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DURING THE LAST WEEKEND IN JANUARY, 21 students and 13 faculty and design professionals met at the University of Georgia’s Center for Community Design & Preservation (CCDP) to explore innovative design techniques for affordable housing through a design charrette. A component of the College of Environment and Design, the CCDP provides Public Service and Outreach for communities in need of high quality design services without the funds to hire private design firms. The CCDP’s mission is to provide service learning experiences for students in landscape architecture, historic preservation and environmental planning and by utilizing a mix of faculty, professional staff and students, professional quality design work is produced.

By partnering with Athens Land Trust (ALT) – whose mission is to promote quality of life through integration of community and the natural environment by preserving land, creating energy-efficient and affordable housing, and revitalizing neighborhoods – the CCDP has a unique opportunity to conduct innovative research that will investigate the effectiveness of site design for affordable housing.

ATHENS LAND TRUST
A DESIGN PROGRAM for AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Cottages at Cannontown is proposed as an “infill” subdivision in Athens, Georgia. Located off of North Avenue on Bray Street, it is within walking distance of downtown Athens and many local services. The property had been subdivided and platted by a developer and “flipped” several times before it was foreclosed last year. ALT purchased the property and has finished the infrastructure improvements partially constructed by past owners.

The finished development will have 15 single-family homes available to purchase by low-to-moderate income first-time home buyers; the target for completion of the first five homes is the end of 2012. The project is less than a half mile from a local elementary school, Boys and Girls Club, a city park, a job center, pharmacies, a grocery store, and many other retail shops. Two bus lines stop within a block of the site, and two major centers of employment, the downtown district and an industrial park, are within a one mile radius from the site.

Figure 6 - An aerial photograph of the site with the site plan overlaid on top

Figure 7 - An aerial photograph depicting the site and the greater surrounding area. The site is outlined in orange in the upper middle portion of the image
Another imperative piece of creating community is design that is intentional and socially aware. This sort of thoughtful design can be instrumental in creating community.

To encourage this sort of design, the policy & social elements group members established a framework for a design competition to encourage high-quality sustainable design. This furthers ALT objectives and also helps keep the project affordable.

The group hopes that the design competition can generate good building development in accordance with Earthcraft standards (and possibly beyond) and can encourage/build relationships with the design community in Athens. All of these designs will be built to the minimum landscape and architecture standards which will be elaborated upon in the other sections of this design program.
LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS
SITE SPECIFIC

DESIGN CHALLENGES
- Cul-de-sac diameter (96’)
- A lack of human scale

REQUIREMENTS
- One on street parking spot must be provided for each house on the cul-de-sac

DESIGN SOLUTIONS
- Create a public art & play area
- Develop a planting area with a rain garden

With a diameter of 96 feet the cul-de-sac of Cannon Drive seems disproportionately large and results in a space that seems to lack any human scale.

These conditions present a unique challenge for the ALT and potential designers. County regulations for subdivision design, requirements for on street parking, and international fire code dictate the size of the cul-de-sac. Even without the regulations it would be cost prohibitive to reduce in size. Two designs generated at the charrette, present possible mitigation methods.

Figure 83 - The lack of human scale of the cul-de-sac is evident in this image in which the cars and individuals are dwarfed by the 96’ diameter.

Figure 82 - Cannon Drive cul-de-sac detail.

Figure 84 - Panoramic view of Cannon Drive cul-de-sac taken from the stormwater detention area looking towards Bray Street.
LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS
SITE SPECIFIC

DESIGN CHALLENGES
- Cul-de-sac diameter (96')
- A lack of human scale

REQUIREMENTS
- Any center installation may not interfere with the drive lane or required on street parking spaces

DESIGN SOLUTION
- Develop a planting area with a rain garden

The first design solution proposes the installation of a rain garden within the center of the cul-de-sac. This will help mitigate stormwater runoff, create a more human scale for the space, and allow ALT to bring a more natural environment into the cul-de-sac design. This integration speaks to their desire to provide a more natural environment for community members.

Through the use of native and low or no maintenance plants, ALT can integrate more of the natural environment into constrained sites. Additionally, native and low or no maintenance plants should require little maintenance from community members or ALT.

Through an innovative design such as this, ALT can humanize the scale of the cul-de-sac while also creating a mechanism to assist in stormwater management for the site.
Using the cul-de-sac as an area for public art and an area for children to play will create a sense of place for the community. Public art can enhance public spaces, transforming the areas where we live and play into places that encourage creativity and foster community engagement and interaction. The small scale of the site and other limiting factors leave neighborhood children with little space to play but developing the cul-de-sac as a play area will mitigate this constraint and provide a common community space.

Developing the cul-de-sac as a space for the community to congregate and play brings up valid concerns regarding the safety of the space in relation to vehicular traffic. Cannon Drive is a short residential street with a low number of homes serviced. This combination allows ALT to consider nontraditional street uses, such as a Shared Street and the Netherlands woonerf. In a woonerf the standard street hierarchy is reversed. Motorists are limited to traveling at a speed no greater than a pedestrian and are legally required to yield the right of way to bicyclists and pedestrians. The Shared Street concept has evolved out of this idea although all users are considered equal. They aim to provide a better balance of the needs of all road users to improve safety, comfort, and livability.

The Shared Street method works by eschewing many of the traditional roadway treatments such as curbs, signs, and pavement markings, resulting in the distinction between different transportation modes being blurred. This introduces a level of uncertainty amongst street users that heightens their sense of awareness and requires caution and interaction with one another. These factors help to create an environment that is more comfortable, particularly for vulnerable road users who benefit from slower motor vehicle travel speeds and more attentive motorists.

The creative use of on street planters, road painting, and other visual cues Cannon Drive can be transformed as an area for public art & play. This transformation will help ALT with their mission of neighborhood revitalization, creating an area where the community can congregate and interact.
LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS

SITE SPECIFIC

DESIGN CHALLENGES
- Aesthetics, functionality, and safety of space
- Community desire for diverse uses in a small space

REQUIREMENTS
- Provide common space for community members
- Topography cannot be modified

DESIGN SOLUTIONS
- Attractive and functional plants for water retention area
- Low maintenance design (low cost for homeowners)
- Scalable design for common space

Figures 92 (below) and 93 (right) - These images depict the current condition of the stormwater management feature. In the image to the right, it can be seen that the detention pond is currently being used as a dumping site for trash and unwanted construction materials. Below, the scale of the stormwater feature can be seen in relation to the person standing on the sidewalk near the cul-de-sac (top center). These images call attention to the need for thoughtful design to mitigate the current conditions, which could persist if not addressed appropriately.
LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS

SITE SPECIFIC

DESIGN CHALLENGES
- Aesthetics, functionality, and safety of space
- Community desire for diverse uses in a small space

REQUIREMENTS
- Provide common space for community members
- Topography cannot be modified

DESIGN SOLUTIONS
- Attractive and functional plants for water retention area
- Low/no maintenance design (no cost for homeowners)
- Scalable design for common space

The stormwater management area is one of the few areas of the site which can be utilized by community members as open space. Currently, it functions solely as a stormwater management area and is a missed opportunity for use as an area for the community to congregate. Through careful and thoughtful design, ALT can redesign the stormwater feature into a common space for the community.

Through the initial public workshop that informed the charrette process, potential community members expressed a desire for an area where they can interact with one another. Due to the lack of open space, charrette participants sought to find a creative way to integrate the desire for community space within the stormwater feature.

Figures 94 (left), 95 (middle), and 96 (right) - The levels of public realm within the site are depicted to the right. Figure 94 (left) depicts the traditional public realm, which is comprised of the street, Cannon Drive. This traditional understanding of the public realm does not provide residents with any community open space. Figure 95 (middle) integrates the stormwater management area into what is considered public space, providing community members with a potential place to interact and convene. Figure 96 (right) incorporates the front yards of the housing lots as well, creating a semi-public realm which further encourages community interaction.

ATHENS LAND TRUST
A DESIGN PROGRAM FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AREA
DESIGN CHALLENGES
- Aesthetics, functionality, and safety of space
- Community desire for diverse uses in a small space

REQUIREMENTS
- Provide common space for community members
- Topography cannot be modified

DESIGN SOLUTIONS
- Attractive and functional plants for water retention area
- Low/no maintenance design (no cost for homeowners)
- Scalable design for common space

The stormwater management area is one of the few areas of the site which can be utilized by community members as open space. Currently, it functions solely as a stormwater management area and is a missed opportunity for use as an area for the community to congregate. Through careful and thoughtful design, ALT can redesign the stormwater feature into a common space for the community.

Through the initial public workshop that informed the charrette process, potential community members expressed a desire for an area where they can interact with one another. Due to the lack of open space, charrette participants sought to find a creative way to integrate the desire for community space within the stormwater feature.

Figures 94 (left), 95 (middle), and 96 (right) - The levels of public realm within the site are depicted to the right. Figure 94 (left) depicts the traditional public realm, which is comprised of the street, Cannon Drive. This traditional understanding of the public realm does not provide residents with any community open space. Figure 95 (middle) integrates the stormwater management area into what is considered public space, providing community members with a potential place to interact and convene. Figure 96 (right) incorporates the front yards of the housing lots as well, creating a semi-public realm which further encourages community interaction.
LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS
SITE SPECIFIC

This design utilizes the storm water detention facility already on site to provide a common area for residents as well as to create connections to the community. The rain garden is designed to have four components:

- A walking path circling the perimeter of the detention pond providing for exercise, seating, and views.
- A boardwalk to a deck in the center of the detention pond which can be used to view birds and other wildlife. The deck features a recessed area for seating. There is also a cut out in the middle of the deck to observe plant and wildlife from above.
- A deck projecting out from the slope in the back of the lot provides a large space, which can accommodate all residents comfortably. Seating is available and there is also potential to install raised planting beds to serve community garden needs.
- Along the side of the rain garden a path has been created to connect the development to 4th Street and the amenities available there.

Although interrelated, each part serves a unique function and is designed to be separated. Because of this one or more of the components may be developed depending on community needs and available funding. Plant selection and placement is based on a goal to achieve little to no required maintenance. It is also advised that affordable and low maintenance materials be explored (like Trex) for the construction of the decks.
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

HOUSING PROTOTYPES

Building Setbacks:
- Front—15’ (Front porch cannot encroach due to utility easement)
- Side—0’ (10’ adjacent to street)
- Rear—10’ (+1 ft./foot of building height over 20’)

Building Features:
- Envelope—Approximately 24’ x 42’
- Square feet—Approximately 860 sq. ft.
- Stories—1
- Bedrooms—2
- Bathrooms—2 minimum
- Accessibility—Full (Universal Design)
- Floor plan—Open floor plan for living spaces

Figure 168 - Prototype 1
Figure 169 - Front elevation, prototype 1
Figures 170 - 172 - These houses all represent appropriate interpretations of prototype 1

ATHENS LAND TRUST
A DESIGN PROGRAM for AFFORDABLE HOUSING

ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS
Prototype 1

COMPONENTS & PRECEDENTS

PAGE | 49
Lot 11
Size—Large (5076 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—2538 sq. ft.
Shape—Atypical (Triangular)
Driveway—762 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1776 sq. ft.

Lot 14
Size—Small (3860 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—1930 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical (Quadrilateral)
Driveway—472 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1458 sq. ft.
 prototype 2

Building Setbacks:
- Front—15’ (Front porch cannot encroach due to utility easement)
- Side—0’ (10’ adjacent to street)
- Rear—10’ (+1 ft./foot of building height over 20’)

Building Features:
- Envelope—Approximately 24’ x 40’
- Square feet—Approximately 1300 sq. ft.
- Stories—1.5
  - Ground floor: 960 sq. ft.
  - Additional floor: 340 sq. ft.
- Bedrooms—3
- Bathrooms—2 minimum
- Accessibility—ADA compliant desired on first floor
- Floor plan—Master bedroom downstairs and two bedrooms upstairs.
  One bathroom on each floor. Includes dormer.

Ground floor: 960 sq. ft.
Additional floor: 340 sq. ft.

Figures 176 - 178 - These houses represent appropriate interpretations of prototype 2
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

HOUSING PROTOTYPES

Lot 2
Size—Small (3646 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—1823 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical (Rectangular)
Driveway—588 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1235 sq. ft.

Lot 6
Size—Medium (4142 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—2071 sq. ft.
Shape—Atypical (Triangular)
Driveway—382 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1689 sq. ft.

Lot 12
Size—Medium (4930 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—2465 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical (Quadrilateral)
Driveway—762 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1703 sq. ft.

Lot 15
Size—Large (5204 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—2602 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical (Quadrilateral)
Driveway—572 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1703 sq. ft.

Page 52

Figure 179 - The lots that have been recommended for prototype 2
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Building Setbacks:
- Front—15’ (Front porch cannot encroach due to utility easement)
- Side—0’ (10’ adjacent to street)
- Rear—10’ (+1 ft/foot of building height over 25’)

Building Features:
- Envelope—Approximately 24’ x 40’ with 6’ x 18’ offset in two opposite corners
- Square feet—Approximately 1300 sq. ft.
- Stories—2
- Ground floor: 968 sq. ft.
- Additional floor: 332 sq. ft.
- Bedrooms—3
- Bathrooms—2 minimum
- Accessibility—ADA compliant if master bedroom is on entry level.
- Floor plan—One bedroom on each floor with a minimum of one bedroom on the entry level. If there is a walkout basement the entrance is on the top floor. If it is a true 2 story building the entrance is on the bottom floor.

Figures 180 - Prototype 3
Figure 181 - Side elevation, prototype 3
Figure 182 - Front elevation, prototype 3
Figure 183 - Prototype 3
Figures 184 - 187 - These houses all represent appropriate interpretations of prototype 3
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

HOUSING PROTOTYPES

Lot 7
- Size—Large (5423 sq. ft.)
- 50% lot coverage—2711.5 sq. ft.
- Shape—Typical
- Driveway—401 sq. ft.
- Maximum house footprint—2310.5 sq. ft.

Lot 8
- Size—Large (5199 sq. ft.)
- 50% lot coverage—2599.5 sq. ft.
- Shape—Typical
- Driveway—508 sq. ft.
- Maximum house footprint—2091.5 sq. ft.

Lot 9
- Size—Large (5247 sq. ft.)
- 50% lot coverage—2623.5 sq. ft.
- Shape—Atypical
- Driveway—508 sq. ft.
- Maximum house footprint—2115.5 sq. ft.

Lot 10
- Size—Medium (4592 sq. ft.)
- 50% lot coverage—2465 sq. ft.
- Shape—Typical
- Driveway—309 sq. ft.
- Maximum house footprint—2156 sq. ft.

Figure 187 - The lots that have been recommended for prototype 3
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

HOUSING PROTOTYPES

Prototype 4

Building Setbacks:
- Front—15’ (Front porch cannot encroach due to utility easement)
- Side—0’ (10’ adjacent to street)
- Rear—10’ (+1 ft./foot of building height over 25’)

Building Features:
- Envelope—Main section approximately 18’ x 36’, first floor extension approximately 16’ x 18’
- Square feet—Approximately 1300 sq. ft.
- Stories—1.5
- Ground floor: 936 sq. ft.
- Additional floor: 364 sq. ft.
- Bedrooms—3
- Bathrooms—2 minimum
- Accessibility—ADA compliant desired on the first floor.

Floor plan—If ADA compliant, master bedroom downstairs and two bedrooms upstairs. Includes dormers.

ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

Prototype 4 DESIGN

COMPONENTS & PRECEDENTS

Figures 188 - Prototype 4

Figure 189 - Front elevation, prototype 4

Figures 190 - 192 - These houses all represent appropriate interpretations of prototype 4

Figure 190

Figure 191

Figure 192
Lot 3
Size—Medium (4221 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—2110.5 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical
Driveway—389 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1721.5 sq. ft.

Lot 4
Size—Small (3354 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—1667 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical
Driveway—435 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1242 sq. ft.

Lot 5
Size—Small (3525 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—1762.5 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical
Driveway—425 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1337.5 sq. ft.

Lot 13
Size—Small (3297 sq. ft.)
50% lot coverage—1648.5 sq. ft.
Shape—Typical
Driveway—307 sq. ft.
Maximum house footprint—1341.5 sq. ft.
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

HOUSING PROTOTYPES

Lot 1

Building Setbacks:
- Front—15’ (Front porch cannot encroach due to utility easement)
- Side—0’ (10’ adjacent to street)
- Rear—10’ (+1 ft./foot of building height over 20’)

Building Features:
- At designer’s discretion to fit the difficult lot

Lot Information:
- Size—Small (3516 sq. ft.)
- 50% lot coverage—1758 sq. ft.
- Shape—Typical
- Driveway—588 sq. ft.
- Maximum house footprint—1170 sq. ft.

Figure 194 - This view of Lot 1 depicts the small and constrained site

Figure 195 - Thoughtful design needs to be given to lot 1, as the site is quite constrained due to its small size and setback requirements
The previous pages outline the results of a charrette that used the needs and wants of the community and Athens Land Trust to guide both students and design professionals through the redevelopment of Cottages at Cannontown. Through the community land trust model, ALT has found an innovative and plausible way to reuse failed subdivisions as a mechanism for affordable housing.

This redevelopment will not only help revitalize the greater neighborhood, by providing long-term homeowners, but it can provide a way for ALT to apply all portions of their mission to the community. While limiting in some ways, the already completed infrastructure and platting of lots allows ALT to focus on providing energy efficient and affordable housing rather than spending their limited funds on the design and layout of the community. Further, through thoughtful redevelopment of the stormwater management feature and street and yard plantings, ALT can better integrate the community with the natural environment with the planting of native grasses, shrubs, and trees. Finally, the redevelopment itself will help revitalize the neighborhood by removing a vacant and unused property and replacing it with thoughtful, energy-efficient, and affordable housing for Athens-Clarke County community members.

This program is provided to help potential designers better understand the process that has taken place to their involvement. While not meant to be limiting, designers are encouraged to take advantage of the information provided in the previous pages as they develop designs for Athens Land Trust.

Figure 196 - This word map represents terms used during the community input session by community members to describe different components of a home, neighborhood and community. The larger words were mentioned more frequently and should be given more consideration when designing potential houses for Cottages at Cannontown.