

## AN EVALUATION OF OPEN SPACE QUALITY IN A NEO-TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY: A CASE STUDY OF KENTLANDS

ELIZABETH BRABEC, JD

**Using Kentlands as a case study, this paper analyzes the success of a neotraditional development for recreational, habitat, visual and water quality goals. The paper identifies and analyzes open space and green infrastructure protection goals and their outcomes, along with pre-and post-development forest stand and open space protection.**

THE FLIGHT OF homeowners out of cities to relatively inexpensive land and housing in the suburban fringe has placed tremendous pressure on ecosystems, water quality, visual quality and recreation opportunities. For these reasons, the goals for green infrastructure (open space) in many suburban developments over the past two decades have been to provide active and passive recreational areas, to serve as stormwater quality enhancements, wildlife habitat, and as a visual buffer to the hard surfaces of urban areas. This was certainly the case with the neotraditional development of Kentlands in the late 1980's which was simultaneously seen as an antidote to the placeless sprawling suburbs and the environmental degradation that ensued.

However, almost 20 years after its development the question remains: How effective was Kentlands, and by implication, other neotraditional developments, in protecting functioning open space systems? In the literature, post occupancy assessments of suburban forest and open space systems have been few. These have largely focused on the total land area protected (and in some cases patch size) (Brabec 2001), rather than the functionality and condition of the protected area. Specific assessments of Kentlands and other neotraditional communities have focused on the increased real estate values achieved (Tu and Eppli 2001), walkability (Lee and Ahn 2003), and sense of community (Kim and Kaplan 2004) rather than on the open space system.

This paper, therefore, serves as an initial step in the analysis of the success of neotraditional developments for recreational, habitat, visual landscape quality and water quality goals. The paper identifies and analyzes:

1. Open space and green infrastructure protection goals through two methods: a content analysis of public documents filed in connection with development and site plan approvals, and interviews with the developer,

planners and designers.

2. Evaluation of pre-development forest stand protection through the comparison of current and pre-development aerial photographs and site level inventory, resulting in a finding of the amount and quality of existing forest stands that were protected during the development process.

3. Forest stand and open space protection measures and outcomes, using aerial photographs, a detailed site-level inventory of ecosystem, recreational, visual and water quality indicators, and an analysis of local regulatory and homeowners association codes, the outcomes of existing protection tools are defined.

5. Level of compliance and achievement of green infrastructure protection goals through a comparison of current conditions and intended outcomes.

The findings from this analysis are mixed. While the developer and designers of Kentlands had lofty goals and local planners attempted to protect key open space and forest stand areas, the execution contained serious flaws that compromised the ecological system. For example, water quality goals were hampered by direct discharge of stormwater into the stream system, and an inability of the protected stream buffers to absorb levels of site runoff created by new development. In addition, the mix of jurisdictional control of protected areas and the lack of removal of invasive exotics compromised the ability of the areas to serve as native habitat, and attractive, passive recreational areas.

**Keywords: Sustainability, post-occupancy evaluation, open space conservation, urban forest, community planning**

---

## REFERENCES

- Brabec, Elizabeth. 2001. An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Cluster Development in the Town of Southampton, New York. *Urban Ecosystems* 4: 27-47.
- Kim, J. and R. Kaplan (2004). "Physical and Psychological Factors in Sense of Community: New Urbanist Kentlands and Nearby Orchard Village." *Environment and Behavior* 36(3): 313-340.
- Lee, C.-M. and K.-H. Ahn (2003). "Is Kentlands better than Radburn? The American Garden City and the new urbanist paradigms." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69(1): 50-72.
- Tu, C. C. and M. J. Eppli (2001). "An Empirical Examination of Traditional Neighborhood Development." *Real Estate Economics* 29(3): 485- 501.