield properties. According to PwC (2001:4), “Our model estimates that greyfield malls represent approximately seven percent of existing regional malls in the US, with an additional 12 percent of regional malls potentially moving to greyfield status over the next five years.” Examining the reasons behind the increase in greyfields can aid in drafting plans for their redevelopment.

Since the 1980s, during which shopping center construction increased dramatically, increased emphasis has been put on the design of the public spaces in shopping centers (Maitland, 1990). Where the older mall may have been constructed with a set formula of a central axis lined with small stores, similar to an enclosed street surrounded by parking lots, newer designs include an increase of the quality of available
public spaces, multiple floors, and a comprehensive architectural approach that addressed the charter and style of the interior spaces (Maitland, 1990:37).

The primary difference in the various types of shopping centers, as they evolved over the past fifty years is that popular new village-type “lifestyle centers” address pedestrian needs, while outdated greyfields catered to the automobile. Greyfield mall buildings are also often seen as architecturally dated, and unappealing to the consumer who has a myriad of bright new choices (PwC, 2001).

In addition to the changes in shopping center design, it has been found that consumers want a better shopping experience overall, more closely related to what one imagines existed along a traditional neighborhood “Main Street” (Grogan and Proscio, 2000). The fascination with the anonymous mall appears to be waning as people search for locations with character and a sense of place.

Virtually every first-ring suburb in America is home to a shopping center and the assumption that many of them were distressed was confirmed by the study. Upon review, CNU began exploring methods to apply their design guidelines to such locations. The study found greyfield sites to be ideal locations for applying New Urbanism principles due to their large size and great infill possibilities on which one can apply theories of design, circulation, and mixed-uses (Bodzin and Greenberg, 2001). Greyfields accommodate New Urbanism designs as easily as greenfields, without contributing to sprawl.

---

3(Rubenstein, 1992) The lifestyle center is a popular trend in new retail design. The shopping center is typically built without covered walkways, and oriented to meet the pedestrian’s needs. This popular concept will be further discussed in Chapter four, in relation to the design of the case studies.
Redevelopment Opportunities

Developers acknowledge the need for change in many of the retail malls that are failing across suburban American. “Many suburban areas have huge populations, vast residential neighborhoods and shopping center after shopping center. But they lack the true spirit of a downtown gathering place.” (Siegel, 1999:112) In every greyfield site, opportunities exist to transform the abandoned property into the community center, providing faceless suburbs with an identity and sense of place that enriches the lives of residents.

The market for redevelopment is immense due in part to the lack of greenfield space available in the dense core of a suburb that may have already been built out to capacity, which has driven up land purchase costs (Longman, 1998). Redeveloping sites that already have an existing high population base is a financially attractive opportunity for many developers. Although some first-ring suburbs have experiences population decline, greyfields that are prime redevelopment sites are surrounded by population base that has left the property only because there are other more modern and appealing options. Noted in a recent article on strip mall remodeling, by Broderick Perkins (2002:1), “‘The older buildings don’t attract good tenants, which is the main reason why we did what we did (remodeling)…You get a better mix of tenants, a larger mix of tenants, and a larger mix of customers who have money to spend.’” Through such renovations of existing properties, developers can attempt to meet the needs of the consumers, while ensuring continued prosperity for the property and their communities.

Developers are now recognizing that opportunities for work on greenfield sites are become less available. According to Matt Valley (2002:6),
Louis Taylor, senior real estate analyst with Deutsch Bank securities in New York, agrees there has been a shift. ‘More and more now, the idea that we can expand into the prairies or America is being challenged,’ says Taylor referring to urban sprawl. ‘Development that occurs in far-flung, greenfield sites takes people away from the office and job centers.

Utilizing existing sites can prevent further sprawl, and have a positive social and environmental impact on communities because less Greenfield land is consumed and an eyesore that communicates failure has been alleviated. Economically, redevelopment can also lead to higher returns of 12 to 15 percent based on the investment, with less risk than greenfield development (Valley, 2002:5).

PwC’s study concluded that redevelopment of greyfields offers the following benefits:

- Reallocation of land use, existing infrastructure, and non-productive urban locations into high-density residential and mixed commercial use providing an increased property tax to local governments.

- Temporary boost to local employment through construction and redevelopment activities of greyfield mall sites and permanent employment in new offices, retail and residential property management.

- An increase in retail demand from new households moving to redeveloped greyfield mall sites. Economic renewal for greyfield sites located in blighted area with potential positive value impacts on surrounding land uses and properties.

- Opportunities for alternative highest and best uses recognizing that the residual value of greyfield mall sites is primarily land.

- Traffic mitigation for inner city greyfield sites located in major transportation corridors with public transportation. (2001:3)

PwC’s findings and the needs expressed by consumers for a better shopping environment present a strong case for the need for greyfield redevelopment.

Smart growth concepts are also central to greyfield redevelopment because such work prevents the consumption of additional greenfield space. Sprawl is seen as a massive consumptive force, with over 400,000 acres per year of greenfield sites being
permitted for the shopping centers, subdivisions, strip malls and roadways (Phillips, 2000:8). The abundance of greyfield sites available in suburban areas can contribute to limiting sprawl because continuing to develop new malls in greenfields is unnecessary when infill sites already exist in suburban centers.

**Community Revitalization**

Revitalizing greyfield sites can contribute to community revitalization through the transformation of what were unremarkable spaces to locations that contribute to the community. Frequently, a shopping center surrounded by vast parking lots is oriented to the “stranger driving by,” rather than the local residents (Duany et al, 2000). Shopping centers were not designed to enrich a community, or add to the social fabric. As a result, suburbs across the country have been left with declining retail centers that have little character, identity, or community value.

Greyfield redevelopment can be approached using asset based community development, which can aid revitalization because it uses the strengths of a location to revitalize a community (Green and Haines, 2002). Community development that capitalizes on assets enables residents to improve their quality of life and enriches the overall environment and quality of life (Green and Haines, 2002:8).

Community assets, which includes the built environment, physical, social, financial, and environmental assets, can be capitalized upon to spur successful community redevelopment (Green and Haines, 2002:10) For example, evaluating a community’s employment base may lead to the discovery of a large artist colony, which can then be supported through incubators such as festivals and the establishment of an artist’s guild, and can result in the establishment of a unique identity for a community.
Location is a primary greyfield asset. The majority of suburban shopping centers are located along primary arterial corridors in first ring suburbs, which are adjacent to large populations. Because of the visual accessibility redeveloping such a site can have a major impact on the community due to the improved aesthetics and greater sense of place. Fostering identify in a faceless suburb can greatly enrich its successful economic future.

A failing shopping center negatively affects the surrounding area because it communicates a message of economic failure, which is remedied through the combination of community revitalization and economic-based development theories. The goals of community economic-based development include the following:

1. Stabilize economic conditions through public sector investments and coordination with private and nonprofit development organizations.

2. Increase quality and quantity of housing to support development and improve quality of life.

3. Improve commercial functions of the community via supporting zoning, infrastructure investments, and programmatic elements, such as business improvement districts or tax increment financing districts.

4. Improve the physical aspects of the community via land use planning for traffic flow; public space including recreation and parking facilities; and incorporating multimodal transportation facilities.

5. Integrate the concept of urban design, such as design review and standards to facilitate the physical attractiveness of the community.

6. Provide a variety of public services to support quality development outcomes, such as a high quality educational system and business support services (e.g., permitting processing, etc.). (Phillips, 2002:4)

When applied to greyfields, economic development can aid in the revitalization of sites and the improvement of communities because each element noted is directly applicable to such a project. For example, fostering public/private partnerships, integrating housing,
and addressing the aesthetics of a greyfield, are all key elements to their revitalization. Greyfields provide the opportunity to apply mixed-use principles related to zoning, urban design, housing, and public services, while increasing and stabilizing the overall economic base of a community.

A key aspect to economic-based community development is the reestablishment of the retail base of the greyfield. Retail contributes to a community’s economy through sales taxes and often spurs additional growth in the office and industrial sectors (Phillips, 2002).

If the retail development increased the amount of income available in a community by bringing in outside expenditures, and helps to reduce retail expenditure leakage from a community, then it is considered as vital as traditional industrial activities. (Pittman and Phillips, 1995 in Phillips, 2002)

Shopping centers that have lost their retail base must work to reestablish interest in the locale. Retail provides a solid foundation on which to build, and supports further uses considering the location.

Improving quality of life, the primary goal of economic development, is becoming more important in determining the success of a location or development (Segedy, 1997). According to Signe M. Rich (1997:76)

At the juncture of people and economics is a sense of quality of life—culture, art, music, neighborhoods, historic districts, excellence in design of public places, inclusion, and social equity. These building blocks of communities are assets for economic development.

Amenities, such as those noted by Rich, are frequently absent in suburbs that were built for commuters, and not for community. Successful greyfield revitalization that includes elements that a community is lacking, embraces assets, and stimulates the local economy has the ability to enhance the overall quality of life.
Mixed Use Zoning

A fundamental component to New Urbanism design is the creation of a mixed-use environment. Euclidian zoning, which separates uses, has contributed to sprawl by demanding that development located on greenfield tracts separate from the market they are trying to serve (Farris, 2001). Planning for mixed uses decreases environmental ramifications by lessening traffic congestion, limiting the loss of agricultural land and open space, and decreasing the fiscal impact on local governments and utilities (Frankel, 2001). Mixed-use development includes not only a retail core that is designed to meet the local resident’s needs, but also places to work and live, which contribute to the creation of a fabric of community resources.

Mixed-use zoning contributes to a successful project because it fosters interdependence and a sense of community. Historically, mixed-use environments arose due to the shopkeepers need to live above their places of business; the natural evolution of a small village followed, which met the needs of the residents for offices, retail establishments, and homes. People now want the same type of environment in today’s communities. “[T]here is an undeniable resurgence in the demand for development that puts the best of retail offerings close to the infrastructure of consumer’s lives— the very places where they live work and play”(Gentry, 2000:145). The success of the new mixed-use “villages” frequently found in New Urbanist developments, such as downtown Celebration, Florida, attests to the desire for diverse environments with a sense of place— a far call from the characterless strip mall.

Existing sprawl can be improved, borrowing from the examples set by new towns created to exemplify best practices. Reexamining zoning codes to accommodate historical patterns, such as the New England style village, supports a mixture of uses
vertically and horizontally as well as a fostering a sense of place. It has become apparent that the past is greatly influences present development.

While communities today search for ways to reconnect and create focal points, the planning and development philosophies of the early 1990s have sparked discussion on ways to reinvent municipal zoning that allows for the ‘innovation’ of mixed-use development that answer the cry to bring a village-type atmosphere back to our neighborhoods. As we often find, the lessons of the future will be garnered from the past. (Steiner, 2000: 363)

Redeveloping greyfields to create a complete environment can contribute to the recreation of a village-type atmosphere. According to Victor Dover (2001), “We are only beginning to discern the social entropy that results when ‘sense of place’ vanishes.”

In order to allow such mixed-use redevelopment to occur, rezoning is often required. Some strip malls across the county have had to incorporate non-retail tenants, such as gyms and dance studios, to ensure longer-term viability and increase traffic (Paquette, 2002). Although pursuing mixed-use development may be initially more challenging than continuing with the current suburban separation of uses, the possibility for long-term success is great because of the diversified environment.

The review of literature has contributed to the formulation of the research questions and methodology to be used in this study. The research has proved that greyfields plague communities, as they are not only eyesores, but also signify a suffering economy. The redevelopment of such locations utilizing assets and economic development principles, in addition to New Urbanism design theory can contribute to fostering a healthy community. Although many greyfield sites are considered ideal for demolition and infill, the implications of such actions are worth considering. The creation of a comprehensive greyfield redevelopment strategy has the potential to be
widely used as communities across the country struggle with decaying sites and suffer their effect.
CHAPTER 3
METODOLOGY

The primary body of available greyfield research describes existing sites, factors that contribute to shopping center decline, and recommendations for redevelopment. The PricewaterhouseCoopers report and the book, *Greyfields to Goldfields*, are the two primary comprehensive sources that specifically address greyfield redevelopment for community enrichment. The research conducted will contribute to the available literature that analyzes the revitalization process and recommends strategies that are proven successful.

**Exploratory Research Approach**

To add to the existing body of research, an exploratory research approach involving the primary stakeholders of two greyfield projects is used. This approach allows the researcher to draw conclusions regarding the community impact and redevelopment techniques of two greyfield projects. Exploratory research is a form of social science research, which entails the study of human behavior and environments in an analytical fashion (Babbie, 1992). Such research is grounded in the following perspective: “We can’t solve our social problems until we understand how they come about and persist. Social science research offers a way of examining and understanding the operation of human social affairs” (Babbie, 1992:xxi). Studying successful redevelopment projects and formulating conclusions and recommendations for work is useful for guiding future redevelopment.
Case study research has been the primary vehicle for this exploratory study.


A case study is an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used.

A multiple case study approach allows this researcher the opportunity to evaluate two greyfield projects.

Case study analysis is particularly relevant to planners because it utilizes narratives and stories, which are the primary sources through which one learns about other communities. Although time series and econometric studies are also useful methods of evaluation, an insufficient amount of greyfield redevelopment has been in existence long enough to perform such analyses.

Research Question

The case study evaluation has been conducted to answer the research question: How are greyfield projects being used for community redevelopment? Through the exploratory method the researcher will examine cases to find strategies that lend themselves to successful greyfield redevelopment and positive community impacts. Contributing factors, such as site location, size, and design play key roles in greyfield redevelopment, and when commonalities are found among the site development strategies, other communities may be able to apply similar methods to their own projects.

Study Propositions

Study propositions have been used to focus attention on factors that can help guide research (Yin, 1989:30). Based on the review of literature, the primary factors that are involved in greyfield revitalization are New Urbanism design and the utilization of a
mixed-use approach, which contributes to fostering a sense of place in a community. To aid in answering the primary research question, each case study has been evaluated according to the following factors for:

- **Plan development and implementation**: How was the plan developed?
- **Physical design**: What role has the physical design played in the projects success? What design principles are primarily used? Are a variety of uses existent? If so are they successful and do they contribute to the overall project?
- **Community impact**: Was the community successfully or negatively affected by the redevelopment?
- **Viability**: What is the long-term sustainability of the project?

The propositions contribute to the final recommendations that have been made as a result of the case study evaluations.

**Case Studies**

**Units of analysis.** Two case studies comprise the primary body of research. After examining nine greyfield redevelopment projects, the researcher determined that the most useful study would be conducted on projects that have been in existence for at least ten years. Development often occurs in a phased process; reviewing projects in the final stage of redevelopment provides a complete picture of the final product. Studying more recent greyfield redevelopments, for example, would not have provided the researcher with insight into impact on the community, because those projects are not near their final completion.

Using targeted selection, two projects were chosen based on their financing strategies, community success and implementation of New Urbanist design. Although both case studies are located along the Eastern coast of the U.S. they are located in different environments, one in a small city, and the second in a small town. The two
projects are successful in that they have accomplished the stakeholders’ goal of redeveloping a greyfield in a manner that provides a sense of place and gives back to the local community.

Each project also has unique characteristics that provide useful lessons for other communities. For example, Mizner Park, in Boca Raton, Florida, was selected because it is located in a downtown and utilized a public-private partnership for development planning, funding, and implementation. At the time of Mizner Park’s development, downtown Boca Raton was considered blighted, the result of years of abandonment. The project took place because it utilized a public-private partnership between the private developer and the city, an approach that can be applied in many locations. Since its implementation thirteen years ago, it has acted as a catalyst for the revitalization of the downtown.

Mashpee Commons, in Mashpee, Massachusetts, was selected because it was developed to become the town center for a small town that had no identity. The privately funded project overcame numerous zoning and public relations obstacles and is poised to implement the residential component of the project. Mashpee Commons is also a high growth area, surrounded by sprawling patterns of development that are the result of poor planning, which has become locally known as the “malling of Cape Cod.” The study examined both why the developers selected a traditional neighborhood development approach as well as why the community has embraced the new shopping center as the center of their town.

The two case studies also were chosen because they are both over ten years old, thus allowing the research to assess the effectiveness of applications, and have overcome
development hurdles. Both locations have experienced economic lulls as well as building booms, yet the projects remained economically viable. The mixed-use components have been adapted to meet the changing needs of the communities and as a result, the projects have experienced success, which can help guide new communities considering revitalizing greyfields into dynamic mixed-use center.

**Mizner Park.** Named after the legendary Florida architect Addison Mizner, Mizner Park, in Boca Raton, Florida, is a successful thirty-acre, mixed-use development (Valley, 2002). The earlier 430,000 square foot regional shopping center opened in 1974 and failed in the 1980s due to competition from the 1.3 million square foot Town Center at Boca Raton Mall, which located on the west side of the city as population boomed in this half of the county (Valley, 2002:3).

In 1989, the town’s Community Redevelopment Agency formed a public-private partnership with a developer to revitalize the downtown and demolish the mall, which is located just on the edge of the downtown core. The same year, the first phase of the project was erected including residential units, abundant retail, and office space (Valley, 2002:4). Since then, the project has grown, and it now acts as the new Boca Raton downtown. The funding partnerships and development process of this project provide an additional perspective on greyfield redevelopment.

**Mashpee Commons.** Mashpee Commons is located in the small town of Mashpee, on Cape Cod, Massachusetts. Prior to its redevelopment in 1986, the small strip mall was anchored by a grocery store and surrounded by a vast parking lot. The small town of Mashpee, with only 7,000 year-round residents at the time, is surrounded
by the larger towns of Falmouth, Sandwich, and Hyannis, each with populations from 20,000 to 30,000 people.

Architect Arnold Chace and planner Douglass Storrs collaborated to rethink the site that Chace’s family had owned for years. They knew they wanted to give something back to the community and sought to develop the thirty-five acre site in a responsible manner so it could serve as the downtown for Mashpee, which lacked any type of central core that is characteristic of so many New England towns. They created the first plan for the area in the early 1980s, and in 1988, the architecture firm Duany Plater-Zyberk (DPZ) drafted a comprehensive master plan for the five surrounding neighborhoods that are part of the master development, which centers on Mashpee Commons.

The greyfield redevelopment is now complete and the developers continue to refine their plans in anticipation of the implementation of the surrounding neighborhood plans. Mashpee Commons has become a destination for those seeking the outdoor, marketplace-style-shopping experience, rather than the standard indoor shopping mall. In addition, the redevelopment has become the functioning downtown for Mashpee.

**Case Study Methodology**

The case studies have been evaluated using a variety of approaches. First, site plans and photographs before and after redevelopment were collected. The materials were evaluated for their design characteristics and success and completeness of implementation. The overall design strategy and concept were discerned through this evaluation, as well as through interviews with the primary planners and consultants.

Next, interviews were conducted with stakeholders who played a role in the redevelopment process, such as the developer, planner, Community Redevelopment Agency director, and community officials. The same questions were used to gather
information regarding the process of greyfield redevelopment, community and economic impact, and success of the project. Interview questions included the following:

1. What has been the greatest impact of the project on the economy and the community?
2. What were the most effective redevelopment strategy(s)?
3. What were the least effective strategy(s)?
4. What would you do differently, if you were to do it again?
5. How do you see the long-term viability of the project?

This research will provide insight into the actual process of redevelopment plan formulation and the implementation of the plan. As a result of the research, greyfield redevelopment recommendations that can aid communities in conducting their own successful projects will be drafted for application towards future projects.

Criteria for Interpreting the Findings

In reviewing the case studies, the researcher examines the information for existence of pattern matching, a method of determining if similar characteristics exist. According to Yin (1989:107), “Such logic compares an empirically based pattern with a predicted one (or with several alternative predictions).” The research will be analyzed to discern what elements occur throughout the two primary cases and how they may be applied to other communities.

The exploratory case study approach contributes to the formulation of a comprehensive study. Because the study of greyfields is relatively new, little information exists regarding specific greyfield redevelopment theory. Initial studies have been conducted, such as PwC’s, but there is a lack of information regarding the success of existing projects, and specifically, what makes those projects a success. This study
satisfies a need for research into greyfield redevelopment strategies and therefore should prove useful for communities considering such projects.
CHAPTER 4
CASE STUDIES

Greyfield redevelopment can take many forms. Although it is easy to raze a distressed shopping center and replace it with a newer version of the same thing, the fact that the first one failed implies that it should not be tried again. Thus, planners and developers must devise new approaches for redeveloping such sites. This chapter presents a variety of approaches utilized in greyfield projects and comprehensively analyzes two mixed-use greyfield redevelopments.

Greyfields have wide-ranging effects on the surrounding economy, environment, and public perception of the community. Redevelopment can revitalize the community because it addresses such issues by eradicating blight. Distressed sites have the ability to be transformed to become centers for community activity and pride.

To analyze greyfield redevelopment techniques for community revitalization several redevelopment projects were reviewed and then Mashpee Commons and Mizner Park were selected. The greyfields redevelopments were chosen based on their longevity and comprehensive approach to redevelopment that utilized mixed-use zoning and New Urbanism design strategies. Studying the two oldest projects provided insight into development phasing and implementation and tests the effectiveness of the design strategies.

Current Greyfield Redevelopments

Seven additional greyfield projects that are currently under construction were researched for this study and include: City Center, Englewood, Colorado; The Crossings,
Mountain View, California; Eastgate Town Center, Chattanooga, Tennessee; Winter Park Village, Winter Park, Florida; City Place, Long Beach, California; The Village of Rochester Hills, Rochester Hills, Michigan; and The Block at Orange, Orange, California.\(^1\) The projects provided insight into current revitalization strategies being applied at sites across the country. Because all seven projects are currently under construction, except for the residential village The Crossings at Mountain View in Mountain View, California that was completed in 1998, provides insight into new designs being implemented on aging mall sites.

Research showed that redevelopment projects take many forms, such as single-use retail or residential developments. Of the seven projects, four are mixed-use and two are primarily retail redevelopments, and one is residential. Three of the projects used both public and private funds for development and the Winter Park Village in Winter Park, Florida was financed privately. New Urbanism designs appear to be utilized at the Eastgate Town Center, The Crossings, and the Winter Park Village. The variety of greyfield redevelopment approaches may be applicable to communities depending on their needs.

As a result of the review of these projects, the researcher determined that although they provide insight into current practices, they have yet to be tested. It is difficult to evaluate community impact and subsequent revitalization on a project that has been complete for only a short time. Frequently, a new retail establishment may enjoy a surge of business upon opening due to the public’s natural curiosity to see a new place. However, such business has a tendency to ebb and flow over time, and the true test of a

\(^1\)Complete project descriptions of the seven current greyfield redevelopments are located in Appendix B.
project’s success and community impact occurs many years later when it has managed to remain competitive in the market. In addition, the single use projects, such as the Block at Orange and The Village of Rochester Hills, do not test the mixed-use component of New Urbanism theory. Additionally, the projects are in the early to mid stages of redevelopment, which makes it difficult to understand how the projects will function and what the design will look like when complete. Although the projects may be studied at a later date to gauge the effectiveness of the redevelopment until then they are considered projects to watch and evaluate in the future.

**Case study selection.** The two case studies selected have many of the components of the current redevelopments previously discussed, such as a village character and a retail component. What sets Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons apart from the current greyfield redevelopment is that they have been in existence for a minimum of ten years, implemented interpretations of New Urbanist designs, and incorporated mixed uses. Studying two enduring redevelopments provides insight into the implementation process and long-term community impact.

The selected case studies also incorporate New Urbanism design techniques, which allow the researcher to evaluate the appropriateness of the method. New Urbanism design techniques can be applied in single use environments, such as in The Village of Rochester Hills in Michigan, yet the single use retail development does not truly embody the dynamic environment that is central to New Urbanism.

The developer of Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons utilize a variety of redevelopment techniques and development strategies to foster a sense of community for their redevelopment. Such work provides a model for other communities to consider
when implementing their own projects. Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons are pioneers in greyfield redevelopment, and a great deal can be learned from their processes and their impacts on community revitalization.

**Case Study One: Mizner Park**

Located in downtown Boca Raton, Florida, Mizner Park is a New Urbanist style greyfield redevelopment. The thirty-acre mixed-use site was once the home to the Boca Mall, which opened in 1973 and failed as a result of competition from another regional shopping mall built in 1980, The Town Center at Boca Raton. The Town Center sparked a building boom west of the city, which resulted in decreased business in the downtown and widespread blight.

Many communities face shopping center decline as a result of competition from larger and newer regional malls. This case study details how one community addressed such decline by utilizing a public-private partnership to carry out their greyfield redevelopment, which acted as a catalyst for revitalization.

**History and Context**

Even prior to the westward population growth, Boca’s downtown was economically weak. As is common in many locales, roadway construction turned business away from the downtown, which resulted in decreased population in the area. Interstate 95 marks the Western edge of the city, with the eastern city-side being located on Florida’s east coast. “Interstate 95, completely bypassed the coastal cities’ centers, and new development sprung up along the interstate. Most were outside city limits and their strict zoning laws, located in unincorporated areas where a series of rubber-stamp county commissions welcomed large-scale development” (Thompkins, 1991:12M). The
major artery of the Eastern U.S., Interstate 95, provided access to Boca Raton, yet, ironically, also led people away from the downtown.

Slum and blight spread through downtown Boca as a direct result of the draw of newer retail establishments located outside the city. “Many long-time residents say the 500,000 square-foot, seventeen-year old Boca Raton Mall well defined the word ‘blight,’ a legal term that land-use attorney Charles Siemon describes as being a commercial area that is obsolete and ill-conceived” (Comisco, 1999a:1A).

**Plan Development and Implementation**

To address the blight that existed throughout the downtown region, the city’s planning director established the Boca Raton Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) in 1982. The primary task of the CRA was to create a master plan for the redevelopment of the downtown. According to John Shuff (1992:78), “There had only been 72,000 square feet of new development from 1981 to 1988, and prior to Mizner Park, the last building constructed in downtown Boca Raton that exceeded 25,000 square feet was the Boca Mall.” The stunted growth deeply affected the downtown fabric, as the feeling of abandonment became ever present.

In 1985, the first proposed redevelopment plan was voted down by residents in a referendum, and it was assumed that the grand size of the proposed office and hotel complex did not represent what people wanted in their downtown (Thompkins, 1991). Two years later, the CRA proposed tearing down the defunct Boca Raton Mall, to construct an art park, which would provide a cultural center for the city and a home for local arts groups (Thompkins, 1991:12M; Shuff, 1992). However, the plan required increased taxes to fund the $93 million project, which residents also refused (Thompkins, 1991:12M).
The CRA amended the art park master plan to include retail, office, residential, and cultural spaces. However, financing continued to pose a problem. Faced with the challenge of finding a private investor willing to become involved in a large-scale project, the CRA called for outside proposals for redevelopment in the downtown (Shuff, 1992:79). In 1988 Tom Crocker, a local private real estate developer, proposed a public-private partnership with the city to build a shopping center similar to the Town Center at Boca Raton that would include a large parking lot and a hotel, because he did not see viable residential opportunities in the downtown (Commisso, 1999a). After meeting with CRA officials, land-use attorneys, and architects to discuss the potential project, Crocker amended his proposal resulting in a mixed-use development that would include retail space, offices, residential, and cultural centers (Thompkins, 1991:12M; Shuff, 1992:79). Before the city agreed to the partnership, Crocker purchased the Boca Raton Mall site for approximately $31-33 million, edging out a New Jersey company Shopco, who planned on building a J.C. Penny on the site (Shuff, 1992:80; Commisso, 1999a:1A).

The CRA had already received state Development of Regional Impact (DRI) approval for their $50 million infrastructure “Visions 90” plan that detailed the infrastructure and beautification needs for the downtown (Commisso, 1999a:1A). The development financing process continued in a complex manner:

Because some businesses had to be condemned and the city wanted less development and more green space and cultural entities in Crocker’s Mizner Park, it agreed, through voter referendum, to buy the Boca Raton Mall in 1989 from Crocker and then lease the land back to him. This was done to create a revenue stream to pay back the $68 million that the city borrowed to do it. (Commisso, 1999a:8A)
The CRA then issued $56.5 million in tax-free redevelopment bonds to buy the mall property from Crocker, and began construction of infrastructure and a utility, including what is now the center promenade park and distinctive fountain.2

As a result of buying the property, the city had control over what could be developed. The greatest fear at the time was that the owner of the mall site would raze it only to construct another strip center, which would not spur the type of major redevelopment Boca Raton greatly needed (Shuff, 1992). The city was fortunate to have a developer interested in financing construction of the project, while working with the city to achieve their goals, which is a true public-private partnership (Siemon, 2003). The city’s decision to lease the property back to Crocker ensured that the project would be mutually beneficial to both parties.3 The bondholder is repaid using tax-increment financing, which measures the assessed tax increase from the base year of the Community Redevelopment District formation (1982). The money is then reinvested in the community and used to pay off the bonds. Mizner Park would not have been possible without the establishment of a public-private partnership and the steadfast belief of all those involved in the project.

2 (Gonzalez, 1999) The tax-free bonds were issued using funds borrowed from the city of Gulf Breeze, Florida. The bonds were exempt from the 1986 tax law, which allowed more liberal provisioning and higher repayment from private sources (Shuff, 1992). The City anticipates paying off the bonds by 2018 (Commisso, 1999a).

3 According to the CRA Executive Director during the time of the development, “The retail lease dated May 1990, has a minimum payment of $280,000. The residential lease dated May 1991, has a $200,000 minimum and the office lease dated May 1994, has a $700,000 minimum. At the end of each 10-year lease the amount paid to the city is the greater of 15 percent of the net operating income from the leases or the minimum stipulated” (Shuff, 1992:84).
Although the financing for the project was complicated, its success is clearly apparent in recent tax assessments. According to M.J. Arts, president of the Greater Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce in 1996:

Mizner Park is an economic investment for this community. In 1995, Mizner Park was valued at $61,599,535 - four times the value of the former Boca Mall. Total property taxes on the property in the last year were $1,318,249. Of that, for example, $162,931 went to local schools. That is $162,931 that the schools would have been without were there no Mizner Park. (M.J. Arts, 1996:5)

The city’s financial investment has been profitable, and Mizner Park has enjoyed great success in the commercial, retail, and residential sectors.

Community Impact should move here

Design

After reviewing the existing distressed economic conditions of downtown Boca Raton, all parties involved acknowledged the need to remake the image of the city and provide an identity for the downtown area. Architect David Kitchens worked closely with CRA director Jorge Camejo and based their design on European plazas with central pedestrian promenades, inspired particularly by the Plaza Navona in Italy (Kitchens, 2003). They agreed a mixed-use project would best enrich the community, and developed the project according to New Urbanism design guidelines. The aesthetics, mixed-uses, and pedestrian scale have contributed to the success of Mizner Park.

The development is organized along two city blocks, which are aligned along a public promenade. The map shown in Figure one displays the overall layout of the site. Four buildings are arranged opposite one another and utilize vertical mixed-uses with parking garages behind. Retail stores, restaurants and cafes line the primary red brick paved street, Plaza Real, and residential apartments and offices occupy the upper floors of the buildings.
The project’s namesake, Addison Mizner, influences Mizner Park’s architecture. Mizner first brought his ornate Spanish-style architecture to South Florida in the early 1920s. According to Michael Gannon (1993:80), “By the mid-twenties, Mizner had created a pink-walled, red-tiled, wrought iron-gated world of unreal luxury, set amidst sea grapes, oleanders, and lofty coconut palms.” Like many of the inspirational architect’s previous designs, Mizner Park is also painted pink and lined with palm trees and wrought iron balconies. Embracing the regional architecture of the area has contributed to fostering an identity for Boca Raton, while aesthetically improving the downtown.
The primary organizational element in Mizner Park is the central linear park that divides the Plaza Real. The public green space is accented with benches, gazebos, and a large fountain, which further enhances the aesthetic of the area (Figure 2). The promenade has been utilized extensively, and children are often seen playing in the fountain. Towering Royal Palm trees line the street, a design treatment evident throughout the older areas of nearby Palm Beach, Florida, that also serves to add a feeling of establishment to the development.

Providing public green space is a vital aspect of New Urbanism design because it unites urban fabric and fosters a sense of community through casual social interactions. The design of the park emphasizes the linear arrangement of the buildings and strengthens the relationships between the public and private spaces. Although the park is widely used by the public, architect Kitchens (2003) believes that it could be built at half the size, and still be as effective, if not more so. The park is approximately 185 feet wide, totals six acres, and is bordered by three-story buildings. Kitchens (2003) believes that is not the optimal size because it does not foster a feeling of containment. Ideally,
Kitchens maintains that the park should be approximately half as wide thus facilitating foot traffic to shops across the street (2003). However, the park size was mandated by the city because they wanted six acres of green space in the downtown (Kitchens, 2003). Although it is not the optimal size to support the retailers of the development, the park has been popular with pedestrians.

Figure 3: Pedestrian friendly design
(http://www.miznerpark.org/commercial/retailSpace.asp. 2/23/03)

The pedestrian scale of Mizner Park is consistent with New Urbanism guidelines. As seen in Figure 3, the sidewalks are wide enough to accommodate groups of pedestrians. Public green space is provided for relaxation, and awnings and cantilevers protect from the elements. Additional landscaping further accents the architectural components of the buildings, and adds to the visual interest of the area.

Addressing parking in a New Urbanist mixed-use site is often problematic. New Urbanism guidelines stress the importance of maintaining pedestrian accessibility while taking the focus off the automobile (Katz, 1994). Pursuant to these ideals, the parking garages in Mizner Park are hidden behind the four primary buildings, partially sunken into the ground, and are accented with landscaping and planters. The parking garages are
not visible from the core of the site, although they face primary surrounding arterials. Town homes buffer one side of the parking garage from the established developments around Mizner Park and contribute additional residential units. Orienting parking away from the development accomplishes the New Urbanism goal, although it may have a negative effect on the adjacent areas where it is most visible to the passerby.

Although the majority of parking is located in multi-story garages, on street parking, as well as valet parking, lines the Plaza Real. The diagonal parking spaces both provide a buffer for pedestrians walking along the sidewalks and slow traffic. The storefronts are oriented towards the public promenade, away from the primary adjacent arterials, and traffic driving along Plaza Real looking for on street parking increases visual accessibility, which was a careful consideration of the developers when they selected the racetrack oval design (Root, 2003).

Figure 4: Cultural aspects of Mizner Park  
(http://www.miznerpark.org/theArts/theArs.asp, 2/23/03)

Mizner Park has successfully implemented the mixed-use theory, central to the New Urbanism guidelines. As indicated in the master plan, the fully developed arts center, which occupies the west end the site, compliments established retail, residential,
and office units. Public art displays, as seen in Figure 4, are commonly found in locations such as the sculpture garden, which borders the concert amphitheatre. The stakeholders interviewed for this project all believe that incorporating civic and cultural uses into Mizner Park has helped to establish it as a community asset (Root, Siemon, Camejo, and Kitchens, 2003).

The completion of the amphitheater, the Boca Raton Museum of Art, and the Concert Hall at Mizner Park fulfills the cultural promises of the development team. Prior to the addition of such cultural aspects, residents voiced their concerns regarding the lack of promised cultural and civic spaces. “After we voted, the plans changed,” said Jo-Ann Landon, a 20-year Boca Raton resident and member of the city’s beautification committee, ‘We were told it was going to be a cultural center. Every time Crocker wanted more density, the Council approved it’” (Comimso, 1999a, 8A). The developer was able to quickly construct retail, office, and residential components because he was funded to do so, and the city approved his plans. Acquiring construction funding to complete cultural components was challenging was because Crocker was not required to finance or build such portions of the development (Gonzales, 1999). The city secured private funding for the cultural center was done primarily through public fundraising and as a result the development progressed slowly.

The New Urbanism design of Mizner Park appeals to the consumer as well as smart growth advocates. In 1997, Boca Raton was named one of Florida’s five Sustainable Communities due primarily to its redeveloped downtown area, which centers on Mizner Park (Hussey, 1997). The developers and designers celebrated the award,

---

4 The award for a Sustainable Community is a statewide award program that recognizes communities that have undergone revitalization or implemented smart growth principles.
which signified that Boca Raton indeed had a healthy downtown once again (Kitchens, 2003).

Despite the overwhelming success of the project, accommodated by the mixed-use high-density zoning, residents remain unconvinced that such zoning should be applied elsewhere in Boca Raton. An article discussing resident opinions on Mizner Park noted that “[T]hose same citizens haven’t welcomed all urban infill. Just about two weeks ago, the city’s planning staff proposed an amendment to Boca’s comprehensive master plan that would allow mixed-use development in deteriorated areas. That policy was ‘violently opposed’ by crowds of people.” (Graff, 1999, A11). Mizner Park was a public relations challenge, and residents criticized the project throughout its development. Yet, upon the redevelopment’s completion, many residents are realizing that it is, in fact, one of the primary assets of the area, and it has greatly improved their quality of life (Gonzalez, 1999).

**Community Impact**

From the inception of the CRA, the downtown drastically needed widespread revitalization to eradicate blight, yet there was no asset remaining off of which to build. The establishment of Mizner Park, however, has revitalized the area. Camejo notes, “We hoped Mizner Park would spur additional investment in downtown. It has done that tenfold” (M.J. Arts, 1996:5). Commissio (1999a, p.1A) writes,

The original idea was that Mizner Park was going to be a catalytic project and defray the cost of redeveloping the surrounding areas and infrastructure,” said Charles Siemon, a land use attorney who has been involved in Mizner Park since its inception. ‘It was always possible that there would be a shortfall, but now the market is going bonkers and the tax revenue is gaining.’

As seen in Table 1, the assessed value of the property surrounding the area has increased due to the development taking place.
Table 1: Increased Assessed Values of Mizner Park and the CRA district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Value:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downtown Community Redevelopment District</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992: $16,234,646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: $229,795,741</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mizner Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990: $28,845,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002: $68,254,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CNU X: Guidebook to New Urbanism in Florida, 2002)

Mizner Park has served as an anchor to the community, and its popularity and success has led to additional redevelopment on adjacent properties, such as nearby Royal Palm Plaza (Root, 2003). The greyfield redevelopment has turned a previously unused property into a profitable village within the city and spurred revitalization efforts throughout the community, which in turn has generated additional tax revenue and increased property values. When asked about Mizner Park’s community impact, every interviewee noted that it has been a catalyst for community revitalization. Camejo notes that a local Boca Raton magazine annually polls residents regarding local attractions and one particular question is telling of Mizner Park’s success. When asked “Where do you bring out of town visitors to show off your town?” the answer is consistently “Mizner Park,” which testifies to the community’s pride in the project (Camejo, 2003).
Ensuring Continued Success

The redevelopment process is never complete in a project such as Mizner Park. Jo Ann Root, marketing director for Mizner Park, stresses the need to remain a head of retail and residential trends (2003). For example, Mizner management anticipated the bankruptcy of the department store anchor Jacobson’s, and has filled the 8,000 square foot vacancy with Robb and Stucky, an upscale home furnishings company that is a major retail trend. The only change Root would make to Mizner Park would be to add additional retail space, because there has been a great demand especially for stores with large frontage, which is sometimes required by national chains (Root, 2003).

Funds have also been allotted to renovate the apartments to allow them to remain competitive with the luxury condominiums that have sprung up around the area. Siemon, who has been involved in Mizner Park since its inception, lives and works in the development. Siemon is a resident of one of the original apartments and noted that due to skepticism about the residential component of the project, the apartments were built
conservatively and do not include many of the amenities common in the new complexes (Siemon, 2003). The phased remodeling will make the apartments more luxurious and thus will allow the apartments to compete in the market. Their desirable location in Mizner Park should provide an edge.

Looking to the future of the development the stakeholders forecast continued success for Mizner Park and Boca Raton. Camejo believes that because Mizner Park is oriented towards people and not automobiles it will feel more and more like an established urban neighborhood as it ages (2003). To remain competitive, Mizner Park will continuously reinvent itself to meet the latest needs in the retail, office, and residential sectors (Kitchens, 2003; Root, 2003). Although buildings may be remodeled over time, it is thought that the plaza will endure for long into the future, and Mizner Park will continue to evolve to meet the community’s needs (Siemon, 2003).

Mizner Park’s public-private partnership allowed the accomplishment of a public objective, while providing a profitable joint investment strategy. Boca Raton has been provided with the cultural, retail, and residential center they were promised, and the surrounding properties continue to reap the benefits. Mizner Park has galvanized the redevelopment of the downtown and helped to distinguish Boca Raton as a travel destination (Siemon, 2003). Florida’s economy relies greatly on tourism and Mizner Park has served as an asset to surrounding resorts and residents alike.
### Table 2: Mizner Park Project Profile

#### Project Profile

**Design:**
- High Density New Urbanist style downtown
  - Mixed Uses: 30 Acres
    - Retail Space: 235,000 square feet
    - Office Space: 270,000 Square feet
    - Residential Space: 272 rental apartments and town homes
    - Parking: 2,500 spaces
  - Central linear plaza with a tree lined public promenade
  - Mediterranean style architecture inspired by Addison Mizner

**Cultural Assets:**
- Center for the Arts at Mizner Park
  - Boca Raton Museum of Art: 44,000 square-feet
  - Mort Walker’s International Museum of Cartoon Art
  - Amphitheatre and concert green
  - Concert Hall at Mizner Park (CHAMP): 1,800 square feet
  - Sunrise Cinemas: 1,913 seats, eight screens.

**Economic Aspects:**
- Public-private Partnership
- Tax Exempt bonds

(http://www.miznerpark.org/commercial/retailSpace.asp, 2/12/03)
Case Study Two: Mashpee Commons

Located in one of the fastest growing towns in Massachusetts, Mashpee Commons is more than just a shopping center; it is the town center. The thirty-five acre mixed use development was built around the aging New Seabury Shopping Center a 65,000 square foot, twelve-acre strip mall built in 1962 that featured a supermarket and several small stores. Rather than razing the site, the developers added to it, creating what is now the village center for a town that was lacking one.

History and Context

Unlike most New England towns, Mashpee lacked the traditional downtown village core. The building boom that struck Cape Cod in the 1970’s and early 1980’s passed over the town due to a protracted land ownership suit by the Wampanoag Indian Council that prohibited land sales, thus restricting development (Robertson, 2002). The uncontrolled growth that occurred in neighboring towns skipped Mashpee and stunted its business growth, yet it also provided the unique opportunity, for Mashpee government officials to observe the results of such development.

After winning the land suit in 1979, thus removing prohibition on land transactions, the town planners drew up their own master plan to try to guide all future development in an organized and comprehensive manner. Because Mashpee had no downtown, the plan called for the placement of new civic, commercial, and religious buildings around the existing shopping center, which is located along the primary arteries of the upper Cape and at the junction of the Mashpee rotary (the intersection of Routes 151 and 28) (Sachner, 1989).

Developer Arnold B. Chace Jr.’s family owned the shopping center property and large tracts of adjacent parcels, which provided Chace with the opportunity for further
development without the initial land expenditure costs. Rather than expanding the tired strip mall to add more stores, Chace envisioned the site as a potential center for the community, complete with retail, residential, office, and civic buildings. In 1985 Chace partnered with Douglas Storrs, who had trained as a planner, to create the land development company Fields Point Limited (now known as Cornish and Associates), and they embarked upon the development. In an interview, Chace spoke about the plan’s origins:

Our attitude at first was that we had a shopping center that we can just renovate. But the more we thought about it, that direction did not appeal to us. We decided, after a lot of study and discussions with the town: Why not try to make this area into a mixed-use center, with new roadways and a street grid pattern, something more analogous to a downtown than merely having a shopping center. (Yudis, 1987:A22)

Chace and Storrs wanted to build a town that would reflect traditional New England villages such as Nantucket, Massachusetts; Hanover, New Hampshire; and Woodstock, Vermont. The developers traveled to these locations and took pictures and measurements of everything from granite curbs to the spacing of pickets of a fence (Muro, 1987). The data helped them define what they wanted to include in their new downtown’s architecture and street fabric. Storrs commented on the need for careful preparation: “We had seen what had happened to commercial patterns on Cape Cod and we didn’t want to exacerbate the problems of poor planning in the past” (Homsy, 2002).

Numerous meetings with the town followed, and the plans were reviewed and revised accordingly, resulting in a mixed-use center analogous to a downtown. In 1986, Mashpee town officials approved the central core of the development, a three block Main

---

5 The land owned by the Chace family totaled 175 acres at the time, most of which was assembled by the developer’s grandfather in the years prior to the construction of the New Seabury Shopping Center (Muro, 1987).
Street that ran adjacent to the existing grocery store and included a bank movie theatre, and retail stores.\(^6\)

**Plan Development and Implementation**

While developing their master plan’s residential component, Chace and Storrs went far outside New England, traveling to Seaside, on the panhandle of Florida. The partners were anxious to learn more about the new planned town created by the New Urbanism architects and co-founders of the CNU, Andres Duany and Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk. Mashpee Commons, with its pedestrian scale, connected street network, and mixed-use plan, was consistent with many of the tenets of New Urbanism even before Duany and Plater-Zyberk entered the picture.

The visits prompted a dialogue between the development team and Duany and Plater-Zyberk. The architects were interested in working on Mashpee Commons because they saw a need for New Urbanism type development in the region, as historical elements associated with the New England village inspired a great deal of the organizational concepts central to the design theory (Storrs, 2003). Duany and Plater-Zyberk traveled to Massachusetts in August 1988 to hold a charette in Mashpee regarding the residential neighborhoods of Mashpee Commons which was attended by architects, planners, engineers, town officials, and residents (Anderson, 1989).

The two architects were instrumental in the design of the five connected residential neighborhoods around the primary core.\(^7\) The residential plans reflect their

---

\(^6\)Although the town approved the plan, as part of the negotiations, they reserved the right to review every building plan prior to construction.

\(^7\)Although the overall development is known as Mashpee Commons, the name specifically refers to the central mixed-use neighborhood that is the greyfield redevelopment site. The other five neighborhoods are individually named, yet they are part of the Mashpee Commons master plan.
previous work: “It would look a little like Seaside, the individual houses lined up close against the sidewalk, and all with wooden fences, all on small lots” (Anderson, 1989:24). The neighborhoods are all designed in accordance with New Urbanism standards and feature small lots, a variety of housing types, minimal street setbacks, and public green spaces. Traditional New England architecture will be used throughout the development, reflecting the whaling captain’s homes on Nantucket and the smaller cape styles that dot the peninsula.

Antiquated Euclidean zoning has slowed Mashpee Commons’ progress. Although the project was designed to be consistent with New England downtowns, Chace and Storrs learned that it was impossible to build a New England downtown according to today’s zoning and building code standards. From the outset the team faced challenges. For example, the interior streets of the three-block core had to be considered part of the surrounding parking lot access roads rather than primary arteries or else they would have had to be built to a different standard and would have required two-hundred foot setbacks; such wide setbacks did not fit the street pattern of a typical downtown (Homsy, 2002).

Street design has not been the only challenge. Incorporating mixed-uses and high density residential has proven to be even more problematic. Town residents became skeptical of the project because they feared that the high growth that harmed other towns would have the same effect on Mashpee, increasing traffic congestion, overcrowding schools, and harming their peaceful and quiet lifestyle (Becoming Good Neighbors, 1998; Dumas, 1998).
Design

The plan for the downtown of Mashpee Commons consists of what one would find in many of the New England towns that inspired the developers. The interconnected street pattern and mixed uses, both horizontal and vertical, provide a feeling of authenticity to a new downtown (Figure 6).

![Mashpee Commons Map](http://www.mashpeecommmons.com/mashcomlp/about.htm, 2/28/03)

The developers wanted each building to look different, as one frequently sees in old villages that evolved over time. To accomplish this goal, several architects were employed to design individual buildings. The final product was an interesting mix of traditional New England styles, yet the buildings are diverse due to the characteristics, sizes, and scales constructed. Typical vernacular materials, such as weathered cedar shingles, clapboards, and white painted trim accent many of the buildings. Variety is achieved though the application of the materials and the incorporation of a large brick bank and curvilinear movie theater. Although the development reflects its locations, it is
unique in its interpretation and dynamic character. Although Storrs admits the process of coordinating many architects was challenging, it was a creative solution to achieve the variety of styles the developers desired (personal communication, 2/28/03).

To support the civic uses that are vital to the design of a true town center, land was reserved for community buildings. The developers deeded a two and a half-acre site to the Town of Mashpee for one dollar to build a library and another parcel nearby to build a fire station. Additional land was donated to the Archdiocese of Fall River, Massachusetts, for the construction of a 45,000 square foot parish center complete with a 1,200-seat church. The remainder of the redevelopment was designed in relation to these civic uses.

The post office also was relocated from the original shopping center to a more prominent location on a street in the center of Mashpee Commons, as shown in the neighborhood plan (Figure 7). The inclusion of community buildings, offices, and retail contributed to establishing Mashpee Commons as a community center.

Figure 7: Mashpee Post Office located in central Mashpee Commons. (http://www.mashpeecommons.com/mashcomlp/about.htm, 2/23/03)
Mashpee Commons consists of more than just the “town center” core. The master plan includes six interconnected neighborhoods that revolve around the greyfield redevelopment site (Appendix B). The residential neighborhood plans are featured in Appendix C. Although this report focuses primarily on Mashpee Common’s central area, the location of the greyfield, the residential plans are of note because they contribute to the establishment of a mixed-use environmental, a primary objective of the developers.

In addition to the residential and civic components, a variety of retail tenants were courted, including national chains, regional stores, and unique local shops. Currently, retail is divided equally among the three categories. Storrs notes that is was initially hard to attract national retailers because they were wary of the potential failure of the project (Planning 2002).

To woo a hesitant Gap, the developers offered to build out the store and to take a portion of the sales revenue instead of rent. In essence, Storrs says, it cost the chain nothing to move in. ‘In a year,’ he says ‘the Gap was doing so well that it was paying the highest rent in Mashpee Commons.’ (Homsy, 2002:26)

The Gap has enjoyed continued financial success and now occupies a two-story 25,000 square foot store.

---

8 National retailers, such as the Gap, Talbot’s, and Banana Republic, are limited to one third of the overall retail space. Regional retailers unique to New England, such as Puritan’s of Cape Cod, which has three other stores on Cape Cod, comprise another third of the retail space. Finally, unique local boutiques, such as the Sandy Paws pet specially store, fill the remaining spaces.
Figure 8: Small stores built for local retail tenants.
(http://www.mashpeecommunes.com/mashcomlp/liners1.htm, 2/28/03)

Other retail throughout the project has experienced similar financial success as a result of assistance provided by the developers. Chace and Storrs review monthly financial reports for each tenant to check for potential problems evidenced by decline of sales; if a decline is detected, a meeting is held with the storeowner or manager to assess the situation and devise potential solutions (Storrs, 2003). The most recent addition to the retail sector at Mashpee Commons is the establishment of twenty-four foot deep smaller stores along a double loaded street, built to house small local businesses that are just beginning (Figure 8). Storrs noted that the traffic generated from larger established stores across the street has helped the smaller stores to thrive (Storrs, 2003).

Community Impact

Despite stringent development regulations, the town of Mashpee has experienced a 64.2 percent population increase since 1990, according to the 2000 census (Robertson, 2001). The strong economy in the 1990s and a plethora of developable land have sparked much of the growth. That the Wampanoag tribe fought to protect the same land that accommodates such development is an irony not lost on its residents. According to
Wampanoag Tribal Council president Glenn Marshall “Mashpee is becoming so gentrified that my people can’t even live here” (Robertson, 2002:B1).

The lack of housing available, especially affordable housing, plagues much of Cape Cod, especially in high-growth areas due in part to the high land costs and prohibitive development regulations. Storrs and Chace have worked to develop their housing component since the inception of the project, yet they have been met with great resistance. The five residential neighborhoods contain a mixture of housing styles, from single-family homes to townhouses that would be built on small lots, adjacent to central green spaces. The range of sizes and housing types cultivates a diverse community with a variety of incomes. At this time, Storrs considers Mashpee Commons another pretty shopping center, because it still lacks the residential neighborhoods that make up a true town (Storrs, 2003).

Ensuring Continued Success

The developers believe the success of Mashpee Commons is due in part to the layout of the three block downtown core. The intent of the first phase of construction was essentially to build a department store with the departments divided into individual stores and to locate them on a connected street network (Storrs, 2003). The strong linear arrangement and street network provided the framework for the remainder of the development to continue in the same organized fashion.

A new phase of development completed in 2001 provided the double loaded streets that the developers believe are vital to ensuring success for tenants (Storrs, 2003). Such design contributes towards the creation of an “outdoor room,” with stores that face one another across a narrow street lined with parallel parking, just as one may find on a traditional Main Street. In addition, large stores on either end of the street (in this case
the large Gap, and a CVS drugstore) allow for terminated vistas and provide a sense of enclosure. The developers have found that double loaded streets increase sales because they provide the opportunity to “cross shop,” an industry term which describes shoppers who cross the street going in and out of stores (Storrs, 2003). Since Mashpee Commons’ inception, sales throughout the development have increased steadily, and the combination of pedestrian friendly design, evidenced by wide sidewalks, and slow traffic has proven to be agreeable to visitors.

Contributing to the community has helped the project become a true downtown that is embraced by the residents, and will help ensure future success. In addition to donating land for civic uses, the developers sponsored a community concert series during the early years of the development. The series was then taken over by town residents, forming the Community Concert Committee that now organizes sixty-two events per year (Storrs, 2003). Attracting people to the area and providing for opportunities of individual involvement has contributed to the project’s integration into the fabric of daily life.

Figure 9: Apartments located above Talbots overlook the street. (http://www.mashpeecommons.com/mashomlp/about.htm, 2/23/03).
Although Mashpee Commons has been financially successful, its developers would, in retrospect, consider adding additional second floor apartments to the downtown single story retail establishments. The thirteen apartments built above the Talbots building, seen in Figure 9, were rented within one month of their completion and have proven to be so successful the developers wish they had planned for more units of a similar type (Storrs, 2003). The developers determined that it is cost prohibitive to add a second story after construction is complete, and as a result future residential units will be relegated to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Yet incorporating additional residential may not have been an option, as the town has delayed the construction of the new residential neighborhoods for many years. The greatest change Storrs hopes to see in the coming years is the addition of the neighborhoods, which are planned and ready to be developed. Recognizing the lack of affordable housing opportunities that plague Cape Cod, ten percent of the units built will be set aside as affordable housing units, which will greatly contribute to the town's housing stock (Storrs, 2003).

The master plan for Mashpee Commons includes additional retail, office, and residential units that will be built over the next five to ten years, which makes the overall planning and construction of this project a twenty year endeavor. The development phasing has been unique to the project in that the residential units have followed the retail development:

Mashpee Commons’ unconventional “retail-first” strategy recalls a proven model from a much earlier time- that of a country store at the intersection of two well traveled roads. In this traditional pattern, the blacksmith’s shop, and inn, another store, more houses, a bank and so on. In this model, as Mashpee Commons, growth responds to market forces in a more sensitive way. (Katz, 1994:171)
The developers anticipate receiving approval for the residential component within the next twelve to eighteen months, and expect to complete neighborhood construction in five to ten years (Storrs, 2003). Gaining approval for the high-density neighborhoods has been problematic due to resident and planning board fears of too much growth.

The establishment of the Cape Cod Commission regional planning agency in 1990 to oversee planning and land use regulations on Cape Cod has renewed the developers’ hope that their project will be able to progress. Chace and Storrs’s plan is in accordance with the type of medium density-cluster development that the Commission advocates. According to Margo Fenn, the head planner for the Cape Cod Commission,

‘It fosters this sense of place, which I think has been lost in the world of suburbs and shopping malls. The regional policy plan is recommending that towns look at their local by-laws and see what are the obstacles to encouraging this type of development and what needs to be changed.’ (Sit, 1991:41)

Chace and Storrs have persevered and are continuing to seek approval for the final phase of development. When Mashpee Commons currently has thirteen residential units, 274,000 square feet of retail space, 109,000 square feet of commercial space, and 1,021 parking spaces (Renz, 3/19/03). The development has already become the largest taxpayer in Mashpee as well as the town’s biggest employer.

Chace and Storrs continuously modify the plans to accommodate the community’s needs and remain in contact with Duany and Plater-Zyberk. The development team seeks not only financial profit. Rather, they want to provide Mashpee with a town center and ensure that the end result of the project is something they can be proud of orchestrating (Storrs, 2003). Storrs believes one indication of the project’s success is that it is now being referred to not as Mashpee Commons, but simply Mashpee, and has truly become the center of the town.
Table 3: Mashpee Commons Project Profile

Project Profile

Design:
- High Density New Urbanist style downtown
  - Mixed Uses: 30 Acres
    - Retail Space: square feet
    - Office Space: square feet
    - Residential Space: rental apartments and town homes
    - Parking: spaces
  - New England village-type atmosphere
  - Traditional New England architecture inspired by historic downtowns

Cultural Assets:
- Post office
- Fire Station
- Police Office
- Public Library
- Christ the King Parish church
- Movie Theatre: eight screens.

Economics:
- Private funding

(http://www.mashpeecommons.com/mashcomlp/images/about/hoytslg.jpeg 2/24/03)
Summary

As seen in these two case studies, there exists a common approach to the development of greyfields for community revitalization. Both projects relied on a mixed-use environment built with pedestrian accessibility and integrated civic uses. New Urbanism design theory was adapted to fit the unique sites and in each case helped to foster a sense of place by contributing character-defining features that hearken back to older established villages. Although each project is of different size, as seen in Table 4, they applied similar treatments to accomplish successful redevelopment.

Table 4: Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Previous Use</th>
<th>Site Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Retail (s.f)</th>
<th>Office (s.f)</th>
<th>Civic Uses</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mashpee Commons</td>
<td>New Seabury Shopping Center</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>247,000</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>Post Office, Fire and Police stations, town library, church</td>
<td>13 currently additional units planned</td>
<td>1,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizner Park</td>
<td>Boca Raton Mall</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>262,000</td>
<td>Boca Raton Art Museum, amphitheater, concert hall</td>
<td>274 rental</td>
<td>2,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Root, 2/28/03; Renz 3/19/03)

One aspect of development both projects struggled with was accommodating parking in a pedestrian-friendly environment. New Urbanism design stresses the need to take the focus off of the automobile. However, one typically travels to developments such as Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons via cars. Thus, the development had to accommodate cars, yet not make them the focus.

Mizner Park’s parking garages provide adequate parking and attempt to hide the cars from public view. The on street parking is strategically used allow the public access to the main stores on the promenade. Efforts were also made to buffer the parking garages from the surrounding neighborhoods, and make them visually appealing.
Mashpee Commons is ringed by large parking lots. Development regulations on Cape Cod prohibit parking garages, which leaves developers with few options. The first thing one sees when approaching Mashpee Commons are the large parking lots. Efforts could have been made to hide the parking lots from public view. For example, the downtown village of Celebration, Florida, has many large parking lots, yet they are well hidden by rings of surrounding buildings. The developers could have incorporated such design aspects into Mashpee Commons, which would have de-emphasized the parking lots.

Fundamental redevelopment practices were successfully used in both locations. New Urbanist designs, mixed-uses, and aesthetic improvements contributed to successful redevelopments. Greyfield redevelopment is important because the sites play important roles in influencing the feeling of community stability, and thus redevelopment can have enormous impacts towards improving the surroundings. Finally, as a result of this information, this researcher is able to discern principles of greyfield redevelopment that are vital for communities considering such projects.

Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons contributed to community revitalization because they turned greyfield eyesores into assets. Mizner Park’s redevelopment sparked widespread revitalization and was a key element in the downtown’s renaissance. Mashpee Commons’ redesign created a downtown for a town that lacked an identity and sense of community. Although a plethora of redevelopment options exist, these two case studies illustrate the great potential of greyfield redevelopment for community revitalization.
CHAPTER 5
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Virtually every older suburban town has at least one shopping center; unfortunately some are failing or at risk of doing so in the upcoming years. The wide-reaching impact of such greyfields negatively affects surrounding areas because blight telegraphs decline, economic distress, and ultimately failure. However, greyfields may be assets in disguise that provide opportunities for community revitalization.

As communities focus their efforts on improving the quality of life for residents, it is only natural that they would consider methods of redeveloping distressed properties. Greyfields are prime sites because they are frequently large developments that can be expanded or completely redeveloped to create a healthy village-type development. Greyfield redevelopment is becoming more common across the United States as planners and developers work to revitalize suburban communities and utilize infill sites. To exploit our resources fully, moribund shopping centers must be addressed in a way that not only revives the site but also stimulates other integral facets of the community.

Greyfield Redevelopment Recommendations

Greyfield redevelopment can be a powerful revitalization technique for communities. Out of the case study analysis come the following nine recommendations for greyfield redevelopment:

1. Establish Partnerships
2. Invest in Community and Civic Uses
3. Integrate mixed-uses
4. Utilize regional architecture
5. Foster a sense of place
6. Recognize resident concerns
7. Establish connections
8. Address individual community needs.
9. Be Flexible and Creative

Although new design methods in retail development are emerging and are being applied on various greyfield sites, such as The Block at Orange in California, such applications do not have proven long term sustainability. These recommendations can be used as building blocks on which to establish a redevelopment plan.

Establish Partnerships

In order for a greyfield redevelopment to take place it is often necessary to establish a public-private partnership. The public frequently has clear ideas of what they want to accomplish to aid community revitalization efforts. However, land and development costs are often prohibitive of any work taking place. Fostering partnerships between the public and private sector can allow for redevelopment by using private funding to accomplish public objectives. A private developer must be willing to work with community officials, as seen in Mizner Park, in order to accomplish the redevelopment in a way that respects the public good.

Additionally, public officials have to remain willing to assist private sector developers. Public officials can contribute to a portion of the financing through the establishment of Community Redevelopment Districts, recommended by planners from Mizner Park, and Business Improvement Zones. Planners must remain open to considering zoning alternatives, including mixed-use codes that can aid private developers. For example, planners were resistant to alternative zoning codes in Mashpee Commons, which hindered progress of the residential component. It is vital to clearly define what lies in the best interest of community revitalization efforts, and then foster
partnerships to implement the project effectively. The Urban Land Institute also advocates partnerships as a method of building consensus and encouraging responsible development practices (Beyard and Pawluliewicz, 2001:2).

**Invest in Community and Civic Uses**

Integrating community and civic uses, such as an art museum or library, in a greyfield redevelopment enriches a project. Civic and cultural establishments attract a range of visitors that otherwise may not frequent the site for its retail, residential or office uses. Although such uses are not the financial powers of a project, they represent aspects of community that contribute to long-term viability because museums and libraries are thought of as permanent fixtures in a community.

Both Mashpee Commons and Mizner Park incorporated civic uses into their redevelopment projects. The post office, library, and church in Mashpee Commons are institutions that one expects to find in a traditional downtown, which the developers were trying to establish. In Mizner Park, the art museum and amphitheater are community assets that were previously inexistent on Boca Raton. Civic uses support the retail sector by increasing foot traffic throughout the development and enrich the dynamic character of a development.

The following ideas include additional cultural and civic uses that can be incorporated into greyfield redevelopments:

- Performing Arts Center
- Festival Series (art, food, wine, music)
- University or college extension branch
- Artists in residence programs with gallery space
- Community hall/ recreation space
- Small business incubator
Integrate Mixed-Uses

Mixed-uses are a key aspect of greyfield redevelopment. As seen in Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons, as well as current greyfield redevelopments, incorporating mixed-uses guides the development of the project. Office space, retail stores, community spaces and residential units create a vibrant development that is diversified to ensure continued success.

A fundamental component of greyfield redevelopment is the retail component, which plays an important role in mixed-use. Retail is a key component of a healthy mixed-use environment. However, the retail component of the greyfield site had previously failed, as evidenced by PwC’s study that showed high vacancy and low sales. Incorporating a variety of retail establishments can help ensure durability in the redevelopment.

National, regional, and local retailers contribute to the economic feasibility of a greyfield redevelopment in very different ways, which makes it even more important to incorporate each type. National chains, such as the Gap, are widely recognizable. National retailers also have the financial capability to afford higher rents and occupy larger stores; therefore one third of the retail should be delegated to national tenants. Regional retailers make up an additional one third of the retail components. The stores may exist in other locations in the immediate region and they provide a unique regional influence and character to the development. Finally, reserving the remaining space for local businesses, such as Chance and Storrs did with their small twenty-four foot deep stores, fosters a sense of local investment in the development. Communities that have strong locally owned businesses signify a healthy local economy, which can be accomplished by including local businesses in a redeveloped greyfield.
**Utilize Regional Architecture**

When considering architectural styles to guide redevelopment, regional architectural style should be given consideration. Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons utilized unique, regionally specific architectural styles that enabled the developments to blend in with their surroundings. If, for example, the two developments switched places, both would look grossly out of place.

Greyfields frequently suffer from poor aesthetics as a result of age and decline. The characteristic concrete “big-box” design could be located anywhere, and does not enrich or reflect the existing character of the location. Improving the aesthetics is a key element of their redevelopment and can also contribute to community revitalization efforts by incorporating regional styles. Regional architecture is a marketable factor that can enrich the visitor’s experience, and contribute to a sense of place and character.

In addition to the building exteriors design should reflect the street pattern and diversity of architectural size and scale that is typically found in a historic town. The gradual evolution of town results in a variety of building typologies that were built to meet the present need. Incorporating such individual aspects, as seen in Mashpee commons, lends a sense of character and establishment to the development.

Design can be addressed through the use of pattern books and the establishment of design guidelines. Planners must play a role in the development of such elements because private development does not always place design in the highest regard. To generate such guidelines, planners can facilitate visioning seminars, design charettes, and community workshops that allow residents to express opinions for the development. Private architectural firms and development companies may also coordinate with
planners to form additional design partnerships to ensure the end results reflects the location and goals of the community.

**Foster a Sense of Place**

Sense of place is an elusive term. One knows locations that embody a sense of place, yet applying a definition is almost impossible. Quaint New England villages, thriving Main Street, and prospering downtowns have a sense of place; typical strip malls and failing shopping centers do not. The term is often applied when discussing community revitalization because fostering a sense of place can greatly improve the community “feel” of a location.

New Urbanism design principles can contribute to development that affords a sense of place. By utilizing elements such as public green spaces and pedestrian scale buildings that encourage community interactions a greyfield can be transformed into a special location that feels like a true community.

**Recognize Resident Concerns**

Redeveloping sites that are in the public eye is liable to raise concerns regarding what is best for the community. It is rare that a community can undergo a redevelopment project without some resident concern because people’s opinions can vary greatly over what they want in their town or city.

The developers of Mashpee Commons faced challenges in response to residents’ concerns over growth and development. To address such concerns, the developers worked with the town and regional planning agency to educate others on their development ideas. The design charrette, held by Duany and Plater-Zyberk, also contributed to establishing a positive relationship with residents because it accounted for their opinions.
Establishing communication with residents is an important process for development undertaken by the public or private sector. Hosting visioning seminars, charettes, and town meetings can greatly improve relationships with residents and increases the developers understanding of the needs of the community.

**Establish Connections**

Greyfields exist in a context and the surrounding environment should be addressed when formulating redevelopment plans. For example, Mizner Park consciously developed town homes on the edge of an established neighborhood to screen the parking garages. Developing a greyfield in a manner that establishes a street and building pattern in respect to the locale contributes to the businesses’ integration with the street, nearby surrounding neighborhoods, and other commercial establishments when formulating plans. Allowing for connections between the existing context and redeveloped site can further community revitalization efforts by allowing for a ripple effect emanating out from the greyfield core. As seen in Mizner Park, the effects of the redeveloped site led to widespread community revitalization, fostered by the connection of the development to the surrounding area.

**Address Individual Community Needs**

Every community has unique needs, and as a result, there is no set redevelopment plan that can be applied to every greyfield. Rather, communities must work with planners and developers to create a redevelopment plan that will benefit the revitalization efforts underway. For example, a greyfield may be just one element in a much larger redevelopment area, and thus it should be addressed in relation to its surroundings so that it can contribute to the work taking place. Or, a greyfield may be a stand-alone strip mall that a community must work to revitalize into a location that benefits rather than detracts
from their town. Greyfield redevelopment presents unique challenges and assets that should be addressed in a manner appropriate to the area.

**Be Flexible and Creative**

Community redevelopment practices must constantly be adapted to meet the planners, developers, and citizens needs. Undertaking a greyfield redevelopment can be complex and one must remain flexible in order to accommodate changes as they arise. Both case studies illustrate the importance of this recommendation. Mizner Park changed development strategies as their partnerships were established, and community needs were expressed. Mashpee Commons has remained flexible in their implementation due to changing development regulation and community opinions regarding growth and development. Had either project not been as flexible, to change, then the projects may not have evolved to be the dynamic environments they are today.

Creativity is a fundamental component of design. However, creativity in development can be lacking. Planners should be open to considering ideas that allow developments to be implemented in a manner that accomplishes the goals of the project. For example, Chance and Storrs creatively categorized the roads through Mashpee Commons as parking lot access roads, and not arteries in order to implement their design. This solution may not have been the first choice of the developer, but it was an effective solution to their problem. Thinking “outside the box” and implementing creative designs greatly improves greyfield sites and leads to dynamic environments.

**Opportunities for Future Research**

Communities seeking to undergo such projects do not have a great deal of resources to guide their process. Although this analysis provides recommendations that may be useful for some communities, it is not a standardized process. Further research is
needed regarding greyfields of other sizes, such as small strip malls, including
recommendations for their redevelopment. Additionally, the historic preservation
implications of such work should be considered. The primary opportunities for future
research are further discussed and interface with the existing body of knowledge to
provide a comprehensive view of the type and implication of different types of
development.

**Greyfields of Every Size**

The report conducted by PwC was the first comprehensive look at the greyfield
problem many communities are facing. Although the report only addresses regional
malls, it alludes to the fact that mall decline is prevalent at every scale and thus it has a
far-reaching negative impact on communities.

Regional mall revitalization strategies and research has the potential to be applied
to different sizes and categories of malls. The large size of regional malls, for example,
is ideally suited to the recommendations of this research. Mashpee Commons, although
previously a smaller neighborhood center, was surrounded by ample land owned by the
developer, which permitted treatment as if it were a regional mall. However, in some
urban infill cases, such land may not be available, and thus different approaches would
have to be applied. Additional research is needed on greyfield redevelopment strategies
for neighborhood enters, strip malls, and vacant big box retail and department store
establishments, all of which negatively affect community revitalization efforts.

**Historic Preservation and Rehabilitation**

The redevelopment of buildings that are approaching fifty-year old status presents
the challenge of discerning what is of historic value, and what warrants preservation,
restoration, and rehabilitation. Historic preservation no longer applies to storied mansions
and historic battlefields; the landscape of post-World War II America can also be considered of historic importance because it represents a time of significant growth and social development.

Historic preservation and restoration debates plague post-World War II architecture. It is difficult for society to apply value to fifty-year old buildings, in comparison to pre-colonial structures valued for their significance. Yet, without preservation considerations, which may have seemed radical at the time, those buildings would have been lost as well. Granting historic status to buildings also makes the developer eligible for tax credits, which is a lucrative incentive if one is willing to work within the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. As a result, historic preservation issues should be considered when evaluating greyfield projects, and when formulating principles to guide redevelopment.

An early shopping center has the potential to have architecturally significant features, which may warrant restoration, although the accuracy of such work must be addressed. Just as art deco buildings have been embraced in South Miami Beach, Florida, and restored to their former glory, features on shopping centers can also be restored to reestablish the character of the building, which may still be appealing.

Although not all malls can be considered of historic value, the implications of mass teardowns must be considered. According to Norman Tyler (2000:97),

[R]elatively new buildings that need recognition include the fast disappearing examples of roadside commercial structures, such as diners, motels, and even an early McDonald’s restaurant built in 1953 in Downey, California. These building types need to be identified and protected as important elements of our mid-twentieth-century lifestyle, with the best being designated.

Preservation at this stage may also mean preserving the communities that have evolved around the mall. David Hay (1995:44) notes, in *Preservation* magazine, “In many cases,
resuscitating malls means preserving the integrity of the communities that surround them.” If malls are all bulldozed to make way for new community-focused hubs, what is society at risk of losing?

**Conclusion**

The lack of literature available signifies the need for additional research regarding greyfield redevelopment. This thesis addresses one of the needs, which concerns how greyfield redevelopment contributes to community revitalization. It was found that distressed shopping centers that negatively affect surrounding areas can be catalysts for community revitalization.

Through the review of two primary case studies, the researcher determined that greyfield sites can be transformed from characterless failing shopping centers to thriving community centers. Both Mizner Park and Mashpee Commons were redeveloped as part of a larger plan. In Boca Raton, the city needed to address widespread blight and redeveloped Mizner to act as a downtown anchor with mixed uses, including a growing cultural center. Mashpee Commons transformed a strip mall into the village center, complete with the town’s post office, library, fire and police station. Both cases are testaments to the great redevelopment possibilities that exist in suburban greyfields.

The nine recommendations for greyfield redevelopment highlight effective practices that have been successfully employed in other locations and have endured over ten years. The recommendations may be particularly useful to communities because they do not prescribe a set design pattern or template for redevelopment. Rather, the individual site and community needs define the greyfield redevelopment, while the recommendations act as a guide.
Community revitalization efforts have the power to transform failing suburban environments. Utilizing infill properties such as greyfields, sprawl can be curtailed, and the community can be restored to a healthy functional locale. Continuing to explore methods of revitalization, such as redeveloping greyfields, provides opportunities that may have been previously unrecognized. As future greyfield redevelopments come of age, they may follow in the footsteps of Mashpee Commons and Mizner Park and prove to be vital tools in community revitalization.
APPENDIX A
CHARTER OF THE NEW URBANISM

The Region: Metropolis, City, and Town

1. Metropolitan regions are finite places with geographic boundaries derived from topography, watersheds, coastlines, farmlands, regional parks, and river basins. The metropolis is made of multiple centers that are cities, towns, and villages, each with its own identifiable center and edges.

2. The metropolitan region is a fundamental economic unit of the contemporary world. Governmental cooperation, public policy, physical planning, and economic strategies must reflect this new reality.

3. The metropolis has a necessary and fragile relationship to its agrarian hinterland and natural landscapes. The relationship is environmental, economic, and cultural. Farmland and nature are as important to the metropolis as the garden is to the house.

4. Development patterns should not blur or eradicate the edges of the metropolis. Infill development within existing urban areas conserves environmental resources, economic investment, and social fabric, while reclaiming marginal and abandoned areas. Metropolitan regions should develop strategies to encourage such infill development over peripheral expansion.

5. Where appropriate, new development contiguous to urban boundaries should be organized as neighborhoods and districts, and be integrated with the existing urban pattern. Noncontiguous development should be organized as towns and villages with their own urban edges, and planned for a jobs/housing balance, not as bedroom suburbs.

6. The development and redevelopment of towns and cities should respect historical patterns, precedents, and boundaries.

7. Cities and towns should bring into proximity a broad spectrum of public and private uses to support a regional economy that benefits people of all incomes. Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the region to match job opportunities and to avoid concentrations of poverty.

8. The physical organization of the region should be supported by a framework of transportation alternatives. Transit, pedestrian, and bicycle systems should maximize access and mobility throughout the region while reducing dependence upon the automobile.
9. Revenues and resources can be shared more cooperatively among the municipalities and centers within regions to avoid destructive competition for tax base and to promote rational coordination of transportation, recreation, public services, housing, and community institutions.

**Neighborhood, District, and Corridor**

1. The neighborhood, the district, and the corridor are the essential elements of development and redevelopment in the metropolis. They form identifiable areas that encourage citizens to take responsibility for their maintenance and evolution.

2. Neighborhoods should be compact, pedestrian-friendly, and mixed-use. Districts generally emphasize a special single use, and should follow the principles of neighborhood design when possible. Corridors are regional connectors of neighborhoods and districts; they range from boulevards and rail lines to rivers and parkways.

3. Many activities of daily living should occur within walking distance, allowing independence to those who do not drive, especially the elderly and the young. Interconnected networks of streets should be designed to encourage walking, reduce the number and length of automobile trips, and conserve energy.

4. Within neighborhoods, a broad range of housing types and price levels can bring people of diverse ages, races, and incomes into daily interaction, strengthening the personal and civic bonds essential to an authentic community.

5. Transit corridors, when properly planned and coordinated, can help organize metropolitan structure and revitalize urban centers. In contrast, highway corridors should not displace investment from existing centers.

6. Appropriate building densities and land uses should be within walking distance of transit stops, permitting public transit to become a viable alternative to the automobile.

7. Concentrations of civic, institutional, and commercial activity should be embedded in neighborhoods and districts, not isolated in remote, single-use complexes. Schools should be sized and located to enable children to walk or bicycle to them.

8. The economic health and harmonious evolution of neighborhoods, districts, and corridors can be improved through graphic urban design codes that serve as predictable guides for change.

9. A range of parks, from tot-lots and village greens to ball fields and community gardens, should be distributed within neighborhoods. Conservation areas and open lands should be used to define and connect different neighborhoods and districts.
Block, Street, and Building

1. A primary task of all urban architecture and landscape design is the physical definition of streets and public spaces as places of shared use.

2. Individual architectural projects should be seamlessly linked to their surroundings. This issue transcends style.

3. The revitalization of urban places depends on safety and security. The design of streets and buildings should reinforce safe environments, but not at the expense of accessibility and openness.

4. In the contemporary metropolis, development must adequately accommodate automobiles. It should do so in ways that respect the pedestrian and the form of public space.

5. Streets and squares should be safe, comfortable, and interesting to the pedestrian. Properly configured, they encourage walking and enable neighbors to know each other and protect their communities.

6. Architecture and landscape design should grow from local climate, topography, history, and building practice.

7. Civic buildings and public gathering places require important sites to reinforce community identity and the culture of democracy. They deserve distinctive form, because their role is different from that of other buildings and places that constitute the fabric of the city.

8. All buildings should provide their inhabitants with a clear sense of location, weather and time. Natural methods of heating and cooling can be more resource-efficient than mechanical systems.

9. Preservation and renewal of historic buildings, districts, and landscapes affirm the continuity and evolution of urban society.

(Leccese and McCormick eds., 1999: vi)
APPENDIX B
CURRENT GREYFIELD REDEVELOPMENTS

City Center

Location: Englewood, Colorado

Type: Mixed Use

Costs: $16.7 million public/ $123 million private

Completion: Construction ongoing. (Sobel et al., 2001)

The Cinderella City Shopping Mall, which was the largest mall west of the Mississippi River, opened in 1968 with 275 shops and 7,000 parking spaces (Sobel et al., 2001). The mall went into decline in the mid-1980s due to competition from newer regional malls in the vicinity (Sobel et al., 2001:62). In 1994 the city of Denver began holding community meetings to determine the future of the site, and partnered with Calthorpe Associates to plan a new mixed-use transit oriented development.

Upon completion, the new fifty-five acre mixed-use redevelopment will have 438 to 450 apartments, 25,000 square feet of office space, a civic center, 460,000 square feet of retail space (of which 130,000 square feet are located in the new Wal-mart) (Valenti, 2002; Sobel et al., 2001). A unique aspect to this redevelopment is the connection established to downtown Denver via train. Attention to transportation is an important aspect for redevelopment to ensure connectivity with the surrounding environment.

The Crossings

Location: Mountain View, California
**Type:** Residential Development

**Costs:** unknown

**Completion:** 1998 (Sobel et al., 2001).

Completed in 1998 as a transit-oriented mixed-income residential development by Calthorpe Associates, this diverse residential neighborhood replaced a dilapidated strip mall. Rather than incorporating mixed-uses, the neighborhood is within a short walk to existing shopping centers and a CalTrain commuter station (Valenti, 2002:1). In response to the need for housing in the area, the developer (The Plymouth Group) sought to rebuild the site as neighborhood, including fifteen percent of units reserved for affordable housing (Sobel et al., 2001).

**Eastgate Town Center**

**Location:** Brainerd, Tennessee

**Type:** Mixed Use

**Costs:** $250,000 public/ $35 million private

**Completion:** Phase I complete (Sobel et al., 2001).

Also a victim of new mall development, the Eastgate Mall opened in the 1960s and declined in the 1980’s as a result of the opening of the Hamilton Place Mall in the newer suburbs (Creating Quality Places, Retrieved 2/23/03). The Chattanooga-Hamilton County Regional Planning Agency partnered with the architectural firm Dover-Kohl and Partners to develop a revitalization plan for the site. The mixed-use plan was formulated after a community design charette. Construction began in June 2001 and when complete the site will resemble a town center, complete with a grid street pattern, neighborhoods, and office park, and landscaped public spaces (Creating Quality Places, Retrieved 2/23/03). Housing is planned for a later stage of development.
Winter Park Village

**Location:** Winter Park, Florida

**Type:** Mixed Use

**Costs:** $64 million private

**Completion:** Construction ongoing; opened in 1999 (Sobel et al., 2001).

The Winter Park Village is located in the affluent Orlando suburb of Winter Park, Florida, on the site of a 1960s style, 500,000 square foot mall that had fallen victim to the competition of larger regional shopping centers and the popular main street in the town. Fearing that yet another shopping mall would be built on the greyfield site, the town’s planning agency met with a private developer and explored different opportunities and methods of redevelopment. In 1997, the architectural and planning firms Dover, Kohl & Partners, Glatting Jackson Kercher Lopez Anglin Rinehart, and Gibbs Planning Group devised a redevelopment plan of the mall to transform the site into an urban village.

Don M. Casto, a private development organization, implemented the plan and has since completed phase one, to create the Winter Park Village, which consists primarily of retail establishments, a twenty-screen movie theatre, and some apartments over the stores. Don Martin, Winter Park’s planning director, commented on the success of the project and believes that they could have built a third story for additional residential units because they have proven so popular, and the site could use additional parking (2/23/03). Construction of phase two has recently begun and will include the transformation of a vacant department store into housing as well as additional retail.

City Place

**Location:** Long Beach, California

**Type:** Mixed Use (no office space planned)
Costs: $18.392 million public/ $56 million private

Completion: Construction ongoing (Sobel et al., 2001).

To meet the need for additional housing in this highly urbanized environment, a private development corporation is constructing 358 apartments and seventy lofts on what used to be Long Beach Plaza (Sobel et al., 2001). The redevelopment plan incorporates 478,000 square feet of retail, underneath the residential units, which results in vertical mixed uses, a useful approach to maximize the use of space on the twelve-acre site.

The Village of Rochester Hills

Location: Rochester Hills, Michigan

Type: Retail

Costs: unknown

Completion: Complete in 2002

Located in an affluent suburb of Detroit, the Village of Rochester Hills was built in September 2002 and provides a town center that the area formerly lacked. A new 375,000 square foot redevelopment was constructed on the former site of a twenty-six year old 150,000 square foot Meadowbrook Village mall that the owner had been trying to revitalize since the early 1990s (Boswell, 2001). Developed and advertised as a “lifestyle center,” the site virtually turned the mall inside out to create an outdoor marketplace-style shopping experience; the pedestrian scale project features double-loaded streets, and a small green space complete with benches for relaxing (Boswell, 2001:28). The Village of Rochester Hills is surrounded by residential neighborhoods and it does not include additional residential units or office spaces in its design (Boswell, 2001:28). This redevelopment is an example of a single-use approach, which meets the
needs of some communities who cannot establish or obtain zoning ordinances to allow
mixed-use development.

The Block at Orange

Location: Orange, California

Type: Retail

Costs: unknown

Completion: Completed in 1998

Representing the redevelopment trend of recreating the urban block, The Block at
Orange is an entertainment and retail complex that devotes only thirty percent of its space
to tenants selling conventional soft and hard goods (McCloud, 1999). The majority of the
811,000 square foot center is devoted to the thirty-screen movie theatre, restaurants, and
interactive game centers (Seigel, 1999; McCloud, 1999).

The Block, as it is commonly known, was built in 1998 on the site of a mall built
in 1957. The Mills Corporation had undertaken such redevelopment projects before and
sought to build an urban streetscape destination in a suburban location (Seigel,
1999:112). “The Block at Orange, as well as future Blocks in other locations, will be
designed to evoke the essence of America’s great city blocks like Times Square,
Michigan Avenue, Rodeo Drive, and South Beach” (Seigel, 1999:112). The
redevelopment is designed to emulate an urban center with stores opening to the sidewalk
(McCloud, 1999). Although the developer strives to create an urban atmosphere and has
revitalized the retail component of a greyfield site, the fact that the same method is being
applied elsewhere in a standardized fashion does not contribute to meeting individual
communities’ unique needs, which can ultimately limit success.
The Mashpee Commons neighborhood represents the commercial center of the community.
This central core is bounded by Route 28 on the east, Route 151 to the north, the Police and Fire Station, Town Library and Christ the King Church to the west.
This neighborhood consists of 29.9 acres of land. It is zoned C-1 Commercial.
The plan for the 3 block central core of the project was approved in 1986.
The permit provides for 36 mixed use buildings with a footprint of 255,000 square feet (many will be 2-story buildings) and up to 100 dwelling units.

To date, there has been 97,923 square feet of retail, 24,505 of restaurant, 36,415 of office and 13,250 of theatre space. Approximately 42,288 square feet retail space is currently under construction.
(http://www.groupquick.com/mashpeecommons/directory.htm, 2/23/03)
The East Steeple Street neighborhood will reflect the vernacular established in the existing neighborhoods of Mashpee Commons and North Market Street. Two-story buildings will front on the extension of Steeple Street and a commercial street forming the connection to Donna's Lane. These streets intersect at an internal village green, which will be enclosed by buildings with first floor retail, restaurant and office space and apartments on the upper floors. A combination of on-street parking and off-street lots behind buildings will support the uses in this neighborhood.

- This neighborhood is bounded by Route 28, Great Neck Road South and Donna's Lane.
- The Local Comprehensive Plan designates this parcel as being in the Growth Center.
- The property has 19 acres zoned C-1/SV allowing for commercial development.
- This neighborhood will be developed using the Town's Commercial Center Bylaw.
- The plan calls for approximately 35,000 square feet of office, 135,000 square feet of retail and 10,000 square feet of restaurant space. The plan includes a 120-room hotel and 40 apartments.
- The buildings will be a combination of one- and two-story structures.
- East Steeple Street terminates at the entrance to the Boch Center for Performing Arts.

(http://www.mashpeecommons.com/mashcomlp/map1.htm, 2/23/03)
The Jobs Fishing Road neighborhood will provide for a true mix of all types of commercial and residential units interspersed throughout the neighborhood. This neighborhood will be connected to the adjacent neighborhoods of Mashpee Commons, Whitings Road and East Steeple Street via a series of interconnecting streets. The neighborhood consists of a mix of fee-simple townhouses, apartments, retail, office, restaurant and civic space. Internal pocket parks are provided throughout the neighborhood. Apartment buildings and residential units over shops will enhance the character of the neighborhood.

- This property has 25.5 acres of land and is zoned C-1 commercial development.
- The Town's Open Space Incentive Development Bylaw will be used to develop this parcel.
- Commercial plans include 63,000 square feet of office; 8,600 square feet of civic; 30,500 square feet of retail; and 10,000 square feet of restaurant. There are 20 bed & breakfast rooms proposed.
- Residential plans include 142 units ranging from one-bedroom apartments to three bedroom townhouses.

(http://www.mashpeecommons.com/mashcomlp/map2.htm, 2/23/03)
North Market Street Neighborhood

The North Market Street West neighborhood focuses retail uses around a small village green. This neighborhood will be centered on the existing Picabo Street which parallels Route 151 and will connect to the Fire and Police access road at the west end. One- and two-story buildings with offices and apartments on the upper floors will front along this internal street with parking located to the rear and sides of the buildings. Connections to existing neighborhoods will occur at signalized intersections at Market Street and Jobs Fishing Road across Route 151.

- The North Market Street neighborhood totals 19.9 acres. It is zoned C-1 Commercial.
- Primary frontage is along Route 151.
- Phase 1 includes 12.38 acres governed by a Special Permit and DRI approval granted in 1993.
- Phase 1 consists of 92,000 square feet of retail, bank, and office space. 82,000 square feet has been constructed.
- Phase 2 is approximately 7.5 acres that are currently undergoing permitting.
- Phase 2 includes 85,000 square feet of building footprint in a variety of smaller buildings. There will be a mix of retail, and restaurant space. A number of the buildings will be two-story.

(http://www.mashpeecommons.com/mashcomlp/map4.htm, 2/23/03)
Whiting Road Neighborhood

Whitings Road will be developed primarily as a single-family residential neighborhood. It will be designed to promote a sense of community through clearly identifiable blocks around which the houses will be oriented. Houses of various types and sizes (some with accessory units) will front on the street with front and side yards. Several parks and significant open space will be set aside to provide the residents with visual and functional access to natural areas. Significant dedicated open space conservation land will be set aside along the Quashnet River and behind the Christ the King Church.

- This parcel has 40 acres of land zoned R-3 and R-5 residential development.
- The Open Space Incentive Development (OSID) Bylaw will be used for Whitings Road.
- Approximately 11.5 acres along the Quashnet River will be protected as open space.
- The plan calls for 90 single-family units and up to 30 one-bedroom accessory units.
- Development rights will be transferred from the Great Neck Road South parcel.

(http://www.mashpeecommons.com/mashcomlp/map3.htm, 2/23/03)
Trout Pond Neighborhood

The Trout Pond neighborhood includes a mix of residential and neighborhood office and retail uses along a series of internal roads. Dedicated open space around Trout Pond will allow visual and interpretive access. This neighborhood will be enhanced by the Boch Center for Performing Arts at the terminus of East Steeple Street.

- This property consists of 52.7 acres and is zoned C-1, allowing for commercial development.
- Approximately 7.2 acres are water or wetland comprising Trout Pond.
- The Open Space Incentive Development (OSID) Bylaw will be used for this neighborhood.
- The Mashpee Commons Wastewater Treatment Plant is located on this parcel.
- 9 +/- acres will be donated for the Boch Center for Performing Arts.
- The plan includes approximately 45,000 square feet retail, 40,000 square feet office, 52 apartments and 26 townhouses.
- 21 +/- acres will be placed in permanently protected open space around Trout Pond.

(http://www.mashpeecommmons.com/mashcomlp/map6.htm, 2/23/03)
APPENDIX E
INTERVIEWS

The following people were interviewed for this study.
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