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ABSTRACT

Atlanta is a diverse but highly segregated city impacted by spatial injustice through uneven development and revitalization. This research project investigates how the redevelopment of Atlantic Station, a live, work, and play environment, increases spatial inequality within Atlanta, GA. Specifically, I identify how gentrification: 1) impacts the city’s socio-spatial dialects, 2) impedes on individuals’ right to the city, and 3) increases spatial injustice within Atlanta. Additionally, the purpose of this study is to explore the interaction of physical and nonphysical aspects of live, work, and play environments and how they impact the surrounding areas, and how they manifest in exclusion for people who visit. The data for this project was collected from an original survey detailing visitors’ perceptions, experiences, and feelings of and at Atlantic Station. This project also employed non-participant observations using the Public Open Spaces in Private Development Index as well as secondary data including decennial census summary files and American Community Survey five-year estimates.

Findings indicated that areas surrounding Atlantic Station were mostly consistent with Atlanta’s overall trend of gentrification and as predicted, the more exclusion visitors experienced, the less likely they were to return. Relatedly, participants expressed that authenticity, design, identity characteristics, residential and retail space contributed to feelings of exclusion. Participants also recognized and articulated concepts of destruction, gentrification, and tensions between community and consumerism within Atlantic Station. Additionally, findings indicate that Atlantic Station is a highly regulated and strictly surveilled development designed to be visibly beautiful but not physically comfortable. Study findings help pinpoint successful factors for placemaking and offers suggestions for areas where Atlantic Station could improve.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Atlanta’s history of Black political influence, numerous Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), and Black entrepreneurship and wealth (Sweet Auburn) has earned Atlanta the nickname of the “Black Mecca” (Hobson 2017). In 2018, approximately 52% of Atlanta was Black which is nearly four times the national average of Black residents in the United States (United States Census Bureau 2018). Even though Atlanta is known for Black success and draws in a substantial number of Black people it is still a highly segregated city that continues to be impacted by unequal development (Raymond, Wang, and Immergluck 2016).

Atlanta, like most cities, is intentionally spatially organized. Throughout the city’s history various tactics ranging from racial zoning and the destruction of low-income housing to urban renewal projects, and the purposeful building of highways and roads as barriers have all physically shaped the city (Bayor 1988). Unfortunately, they have also contributed, maintained, and reproduced inequalities such as sprawl and the stigmatization and disinvestment of certain neighborhoods.

The city of Atlanta is plagued by urban sprawl and the problems that come with it such as congestion, increased air pollution and energy consumption, and other detriments to one’s physical health. Consequences stemming out of urban sprawl have become an area of concern leading cities to attempt to remedy these urban problems through smart growth. As a result, public entities join with private investors to create public private partnerships where they then redesign and redevelop public spaces. One way this is accomplished is through mixed use development; a new trend where one can live, work, and play. Research suggests that mixed use developments can be segregated by race and class which can potentially result in the change of neighborhood demographics over time through displacement, influencing gentrification and the
whitening of select spaces, and increasing economic segregation (Dierwechter 2014; Markley 2018; Moos et al. 2018).

When researchers analyze gentrification and segregation, they often focus on inequality related to residential areas (Grigoryeva and Ruef 2015; Klinenberg 1999, 2002, 2015; Krivo et al. 2013; Massey and Denton 1988, 1989, 1993; Quillian 2012; Rankin and Quane 2000; Reardon et al. 2008; Schnell and Yoav 2001; Wilson 1978, 1987, 1996). Studies of public and private spheres date back to the Chicago School of Urban Sociology where scholars focused on how people interact with each other in cities. In their studies they often conclude that over time urbanites developed a blasé, indifferent or reserved outlook due to large population size and the constant rapid change of the city which led to relationships being hard to establish and thus most interactions with others became transactional rather than communal (Park 1915; Simmel 1969; Wirth 1938).

Recently, when researchers analyze public space and place, they often focus on leisure. For example, in the early 1990s, two seminal texts researched various public spaces and places: Mike Davis’s City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles (2006) and Michael Sorkin’s edited Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space (1992). These books also set the trajectory for scholars to retheorize the city. In City of Quartz, Davis (2006) analyzed transformation, over-surveillance, and destruction of public space through privatization to protect the elite from others and make way for capital accumulation. Similarly, in Variations on a Theme Park (Sorkin 1992), various authors continued to examine elite centered and dominated places and spaces such as Disneyland, malls, gentrifying neighborhoods and suburban areas. As inner cities began to gentrify, public places and spaces transformed becoming sanitized versions of themselves (Sorkin 1992). Some places and spaces even restricted and
rezoned areas to limit particular behaviors and activities of activists, protestors, and unhoused individuals (Herbert 2007; Mitchell 1997; Sorkin 1992).

Since then, Davis (2006) suggested that public space was no longer geared towards the “Olmstedian vision” where public space is a facilitator for various social classes and ethnicities to mix. Contrastingly, Elijah Anderson’s (2011) thirty year ethnography of public space in Philadelphia coins the term “cosmopolitan canopy,” a pluralistic space that allows people rest from urban tensions. A cosmopolitan canopy is an opportunity for people with vastly different backgrounds to engage with each through civility, comity, and goodwill. Anderson’s analysis of public space as a site of retreat and reprieve reveals that discrimination and racism still happen. While public space can act as a site of leisure and retreat, in a historical analysis, Don Mitchell also identified public space as a site of politics and struggle (Mitchell 1995, 2017).

In a follow-up study, Mitchell traces the history of the “end public space thesis,” ultimately revealing that public space has met its demise due to privatization (Mitchell 2017). Typically, most space and place studies either focus on people or the site. In Designs on the Public: The Private lives of New York’s Public Spaces, Kristine Miller (2007) urges urban architects, designers, and planners to move beyond just thinking about the physical design and also consider the nonphysical qualities of a space such as the legal, economic, political, and aesthetic aspects that affect a public area. These are qualities that are increasingly prevalent as public and private developments become more common.

Similar to the aforementioned scholars, I am interested in how spatial patterns affect one’s everyday experience. However, I diverge from them by exploring how residential and social leisure space and place combines to result in spatial inequality via gentrification.
Specifically, I focus on the interaction of physical and nonphysical aspects of live, work, and play environments and how they impact the surrounding areas and the people who visit.

Working within critical urban theory, the overarching concepts for this study are the socio-spatial dialect, the right to the city, and spatial (in)justice. Broadly, the socio-spatial dialectic is when geography shapes everyday social aspects of individual lives which then go on to shape their surrounding environment (Lefebvre 1976, 1991; Soja 2020). Power relations within the socio-spatial dialect can make some environments unequal, unsustainable, and non-inclusive. Lefebvre’s (1996) right to city aims to correct inequality and make cities just.

The right to the city includes two components. First, is the right to appropriation which encompasses the access, use, and enjoyment instead of ownership of the city. Second, is the right to participation when it comes to decision making and the production of urban space. For this project, I focus on the right of appropriation. A crucial component of Lefebvre’s concept is that the right to the city is not about the present city, but the future one. The right to the city aims to give those who are not privileged access to all their rights in totality. By focusing on the right to access and the use and enjoyment of live, work, and play environments, I explore how gentrification: 1) impacts the city’s socio-spatial dialects, 2) impedes on individuals’ right to the city, and 3) increases spatial injustice within urban areas.

Place research shows a wide range of how people experience residential and public areas and whether these areas are adverse or beneficial (Anderson 2011; Gay, Farinu, and Issano Jackson 2022; Grigsby 2021; Klinenberg 2018; Ocejo and Tonnelat 2014). However, with the increase of public-private partnerships revitalizing urban areas there is a missing analysis of how live, work, and play environments impact their surrounding areas and impact those who visit them. To fill this gap and offer a new perspective, I examine Atlantic Station: a live, work, and
play environment located in the City of Atlanta, Georgia as a case study where I argue that live, work, and play environments potentially increase spatial inequality within urban areas.

This research offers a new perspective first by studying a combined residential and leisure place which can expand understandings of how live, work, and play environments potentially influence gentrification and economic segregation of the immediate and surrounding areas. Second, this research highlights how inauthentic placemaking not only impacts the sociability of a development but also highlights the unequal use and enjoyment. In the following sections, I first discuss the methodological overview for this research. Next, I detail the organization of each dissertation chapter. Lastly, I briefly discuss the theoretical frameworks along with the main goals and findings of each chapter.

1.1 Study Design

This research study employs a multi-level analysis of live, work, and play environments that focuses on 1) demographic changes surrounding Atlantic Station, 2) researcher observations within Atlantic Station, and 3) public perceptions and content analysis of Atlantic Station. I track population and neighborhood characteristics before and after the development of Atlantic Station to explore whether the development potentially has spillover effects to surrounding neighborhoods. Next, I observe how Atlantic Station is surveilled, designed, made accessible and inclusive, and utilized. Lastly, I explore visitors’ levels of exclusion and their public perceptions of art visuals. Due to the exploratory nature of the research questions, this study uses both qualitative and quantitative research methods that are complimentary to each other and produce richer data. Detailed information about data sources and collection are in each chapter. In the next sections, I briefly summarize the data produced during this study.
1.2 Data Summary

Primary data collected for the research project include: 1) research non-participant observations and field notes along with digital photographs of 15 unique art panels and other visual images such as marketing, advertising, and observation photos, and 2) survey responses gathered from non-probability sampling of participants who are 18+, reside in metro Atlanta, and have visited Atlantic Station at least once since 2018. Secondary data include two decennial census summary files and five-year estimates of American Community Survey data from the U.S Census Bureau and Social Explorer.

1.3 Data Sources and Collection

1.3.1 Visitor’s Experiences and Perceptions

This study uses data from an original survey of Visitor’s Experiences and Perceptions (Appendix A) composed of Metro Atlanta residents 18 and over who have visited Atlantic Station at least once since 2018. The survey collected visitors’ perceptions, experiences, and feelings of and at Atlantic Station. Also included in the survey are questions probing respondent’s perceptions of 9 art panels from Atlantic Station’s 2018 renovations.¹ During their renovations Atlantic Station hired Vesper & Violet, an Atlanta-based art and design company, to illustrate Atlantic Station’s total transformation, rebirth and renewal. Vesper & Violet produced 15 “progressive and edgy” artistic panels spanning 1,048 feet that covered the inconvenient and overwhelming construction barricades (Sarah Adams n.d.).

¹ Out of the 15 art panels, I chose to include 9 panels in the survey. Those that were selected were either implicitly reflective of transformation and change and left room for interpretation. Panels that were not selected either provided textual information about the art project or did not leave room for interpretation.
The survey was disseminated online via social media platforms and in Georgia State University sociology courses which resulted in 181 useable responses\(^2\). Since this research study focuses on exclusion, I did not recruit study participants *at* Atlantic Station because I did not want to potentially skew data by only gathering responses from those who visit. People who feel excluded or dislike going to Atlantic Station may not visit much or at all. Within the sample, 40% of participants ranged between 25 and 34 years of age and 68% were women. Participants were highly educated with 68% of the sample having a bachelors’ degree or higher. Racially, the sample was evenly split with Black and white participants each making up 45% and Asians making up around 9%. The study sample is not representative of Atlanta’s adult population. Compared to Atlanta, the study sample includes more women, more college educated residents, and more residents between the ages of 18 and 34 (see table 1). The survey unintentionally oversampled three demographics which could potentially introduce bias into analysis and skew results.

*Table 1. Study Sample compared to Atlanta’s Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual characteristics</th>
<th>Study Sample</th>
<th>Atlanta’s population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=female)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>40.80%</td>
<td>21.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>13.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>32.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>49.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>40.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>497,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: 2020 American community survey five year estimate.

\(^2\) 26 people were removed who did not answer any questions at all, 2 who never visited Atlantic Station, and 2 who were under 18 years of age.
1.3.2 Non-Participant Observations, Field Notes, and Photographic Material

I adapted the Public Open Space in Private Development Index (POSPD) (Appendix B) (Rossini and Yiu 2020) to conduct covert nonparticipant observation. The POSPD is an instrument aimed at empirically evaluating the access and use of public spaces within private developments over four dimensions: rules and surveillance, image and design, access and territoriality, and inclusiveness and sociability. The POSPD does not evaluate race, which is an integral component of this project. Therefore, I amended it and added a fifth dimension concerning race and ethnic relations in order to include a racial analysis. In addition to the POSPD observations, I took pictures and video recordings of design and beautification elements, people, buildings, activities, and events in Atlantic Station. I also recorded general observations that included what people were doing and how they were interacting. For example, were visitors there for activities/events, restaurants, or hanging out? I conducted 42 observations between July and October 2021 on weekdays and weekends between 10am and 8pm.

1.3.3 Demographic, Economic, And Population Data

Lastly, I accessed demographic, economic, and population data for years 1990, 2000, 2007-2011, and 2016-2020 from the U.S Census Bureau and Social Explorer websites. I transferred the data and organized it by year and study area (Atlanta, Atlantic Station, and surrounding zip codes) in an Excel sheet where I analyzed the data.

1.4 Organization and Theoretical Frameworks

Chapter 2 proceeds with an overview of Atlanta history that sets up important background information for the present-day study. I then present my substantive findings in chapters 3-5, where each chapter is informed by complimentary theoretical frameworks. In

---

3 The first two time periods are decennial census periods and the last two are American Community Survey data.
Chapter 3, “It’s as if Gentrification is a Gift.” I explore if the introduction of Atlantic Station has resulted in neighborhood demographic changes or the perception of such changes. The goal of this chapter is to understand what mechanisms of gentrification are contributing to exclusion and how these concepts are interpreted within Atlantic Station.

For this chapter, I use the concept of spatial (in)justice. Specifically, I focus on how spatial (in)justice contributes to gentrification and uneven development by exploring the presence of neighborhood change brought on by Atlantic Station. In addition, I examine visitor’s perceptions of art panels around Atlantic Station. I found that the areas surrounding Atlantic Station were mostly consistent with Atlanta’s overall trend of gentrification. I also found that Atlantic Station visitors recognized and articulated concepts of destruction, gentrification, and tensions between community and consumerism.

In Chapter 4, “Emerge Unrecognizable: Design Politics in Atlantic Station,” I demonstrate how Atlanta has routinely used destruction and reinvestment as a means of rebranding and how Atlantic Station has replicated this process also through rebranding and by regulating space. The first goal of this chapter is to understand how Atlantic Station is surveilled, designed, made accessible, made inclusive, and utilized. I also specifically analyze the code of conduct to illustrate how surveillance and design limits how people enter and use pseudo public space.

For this chapter, I use Lawrence Vale’s (2013), term design politics which identifies the ways that the design and development of a site, while aesthetically pleasing, are inherently social and political acts. I also use Cedric Robinson’s (1983) concept of racial capitalism which looks at how the intertwining of racism and capitalism function together for the purpose of exploitation. I use these theoretical concepts to explore how Atlantic Station visitors are invited
into the space, how design controls how they use the space, and how exclusion is manifested. I found that Atlantic Station has low levels of racial diversity and a limited range of visitors of different ages and social classes. I also found that Atlantic Station is a highly regulated and strictly surveilled development designed to be visibly beautiful but not physically comfortable.

In Chapter 5, “Through Visiting Eyes: Experiences and Perceptions of Atlantic Station,” I use Edward Relph’s (1976), term place identity which is “persistent sameness and unity which allows that [place] to be differentiated from others” (1976:45). Place identity considers the lived experience of individuals as they experience place known as insideness; the extent to which an individual is attached or involved with a particular place (Relph 1976). Relph also suggests that individuals can experience the inverse – being alienated from a place which he calls outsideness (Relph 1976).

Using these theoretical frameworks, I demonstrate the extent to which participants in the study could be described as excluded. The first goal of this chapter is to measure exclusion and its relationship to a participant’s total times visiting Atlantic Station, the relationship to the likelihood of returning, and race. The second goal is to understand what factors influence feelings of exclusion for visitors. I found that the more exclusion visitors experienced, the less likely they were to return. In particular, Black and Asian participants felt less exclusion and Black participants were more likely to return. However, quantitative and qualitative results were contradictory as participants expressed that race did contribute to exclusion. I also found that authenticity, design, identity characteristics, residential and retail space contributed to feelings of exclusion because of the physical design of Atlantic Station and perception of the development’s target audience as upscale.
1.5 Study Contributions

A recent study explored the characteristics of mixed-use development in different parts of Montgomery County, Maryland, and national trends in the United States (HR&A Advisors 2021). The research team studied what worked well, what didn’t, and recommended improvement to Montgomery County policies that would enhance their mixed-use development. The successful factors they identified were sustainability, walkability, authenticity, convenience, flexibility, and inclusion.

Many of the elements they identified as contributions to creating successful developments are key components of this research study. Thus, my study is applicable for city officials, developers, and urban planners as it provides a better understanding of how live, work and play environments change urban areas and affect those who patronize such sites. My study also has important implications for cities. It demonstrates that while consumer-based placemaking may spur revitalization it does little to add to the local culture of an area, maintain a sense of place, or create inclusion.

2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF ATLANTA, GEORGIA AND ATLANTIC STATION

2.1 Atlanta’s Beginnings

Atlanta, Georgia lays “South of the North, yet north of the South”(Du Bois 1996:56). Atlanta, originally named Terminus because of its location at the end of the Western and Atlantic railroad, is an inland city set in the forest among red clay rolling hills and mountains (Reed 1889). Within miles of the city there are elements and minerals such as gold, silver, lead, copper, granite, marble, coal, iron, and limestone. Other natural resources are also within reach such as
the timber filled forests of North Georgia and water provided by the Chattahoochee River and Peachtree Creek (Reed 1889).

Atlanta’s geography, known for its natural advantages, enabled the city to become a part of the national economy through the railroad (Reed 1889; Weiman 1988). During the mid 1800s, railway construction increased across the United States, for states in the South, Georgia dominated railroad mileage and nearly doubled mileage from 682 to 1,420. By 1860, Georgia had one mile of railroad for every 744 residents (McGuire 1932). Georgia’s railroad system encompassed intra and inter-state lines and by 1915 all of Georgia’s railroad lines consolidated into one of the four railroad systems: Atlantic Coast Line, Seaboard Airline Railway, Southern Railway and Central of Georgia (Matrovita 2014; McGuire 1932).

Despite being a noncoastal city, Atlanta’s location as a state and national node on the railroad line allowed the city to connect to numerous cities along both the Gulf and Atlantic ports. So much that the city took on a new nickname, the “Gate City” for to reach the West from the Sea or vice versa, the route was through Atlanta (Clarke 1877). The railroad allowed for transportation of goods across the U.S. In the 19th and 20th century, Atlanta’s economy resembled the rest of the agricultural South that used enslaved people to grow crops such as tobacco and cotton to bring in steady profit (Chaplin 1991; Clarke 1877). The South’s economy heavily relied on slave labor in contrast to the North’ economy that revolved around manufacturing. However, both Northern and Southern states profited from enslaved labor which was inextricably tied to the USA. Soon, the Westward expansion of slavery would worry Northern abolitionists and increase friction between the North and the South.
2.2 The Civil War’s Impact on Atlanta

The discord between the states regarding slavery resulted in several major events that ultimately led to start of the Civil War. First was the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act that gave states the choice of slavery through popular vote. The Kansas Nebraska Act overturned the Missouri Compromise of 1820 that deemed all territories North of Missouri’s Southern border as free soil. Second was the 1857 U.S Supreme Court’s Dred Scott Decision that established banning slavery was unconstitutional, therefore neither congress nor territorial governments could ban slavery. The Dred Scott decision effectively invalidated the Kansas Nebraska Act (History.com 2009).

Although tensions between the Northern and Southern states had long been brewing, Abraham Lincoln’s presidential election was the tipping point for the South. After Lincoln’s election, 11 states seceded to form the Confederate States with Georgia being one of them (Schwab 1901).

The Civil War was not only a pivotal point in national history but also a defining point for modern Atlanta (Link 2013). After the Civil War’s wake of destruction and burning of Atlanta, Atlanta rose from its ashes to experience growth from a new economic development that would propel it to become “the New South”, an international city that is “too busy to hate.” Atlanta’s growth and marketing as the “New South” is attributed to Henry Grady who was an editor at the Atlanta constitution in the 1880s (Davis 1987). Grady, a big proponent of the new south, urged for the diversification of crops that would garner enough capital for Southerners to build and invest into manufacturing sites that would ultimately lead to the expansion of industry within Atlanta (Davis 1987). Grady’s influence helped bring in a new era of economy that embraced industrial growth rather than a plantation system (Davis 1987; Werner 2001).

Southern entrepreneurs flocked to Atlanta to take advantage of the capitalist opportunities and ongoing expansion in the city. George W. Connors, an ambitious salesman and loan investor,
noticed an opportunity to keep money within the local community (Stone 1951). Even though the Southern part of the United States were large buyers of cotton ties and metal hoops that kept cotton bales together they relied on northern distributors (Stone 1951). Connors proposed a business idea to build a steel mill to keep business local. Connors was joined by Dr. Abner W Calhoun, Charles E. Currier, John N. Goddard, Frank Hawkins, Kohn K. Ottley, J. Carroll Payne, and Samuel T. Weyman. These eight men had occupations ranging from merchant to banking and real estate, but no experience with the steel industry. However, they were willing to invest their own capital in the spirit of the New South. Hence, on March 5th, 1901, the Atlanta Steel Hoop Company was founded (Stone 1951).

2.3 The Atlantic Steel Hoop Company’s Background

Constructed on 75 acres along the Southern Railway beltline, the Atlanta Steel Hoop Company (see figures 1 and 2) sat between Atlanta Water Works Reservoir and Peachtree Street. Today, that area is located between Interstate 75-85, the Home Park neighborhood and Norfolk Southern Railroad (see figure 3) (CRB Realty and Lawrence D. Frank 1998). During its tenure, the Atlanta Steel Hoop Company was Georgia’s only steel manufacturing plant and produced all items in Atlanta, Georgia (M. P Lawton 1924). During the company’s early years, there was growth in stockholders, capital stock, equipment diversification, and a brief second location.

Yet, their steady growth was not without hardships as operations and sales declined during World War I and the Great Depression led the company into red with a huge net loss reaching up to six figures. Along with these developments, the company also went through several name changes. In 1906, the Atlanta Steel Hoop Company became the Atlanta Steel Company. Then in 1915, Atlanta Steel Company financially reorganized and became Atlantic
Steel Company (Stone 1951). In 1983, the final name changed to Atlantic Steel Industries, Inc (Joan S. Clemens 2010).

Figure 1. Atlantic Steel Mill in Downtown Atlanta, 1979

Figure 2. Atlantic Steel Mill, 1930


Figure 3. Atlantic Station boundary

Alexus Moore, 2023. “Atlantic Station boundary.”
During its time, Atlantic Steel Company was Georgia’s largest employer and helped grow the neighborhood around it. What was once before routes through woods and fields became the Home Park neighborhood (Garrett 1969). The Home Park neighborhood, originally known as Chastaintown, housed Atlantic Steel employees along with workers from the Exposition Cotton Mill, and the Miller Union Stockyards (The Georgia Conservancy 1998). In 1909, Atlanta’s boundaries were extended, and the Home Park Neighborhood was incorporated into the City of Atlanta.

The incorporation contributed to the growth and attraction of the neighborhood through schools, churches, shops, and restaurants. In the 1960s, like many Atlanta Neighborhoods, Home Park declined due to white flight. With many families fleeing, Home Park transitioned from a working-class neighborhood to a college neighborhood as Georgia Tech expanded its campus and purchased Home Park houses for student housing. Today, Home Park is made up of students, young homeowners, and older residents (The Georgia Conservancy 1998).

For almost a century, Atlantic Steel Company operated from 1901 to 1998 producing steels items such as cotton bale ties, nails, barbed wires, and fence wires (Ronald Papa 2008; Sousa and D’Souza 2013, garret-vol 2). In 1979, Ivanco Inc., a Montreal steel maker, acquired Atlantic Steel Company. Then in 1998, Jacoby Development Inc., (JDI) bought out Ivanco Inc. In 1998, Atlantic Steel Company closed its doors due to rising production costs and deindustrialization, a national trend of where manufacturers opted for cheaper labor and took their businesses overseas. All that remained was a brownfield; a vacant and contaminated site that could not be immediately used without intervention (Alker et al. 2000). In 1999, JDI formed a partnership with AIG Global Real Estate with intentions to redevelop the Atlantic Steel brownfield (Ronald Papa 2008).
Although private developers spearheaded the project, only about one-third of the development was financed privately (Papa 2008). The City of Atlanta, created the Atlantic Steel Brownfield Redevelopment Plan and Tax Allocation District (ASBTAD) to reduce the cost and risk of redeveloping Atlantic Station (Invest Atlanta 1999b). The City anticipated increases in property taxes in the redeveloped area so any tax money over a certain threshold would be aside for a set period of time (Sjoquist 2014). The funds would then be placed into a tax free bond and used to pay off the debt that accrued in the redevelopment process (City of Douglasville, GA n.d.). With this creative financing scheme, the ASBTAD financed approximately two-thirds of redevelopment with private developers financing the remainder (Papa 2008).

2.4 Developing Atlantic Station

Before Atlantic Station could get the greenlight, they had to secure the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) approval for construction of a new transportation project, a bridge that would connect the Atlantic Steel project to the rest of Atlanta’s Midtown neighborhood. Construction of the 17th street bridge would not only connect the site to Midtown but also connect nearby neighborhoods and provide pedestrian access to a rail station operated by the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2001).

However, construction of the 17th street bridge could not be completed because between 1998 and 2000 the city of Atlanta did not conform with the EPA’s 1970 Clean Air Act (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2001). The EPA’s 1970 Clean Air Act established air quality standards by reducing emissions of toxic air pollution from stationary and mobile sources. As a result, the Clean Air act mitigates the effects of toxic air pollution on society’s health, the environment, and the economy (United States Environmental Protection Agency
2007). Atlanta’s violation stemmed from its growing population which increased automobile emissions and went above the safe threshold for ground-level ozone (Shrouds 2000; Woolf 2001).

The city’s violation resulted in the withdrawal of federal funds and federal approval to construct new transportation projects. To get back in compliance with the EPA, Atlanta was required to produce a regional transportation plan. However, they did not, and repercussions were felt as Atlanta lost businesses and potential future businesses (Geewax 1999; Goldberg 1998). Concerned, Atlanta’s business elite called for alternate forms of mobility aside from automobiles. Atlanta’s business elite was inspired by the growing trend of smart growth which emphasizes compact building design, mixed-land uses and walkable communities (Smart Growth America 2023). Thus, they endorsed concentrated transit-oriented development along with community improvement districts (Frankston 2003; Zimmermann, Göktug, and Stich 2003).

Without the 17th street bridge, which was necessary to connect the development to the rest of Midtown, the Atlantic Steel project would not succeed. However, JDI found a workaround. In 1995, the EPA established the Environmental eXcellence and Leadership initiative known as Project XL. Under Project XL, the EPA partnered with public and private sponsors to experiment how policy, procedural, and regulatory options for 50 different projects could lead to better environmental performance, advances in economic efficiency, and further develop environmental protections (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2001). Through Project XL, JDI-AIG could bypass the EPA’s ban if they could illustrate that the Atlantic Steel Brownfield redevelopment qualified as a Transportation Control Measure that would provide clean air benefits (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2001). To do so, the EPA analyzed three ways that the Atlantic Station site could have an impact on Atlanta:
1) regional transportation and air emissions impacts; 2) site level travel and air, open space, brownfields, and surface impact; and 3) local emissions hot spot impacts.

For the regional transportation and air emission impacts, the EPA analyzed three potential locations of similar scale located in Sandy Springs, GA; Cobb/Fulton County, GA; and Henry County, GA. Their results showed that building Atlantic Station within the city compared to developing a site in a suburban area would reduce driving and emissions (United States Environmental Protection Agency 1999). For the site level travel and air, open space, brownfields, and surface impact, the EPA analyzed each site design focusing on how the diversity, density, and design would predict consumer’s travel choices to the site. Results showed that the final JDI revised master plan would decrease vehicle miles by 5% and emissions by approximately 5% to 6%. Lastly, the EPA tested whether additional traffic from the Atlantic Station redevelopment would lead to carbon monoxide hotspots. Their analyses showed that carbon monoxide levels would not exceed national environmental and safety standards (United States Environmental Protection Agency 1999).

Given the positive impact tests that determined Atlantic Station would not increase Atlanta’s air quality problem, the EPA gave the go ahead (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2001). The EPA believed that redevelopment of the Atlantic Steel brownfield had unique impacts and would provide long term clean air quality benefits such as: an expedited brownfield cleanup, redevelopment of a site with existing infrastructure and transportation, reduction of vehicle miles traveled through the creation of growth within Atlanta and not outside the city, connection of a new development to mass transit via the 17th street bridge, promotion of pedestrian and transit oriented access, and the establishment of a Transportation Management Association (United States Environmental Protection Agency 2001).
The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) also investigated the Atlantic Station Redevelopment project. They tested whether the contaminated grounds would have adverse health impacts for the community and future residents (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service 2004). Sources of contamination stemmed from the Atlantic Steel Mill and Tri Chem Company, a fertilizer manufacturer, who occupied part of the site for 20 years. Hazardous chemicals used for both companies were either disposed of on site, spilled or seeped (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service 2004).

Soil samples were randomly collected throughout the site; results found that both surface and subsoil were contaminated. The Agency determined that as long as there is no contact with the contaminated soil then there is no concern for public health (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service 2004). A two-foot soil barrier was laid to inhibit possible future exposure. Air samples were taken as well. Approximately 1/4th of the air samples were contaminated but were below the Occupational Health and Safety Administration’s approved occupational exposure limits (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service 2004). The ATSDR investigation concluded that the Atlantic Station site was not a public health hazard and that the original remediation plan did not need additional precautions (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Public Health Service 2004).

2.5 Atlantic Station’s Master Plan

With the EPA’s approval and an adequate remediation plan, JDI set out to develop their Master Plan. Atlantic Station is known for its master plan, a process that started in 1997 and lasted several years as it went through several iterations before gaining approval from stakeholders (Dagenhart, Leigh, and Skach 2006). The original JDI plan consisted of traditional large suburban commercial and residential projects such as a shopping mall, apartment
complexes and an office park. Under this plan each development would be enclosed by parking lots, buffered by green space, and automobile focused. The three separate development areas would be connected to each other via a new 17th street bridge over Interstates 75 and 85 linking East and West Northside Drive (Dagenhart et al. 2006).

Jacoby’s ambitious large scale redevelopment plan would require land rezoning from industrial use to mixed use, environmental remediation that required the clean-up of 180,000 cubic yards of lead contaminated soil, demolition of asbestos contaminated buildings and bridge construction (Ronald Papa 2008). Additionally, this plan would increase sprawl and its consequences. Overall, this plan was not in line with the EPA, Midtown Alliance nor the City of Atlanta’s goal of sustainably managing population growth (Sousa and D’Souza 2013).

JDI went back to the drawing board and the EPA hired Duany Plater-Zybrek (DPZ), a very influential firm headed by two successful commercial smart growth planners who cofounded the New Urban Movement, to improve the original master plan (Congress for the New Urbanism 2015). DPZ then created a second design that utilized lot, block, and street subdivisions and allowed for mixed use across the whole site instead of compartmentalizing the site into three sections (Dagenhart et al. 2006). Additionally, the DPZ site design limited huge underground parking decks by only placing parking decks over contaminated soil (Dagenhart et al. 2006). The DPZ site design also continued the Home Park neighborhood street and block structure into Atlantic Station. Overall, the DPZ site design incorporated feedback from several Atlanta stakeholders, government agencies, and the community such as Midtown Alliance4 to

4 Since Atlantic Station is in Midtown, they would eventually become a member of the Midtown Alliance a non-profit membership organization. According to the Midtown Alliance website, the organization is run by 71 of the top private sector leaders in the area. Midtown Alliance is focused on increasing mixed use properties, urban amenities, transit options, green space, and a pedestrian friendly environment in Midtown. They are also committed to making Midtown a premier location for commerce, culture, education, and living (www.midtownatl.com).
ultimately improve performance, enhance the site’s marketability and also reduce emissions and driving (United States Environmental Protection Agency 1999).

JDI took into consideration DPZ’s revision of their original plan, but did not incorporate many of their recommendations (Dagenhart et al. 2006). The third and final revised plan kept the huge underground parking decks but did introduce fine-grained mixed use into the block subdivisions. The multimodal 17th street bridge included bike, bus, and automobile lanes, with adjacent sidewalks with plans of featuring plant trellises, shade canopies, and perch rails (Jeakle 2005). They also incorporated smaller blocks that created local streets that provided better connectivity within the site. However, they made off site connections to the surrounding neighborhood minimal and not easily accessible (Dagenhart et al. 2006).

2.6 Praise and Criticism of Atlantic Station

Atlantic Station open in 2005 and since its inception, Atlantic Station has garnered lots of attention and recognition such as the 2004 EPA Phoenix award and a spot on the Sierra Club’s 2005 list of Best New Development projects in America (Dagenhart et al. 2006; Eric Olsen, Emily Salomon, and Jimmy Terpening 2005). While Atlantic Station is recognized for its smart growth model, researchers from the Georgia Tech School of Agriculture, among others, have criticized Atlantic Station on three aspects (Dagenhart et al. 2006).

First, the development is divided into three compartmentalized areas (see figure 4): The District is the essence of Atlantic Station containing retail, residential, and office space. The Commons is the main residential area consisting of apartments, condominiums, duplexes, townhomes, and hotels with a lake and park. And The Village is a smaller residential area located by IKEA that includes apartments and lofts. These areas and the buffers between them require automobile transport (Dagenhart et al. 2006). Additionally, the street blocks within
Atlantic Station are for specific building types which does not allow for future changes in building and land use (Dagenhart et al. 2006).

![Atlantic Station areas](https://www.midtownatl.com/about/midtown-transportation/commuter-services/transit-options-in-midtown)

**Figure 4. Atlantic Station areas**


Second, the connecting bridge and 17th street are not pedestrian friendly. The 17th street bridge consists of eight lanes: two bus lanes, two bike lanes, and four automobile lanes. 17th street does not have street parking which puts the sidewalk directly off the street offering no protection for pedestrian walkers (Dagenhart et al. 2006).

Third, Atlantic Station is a “city within a city”; it does not mesh with the surrounding area. The underground parking garage and the streets inside Atlantic Station do not connect to
the surrounding neighborhoods, making it difficult to access on foot (Dagenhart et al. 2006). While surrounding neighborhood residents did not want pass through traffic, it prevents them from walking to the restaurant and grocery and retail stores in Atlantic Station (Dagenhart et al. 2006; Miller 2006). Therefore, the live, work, and play aspects of Atlantic Station are only easily accessible for residents within Atlantic Station and not the surrounding community (Dagenhart et al. 2006). Atlantic Station is practically a fortress. It is enclosed on all sides by either railroad tracks, surrounding neighborhoods, or high-rise buildings.

2.7 Atlantic Station’s Rebranding

Atlanta’s industrial growth was not only a way to revitalize the city through economic regeneration but was also a way to rebrand the city’s image. Atlantic Station has only been around for 17 years, but in its short span has followed in the footsteps of Atlanta. In 2013, Ogilvy & Mather, an advertising and marketing agency, created Atlantic Station’s brand and tagline “forward living” – a representation of the creative class and new class consumer: individuals who value and seek out convenient and walkable communities that promote new ideas, welcome cultural experiences, and technology. Recently, Infinitee, an Atlanta-based branding agency, helped rebrand Atlantic Station’s brand standards and helped build an experiential environment. Atlantic Station has curated several participatory experiences such as a one-mile historic walking tour located in the development that shares historical key moments in Atlanta’s and the neighborhood’s history.

As a vacant and contaminated industrial area, the Atlantic Steel site was a blight on Atlanta’s landscape. After undergoing the largest urban redevelopment in the U.S. and recent rebranding and marketing, Atlantic Station proudly refers to itself as the beating heart of Atlanta and has constructed a narrative of unity and forward living. The self-contained development
boasts that it is a diverse community with local roots and global appeal; a gathering place where individuals can find many reasons to love and linger. In the following chapters, I will explore 1) Atlantic Station’s economic and social diversity, 2) the development’s image as a gathering place, and 3) the development’s appeal and its relationship to exclusion and likelihood of visitors returning.
3 “IT’S AS IF GENTRIFICATION IS A GIFT”

3.1 Who Developed Atlantic Station?

In 1975, JDI started out as a traditional retail developer. However, more recently their real estate development reflects a company-stated focus on environmental stewardship. Whether genuine or not, with this heightened focus they have redeveloped what they call distressed sites such as industrial and assembly plants, landfills, mines, and quarries. Stating “others see these endeavors as time consuming and challenging, we see opportunities for improving environment and quality of life, plus the long-term financial rewards these challenges offer” (Jacobydevelopment.com).

Domestically and abroad, JDI has sourced, invested, managed, and developed industrial, residential, retail, and office sites. Similarly, one of AIG’s goals is to “create value through targeted identification and highly focused execution…to generate superior investment returns” (ibsite.com). Both companies have similar beliefs of developing distressed sites, improving their current surroundings and creating value. Although their business values do not explicitly mention gentrification, they certainly hint at it.

3.2 Gentrification overview

The term gentrification was first coined by Ruth Glass (1964). There have been several waves of gentrification and as a result the definition has extended and become “chaotic” and abstract overtime (Aalbers 2019; Brown-Saracino 2010; Hackworth and Smith 2001; Hyra et al. 2020). Gentrification is now a catchall for any area that has been rehabilitated, renovated, or experienced upward economic change. Gentrification is primarily defined as class change from low-income neighborhoods to predominately middle-class (Glass 1964; Smith 1996). However, for this study, I use Zawadi Rucks-Ahidiana’s (2022) definition of gentrification which is the
“racialized process of class change.” I use this definition because it captures how gentrification is
guided, like many urban processes, by economic and social reasons and thus is inherently
racialized (Rucks-Ahidiana 2022).

As cities are rapidly transforming, many urban areas are undergoing changes that can be
classified as gentrification. The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia found that from 2000 and
2014, Atlanta was the fourth fastest gentrifying city in the U.S. (Brummet and Reed 2019). More
recently, the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta released that Atlanta’s average housing cost has
exceeded the standard 30% of household income, which surpasses The United States Department
of Housing and Urban Development’s threshold of affordability (Domonic Purviance 2023).

When the steel mill was built it was located on the outskirts of town. Overtime, as Atlanta
expanded, the city grew around the vacant area. Now with a multi-modular bridge and highway
overpasses connecting the site to the rest of the city, Atlantic Station refers to itself as the “heart
of Atlanta” and is also cleverly called a “city within a city.” These phrases highlight the
juxtaposition of how Atlantic Station is viewed and leads to the question of whether Atlantic
Station follows the city’s gentrification trend. The goal of this chapter is to explore if Atlantic
Station had spillover effects to its surrounding neighborhoods by potentially increasing median
household income, property values and rent, and impacting their race and class makeups.
Through this exploration, I make analytical connections between the potential economic and
social exclusion in Atlantic Station and the surrounding neighborhoods.

3.3 Spatial (in)justice: Segregation, White Flight, and Gentrification in Atlanta

Critical urban theory emphasizes the politically and ideologically mediated, socially
contested and therefore malleable character of urban space—that is, its continual (re)construction
as a site, medium and outcome of historically specific relations of social power (Brenner 2009:
Working within critical urban theory, I explore spatial (in)justice within Atlanta. Spatial (in)justice is an intentional focus on geographical aspects of justice that not only includes the fair and equitable distribution of socially valued resources but the opportunities to use them as well. One way that spatial justice can be interpreted is through uneven development and exclusionary practices in urban areas (Soja 2009).

During Atlanta’s desegregation period, white Atlantans feared social racial intimacy and actively took preventative measures by boycotting public space, opting for privatized facilities, and moving to Atlanta’s suburbs (Kruse 2005). Thus, Atlanta’s urban core deteriorated as population numbers dropped and tax money left the city. Subsequently, disinvestment became even more prevalent due to interstate constructions, white flight, and sprawl.

In the wake of population loss, neighborhoods were plagued by chronic poverty and structural racism. Recently, scholars have identified a fifth migration of gentrification known as the back to the city movement which is a reversal in sprawl and suburbanization (Birch 2009; Ehrenhalt 2012; Fishman 2005; Sturtevant and Jung 2011). The back to the city movement involves an influx of immigrants, the creative class, and long term residents who are relocating to the urban core and seeking traditional dense urbanism (Fishman 2005). In Atlanta, the back to the city movement has provided investment opportunities in disadvantaged neighborhoods facilitating the revitalization of the urban core and spiking city-wide population growth. While urban renewal is a plus, the downside of this phenomenon is gentrification.

Atlanta’s history of gentrification is highly racialized and began in the 1990s as the city became less black, more college educated, and more affluent. Although this process began in the 1990s, it continues. Raymond and colleagues (2021) found a relationship between purchases of multifamily residences and physical displacement via evictions, which simultaneously decreased
Black households and increased white households in an Atlanta neighborhood from 2000 to 2016. Relatedly, Atlanta has experienced green gentrification, a process that relies on adaptive reuse to revitalize urban areas by adding in green space (Gould and Lewis 2018). Recently, Anguelovski and colleagues predicted green gentrification in the Global North spanning two decades (2000s, 2010s) and found that Atlanta was a lead green gentrification city. Similarly, Immergluck and colleagues (2009; 2018) documented that the development of the Atlanta Beltline, a sustainable redevelopment project where 22 miles of an unused railroad corridor was turned into multiuse trails, increased nearby property values before and during construction of the project.

To overcome the perception of an industrial wasteland, Atlantic Station’s mission was to create a new neighborhood that fostered a strong sense of community and authenticity while revitalizing Atlanta’s Midtown area at the same time (Hunt 2005; Jacoby 2004). Atlantic Station was marketed as a true live, work, and play community that valued environmental sustainability, connectivity via transportation and community, and convenience (Hunt 2005; Jacoby 2004). Through this marketing, Atlantic Station has projected itself as a prime location for a distinct population group made up of thought leaders and creative problem solvers known as the “creative class”.

To explore how Atlantic Station potentially increased spatial injustice via gentrification in Atlantic Station and its surrounding areas I ask: how did the demographics of surrounding neighborhoods change once Atlantic Station was introduced? And how does it compare to city trends? I also explore visitor’s perceptions of several art panels to learn what messages visitors recognize and articulate about who does and does not belong at Atlantic Station. Overall, I make apparent the presence of neighborhood and social change brought on by Atlantic Station.
3.4 Data and Methods

3.4.1 Demographic Analysis

To answer my quantitative research questions, I tracked shifts in population and neighborhood demographics before and after Atlantic Station was built, at the city level and the zip code level spanning four different time points: 1990, 2000, 2007-2011, and 2016-2020. Using four time points at different levels captured how much neighborhood demographics of and around Atlantic Station varied from the larger demographic patterns of the city of Atlanta.

I accessed demographic, economic, and population data from the U.S Census Bureau and Social Explorer websites and transferred it to an Excel sheet. For each characteristic, if necessary, I divided it by the respective characteristic’s total population to receive a percentage. For example: I divided the number of residents with a bachelor’s degree or higher by the total population 25 and older within Atlanta to calculate what percentage of residents have a bachelor’s degree or higher in Atlanta.

I use four measures to signify gentrification. First is median household income which is based on the distribution of pretax income of all individuals 15 years and older in a household. Second is median home value which is the estimate of how much as individual estimates their home would sell for if it were on the market. Third is median gross rent which is calculated by adding contract rent and estimated average cost of utilities. For comparison over years, I adjust monetary values for inflation standardizing to the year 2020. Following the Bureau of Labor Statistic’s instructions, I divide the “Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items in U.S. City Average”\(^5\) of 2020 by the study year then multiply by the variable (Perrins and

\(^5\) For median gross rent I use “Consumer Price Index all items less shelter in U.S. City Average”
Nilsen n.d.). Fourth is percent of college educated residents ages 25 years and older who received a bachelor’s degree from a college or university. I also capture racial makeup with percentages of neighborhood residents who are Asian, Black, white and non-Latine.

In addition to graphing the percent and monetary value of the study variables, I also graph the rate of change for each variable. I subtract the latest study variable by the previous study variable and then divide by the previous variable to get a percent of change. By including the percent of change, it is easier to see if change in the study areas are faster or slower than the rate of change in the city as a whole.

It is important to note there was a change in Census methodology over the study time period. I use population characteristics found in summary files 1 and 3 for 1990 and 2000 census years. For 2011 and 2020, I use ACS 5-year estimates to gather population characteristics. One difference between the Census and the ACS is that with the ACS, data is gathered over a period of time, representing the average of five-year windows, rather than a specific date (Anon 2020). Another difference between the surveys is that the decennial census long form collects data from 1 in 6 households in the U.S. population while the ACS only collects data from 1% of the U.S. population per year (Dillingham et al. 2020). Additionally, the two surveys differ somewhat in the wording of questions, reference periods, and ways of tabulation (US Census Bureau 2021).

\[ \frac{\text{CPI 2020}}{\text{CPI study year}} \times \text{study year variable} = \text{adjusted study year variable} \]

7 I also collect data for other groups (American Indian, Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander but due to very small groups (less than 1%) I do not include them in analysis.

\[ \frac{\text{latest study year}}{\text{previous study year}} \times \text{previous study year} \times 100 = \text{percent change} \]

9 In 2010, the Census replaced the long form effectively getting rid of summary file 3 and replacing it with the American Community Survey. Zip code data were released as 5-year estimates, starting in 2011.

10 Which is subject to sampling error, but all ACS data have confidence levels of 90%.
3.4.2 Content Analysis

Qualitative data come from an original survey of Visitor’s Experiences and Perceptions composed of Metro Atlanta residents 18 and over who have visited Atlantic Station at least once since 2018. The survey collected visitors’ perceptions, experiences, and feelings of and at Atlantic Station. For this chapter, I focus on the survey section detailing visitor’s perceptions of art panels that surrounded Atlantic Station during its renovation. To capture visitor’s interpretation of the art panels, I ask participants to read the phrase written on the art panel (see figures 5-6 for examples) and describe what the text means to them. Out of the 15 art panels, I chose to include 9 that were not so explicit in their meanings on the survey. However, participants randomly saw only 3 of the 9 pictures. The visitor’s experiences and perceptions survey was disseminated online via social media platforms and in Georgia State University sociology courses which resulted in 181 useable responses.

To analyze the qualitative data, I exported participant’s responses from each art panel into NVIVO. I then went line by line assigning codes to different parts of each response. After several rounds of coding, I ran a word frequency query to find the most frequent words which ensured that I did not miss any potential codes. I ended with 74 original codes which were grouped into 14 categories. I then grouped the categories together to form themes presented in this chapter.

3.5 Atlantic Station as an Indicator of Gentrification

3.5.1 Atlanta’s Population Trend

Consistent with prior research, Atlanta is a rapidly changing city (Immergluck 2022; Raymond et al. 2021, 2016) (see figure 7 for a map of the study area). From 1990 to 2020, Atlanta’s recorded population increased and became whiter (see figure 8). The percentage of
Atlantans who were college educated also increased doubling from 1990 to 2020 (see figure 9). Despite the increase in white residents Atlanta is still predominately Black (see figure 10). Even though the city has diversified, it is still highly segregated with a considerable number of areas that are predominately all-white or all-Black (Greer et al. 2011; Raymond et al. 2016). Gentrification, whether directly or indirectly, affects all of Atlanta. In the following sections I explore if the neighborhoods of and surrounding Atlantic Station are experiencing gentrification effects as well.

### 3.5.2 Population Changes in Atlantic Station and Surrounding Neighborhoods

Upon its opening, Atlantic Station was a predominately white zip code. Black residents were the next largest with a small share of Asian residents and at least a third of all residents had a bachelor’s degree (see figures 8 through 11). By 2020, Atlantic Station experienced slight population changes. The area was still majority white, however both white and Black populations dropped as the Asian population more than tripled increasing by 710% in 2020. And residents with bachelor’s degrees increased by 160%.

Bordering Atlantic Station to the north and east is the 30309 zip code. In 2000, prior to the introduction of Atlantic Station, 30309 was majority white. Black residents made up a small portion of residents with an even smaller Asian population and at least a third of residents had bachelor’s degrees (see figures 8 through 11). In 2020, after the introduction of Atlantic Station, 30309’s population remained majority white. There was a decrease in the white population and the Black population also decreased while the Asian population increased, rising by 91% in 2011 and by 83% in 2020. During this time, the percentage of college educated residents also increased (see figures 8 through 11).
Bordering Atlantic Station to the South and West is the 30318 zip code, which also contains the neighborhood of Home Park. In 2000, prior to the introduction of Atlantic Station, 30318 was majority Black. White residents made up a quarter of the zip code’s population with a very small percentage of Asian residents and a tenth of residents had bachelor’s degrees (see figures 8 through 11). In 2020, after the introduction of Atlantic Station, 30318’s population saw changes in their racial groups as Black residents decreased, Asian residents increased and college educated residents increased (see figures 8 through 11).

So far, Atlantic Station, 30309, and 30318 are indicative of racial and educational changes that follow gentrification trends. In the next section, I explore household measures and see whether they also follow gentrification trends and act as mechanisms of exclusion for Atlantic Station and its surrounding neighborhoods.

3.5.3 Mechanisms of Exclusion

Citywide, median household income and median home values rose overall aside from the 2011 period which coincided with the foreclosure crisis (see figures 12 and 13) (Bratt and Immergluck 2015; Immergluck 2015; Raymond et al. 2016). When Atlantic Station opened, its property values were roughly equivalent to the city’s median, although the median household income and median gross rent was higher (see figure 14).

Atlantic Station’s median home value did not follow Atlanta’s increasing trend as home value decreased (see figure 13). However, Atlantic Station’s median household income differed from Atlanta’s trend. Between 2011 and 2020, Atlantic Station’s median household income decreased while Atlanta’s rose (see figure 13). During this time, Atlantic Station’s median gross rent increased by 45% (see figure 14). Atlantic Station’s rent increase is not surprising considering that areas in or adjacent to destination hubs and business districts significantly
increase rent prices (Ryan 2016). Additionally indicators of gentrification also include an increase in the Asian population and property values (Hwang 2015; Wilhelmsson, Ismail, and Warsame 2021). Although Atlantic Station’s household income and college educated residents decreased, the area’s population change paired with household measures suggest gentrification.

In the surrounding neighborhood of 30309, median home values decreased while median household income increased, rising 45% in 2011 and rising 34% in 2020. In 2011, median gross rent decreased, but this decline could be due to the foreclosure crisis, and increased by 55% in 2020 (see figures 12 through 14.) Between 2000 and 2020, the median household income for this zip code was consistently higher than Atlanta’s median household income as was median gross rent (see figure 13 and 14). In a recent study, Rucks-Ahidiana (2021) found that gentrifying middle-class white neighborhoods, like this zip code, experience increases in income and college educated residents. Additionally both groups are more likely to be white or Asian (Joo 2017). With an increase in Asian, college educated residents, and income, 30309’s racial and housing trends support these research findings.

Now looking at the surrounding 30318 zip code, home values, median gross rent, and median household income all rose. From 2000 to 2020, median gross rent followed Atlanta’s increasing trend (see figure 14). Interestingly, the median home value started off very low in 2000 then rose tremendously in 2011 by 110% (see figure 12). Between 2000 and 2020, the median household income for this zip code was consistently lower than Atlanta’s median household income (see figure 13). These trends line up with the idea of ‘marginal gentrification’11 and recent research that suggests majority non-white areas, like this zip code,

11 Marginal gentrification is where the lesser privileged middle-class have high educational capital but low economic capital (Rose 1984).
experience an increase in white residents, college educated residents and a decrease of Black residents but not an increase in higher-income residents (Rose 1984; Rucks-Ahidiana 2021).

3.5.4 Does Atlantic Station and Surrounding Areas Replicate Racialized Gentrification?

Findings suggest that in 30309 and 30318, Black residents are excluded with income and home values acting as mechanisms of exclusion. In Atlantic Station, Black residents are also excluded while rent and property values act as mechanisms of exclusion. The racial and housing trends in 30309 and 30318 support the idea that racial composition not only affects where gentrification happens but also how gentrification occurs in terms of class and racial changes in a neighborhood (Rucks-Ahidiana 2021). In all three areas, the loss of Black residents coincides with the increase of property values. This suggests that the change in racial demographics could be attributed to Black residents being priced out. Overall, these results seem to suggest that Atlantic Station and its surrounding areas do follow a pattern of racialized gentrification.

3.5.5 Messages of Exclusion

The content analysis of the art panels identified three themes characterizing both positive and negative aspects of neighborhood change. These themes are depicted in Table 1 with quotations showing examples of the analyzed material. Each theme highlights various dimensions of the impact of spatial (in)justice. Participants recognized that beauty is valued, and a lack of beauty can be a catalyst for destruction (theme 1). Responses indicated that participants associated demolition as “new,” “better,” and “worth it.” Participants also recognized that beauty via destruction was connected to capitalism. One participant noted that “Atlantic Station is just one of the many hubs of American capitalism, and capitalism is destroying the planet. Nothing
beautiful about that. Gilded age vibes.” For context, The United States’ Gilded Age lasted from 1865 to 1898 and was a time of rapid industrialization resulting in extreme prosperity for a few and poverty for many others.

Despite the negative view, one participant contemplated the bright side of destruction. “There are a lot of things that are destroyed. But in destroying things there can be a silver lining as long as you look for [it]. Instead of always looking at the worst possible scenario look at what is the best in the situation.” This suggests that the cleanup and renovation of the Atlantic brownfield, despite connections to capitalism, are seen as beneficial for the area. Even so, others had differing opinions. Two participants did not identify the outcome of the urban renewal project as a thing of beauty. Out of the two, one participant was unsure what they would call it instead. The other participant pointed out that “While the Atlantic steel mill wasn’t necessarily something that had to be saved, especially considering the environmental issues, it does not seem like the destruction actually resulted in beauty, rather just a replication of the service economy in a formerly industrial economy space.”

Additionally, participants were not hesitant to point out gentrification in their understandings of the art panels (theme 2). One participant’s interpretation revealed that “it is as if gentrification is a gift, I guess it is to a few.” While this participant did not explicitly name the “few,” other participants made connections between the class and race-based aspects of gentrification, specifying that the imagery and phrases in the art panels symbolized Black displacement, middle class communities, and whiteness:

“Maybe this isn’t the best look for Atlanta, a city rapidly displacing its Black population.”
“Reinvention in this sense seems to attract only white and middle-class communities.”

“Whiteness. What is the evolution of the station?”

Additionally, participants not only gleaned concepts of capital, desire, and whitening of spaces from the art panels but they linked these concepts to mixed use developments. Thus, insinuating that Atlantic Station is following in Atlanta’s footsteps:

“This invokes exploitation and Atlanta’s seemingly endless cycles of destruction and bland, corporate, profit-driven reconstruction.”

“Your money fuels our reinvention. Here we prioritize mixed-use developments over people’s lives.”

Participants also clearly articulated interpretations of improvement as most responses indicated that changes in Atlantic Station were growth and people focused. Interestingly, participants used the words ‘growth’ and ‘expectations’ in the same sentence which seemed to convey the importance of the growth process. However, participants grappled with who Atlantic Station’s changes were for (theme 3). Participants expressed that changes were either inspired by people’s interests or Atlanta’s new cultural values. One participant stated that the art panel:

“Gives the impression that the work is driven by the public input and will represent the desires of the community (possibly). As [I] reread the text, it says ‘fuel our reinvention.’ I see this as a possible thank you for your thought. We’ll keep that in mind to keep doing what we planned.”

Although participants mentioned community numerous times and consistently relayed that change was driven by community, it was unclear who the changes were for? In addition to
questioning if changes were inspired by cultural values or people’s interest, participants wondered if changes were for the community or for the consumer?:

“we’d like you to believe that our capitalist agenda matches your social/environmental concerns in order to milk you for every cent.”

“I think this depiction also supports a neoliberal agenda that there needs to be constant (re)development of areas in order to extract the most capital for a good consumer experience.”

“While we destroy the underlying community and culture in this area for capital gain, please pretend we are doing something worthwhile and community-building.”

“To me this means that the area is focused on catering to what the people are demanding, or asking for in some way, what they are wanting out of something (i.e., a place, service) is then going to be aimed for by developers.”

Overall, each theme highlights the intricacies of spatial (in)justice such as how beauty is synonymous with revitalization and growth which can be facilitated by exploitation and gentrification. Most importantly, participants pinpointed that Atlantic Station may be selective in the community that they cater to. In chapter 5, I will revisit content analysis and explore how choosing who to cater to elicits feelings of exclusion while in Atlantic Station.
Figure 5. “To rise from the ashes be the one to set the fire”

Figure 6. “Your dreams fuel our reinvention”

Figure 7. Study areas
Figure 8. Percent of white residents
Figure 9. Percent of residents with Bachelor’s degrees or higher
Figure 10. Percent of Black residents
Figure 11. Percent of Asian residents
Figure 12. Median home values adjusted to 2020 dollars
Figure 13. Median household income adjusted to 2020 dollars
Figure 14. Gross rent adjusted to 2020 dollars
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Destruction for the better | Destruction and starting over is worth it as long as the outcome is beauty. | “Leading to “beautification” of the space.”  
“While the Atlantic Steel Mill wasn’t necessarily something that had to be saved, especially considering the environmental issues, it doesn’t seem like the destruction actually resulted in beauty, rather just a replication of the service economy in a formerly industrial economy space.” |
| 2. Gentrification           | Revitalization and growth facilitated by exploitation and gentrification.    | “Reinvention in this sense seems to attract only white and middle-class communities.”  
“It actually reads as quite racist. It says that what was there before was worthless and terrible and only new brought from outsiders can be seen as good.”                                                                                                                                                           |
| 3. For the community or for the consumer? | Visitors acknowledge the changes Atlantic Station has made but there is a tension between whether the changes are for the community or for consumers? | “Seem like they’re taking something that wasn’t serving the community/their target community and changing it to better represent the area.”  
“They are reinventing the atmosphere based on the needs of the consumer.”  
“Something was seen as needing to be ‘fixed.’ Meaning that out (the consumers) expectations and desires were for a better area and something ‘nicer’ and more mature, and it was catered to.” |
4 EMERGE UNRECOGNIZABLE: DESIGN POLITICS IN ATLANTIC STATION

4.1 Atlanta’s Role in the Civil War

During the Civil War, Atlanta served as a transportation, manufacturing, medical, and storehouse hub (Link 2013). As the gate city, Atlanta’s transportation role was vital to the Civil War which naturally made it a target for the Union Army (Link 2013). Across the south, rail lines and towns were deliberately destroyed but those in the path of General William T. Sherman were hit the hardest (McGuire 1932). During the Summer of 1864, Sherman was tasked to attack the Atlanta and their war resources. For five weeks from July to August 1864, Sherman terrorized the city. Eventually, Atlanta surrendered in early September 1864 and Sherman’s occupation of the city ended in November 1864. When Sherman and his troops left Atlanta, they deliberately set the city on fire to ensure that Atlanta would be useless to the confederacy (Link 2013).

Ironically, Sherman’s burning destruction led to the death and rebirth of Atlanta. For two years Atlanta worked to rise from its ashes, proudly rebuild itself, and construct a post war narrative of unity and boasted the success of conquering social differences (Link 2013). So much so that the seal of the city, still to this day, illustrates a phoenix, the mythical bird who is reborn from its own ashes, the word “resurgens,” which is Latin for “rising again,” along with the dates 1847 and 1865 symbolizing the date of Atlanta’s incorporation and the rebuilding of a new Atlanta (Anon n.d.-a).

4.2 Atlanta’s History of Redevelopment

Throughout the years, the City of Atlanta has nearly perfected its craft of destruction as a means of rebranding. Time and time again the city and its actors have carefully constructed narratives that facilitate destruction and reinvestment that has led to racial minorities and low-
income individuals being pushed out of their neighborhoods (Immergluck 2022). For example, in 1933, the Public Works Administration, a New Deal Agency under President Roosevelt, provided funding for the clearance of slums and the construction of housing. Charles Palmer, an Atlanta real estate developer, quickly took advantage of the subsidies and led the charge to clear Techwood Flats to build Techwood Homes, the first public housing in the U.S. (Palmer 1955).

Techwood homes, built in 1935, was constructed with residents’ health, safety, and comfort in mind, furnished with the latest appliances, and designed with plenty of social and recreational space (Ickes 1935). Two events would ultimately lead to Techwood’s demise. First, between the 1970s and 1980s, approximately ten thousand code violations were found in the housing project along with a huge increase in crime and drug activity (Historic American Buildings Survey 1995; U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development 1996).

Then in September of 1990, The International Olympic Committee announced Atlanta as the site of the 1996 Summer Olympics (Reid 1990). Techwood homes sat on prime real estate as it was located next to the Georgia Institute of Technology and the Coca-Cola corporate headquarters. With Georgia Tech as the chosen site of the Olympic Village, the derelict condition of the housing project posed image concerns that did not match the perception of a robust global city that city leaders portrayed (Gustafson 2013). For almost 60 years, Techwood homes served the community and provided low-income housing until city makers used the Olympics as another way to reshape the city (Gustafson 2013; Hobson 2017; Newman 1999, 2002).

Although the 1996 Olympics put Atlanta on a global stage, the 1996 Olympics also triggered the removal of Atlanta’s public housing over the next few years. The renovations and removal of public housing were political in a couple of ways. First the 1996 Olympics would
potentially show that world that Atlanta was an International City which would result in international investment and infrastructure development. Next is that public housing amassed Black residents in one area which resulted in influential political power that residents used to educate and advocate for their otherwise ignored communities (Rodriguez 2021). The 1996 Olympics and the development and redevelopment of Techwood homes are just a few examples of how the City of Atlanta has repeatedly engaged in design politics. However, they show how removal, renovations, and rebranding are used to control and improve the city’s image (Keating and Flores 2000).

4.3 Placemaking

Renovations and rebranding of spaces and places within a city are not always negative. Ideally, renovations and rebranding would focus on strengthening the connection between people and places which is a process known as placemaking. Broadly, placemaking is a way to improve urban areas. Mark Wyckoff (2014) suggests there are four distinct types of specialized placemaking meant to achieve a specific objective.

First is standard placemaking, which evolved out of the theories of Jane Jacobs and William H. Whyte (Jacobs 1961; Whyte 1980). Standard placemaking involves improving an area by small incremental changes through lots of small projects or activities (Wyckoff 2014). Second is strategic placemaking, which involves sustainable and mixed-use development built at human scale with a focus on pedestrians. Strategic placemaking often occurs in key centers, corridors, or nodes in a city with the goal of attracting talented workers (Wyckoff 2014). Third, is tactical placemaking which involves low cost, short-term experimental projects such as temporary activity spaces, self-guided historic walks, and placing seating and tables on sidewalks (Wyckoff 2014). Fourth, is creative placemaking which involves the use of arts and cultural
activities such as festivals, movies in the park, outdoor concerts, and cultural or historic murals or monuments throughout local areas (Cohen et al. 2018; Wyckoff 2014).

Ultimately, placemaking is a process that uses physical design to create social interaction that involves various intentions and outcomes. Although Atlantic Station has no mention of placemaking, in their master plan or on their website, they have used each of the four types. Additionally, they engage in core elements that are consistent in placemaking projects 1) Buildings and plazas that are designed at the human scale, 2) Outdoor plazas and parks that provide opportunity for nature and community engagement, 3) Offering various programing such as the maker’s market, outdoor yoga, and concerts, and 4) Specialty retail that reflects the local culture and preferences all while maintaining differentiation and distinction (Hines Global Perspective 2021).

4.4 Placemaking and its Relation to Authenticity

When done correctly placemaking can create accessible, interactive, comfortable, and social places. Placemaking brings communities together by creating meaningful places that have a unique essence. There is a dialectical process between place and people where local culture and people’s identities are strengthened by place which in turn reinforces local culture and identities. However, when placemaking is not authentic, it can result in placelessness and non-places (Augé 1995; Relph 1976).

As cities are constantly placemaking, the question of authenticity comes up. With urbanization and the globalization of cities, more and more places are losing their authentic identity. Authenticity is the quality of being real, true, or having an undisputed origin. However, in urban design authenticity is not about origin but instead about the style and experience of a place. Sometimes, when areas undergo redevelopment the goal is to recreate the experience of
the original place (Zukin 2010). Typically this is done by preserving and reusing historic buildings and areas, encouraging the development of small shops, and promoting distinct cultural identities of neighborhoods (Zukin 2010). Thus, authenticity is no longer about what is real or true of a place but becomes about aesthetic markers that simply signal authenticity. When this is done, authenticity is meant to be consumed, through style and experience of place, as places are reconstructed to capture the initial essence of a place.

As urban spaces are gentrifying, Zukin (2009) suggests modern cities face a crisis of authenticity. This crisis involves the socio-spatial restructuring of cities and the regulation of people and space which is viewed and perceived as an undesirable change in the urban experience. Specifically, the crisis of authenticity impacts how low-income and racial and ethnic minorities live their lives and ultimately lessens social and aesthetic diversity within cities (Zukin 2009). Similarly, Fincher and colleagues (2016) examine placemaking in Melbourne, Australia questioning the tensions between placemaking and urban renewal, inhabitation and exhibition, and dwelling and display. They find that the process of placemaking in urban development puts off incorporating social equity because it is not viewed as important (Fincher, Pardy, and Shaw 2016). Placemaking is increasingly focusing on public spaces and consumption. As a result the politics of people and place, within placemaking, seem to be absent which only increases the concern of social equity via placemaking (Fincher et al. 2016). However, as physical design and policies are implemented to regulate and support the distinct identity of a place it actually reintroduces politics in terms of who belongs, who is welcome, and who is the target audience (Bedoya 2013; Fincher et al. 2016).
4.5 Design Politics and Racial Capitalism

For this chapter, I first use Lawrence Vale’s (2013) theoretical concept of design politics which is useful to my project because it identifies how the design and development process of sites are an “aesthetic judgment” that is “inherently a social and political” act (2013:31). Vale explains design politics as “the reimagining of places” through “attempts by designers and their clients to control messages and eliminate stigmatizing visual cues. It entails purging the landscape of negative associations, thereby permitting a new moral order to commence” (2013:30). Through this framework, places undergo a socially constructed transformation where design and messages are not only intentional and political but result in discriminatory acts and oppression through racism, classism, or even ableism.

Since design politics has a race and class-based component, it interacts with racial capitalism. Cedric Robinson (1983) theorizes capitalism as inherently racialized. Historically, racial capitalism has focused on clear difference and has facilitated slavery, colonialism, genocide, and war throughout the world whereas modern racial capitalism, which is also based in differences, uses multiculturalism to promote inclusion and diversity (Jodi Melamed 2015). Despite how racial capitalism is applied it is still devaluing, destructive, and divisive (Jodi Melamed 2015; Mitchell 1993; Summers 2019).

Nancy Leong (2013) traced the legal beginning of racial capitalism to the 1978 Supreme Court Case of Regents of the University of California v. Bakke where the court’s decision backed affirmation action programs based on race. Their decision also stated that affirmative action was meant to promote racial diversity. Here the social value of whiteness emerged and established that non-whiteness serves two purposes: signaling diversity and commodification (Leong 2013). In sum, racial capitalism is upheld by white supremacy which allows for the commodification,
economically and socially, of non-white racial identities and bodies (Lipsitz 1998; Robinson 1983; Rothstein 2017). By using the concepts of racial capitalism and design politics, I tie racial capitalism and design politics into placemaking and explore how these concepts invite or even deter people from entering places which impacts how they use the space and ultimately explore how exclusion is manifested in Atlantic Station.

4.6 Data and Methods

In this chapter, I focus specifically on the visual aspects within the physical site of Atlantic Station. I ask: How is pseudo public space in Atlantic Station surveilled, designed, made accessible, made inclusive, and utilized? To answer my research questions, I adapt the Public Open Space in Private Development Index (POSPD) (Appendix A) (Rossini and Yiu 2020) to conduct covert non-participant observation of five dimensions: rules and surveillance, image and design, accessibility, inclusiveness, and racial aspects.

The original POSPD contains 24 variables. Examples of the variables include: presence of security cameras, design elements discouraging use of space, linkage to pedestrian flows, and available public restrooms. Each variable is directly observed and recorded by the researcher, with scores ranging from 0 to 2 based on the existence and strength of the variables with zero being absent/low and 2 being heavily present/high (Rossini and Yiu 2020).

However, the POSPD does not evaluate race, which is an integral component of this project. Therefore, I added five more variables concerning race and ethnic relations in order to include a racial analysis. In addition to the POSPD observations, I also recorded general observations that included what people were doing and how they were interacting. For example, were visitors there for activities/events, restaurants, or hanging out?
Observations were conducted at various points throughout Atlantic Station. Each observation lasted approximately 2 hours ranging from 10 am to 8 pm. I conducted a total of 42 observations 3 to 4 times a week over the course of 3 months which resulted in approximately 72 hours in the field. Written and verbal observations were recorded discretely through a cellphone, as it is a commonly used device, through the notes and voice memo app. Those under observation were not made aware that they were being studied in order to avoid subject reactivity. Although, over time, security guards took notice of my routine presence and often asked if I was studying or doing homework.

In order to analyze the POSPD index, I first transcribed POSPD observations into an Excel sheet. For each dimension, the variables were added and then divided by the number of observations to calculate the individual index score ranging from 0 to 2. I then calculated an overall index score for each of the five categories, by adding all variables within the respective categories to end up with an overall score ranging from 0 to 10 or 0 to 12 and divide by the number of variables within each dimension to get an average. A high overall index score indicated: high sociability (low rules and surveillance), excellent physical design, high levels of accessibility, inclusivity and diversity. Across the five dimensions, the POSPD total equals 56.

Since racial aspects is not on the same scale, I multiply the average, along with the other dimension’s averages, by 1.2 to rescale it. I then graph the average of each dimension by breaking the graph into weekdays, weekends, before 3pm and after 3pm to see if each dimension showed a trend regardless of the day or time. I chose to exclude the first two dimensions in the bar graph: rules and surveillance, and design and image, because across all 42 observations their scores did not vary.

12 I multiplied by 1.2 because four of the five dimension equals 12 while racial aspects equals 10. Dividing 12 by 10 equals 1.2
Although the POSPD index provides insight into the sociability of Atlantic Station, I strengthen the analysis by using the code of conduct (Appendix C) to illustrate how surveillance, design, accessibility, and exclusion facilitate not only how people exist inside the pseudo public space, but how they are able to use it as well.

4.7 Image and Design

Although whiteness as an identity is socially constructed it still holds institutional power and social advantages (Du Bois 1935; Feagin 2006; Haney-López 2006; Harris 1993; Lipsitz 1998). The foundation of whiteness is constructed through exclusion and racial domination which can be seen through the embodiment of space and the “right to use and enjoyment” which simply means to take advantage of white privilege (Fluri et al. 2020; Harris 1993:1734). One of the dominant ways whiteness holds power is through its “absolute right to exclude,” which is done by denying others access to the privileges of whiteness (Haney-López 2006; Harris 1993: 1736). Below is a general observation of whiteness.

Personal observation #1

I hop off the metal chair grabbing my notebook and water bottle as I scan the surrounding area searching for the building that is going to provide the most shade. I head to the back of Hobnob, adjusting my shorts as I sit on the warm concrete bench directly across from Regal Cinemas (see image 15). As I place my water bottle to the right of me, I notice “crecer” scrawled in cursive on a flower planter that holds colorful flowers. As I get up and walk closer, I notice there are foreign words on each side of the box. I type the words “crecer,” “grandir,” and “wachsen” into google translate which informs me that all three words mean “grow.”

I take a lap around Atlantic Station where I find several more flower planters (see images 16 – 19) with non-English words on them: “joie” and “alegria” (joy in French and happiness in Spanish), “bonjour” and “gutentag” (good day in French and German), and “lacheln” and “sonreir” (smile in German and Spanish). I did not think anything of the chosen languages until I saw one flowerbox with English words. I wondered what the root of the rest of the languages were. A quick google search answered my question. French, Spanish, and German are all Latin derived languages known as the romantic languages; languages praised for sounding beautiful and rooted in whiteness.

In 1935, W.E.B DuBois conceptualized the “public and psychological wage” of whiteness where he theorized that whiteness is deemed superior and thus is a favored status
within racial capitalism (Du Bois 1935). The flower boxes are indicative of how design politics reinforces whiteness’ right to exclude. There are roughly over 7,000 languages in the world but to only incorporate languages that are based in whiteness presents a faux sense of inclusiveness and diversity without actually being representative of more languages in the world. The flower boxes are also a representation of how modern racial capitalism uses multiculturalism to promote inclusion and diversity. While the flower boxes do indeed represent other cultures, they do not include any non-white cultures.

The POSPDs image and design category includes the presence of art, cultural or visual enhancements, upkept physical conditions and maintenance, climatic comfort, and diversity of seating types. The maximum category score was 12 (see table 3), but Atlantic Station’s average score was 8 which indicates that the development has a moderate level of design that is aesthetically pleasing and welcoming. Atlantic Station has plenty of beautification and design elements. Around the development are greenery and eye-catching plants. In the middle of the development is the Atlantic Green, which is an open, functional, and flexible lawn space with an LED jumbotron, a plaza area that includes a water fountain, murals, and is surrounded by restaurants. There is also a diversity of seating types such as concrete, metal, and wood benches, removable lawn chairs, and stationary high tables with swivel metal barstools. Although Atlantic Station offers multiple types of seating, they are very sparse and not evenly spread out through the development. Additionally, none of the seating is comfortable, none are covered by awnings or trees, and some can easily be taken out of the space. There are also several design elements that discourage the use of space such as anti-skateboard architecture placed on ledges and the absence of microclimates which are design elements that provide shade or shelter from rain.
Design is the ideological embodiment of policies and political actions. Viewing design as the material form of power offers insight into how the design of places allows people to interact with an environment. The comfortability of Atlantic Station’s design is just enough for visitors during their stay. From the removable seating, the unavailability of protection from the elements, and seating materials that are either extremely hard or heat up in the sun, it all intentionally limits wanted and unwanted guests from staying too long. This is also an example of antirelationality where relations between people are disconnected or reduced for capitalism to exist (Jodi Melamed 2015; Wilson Gilmore 2002). By keeping the design comfortability at a minimum, it reinforces socio-spatial exclusion as visitors can frequent the same areas but are still separated socially as Atlantic Station does not provide a space where visitors can engage with others.

4.8 Surveillance and Accessibility

Surveillance also exhibits characteristics of design politics and placemaking. In 2019, a group of experts ranging from academics to design professionals and security experts emphasized the need to balance safety and accessibility in public spaces (Anon 2019). According to the Project for Public Spaces, safety and accessibility are one of the many factors that makes a place great (Project for Public Spaces 2023). Below is an excerpt of Atlantic Station’s surveillance from my general observations:

Personal observation #2

I impatiently tap my fingers on my steering wheel as I slowly inch forward in the exit line. I look down at my parking ticket and back to the digital screen illuminating a hazy white blueish tint onto my dashboard. It is now 8:15 pm which means I have three minutes before the two hours of free parking that Atlantic Station offers is up. Nodding my head to the song playing on the radio, I watch as the man in front of me inserts his credit card and waits for the parking machine to approve his ticket. Once it does, the SUV in front of me accelerates up the parking ramp and out of sight. As I pull forward next to the pay machine, it reads 8:16pm. I barely made it. Breathing a deep sigh of relief, I roll down the car window and prepare to hang halfway out the window to insert my parking ticket into the pay machine, but before I could even get my arm out the window the parking arm raises. I stop for a couple of seconds, confused as to why the barrier granted me entry without reading my parking ticket. Within my next couple of visits, I
figured out that from the moment a car enters Atlantic Station’s parking deck, surveillance begins.

There are 80 vehicle recognition and license plate recognition systems over all 40 of the entry and exit lanes within Atlantic Station’s parking garage (Rotenberg 2015). As visitors enter the parking garage, the high-tech computer software converts images of vehicles and their license plates into computer readable data (Rotenberg 2015). Once visitors have parked and either use the elevator or escalator to the street level of Atlantic Station, surveillance increases. When walking around Atlantic Station, it is not immediately apparent that the development is highly surveilled so it can be easy to overlook or even consciously think about the surveillance measures in place.

This is partly due to the development’s natural surveillance with its open physical design, long business hours and high walkability. Each of these elements increase visibility and provide more “eyes on the street” (Jacobs 1961; Newman 1978). Although this type of surveillance is deemed natural it is anything but. Natural surveillance is planned as a part of design politics. Jorge Camacho (2018) points out political changes for design in the social field one of which is the unequal distribution of power among social actors. Part of this is that some actors will have the ability to establish and increase the ability of a preferred situation (Camacho 2018). In the context of Atlantic Station, the preferred situation is order through surveillance.

The POSPDs rules and security category includes the presence of security personnel (see note 1), presence of signs to exclude activities, certain people, and behaviors, the presence of security cameras, and if subjective or judgment rules are posted. The maximum category score was 12, but Atlantic Station’s average score was 0, meaning that Atlantic Station has strict rules and high visibility of surveillance (see table 3). With placemaking, surveillance is used to ensure
and foster safety and security since the safer people feel then the more likely they are to return. Similarly, surveillance is beneficial to consumer based placemaking as it allows for ability to stop subjective deviant behavior that could interrupt people’s return and/or the interruption of the consumer experience.

The code of conduct has rules set in place to ensure consumerism is not interrupted. Loitering, protesting, demonstrating, or any type assembling that may disturb the public is prohibited. Although the code of conduct prohibits loitering, the Atlantic Green is a space meant for gathering, lounging, and hanging out. The Atlantic Station supports this as they provide picnic necessities and lawn and board games available for use on the Atlantic Green (see image 20). However, with these amenities available, the code of conduct seems to contradict the purpose of the Atlantic Green.

Ironically, Atlantic Station is nicknamed a “city within a city” but the development does not contain any supportive public institutions as a real city would (Hankins and Powers 2009). Only repressive aspects of public institutions such as police officers, security personnel, and surveillance are present in Atlantic Station. Furthermore, the development, its residents, or visitors do not have a collective identity (Hankins and Powers 2009). But even if they did, they could not mobilize or utilize their collective identity as the code of conduct prohibits any type of assembling since it would disrupt the highly regulated faux public space that is only meant to engage the public by consumerism.

Recently, Atlantic Station enhanced their surveillance. However, their increased security measures do not stop with just surveillance. They also have a curfew that limits accessibility for certain age groups (see note 2). According to the posted code of conduct, a 6:00 p.m. curfew is strictly enforced for everyone under 18. Parents must accompany minors after 6:00 p.m., and no
one under 21 is allowed onsite after 11:00 p.m. In January of 2022 (see note 3), the curfew became even more strict. Under the revised curfew, individuals younger than 18 cannot be on the property after 3:00 p.m. One adult can only chaperone up to 4 minors, and no one under 21 is permitted on the property after 9:00 p.m. (Dillon 2022).

Curfew is only one example of accessibility. The remaining indicators for this category include constrained hours of operation, areas of restricted or conditional use, and linkage to pedestrian flows. The maximum category score was 12 but the average for Atlantic Station was 6.6 which shows that Atlantic Station is moderately accessible and welcoming (see table 3). There were a few features that made the site more accessible such as large sidewalks and open street space which allows wheelchairs, strollers, and mobility scooters to easily maneuver and get around the development.

Another accessibility feature are street signs and huge store directories and maps that tell visitors where amenities are located. As a part of Atlantic Station promotion of pedestrian and transit-oriented access, the development is within a 15-minute walk of the Marta Arts station and provides free shuttles to and from the station. Although accessibility starts with transportation, it is not the only factor. Successful placemaking includes accessibility which benefits all. Accessibility is not limited to one’s physical or cognitive ability to use and navigate a place, it also encompasses the equitable access of places whether that is through design or policies (Geoghegan n.d.).

There were also features that made the site less welcoming such as very few street connections to the surrounding neighborhood which makes getting into Atlantic Station difficult and congested. When graphing accessibility (see graph 1), there was no variation in the average
of scores based on time of day. Although Atlantic Station scored a 6.6, the lack of variation in accessibility is not surprising due to the physical design and constant measures in place.

4.9 Inclusiveness and Racial Aspects

Aside from physical attributes, accessibility also includes inclusiveness. Whether it is based on age, race, or class, who feels welcome and who is allowed to be in a space is important. Below is an excerpt of Atlantic Station’s inclusiveness from my general observations:

Personal observation #3

It is early morning and Atlantic Station looks like a ghost town compared to the normal hustle and bustle I am used to seeing. The only people I see are dressed in athletic clothing either headed to the gym or walking their dog. I turn my attention to the Atlantic Green where workers are setting up a white fence around the perimeter. “Stay close to me!” I crane my neck to identify the source of the loud voice and see a young boy on a scooter zooming towards me as his mother jogs to keep up with him. This is not the first time I have seen young children turn the Atlantic Green into a makeshift play area (see note 4). As the young boy scooters on the spacious walkway his mother complains that all the lawn chairs are put up. A worker overhears her and explains that they are getting ready for Tot Spot, a signature monthly event for children 5 and under that provides free crafts, games, snacks and sing-alongs. I jot down that Atlantic Station seems to offer events and activities for all ages.

In addition to Tot Spot, Atlantic Station has another age inclusive event. Screen on the Green (see image 21) is a seasonal biweekly movie night that shows family friendly movies geared towards different ages groups. The development also holds several free live music concerts featuring various genres of music throughout the late summer. Unlike age when it came to social class it was hard to visibly tell what class individuals were in, but I did notice that corporate workers visited Atlantic Station during lunchtime.

The POSPDs inclusiveness category includes presence of peoples of different ages and social categories, availability of restrooms, range of activities and permitted behaviors. Atlantic Station lacked multiple community gathering places, and only had pop-up stores or small-scale food vendors at scheduled events and not on an everyday basis. The maximum category score was 12 (see table 3) but on average Atlantic Station’s score was 6.6 which indicates that Atlantic
Station is moderately inclusive and capable of developing social activities. When graphing inclusiveness (see graph 1), weekends showed higher variation compared to weekdays.

Despite Atlantic Station’s efforts at creating inclusive social activities, during my observations I did not notice a high variation in the presence of racial groups. There were almost equal sightings of Black and white people, but very few other racial groups. To explore the development’s racial composition of its visitors, I amended the POSPD and added the category of racial aspects which included presence of racial and ethnic minorities, events geared toward racial and ethnic minorities, and diverse marketing and advertising (see images 22-25). The maximum category score was 10 (see table 3), but on average Atlantic Station’s score was 4 which suggests that Atlantic Station has low levels of diversity.

So far, throughout each category, the “design” of Atlantic Station is apparent and easily observable, but what is less apparent is the “politics” of Atlantic Station. Repeatedly the theme of who this space is designed for and what invites or deters people to use this space or even enter is present. The “dress responsibly” category of Atlantic Station’s Code of Conduct is not only subjective and exclusionary, but it limits inclusiveness and potentially even some racial groups. The code of conducts states, “no gang related clothing” and does not permit obscuring of one’s face with hooded shirts or sweatshirts. Gang related clothing can range from bandanas to sport team/baseball caps or even colored shoe laces (City of Santa Cruz 2022; Gang Enforcement Company 2022; Stafford County Public Schools 2022). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Black and brown working-class urban youth wore hoodies, sneakers, and caps, which is now known as streetwear, as staples in their everyday wardrobe.

Over time street wear has transcended racial and class boundaries and is now a fashionable trend especially among Gen Z, individuals born in the lates 1990s to 2010 (Patel and
Mehta 2021). Although streetwear is now commodified and popularized among the dominant culture, it can have serious consequences when worn by non-white individuals such as expulsion from school or the loss of their life as was the case for Trayvon Martin (McCann 2014). Dress code policies often use colorblind language to ban specific clothing that is seemingly race neutral (May 2018). At face value, dress code rules are meant to create a safe environment, maintain a particular atmosphere, and even draw a certain crowd. Yet, at the same time, dress code rules are used deliberately to invoke order and surveillance (see note 5).

4.10 Atlantic Station’s Overall Sociability

Overall, Atlantic Station is highly regulated, strictly surveilled, and designed to be visibly attractive but not comfortable. Timewise, after 3pm and weekends were more diverse, more inclusive, and more accessible. This could be because more people were likely to visit during those times. Although the development has the capacity to develop inclusive and social activities which could increase people to people and people to place bonds, the lack of free activities and events makes it difficult. Atlantic Station works within its limits to be accessible but with the development’s focus on consumerism, it is not a place designed for full accessibility where people can gather and linger. Yet Atlantic Station creates a false sense of this. Additionally, there is not a collective identity for Atlantic Station or its visitors and there is little to no chance to create one, as Atlantic Station is a primarily a transitory, non-place.

Atlantic Station’s surveillance, design, accessibility, and exclusion are all influenced by and geared towards creating a place of consumption. Even though Atlantic Station did not directly remove people during their redevelopment and construction of the site, they still participate in forms of removal. First is voluntary removal meaning that visitors may self-select not to return due to how the development is surveilled, designed, made inclusive and made
accessible. Second, is involuntary removal since the development has the discretion and power to remove anyone that they deem as violating their subjective code of conduct and property guidelines.

Atlantic Station’s chosen form of placemaking along with its design politics and sociability is not conducive to creating a true community and impacts how visitors enter and use the space. Ideally, the local culture and people’s identities are strengthened by place which in turn reinforces local culture and identities. But the development’s design politics, placemaking, and sociability all come together and interrupt the dialectical process between people and place which helps turn Atlantic Station, a place meant for living, working, and playing into a transitory spot. Overall, just like the City of Atlanta, Atlantic Station uses design politics to its advantage to rid the development of unwanted people and behavior in order to preserve the development’s projected image.
4.11 Notes

1. One of Atlantic Station surveillance measures is private security with a location on site. However, during my observations, I barely saw the security officers. The few times I did they were rarely on foot and often on golf carts cruising the streets within the development. Although their presence was not easily observed, it was even more rare for me to see the off-duty Atlanta police officer. Most of the time, I saw their empty squad car with the lights flashing and engine idling parked on the street, almost as if was a permanent fixture. It was not until one afternoon when an altercation broke out in the green space that I witnessed three Atlantic Station officers (see image 26) and an Atlanta police officer run to the scene where they were able to quickly diffuse the situation.

2. During my visits the enforcement of the curfew seemed relaxed and hard to enforce. I would often see large groups of teenagers hanging in the Atlantic Green, recreating TikTok dances, or dressed up for birthday gatherings. Similarly, children who looked 10 and under would cartwheel across the Atlantic Green, spin in circles until they fell down, or rapidly run and chase other kids, laughing joyously as they dodged in and out of the crowds. This type of play was often reoccurring and led me to wonder if proximity mattered in the curfew. In one instance, a child’s guardians were eating at Hobknob’s outside patio while the child was several feet away playing on the Atlantic Green. Although the child did occasionally check-in, I wondered did adults have to always supervise their children or was simply being in the development enough.

3. Over 500 security cameras placed around the development that monitor the development 24/7. Yet, that does not prevent crime from happening. On November 26th, two adolescents, 12-year-old Zyion Charles and 15-year-old Cameron Jackson, were shot and killed near Atlantic Station after a group of teens were escorted off site due to their behavior and violation of curfew. This tragic incident, as of December 2nd, 2022, led Atlantic Station to increase their off-duty police presence. They also opted in to Atlanta Police Department’s Evening Watch program which mandates that officers have to stay in the surrounding area to respond to any potential incidents swiftly, and integrate their surveillance cameras into Connect Atlanta, a citywide network of over 4,500 surveillance cameras that allows officers to access surveillance footage from their cellphones and car laptops before even reaching the scene.

4. During another visit, little boys ran and leaped through water arches that the fountain jetted out (see image 27).

5. During my observations I did not notice enforcement of the dress code rules, but I did wonder if it was because streetwear is diffused into the dominant culture now.

13 This picture was taken shortly after the altercation which is why the officers are smiling.
Figure 15. Concrete bench

Figure 16. Joie flower box
Figure 17. Alegria flower box

Figure 18. Bonjour flower box
Figure 19. Lacheln and Sonreir flower box
Figure 20. Couple having a picnic on the Atlantic Green

Figure 21. Screen on the Green
Figure 22. Marketing and advertising: Couple taking a selfie

Figure 23. Marketing and advertising: group of friends taking a selfie
Figure 24. Marketing and advertising: group of friends cheers their drinks together

Figure 25. Coffee gradient
Figure 26. Security officers smiling

Figure 27. Young boys playing in water fountain
Table 3: POSPD raw scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average index scores of all observations</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules and Surveillance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image and Design</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Aspects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 1: Averages Scores of POSPD Dimensions by temporal variation
5 THROUGH VISITING EYES: EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF ATLANTIC STATION

5.1 Outsideness
Edward Relph, a geographer, conceptualized the term place identity which is “persistent sameness and unity which allows that [place] to be differentiated from others” (1976:45). Relph (1976) characterizes a place’s persistent identity by three components: 1) appearance of the place’s physical setting, 2) the places activities and events and 3) the individual or societal meaning ascribed to a place. Relph (1976) takes the concept of place identity a step further by considering the lived experience of individuals as they experience place which he terms as insideness; the extent to which an individual is attached or involved with a particular place. Relph (1976) also suggests that individuals can experience being separated or alienated from a place which he calls outsideness. This chapter focuses on outsideness which I refer to as exclusion from here on. In this chapter, I investigate if Atlantic Station visitors are experiencing exclusion. I explore if a lack of belonging, welcomeness, connection, and community are more prevalent for racial and ethnic minorities or for all. I also explore visitors’ experiences and feelings of exclusion.

5.2 Data and Methods

5.2.1 Analyzing Exclusion, Visits, and Returning Quantitatively

I operationalize exclusion with four questions from the Visitor’s Experiences and Perceptions survey. These questions were answered by individuals who had visited Atlantic Station at least once since 2018 and include the following: I feel a spirit of community at Atlantic Station. I sometimes feel like I do not belong at Atlantic Station. I feel welcome at Atlantic Station. I feel that I can really be myself at Atlantic Station (1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree). Due to small
groups in the strongly disagree/disagree and agree/strongly agree categories, I combined those categories and ended with only 3 answer choices: 1=disagree, 2=neither disagree nor agree, 3=agree.

In addition to analyzing the individual questions, I develop an “exclusion index” that adds up all four questions (reverse coding ‘I feel welcome,’ ‘I feel a spirit of community,’ and ‘I can be myself’ so that higher values indicate more exclusion). Theoretically, I would expect individuals that are excluded at Atlantic Station to report high levels of exclusion across many or all the exclusion variables. This created an index ranging from 4 to 12. I subtracted 4 from the index so it would start at 0, resulting in an index that ranged from 0 to 8 with higher scores indicating more exclusion.

I also analyzed times visited and the likelihood of a visitor returning to Atlantic Station, since both are likely connected to exclusion. To capture times visited, I use two questions: Thinking about all your visits ever to Atlantic Station, about how many times have you visited? (1=1 to 3 times, 2= 4 to 6 times, 3= 7 to 9 times, 4=10 times or more) and in the last 30 days, how often did you visit Atlantic Station? (1= Never, 2= 1 to 2 times, 3= 3 to 4 times, 4= 5 times or more). To capture likelihood of returning I use one question: What is the likelihood that you will return to Atlantic Station? (1= Highly unlikely, 2= Unlikely, 3= Neither likely nor unlikely, 4= Likely, 5= Highly likely).

I hypothesize that exclusion is higher for participants who are unlikely or highly unlikely to return. I also hypothesize that the less times a participant visited Atlantic Station then the higher the exclusion they experienced.
5.2.2 Analyzing Exclusion Qualitatively

For this chapter, I focus on open-ended questions from the Visitor’s Experiences and Perceptions survey, that inquire about visitor’s experiences of exclusion while at Atlantic Station. To analyze the qualitative data, I exported participant’s responses from each open-ended question into NVIVO. I then carried out latent content analysis, which is to take what is apparent and obvious and interpret the intended or underlying meaning, in four stages (Bengtsson 2016). In stage one, I decontextualized, I coded and broke down my preliminary data into meaning units. Then I recontextualized and double checked that all applicable parts of the data were coded and assigned a meaning unit. Next, I categorized and grouped the identified meaning units into categories. Lastly, I compiled and organized themes to present results (Bengtsson 2016).

5.2.3 Covariates

To account for participant’s demographic characteristics, I measured age, gender, race, and education. Age is a categorical variable, where participants placed themselves into respective age groups which ranged from 18 to 24, 25 to 34, 35 to 44, and 45 and over. Participants also self-selected their race and ethnicity by marking if they were Alaskan Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Native American, Native Hawaiian, or white. In addition, participants had the choice to write in an answer which were: Black and White (1), South Asian (1), Multiracial (2), White and Black (1), and Hispanic (1). Those who wrote in answers were either coded into a preexisting racial category or coded into a new category of multiracial. Since only 4 participants identified up as multiracial, that racial category was dropped. The Hispanic category was also dropped due to low numbers. Additionally, no participants selected Alaskan Native, Native American or Native Hawaiian thus racial categories for the sample are Asian, Black, or white.
Gender is a three-category variable (0=man, 1=woman, and 2=non-binary), but less than 5 participants identified as non-binary so those participants were dropped as well. Gender was then transformed into a binary variable with 1 indicating participants who were women. Lastly, education is also a categorical variable ranging from less than high school, high school/GED, trade school, associate’s, and bachelor’s degree. For ease of interpretation, education was transformed into a binary variable with 1 indicating a bachelors or higher which could include a master’s, professional or doctoral degree.

5.2.4 Missing Data

The survey was disseminated online via social media platforms and in Georgia State University sociology courses which resulted in 211 responses. However only 181 responses were useable because 26 people did not answer any questions at all and 4 people did not meet the study criteria. There were several variables that had missing data. After listwise deleting those observations, there were 125 responses left. Before listwise deletion, I ran all analyses including observations that had missing data. I obtained similar results as when the analysis was restricted to complete cases only.

5.2.5 Identity Characteristics and Their Contribution to Exclusion

In this chapter, I pair qualitative and quantitative analysis together with the goal of understanding how Atlantic Station visitors feel excluded. Atlantic Station like many other mixed-use developments boasts about its pedestrian friendly development. The blend of commercial and residential space paired with community minded amenities draws in plenty of visitors. In the study sample (table 4), a majority of Atlantic Station visitors identified as women. The sample was also relatively young with most participants ranging from 25 to 34 years old, the
racial breakdown was evenly split between Black and white, and a majority obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher. Statistics for exclusion suggest a low level of exclusion.

Participants mainly visited Atlantic Station for shopping purposes. Nearly 50% had visited 10 times or more ever, but 62% reported that they had not been at all within the last 30 days. Despite that, 40% said they were likely to return. 64% of participants felt welcome at Atlantic Station and 45% felt that could really be themselves while visiting. However, 63% of participants felt that they sometimes do not belong at Atlantic Station, only 32% felt a spirit of community at Atlantic Station, and 28% of participants agreed that Atlantic Station seemed to value diversity.

Qualitatively, participants recognized that their identity characteristics contributed to feelings of exclusion (see Table 5, theme 1). Responses indicated that visitors felt excluded due to their age, stating that the enforcement of a curfew did not allow them to patronize restaurants and entertainment options such as the bowling alley and movie theater. Visitors also felt that race contributed to exclusion. Visitors reported Atlantic Station was a “very white inhabited areas with a diverse visiting population.” Yet, at the same time, several visitors stated that they did not see many Black people during their visits and one participant shared that they received looks for wearing Afrocentric clothing.

Despite a conflicted view on visitor’s racial demographics, participants mentioned numerous times that Atlantic Station seems to be for a specific group of people. One participant shared that “it [Atlantic Station] is definitely made for white middle-class families and does not fully accept other classes and races.” While another mentioned “I feel as though Atlantic Station is a staunch representation of rampant gentrification in Atlanta that caters to white communities
and is indicative of many neighborhoods in and around Atlanta, especially West Midtown (where Atlantic Station is located).”

Participant’s responses are in line with the fact that gentrification is not unusual once neighborhood land-use changes, improvements are made, and urban amenities are added (MacDonald and Stokes 2020). Similarly, another participant felt that “majority of the imagery around, especially for marketing, often tokenizes BIPOC. In reality, the audiences they cater to are gentrifying middle-upper class people that make up the Midtown and surrounding areas.”

What participants point out are negative mechanisms of neoliberal urbanism and gentrification. Neoliberal urbanism has changed the creation and destruction of the built environment due to a focus on consumption via, privatized elite and purified spaces, construction of mega-projects, and gentrification (Peck, Theodore, and Brenner 2009). Together, neoliberal urbanism and gentrification change the population and identity characteristics of people who inhabit and visit areas.

5.3 Urbanization and Place Identity

Urbanization and globalization have changed the way that cities are constructed (Ritzer 2003). Scholars suggest that homogenization has rid urban spaces of their unique cultural and geographic identities resulting in placelessness; places that are inauthentic, ahistoric, abstract, and are void of local meaning (Knox and Pain 2010; Relph 1976). Atlantic Station is a representation of this trend. Even though Atlantic Station offers community events, a gathering space, and numerous amenities at its core it is still a glorified shopping center with its unique place identity contingent on the development’s symbolism of its name and the area’s history (Hankins 2009). Take those away and Atlantic Station has no real place identity outside of its label as a luxury site.
5.3.1 Luxury as an Influence on Number of Visits and Rates of Exclusion

When asked about additional thoughts or experiences at Atlantic Station, participants expressed Atlantic Station’s perceived affluence. Participants equated luxury to inauthenticity and viewed it as a source of exclusion (table 5, theme 2). One participant expressed that “Atlantic Station is an extravagant area. Sometimes a luxury lifestyle is not authentic. That may be the reason why I have not visited in years.” Although Atlantic Station has carefully curated the image and design within the development, many participants expressed that it felt fabricated: “It can feel too staged like an area trying to be urban that is created by and for suburbanites.” Likewise, one participant noted that “Atlantic Station seems inauthentic to me. It lacks character when compared to other neighborhoods/communities of Metro Atlanta.”

Participants also felt that high end retail stores (table 5, theme 3) were another element of exclusion stating that “people without money don’t seem welcome” and “the stores, the prices of products within the stores, the events. Knowing I clearly can’t shop until I drop in this area is kind of alienating.” Similarly, participants felt that residential areas contributed to exclusion (table 5, theme 2). One participant noted that “the apartment/condos don’t help, it just gives off a very uppity standard or ‘I’m better than you’ agenda.” Another participant stated that “I enjoy the environment of Atlantic Station, but I do feel a higher-class culture that I do not partake in. I also cannot resonate with those who live there, seeing as they enjoy a sense of luxury and convenience that is not afforded to me.”

Residential and retail places could play a part in visitors’ exclusion levels and the differences of their visits in the last 30 days and all visits ever (table 6). In the study sample, almost a majority of the sample visited 10 times or more which is likely why this group experienced the lowest amount of exclusion across all their visits ever. A large portion (62%) of
the sample did not visit Atlantic Station at all within the last 30 days and experienced a higher level of exclusion compared to those who did visit frequently during the last 30 days. Overall, results show that the less times a participant visited Atlantic Station, the more exclusion they experienced. However, the causal direction is unclear whether people feel excluded because they never visit or whether people avoid visiting because they feel excluded. Despite this, results suggest that exclusion is related to the number of visits, so it is likely that number of visits is contingent on a person’s likelihood of returning. In the next section, I discuss potential reasons and statistics of the likelihood of returning.

5.3.2 Outsideness, Attachment and Likelihood of Returning

Using Relph’s concepts of place identity and outsideness, I view live, work, and play environments through a growth machine perspective (Logan and Molotch 1976). The growth machine situates place as an unconventional commodity. Unlike conventional commodities, places are limited due to the creation of space being limited. The purpose of a growth machine is to garner capital investments and drive local growth in value free development (Logan and Molotch 1976). The entities that compose the growth machine do not care about the production process (destruction, etc.). Instead, they are only concerned about the use and exchange value of the products. The use values that places create and maintain result in multifaceted social and material attachments (Logan and Molotch 1976). However, not all people who visit places experience attachments.

Atlantic Station’s place identity is not just a way to create a unique local identity but also serves to create place attachment. Creating place is important but the most important component to places are people. Humans are social beings who seek out feelings of belonging, community, feeling welcome, and being their true selves. Each of these characteristics are beneficial to place
identity. When placemaking is done correctly it will create a meaningful place identity which can lead to place attachment, but consumer based placemaking can disrupt this process and lead to feelings of exclusion for visitors. If people do not feel included whether through a sense of community or belonging, then place becomes void of value and social connections thus exhibiting characteristics of a non-place (Augé 1995).

While some participants viewed Atlantic Station as inauthentic, some participants viewed the development as sterile (table 5, theme 2). When asked about any thoughts about Atlantic Station, participants communicated that the design of Atlantic Station plays a big part of exclusion and possible reasons for not visiting: “It seems very sterile and corporate. Too much concrete. Not the warm feeling you get when surrounded by flowers and old red bricks.” While another participant mentioned “I'm mostly indifferent to Atlantic Station…but I'm not particularly a fan of over-priced, over-policed, and over-sanitized (not in the sense of Covid measures but more in the sense of lack of the grungy feel I associate with places I spend time) spaces.” Interestingly, one participant did not mind the over sterilization of Atlantic Station stating that they liked the cleanness and “everything was organized, and streets were clean. However…I cannot define this place as a cultural symbol of Atlanta. From Ponce City Market, I do feel some sense of belonging, but not from Atlantic Station.”

If design, authenticity, and lack of place matter to visitors it could explain the results of differences in average levels of exclusion across number of visits in the last 30 days and all visits ever (table 6). For participants who visited within the last 30 days, the average level of exclusion decreases with more visits and participants who visited at least 3 times or more were significantly different than those who had zero visits. Similarly, for all visits ever, exclusion decreases the more participants visited. Design, authenticity, and lack of place could also explain
the results of differences in the average likelihood of returning to Atlantic Station across number of visits in the last 30 days and all visits ever (table 7). For participants in the study, when considering their visits within the last 30 days, the likelihood of returning is higher for those had visited 1 to 2 times and especially 3 or more times compared to no visits. For all visits ever, there was a similar pattern, with the likelihood of returning being higher for those who had more visits when compared to lesser visits. As expected, regardless of visits within the last 30 days and all visits ever, the less participants visited Atlantic Station, the less likely they were to return. If participants view Atlantic Station as lacking grit and authenticity, then the development’s noticeably planned aspects and inauthenticity could indicate that the development is a non-place.

5.4 Live, Work, and Play Environments as Non-Places

Marc Augé, an anthropologist, contrasts a non-place against a place. Places are relational, historical, and concerned with identity. If a place does not meet those requirements, then it is labeled as a non-place. Specifically, non-places are transitory inorganic places that shifts into space that does not produce a lasting impact or create a singular identity or relations; only a similar solitude (Augé 1995). Due to the ambiguous and ambivalent nature of Augé’s concept some scholars, as well as Augé, point out that a place can be both a place and a non-place (Augé 1995; Gregory 2009). Examples of non-places are airports, hotels, shopping centers, theme parks, and tourist spots; places where individuals do not spend a lot of time and only pass through.

Although Atlantic Station has plenty to offer, participants shared that they go to Atlantic Station for specific reasons. In fact, over 66% of participants said that they mainly go to Atlantic Station for shopping and 47% said they go for dining (table 4). While amenities like shopping and dining are certainly reasons for repeat visits, it does not guarantee visitors coming back. In
this section I discuss differences in the average exclusion experienced for visitors across levels of returning (table 8) and connect transience as a source of exclusion and likelihood of returning. In my sample, those who were likely or highly likely to return experienced lower levels of exclusion on the index. As expected, visitors who were unlikely to return had significantly higher levels of exclusion compared to those who were likely or highly likely to return. Overall, the less likely a visitor was to return, the higher rates of exclusion (table 8).

Participant’s exclusion and likelihood of returning could be related to Atlantic Station’s transience. As mentioned in theme 2 (table 5), one participant did not feel a sense of belonging which is an important aspect of placemaking. Equally important to placemaking is building a sense of place. However, without either of these aspects, it can contribute to the making of a non-place. As one participant indicated that Atlantic Station “should [be] a truly friendly pedestrian place and not an island between midtown and the west side. Just developing for businesses does not give a sense of place.” In addition, another participant explicitly stated that “[Atlantic Station] it’s a bit of a ‘non-place’ that lacks authenticity.” Many participants expressed similar sentiments stating that they do not gather or linger at Atlantic Station. Instead, the development acts as a purely transitory space where they go out of necessity - for food, dining, and entertainment:

“The times I went there were mostly out of necessity, but I doubt I'd ever go there for a night out with friends.”

“I just go in to get what I need to get and then I bounce!”

“I just go to shop never linger.”
“Atlantic Station to me has always be a place to shop and get food. People love to go to the theater there and shop after.”

“All in all, it’s a nice destination to get out and enjoy food and entertainment.”

Atlanta Station has always felt a tad “developed” and dry - maybe touristy? I mostly go to target, maybe a movie or Bowlero once a year. I also have my primary care physician there. I don’t feel excluded, but I don’t feel welcome either.

According to Augé, economics was the force that created non-places. So, for live, work, and play environments that primarily engage in consumer based placemaking, it can be argued that these places are transitory based, inauthentic, exclusionary, and cease to function as places at all.

5.4.1 Predicting Who is Likely to Feel Excluded

So far, I have discussed potential reasons why participants feel excluded which provides a deeper understanding that is valuable and necessary. However more insight on who is likely to feel excluded is needed. In this section, I use ordinary least squares regression to predict increasing levels of exclusion (table 9). In my sample, for visitors who are Black, there is a .17 unit decrease in exclusion and for visitors who are Asian there is a .14 unit decrease in exclusion compared to visitors who are white (see table 9, model 1).

Next, in model 2 (table 9), I control for all study variables adding in age, gender, education, last month’s visits, and all visits ever. Both race variables remain significant. For
visitors who are Black, there is a .15 unit decrease in exclusion and for visitors who are Asian there is a .17 decrease in exclusion compared to visitors who are white. Within this model, 3 or more visits within the last month is also significant. So, for visitors who visited Atlantic Station more than 3 times in the last month there is a 1.9 unit decrease in exclusion compared to those who never visited.

Black and Asian respondents\textsuperscript{14} feeling less excluded than white participants is an unexpected finding but could possibly be explained by differences in the conceptualization and threshold of exclusion for different racial groups. In a recent study, over half of white Americans believed that anti-white discrimination was on the rise, yet a much smaller percentage actually experienced discrimination (National Public Radio et al. 2017). Despite the perceived rise of discrimination, white people are able to draw on and benefit from the wages of whiteness (Du Bois 1935; Payne 2019). Yet, in the United States, racial and ethnic minorities experience discrimination on a daily basis. Discrimination, no matter how intense or subtle, is still discrimination, but when racial and ethnic minorities experience microaggressions, seek healthcare, apply for jobs, or even interact with law enforcement it could culminate in a different perception of discrimination (Anglin and Lui 2023; Bleich et al. 2019; Edwards, Lee, and Esposito 2019; Gonzalez et al. n.d.; Quillian et al. 2017). If participants are not evaluating discrimination on the same scale, it could explain why Black and Asian participants experienced less exclusion.

\textsuperscript{14} In the study sample, Black and Asian individuals are within 5% of Atlanta’s population. While not a huge margin, these racial groups are still oversampled. OLS results could be skewed, but qualitative results support that race plays a factor in feelings of exclusion.
5.4.2 Predicting Who is Likely to Return

So far analysis suggests that participant’s exclusion and likelihood of returning could be connected to race. In this section, I use ordinal logistic regression to predict the probability of returning by race, exclusion, gender, age, and times visited (table 10). In my sample, for visitors who are Black, the odds of moving up a category in likely to return to Atlantic Station is 2.41 greater when compared to visitors who are white (see table 10 model 1).

After adding exclusion to model 2 (see table 10), it is highly significant, but the effect of race disappears. Here, for a one-unit increase in exclusion, the odds of being highly likely to return versus the combined unlikely, neither, and likely categories decrease about 30%. Likewise, for a one unit increase in exclusion the odds of being unlikely to return versus the combined neither, likely, and highly likely categories are about 70% more. Again, in model three (table 10), exclusion is significant. So, for every one-point increase in exclusion the odds of being highly likely to return versus the combined unlikely, neither, and likely categories decrease by 32%. Likewise, for a one unit increase in exclusion the odds of being unlikely to return versus the combined neither, likely, and highly likely categories are about 68% more.

In the final model, model 4 (see table 10), exclusion, 4 to 6 visits, and 10 or more visits are significant. For every one-point increase in exclusion the odds of moving up a category in likely to return to Atlantic Station decrease about 29%. Likewise, for a one unit increase in exclusion the odds of being unlikely to return versus the combined neither, likely, and highly likely categories are about 70% more. For visitors who visited 4 to 6 total times, the odds of being more likely to return is 321% greater for those who only visited 1 to 3 total times and

15 In the previous and final models, none of the oversampled groups are significant. Quantitatively, having a study that is more women, more educated, and younger does not impact on who is likely to return. However, qualitative results support that age plays a factor in exclusion. In addition, unobserved factors might distinguish my sample from a more representative sample.
507% greater for those who visited 10 or more total times when compared to those who only visited 1 to 3 total times.

Overall, findings demonstrate that the less exclusion visitors experienced then the more likely they were to return. Particularly when considering race, Black and Asian participants, compared to white participants, experienced less exclusion and Black participants were more likely to return. Although race mattered when it came to exclusion, results indicate that the likelihood of returning is primarily driven by feelings of exclusion and having visited before.

In addition to race, qualitative findings show that participants identify several factors that bring up feelings of exclusion such as age and class due to Atlantic Station’s curfew and luxury residential and retail areas. Additionally, participant’s exclusion and number of visits could be explained by Atlantic Station’s design, connectivity, and transport options. Even though Atlantic Station is designed as pedestrian oriented and walkable many participants expressed that the development was difficult to navigate due to design (table 5, theme 4). One participant shared that “despite being hailed as a great city design, it isn’t well designed into the overall streetscape.” Another shared that Atlantic Station is a bit challenging for their family member who has trouble walking. Another visitor felt that Atlantic Station is “designed in a way [that] if it’s your first time or if you’re not native to it, it’s extremely difficult to navigate. From figuring out parking to finding specific retailers.”

Although qualitative findings contradict the quantitative results of Black visitors experiencing less exclusion, the discrepancy in findings could arise from limitations with quantitative measurements of exclusion for racial groups. Which is why Van Ham and Manley (2012) call for the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods into one research design because it deepens the understandings of processes.
Table 4: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusion Index</th>
<th>Mean (SD) / %</th>
<th>N non-missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel like I don’t belong at AS</td>
<td>2.8 (2.33)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a spirit of community at AS</td>
<td>41.60%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>28.80%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel welcome at AS</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>39.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mainly go to AS for:</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times ever have you visited AS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 times</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 times</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9 times</td>
<td>15.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 times or more</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 30 days, how many times have you visited AS:</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>62.40%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 times</td>
<td>27.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of returning to AS</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly unlikely</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>18.47%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>40.76%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly likely</td>
<td>33.12%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS seems to value diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24.80%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>47.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=female)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>40.80%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Exclusion index ranges from 0 to 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Identity characteristics  | Aspects of participants identity such as race, class, and age contribute to exclusion. | “I was with a friend who was racially profiled by a security officer at Atlantic Station.”  
“I was kicked out many of times when I was a teenager simply because I wasn’t old enough to be out past 10 which is kind of stupid because there’s a movie theater and restaurants there that are open well past that time.”  
“I am not the target income-level for that area.”                                                                                                                                 |
| 2. Inauthenticity            | Atlantic Station feels too planned and exhibits elements of over-sanitization that results in visitors identifying the development as inauthentic. | “Atlanta Station has always felt a tad “developed” and dry - maybe touristy?”  
“Atlanta Station seems inauthentic to me. It lacks character when compared to other neighborhoods/communities of metro Atlanta”                                                                                                                                 |
| 3. Residential and retail areas | The perception of high-end stores and luxury condos contribute to exclusion. | “The apartment/condos don't help, it just gives off a very uppity standard or 'I’m better than you’ agenda.”  
“As an adult the only unwelcoming experience is knowing that you don’t have enough money to buy anything there that isn’t on clearance. But as of today, it’s way less stuffy than it was 10+ years ago. And a lot less white people shocked that Marta let black kids go there.”                                                                 |
| 4. Design                    | Atlantic Station’s physical design and lack of connectivity are seen as negative. | “Too much parking and disconnected from nearby neighborhoods. Needs better bike, pedestrian, and transit connections.”  
“It can feel too staged like an area trying to be urban but that is created by and for suburbanites”                                                                 |
Table 6: Average levels of exclusion across visits in last 30 days and all visits ever

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits in last 30 days</th>
<th>Sample N (Sample %)</th>
<th>Mean of exclusion index (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None †</td>
<td>78 (62.4%)</td>
<td>3.23 (2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>34 (27.2%)</td>
<td>2.47 (2.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>13 (10.4%)</td>
<td>1.23 (1.64)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2.81 (2.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All visits ever</th>
<th>Sample N (Sample %)</th>
<th>Mean of exclusion index (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>19 (15.2%)</td>
<td>3.10 (2.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>27 (21.60%)</td>
<td>2.92 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>19 (15.2%)</td>
<td>3.52 (2.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>60 (48%)</td>
<td>2.45 (2.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125 (100%)</td>
<td>2.81 (2.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Reference category
Note: Exclusion index ranges from 0 to 8.
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001
Table 7: Average likelihood of returning across number of visits in last 30 days and all visits ever

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits in last 30 days</th>
<th>Sample N (Sample %)</th>
<th>Mean of likelihood of returning (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None†</td>
<td>78 (62.4%)</td>
<td>2.87 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>34 (27.2%)</td>
<td>3.23 (.88)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>13 (10.4%)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125 (100%)</td>
<td>3.02 (.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All visits ever</th>
<th>Sample N (Sample %)</th>
<th>Mean of likelihood of returning (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3†</td>
<td>19 (15.2%)</td>
<td>2.47 (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>27 (21.6%)</td>
<td>3.03 (.70)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>19 (15.2%)</td>
<td>2.73 (.99)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>60 (48%)</td>
<td>3.28 (.90)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125 (100%)</td>
<td>3.02 (.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Reference category
Note: Likelihood of returning ranges from 0 to 4
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Table 8: Average levels of exclusion across likelihood of return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of return</th>
<th>Sample N (Sample %)</th>
<th>Mean Exclusion index (sd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely†</td>
<td>8 (6.06%)</td>
<td>4.75 (3.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>24 (18.94%)</td>
<td>4.04 (2.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>50 (40.15%)</td>
<td>2.88 (2.15)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly likely</td>
<td>46 (34.85%)</td>
<td>1.69 (1.80)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125 (100%)</td>
<td>2.81 (2.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Reference category
Note: Exclusion index ranges from 0 to 8.
*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001
Table 9: OLS regression predicting exclusion with key study variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.170 ***</td>
<td>-.158 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-.144*</td>
<td>-1.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/34</td>
<td></td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35/44</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last month’s visits&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 times</td>
<td>-.683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>-1.91**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All visits&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 times</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9 times</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 times or more</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001 a = reference group is white
b = reference group is never  c = reference group is 1 to 3 times
Table 10: Ordinal logistic regression predicting likelihood of returning with key study variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race^a</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.41*</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>.704***</td>
<td>.680**</td>
<td>.714***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/34</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35/44</td>
<td></td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last month’s visits^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All visits^c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 9 times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 times or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

^a = reference group is white
^b = reference group is never
^c= reference group is 1 to 3 times
6 CONCLUSION

The central aim for this study was to explore how residential and social leisure areas combine to result in spatial inequality via economic and social exclusion. At each level of analysis, Atlantic Station tells a complicated and contradictory story. For example, there is evidence that there are racialized elements of gentrification and in the design of Atlantic Station, yet somehow Black and Asian visitors felt more included and Black visitors were more likely to return. Regardless of this surprising finding, I also found supporting evidence of both physical and non-physical aspects of live, work, and play environments that impeded on individual’s right to access, use, and enjoy Atlantic Station. This goes to show that individuals lacked full rights to the city due to different power relations that manifested through placemaking, design politics, and racial capitalism. Together, critical urban theory, design politics, racial capitalism, and outsideness show that the city is in a socio-spatial dialect that uses consumer based placemaking. Visitors recognize this type of placemaking as exclusionary, destructive, inauthentic, and indicative of gentrification which turns live, work, and play environments into non-places where visitors go mainly for entertainment and shopping.

6.1 Contributions

This study examined three critical questions: 1) How did the demographics of surrounding neighborhoods change once Atlantic Station was introduced? 2) How is pseudo public space in Atlantic Station surveilled, designed, made accessible and made inclusive, and utilized? And 3) do Atlantic Station visitors experience exclusion? Throughout exploring and answering these questions, each question produced a new contribution.
Substantively, this study shows how live, work, and play environments can influence demographic change by increasing gentrification in the immediate areas. This study also shows that individuals who visit live, work, and play environments recognize how they are not designed for the local community due to consumer based placemaking that is focused on profit. Lastly, this study shows how inauthentic placemaking can backfire and result in non-places specifically by illustrating how surveillance, design, accessibility, and exclusion intentionally limit people from entering and using live, work, and play environments to their full potential.

Methodologically, this study makes three important contributions. First, I combine private and public spheres to look at residential inequality and inequality of public space within live, work, and play places. Second, I take advantage of the 2020 decennial census to build upon previous studies on neighborhood gentrification. The 2020 census allows me to add to the literature by analyzing and documenting neighborhood change that has happened over the past four decades. Third, this study is one of the few that utilizes the Public Open Spaces in Private Developments Index and the only one so far that has adapted the index in the Western Hemisphere. These three methodological contributions set the stage for future studies of other live, work, and play environments which will allow for comparison of different developments.

6.2 Implications

There is a call for radical and critical placemaking that focuses on highlighting inequities and disrupting symptoms of domination to promote social justice to create accessible, inclusive, plural, and participatory places (Siroliya 2020; Toolis 2017). Similarly, researchers have identified factors that contribute to successful placemaking in live, work, and play environments (Siroliya 2020; Toolis 2017). In their study of successful mixed-use developments, HR&A (2021) identified six success factors: sustainability, walkability, authenticity, convenience,
flexibility and inclusion. Many of the elements they identified are key components of this research study.

In my study, the first success factor I found is walkability. Atlantic Station has several aspects that enhance pedestrian’s experience such as greenery and flowers, art murals, public transport, traffic safety and wide sidewalks. The second successful factor is flexibility. Atlantic Station’s main avenue of flexibility is open space which increases “eyes on the street,” and also enhances accessibility (HR&A Advisors 2021; Jacobs 1961; Newman 1978).

A missing factor in Atlantic Station is authenticity. In a post-covid observation, HR&A (2021) saw potential for daytime retail and remote working spaces. A recommendation to increase authenticity is to add alternative and free working spaces. Research shows that working spaces outside the home such as coffee shops increase social opportunities and increase informal placemaking (Johnson, Glover, and Stewart 2014; Saad 2021). Another recommendation to increase authenticity is by adding local retailers and restaurants rather than chain stores and restaurants. Lastly, authenticity can be achieved by leveraging and honoring the local essence of a place while also adding to the overall character of the city in a lasting and meaningful way.

An unsuccessful factor of Atlantic Station is convenience which the easy access to transit and amenities. Atlantic Station’s lack of microclimate along the walking route to the MARTA station and within the development provides no protection from the chilly mornings, random rain, or sweltering summer heat. Additionally, the lack of connectivity to adjacent and older neighborhoods is a problem and only allows people access to the development’s amenities once they are in the development. However, initially getting to Atlantic Station and navigating the development can be difficult.
A recommendation for convenience would be to add microclimates. Research shows that architectural design in live, work, and play environments that provide protection from the sun, wind and rain and offer coolness and shade not only impact people-place bond, but the experience and memory of places as well (Rahmatian, Emadian Razavi, and Ayatollahi 2014). Another recommendation for convenience is to connect “the city within the city” to adjacent areas. By creating access to surrounding neighborhoods Atlantic Station could tap into the local character of the surrounding areas which could potentially increase the number of visitors and maybe even the diversity of visitors. Lastly, I would recommend affordable housing which would open access to lower-income residents to enjoy all what Atlantic Station offers.

In all, considering the characteristics of successful mixed-use developments along with my research results, my study is applicable to city actors such as city officials, developers, and urban planners. My study expands knowledge of live, work, and play environments and provides a nuanced understanding of how live, work and play environments impact not only urban places but also affect the individuals that visit there as well. Most importantly, my study has important implications for cities. It demonstrates that while consumer-based placemaking may spur revitalization it does little to add to the local culture of an area, produce or maintain a sense of place, and create inclusion.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research

One of the study’s limitations is that the study sample is not representative. Theoretically, oversampling would lead to bias, as some demographics groups in the study make up a larger portion of the study sample than in Atlanta’s population. Steps were taken to reduce the potential for bias such as recruiting not at Atlantic Station, but there is still the potential for unobserved factors, that I did not capture, that makes my sample different than the population.
Quantitatively, the groups that were unintentionally oversampled (young, college-educated, and women) did not influence findings as the imbalanced variables were not significant predictors of exclusion and likelihood of returning. However, there is no way to tell which way the qualitative data is skewed or if the sample answered different and potentially influenced findings. For example, since the study was shared among sociology classes, participants had a pre-existing knowledge of sociological concepts such as gentrification. Participants not only had the sociological language to describe the art panels but were also able to draw connections between gentrification and similar concepts to Atlantic Station. This may explain the constructive outlook on Atlantic Station. Although sociological concepts are not unique to those who study or are familiar with sociology, a more representative sample may not have the scholarly language to explain what the study sample interpreted from the art panels.

Data collection for this project occurred during Summer 2021, approximately 16 months from the start of the Covid-19 pandemic, a global outbreak of coronavirus that closed borders, shut down the U.S economy and restricted public access and travel. A Pew research study shows that since the pandemic people prioritized staying out of crowded public places and expressed a decrease in the importance of social interactions and going out (Sharpe and Spencer 2022). The Covid-19 pandemic could have impacted visitor’s number of visits and their likelihood of returning.

Also, due to the multi-level structure of this study, it was only feasible to conduct research on one live, work, and play community within Atlanta. Subsequently, there is not a basis for comparison. A comparison of another live, work, and play environment would be valuable because it would help put into context Atlantic Station’s POSPD scores along with
comparing how Atlantic Station’s successful and unsuccessful aspects measure up to other developments.

Live, work, and play environments is an area of research that is expanding. With the combined spaces of residential, work, and leisure there is a ripe opportunity to understand how these environments develop place identity in relation to placemaking and individuals. It is also an opportunity to further understand how live, work, and play environments interact with design politics, sociability, and exclusion. This study has laid the groundwork to examine how live, work, and play environments: 1) play a role in gentrification, 2) create sociable places, and 3) facilitate inclusion and exclusion through placemaking.

In the future, I aim to continue this research in other live, work, and play environments and develop a deeper understanding of how placemaking is influenced and related to the design, sociability, and exclusion of a place. Future research could include a comparison of similar and different live work and play environments either within or outside of Atlanta. Another aspect that would richen this study is to include a spatial analysis of Atlantic Station visitors. This analysis would test whether the likelihood of returning is explained by one’s proximity to the development or if there is another reason why some visitors are more likely to return than others. Future studies also might be able to address how live, work, and play environments influence place attachment and place identity.

Lastly, an interesting question to explore is what does authentic consumer-driven placemaking look like? How does capitalism and consumers factor into authentic placemaking when authentic placemaking prioritizes people over profit, emphasizes equity and increases quality of life (Gattupalli 2022; Project for Public Spaces 2016; Vey 2018)? Is authentic consumer-driven placemaking even possible?
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Appendix A: Qualtrics Survey: Visitor’s Experiences and Perceptions

Your responses will be kept anonymous and combined with others so please be open. If you have previously completed this survey, thank you; there is no need to complete it again. The survey takes up to 30 minutes, thank you for your time.

Section 1 – Demographic info
Read the statements below. Please answer based on your experiences and perceptions.

What is you gender identity?
- Man
- Woman
- Gender nonbinary
- None of the above, please specify: ____________

What is your age?
- Under 17
  - If this is chosen the survey will end and the following response will show on the screen: Participants must be over 18. Thank you for your interest and willingness to participate in the study.
  - 18-24
  - 25-34
  - 35-44
  - 45-54
  - 55-64
  - 65-74
  - 75 or over

Are you of Hispanic or Latinx origin?
- No
- Yes

What is your race?
- African American or Black
- Alaskan Native
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Native American
- Native Hawaiian
- White
- Other, please specify: ____________

What is the highest level of education you have completed?
- Some high school
- High school/GED
- Trade school (Electrician, Carpenter, Plumber, etc.)
• Bachelor’s degree
• Master’s degree
• PhD or professional degree (M.D, J.D)

What zip code do you live in? _______________

Section 2: Visitor experiences while at Atlantic Station
Read the statements below. Please answer based on your experiences and perceptions.

1. I mainly go to Atlantic station for: (Select all that apply)
   • Dining (Yard House, California Pizza Kitchen, Naanstop, etc.)
   • Entertainment (Regal Cinemas, Bowlero, Millennium Gate Museum)
   • Events (Wellness Wednesdays, Maker’s market, festival of lights, etc.)
   • Shopping (Publix, Target, Dillard’s, etc.)

2. Thinking about all your visits ever to Atlantic Station, about how many times have you visited?
   • Never
   • 1-3 times
   • 3 to 6 times
   • 6 to 9 times
   • 10 times or more

3. In the last 30 days, how often did you visit Atlantic Station?
   • Never
   • 1 to 2 times
   • 3 to 4 times
   • 5 times or more

4. Would you say that number of monthly visits is typical for you?
   • Yes
   • No, explain

5. What is the likelihood that you will return to Atlantic Station?
   • Highly unlikely
   • Unlikely
   • Neither likely nor unlikely
   • Likely
   • Highly likely

6. I get more satisfaction out of visiting Atlantic Station than visiting any other like it such as Ponce City Market
   • Strongly disagree
   • Disagree
   • Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

7. Atlantic Station seems to value diversity.
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

8. I identify strongly with Atlantic Station
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

9. Atlantic Station means a lot to me.
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

10. I feel that I can really be myself at Atlantic Station
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

11. I can relate Atlantic Station to other parts of my life.
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

12. When I am at Atlantic Station, others see me the way I want them to see me.
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

13. I have negative feelings for Atlantic Station
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

14. I sometimes feel like I do not belong at Atlantic Station
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

15. I identify with the lifestyles and values of people who live at Atlantic Station
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

16. I feel welcome at Atlantic Station
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

17. I feel a spirit of community at Atlantic Station
• Strongly disagree
• Disagree
• Neither agree nor disagree
• Agree
• Strongly agree

18. Describe any moments of exclusion you have experienced while at Atlantic Station
• Open ended

19. Describe any feelings of alienation you have experienced while at Atlantic Station
• Open ended

20. Describe any other thoughts or feelings about Atlantic Station
• Open ended
Section 3: Public perception of visuals around Atlantic Station

While Atlantic station underwent construction, 15 unique art panels were created to embody Atlantic Station’s transformation as a representation of “Atlantic Station’s rebirth and renewal.” The art panels were placed on unattractive construction barriers with the goal of “intriguing and delighting current and future visitors.”

Please read the captions below the picture and describe what the text means to you.

Text: To rise from the ashes be the one to set the fire
Open ended answer _____________________

Text: Beauty birthed from destruction
Open ended answer _____________________

16 (Sarah Adams n.d.)
17 Ibid
Text: Your expectations have matured. So have we.
Open ended answer _____________________

Text: Get dirty to start fresh.
Open ended answer _____________________
Text: Metamorphosis made in the south.
Open ended answer ____________________

Text: Darwin isn’t the only expert on evolution.
Open ended answer ____________________

Text: Your dreams fuel our reinvention.
Open ended answer ____________________
Text: Maturity comes with age (and an aggressive construction plan).
Open ended answer _____________________

Text: A new era at Atlantic Station has begun. We’re shedding our skin, morphing into something that will surprise you. Possibility is poised around every corner. Opportunity awaits inside each door. Any preconceptions are best left behind. **It’s time to see what happens where transformation takes root.**

Open ended answer _____________________
## Appendix B: Public Open Space in Private Development Index (POSPD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(I) Rules &amp; Surveillance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher score means less strict rules and visible surveillance (better sociability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sign announcing “public space” or “POSPD”</td>
<td>0 = none present, 1 = one small sign, 2 = large sign or 2+ signs</td>
<td>Include signage for “24hr public passage”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Visible sets of rules posted</td>
<td>0 = two or more signs, 1 = one sign or posting, 2 = none present</td>
<td>Visibility of signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Subjective or judgment rules posted</td>
<td>0 = two or more rules visibly posted, 1 = one rule visibly posted, 2 = none present</td>
<td>Set of rules based on personal evaluation and desirability by owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Presence of signs to exclude activities and certain people or behaviors</td>
<td>0 = large sign or 1 = one small sign, 2 = none present</td>
<td>Presence of signs such as “no loitering” or “appropriate attire required”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Security personnel</td>
<td>0 = two or more, 1 = one camera/guard, 2 = none present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Security cameras</td>
<td>0 = two or more, 1 = one camera/guard, 2 = none present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(II) Image and Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher score means more welcoming design (attract social activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Diversity of seating types (Including seating provided by businesses)</td>
<td>0 = no seating, 1 = only one type, 2 = more types available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Design elements discouraging use of space</td>
<td>0 = several instances, 1 = not many / few elements, 2 = none present</td>
<td>Such as spikes on bench or unsuitable height/angle for seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Various microclimates / Climatic comfort</td>
<td>0 = no shade/ fully exposed, 1 = some shade/ wind/rain shelter, 2 = extensive overhands or trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Lighting to encourage night-time use</td>
<td>0 = none present, 1 = one type of lighting, 2 = several lighting types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Art, cultural, or visual enhancement</td>
<td>0 = none present, 1 = minor installation or fountain, 2 = major interactive installation or performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Physical conditions and maintenance</td>
<td>0 = poor, 1 = average, 2 = good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(III) Accessibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher score means spaces more accessible and welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Control of entrance to POSPDs: presence of lockable gates, fences, etc.</td>
<td>0 = two or more, 1 = one, 2 = none present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 | Visual and physical connection and openness to adjacent street/s and/or open space | 0 = none present  
1 = low connectivity  
2 = high connectivity |
| 15 | Linkage to pedestrian flows | 0 = away from pedestrian flows  
1 = one or few connections  
2 = well connected |
| 16 | Orientation and signage to guide users to POSPDs | 0 = no signage present  
1 = one or few signage  
2 = two or more |
| 17 | Areas of restricted or conditional use | 0 = large or several areas restricted  
1 = one or few small areas restricted  
2 = none present |
| 18 | Constrained hours of operation | 0 = open only during business hours, or portions permanently closed  
1 = at least part of space opens past business hours or on weekends  
2 = open 24 hours per day and 7 days per week |
| **(IV) Inclusiveness (observed activities)** | | Higher score means more inclusiveness and capacity to develop social activities. |
| 19 | Presence of people of different ages and classes | 0 = very low  
1 = medium  
2 = high |
| 20 | Restroom available | 0 = none present  
1 = for customers only  
2 = readily available to all |
| 21 | Range of activities and behaviors | 0 = very low  
1 = medium  
2 = high |
| 22 | Presence of community-gathering places | 0 = none  
1 = two or less  
2 = three of above |
| 23 | Presence of pop-up stores or small-scale food vendors | 0 = none  
1 = two or less  
2 = three of above |
| 24 | Space flexibility to suit/accommodate user needs, activities and events | 0 = Not Flexible in most cases  
1 = Relatively flexible  
2 = Quite flexible |
| **(V) Racial Aspects (observed activities)** | | Higher score means more racial aspects |
| 25 | Diverse advertising and marketing | 0 = very low  
1 = medium  
2 = high |
| 26 | Restaurants, stores centered around racial and ethnic minorities | 0 = very low  
1 = medium  
2 = high |
| 27 | Events geared towards racial and ethnic minorities | 0 = very low  
1 = medium  
2 = high |
| 28 | Presence of racial and ethnic minorities | 0 = very low  
1 = medium  
2 = high |
| 29 | Presence of racial and ethnic minorities who are vendor | 0 = very low  
1 = medium  
2 = high |
Appendix C: Atlantic Station’s Code of Conduct

CODE OF CONDUCT

Thank you for choosing Atlantic Station.

Atlantic Station welcomes all guests! Atlantic Station and our parent company, Hines, are committed to our values of an inclusive and diverse community and culture. We condemn discrimination and injustice in all their forms. Atlantic Station is private property. In order to provide all visitors, residents and workers with an enjoyable experience, we ask you to conduct yourself in a respectful and non-discriminatory way in accordance with the code of conduct and all laws and local ordinances.

Curfew -

- A 6:00 p.m. curfew is strictly enforced. All youth under 18 must be accompanied by a parent after 6:00 p.m. No more than 4 youths per parent. Juvenile groups of 4+ will be dispersed. No individuals under 21 are permitted on property after 11:00 p.m.
- When Atlantic Station stores and common areas close, all patrons and guests must be en route to a business that is still open or to their vehicle to depart. All guests may be subject to presenting ID to verify age.

Dress Appropriately -

- No gang related clothing.
- Pants must be worn pulled up to the waist. Pants, shorts, skirts, etc. must be worn in a manner that does not expose undergarments or skin. No visible undergarments of any kind are permitted.
- Shoes and shirts are always required.
- Hooded shirts and sweatshirts may not obscure your face at any time.
- No clothing with obscene language or that exposes body areas management deems indecent are permitted.

Behave Responsibly –

- No solicitation, conducting interviews or distribution of materials.
- No professional photography, videos or audio recordings are permitted without written approval from Atlantic Station Property Management. Photos and video for non-commercial and non-disruptive purposes are permitted.
- No smoking except in designated areas.
- Musical instruments may not be played without written approval from Property Management.
- No shouting, loud noises or overly boisterous behavior.
- No protesting, demonstrating or assembling in a manner that may disturb the public.
- No littering or defacing/destroying property.
- No obscene or defamatory language.
- No loitering.

Allow Others to Shop Safely and Comfortably –

- No hoverboards, Segways, skateboards or other personal transport items.
- Bicycles are permitted and should be secured at designated bicycle areas.
Motorcycles and scooters may only park in street level designated spaces. This includes ride-share scooters.

- No weapons.
- No blocking access to any public areas.
- No cruising or remaining in parked vehicles.
- Vehicles or motorcycles deemed loud by Property Management are not permitted on property.
- Use of alcoholic beverages is restricted to designated areas.

Pets and Other Animals –

- No animals except for leashed dogs, cats and service animals are permitted on property. Pets must be under the control of the owner at all times. Pets are not permitted on Atlantic Green.
  Pets must use designated pet waste areas and owners are required to clean up after their pets.

These and other guidelines must be followed at all times. Failure to do so will result in an escort off property and possible return permission denied for a specific period of time. You may also be subject to prosecution of violation of any applicable laws or ordinances. Other guidelines may be in effect and Hines and Atlantic Station Property Management reserve the right to revise or modify this code of conduct as necessary. Any exceptions to this code of conduct will be determined exclusively by Property Management. Please see an Atlantic Station Security Officer for complete details.