Dorothea Dix Hospital
Raleigh, North Carolina

Strategies to Build a Legacy

October 25-27, 2006
An Advisory Services Program Report

ULI—the Urban Land Institute
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.
Suite 500 West
Washington, D.C. 20007-5201
The mission of the Urban Land Institute is to provide leadership in the responsible use of land and in creating and sustaining thriving communities worldwide. ULI is committed to:

- Bringing together leaders from across the fields of real estate and land use policy to exchange best practices and serve community needs;
- Fostering collaboration within and beyond ULI’s membership through mentoring, dialogue, and problem solving;
- Exploring issues of urbanization, conservation, regeneration, land use, capital formation, and sustainable development;
- Advancing land use policies and design practices that respect the uniqueness of both built and natural environments;
- Sharing knowledge through education, applied research, publishing, and electronic media; and
- Sustaining a diverse global network of local practice and advisory efforts that address current and future challenges.

Established in 1936, the Institute today has more than 35,000 members from 90 countries, representing the entire spectrum of the land use and development disciplines. Professionals represented include developers, builders, property owners, investors, architects, public officials, planners, real estate brokers, appraisers, attorneys, engineers, financiers, academics, students, and librarians. ULI relies heavily on the experience of its members. It is through member involvement and information resources that ULI has been able to set standards of excellence in development practice. The Institute has long been recognized as one of the world’s most respected and widely quoted sources of objective information on urban planning, growth, and development.
The goal of ULI's Advisory Services Program is to bring the finest expertise in the real estate field to bear on complex land use planning and development projects, programs, and policies. Since 1947, this program has assembled well over 400 ULI-member teams to help sponsors find creative, practical solutions for issues such as downtown redevelopment, land management strategies, evaluation of development potential, growth management, community revitalization, brownfields redevelopment, military base reuse, provision of low-cost and affordable housing, and asset management strategies, among other matters. A wide variety of public, private, and nonprofit organizations have contracted for ULI's Advisory Services.

Each panel team is composed of highly qualified professionals who volunteer their time to ULI. They are chosen for their knowledge of the panel topic and screened to ensure their objectivity. ULI’s interdisciplinary panel teams provide a holistic look at development problems. A respected ULI member who has previous panel experience chairs each panel.

The agenda for a panel assignment is intensive. It includes an in-depth briefing composed of a tour of the site and meetings with sponsor representatives; interviews of key people within the community; and a day of formulating recommendations. On the final day on site, the panel makes an oral presentation of its findings and conclusions to the sponsor. At the request of the sponsor, a written report is prepared and published.

Because the sponsoring entities are responsible for significant preparation before the panel's visit, including sending extensive briefing materials to each member and arranging for the panel to meet with key local community members and stakeholders in the project under consideration, participants in ULI’s panel assignments are able to make accurate assessments of a sponsor’s issues and to provide recommendations in a compressed amount of time.

A major strength of the program is ULI’s unique ability to draw on the knowledge and expertise of its members, including land developers and owners, public officials, academicians, representatives of financial institutions, and others. In fulfillment of the mission of the Urban Land Institute, this Advisory Services program report is intended to provide objective advice that will promote the responsible use of land to enhance the environment.
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The Dorothea Dix Hospital is located on 311 acres immediately southwest of downtown Raleigh, North Carolina. The hospital campus, also known as Dix Hill, is surrounded by residential neighborhoods, roadways and thoroughfares, a commercial strip, the State Farmers Market, and the North Carolina State University (NCSU) Centennial Campus.

The hospital has occupied Dix Hill since 1850, a legacy of efforts led by Dorothea Lynde Dix, a leader in reforming mental services in the United States. Over time, the campus has grown into a large complex of building and facilities, the heart of which is located on the prominence of Dix Hill. It was listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a district in 1990.

The Panel's Assignment

As part of the larger reform of mental health services for the state of North Carolina, the Dix Hospital will be closed by 2008. The Dorothea Dix Hospital Property Study Commission was created by the North Carolina General Assembly to determine the disposition of the property. The commission, acting as the sponsor, contracted with the Urban Land Institute for a three-day advisory panel. The sponsor asked a rather ambitious series of questions addressing three broad areas: (1) meeting state needs; (2) preserving historic structures, facilities, and landscapes; and (3) governance and ownership of the property. The panel warned the sponsor that its ability to address questions of this breadth would be difficult within a three-day panel process; thus, the panel limited itself to providing basic and broad strategic recommendations to help the Commission consider alternatives.

The Panel Process

Before coming to Raleigh, each of the panelists received and reviewed extensive briefing materials prepared by the commission staff. The panel also received on-site briefings and toured Dix Hill, the surrounding neighborhoods, and the broader downtown area. The panel met with city officials, community leaders, state officials, business owners, and representatives of NCSU—all of whose knowledge of and passion for Dix Hill and the subject property were informative. This information, as well as the panelists' best professional judgment, helped the panel prepare its findings and recommendations.

Summary of Recommendations

The panel focused its assessment of the site on the strengths and opportunities in the market, the strategic location of the acreage near downtown, and the synergy created by adjacent uses, such as the Centennial Campus. The panel made the following recommendations:

- Preserve important portions of the property, including the Grove, as a world-class park, that would be acquired by the city of Raleigh.
- Preserve buildings in the historic core and permit the adaptive reuse of historic buildings. Provide space for the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) in the Historic Core.
• Acquire new acreage from NCSU to help complete the physical and psychological connection between the university and downtown.

• Permit a portion of the property to be developed privately as a new residential and mixed-use community and use the sale proceeds to support the mental health system.

• Finance the acquisition of the campus by the city of Raleigh through a combination of private sector donations and a project development financing program. The panel suggests that the private sector donations be supervised by a “Dix Park Conservancy” while the project development financing program would be managed and implemented by a public/private partnership called the “Dix Campus Development Corporation.”
The panel’s planning and design for the reuse of the Dorothea Dix Hospital site is preceded by excellent work completed over the past few years by numerous individuals and organizations in the community. Many of those concepts and notions were embraced by this advisory panel. This section outlines the guiding principles used by the panel and discusses its recommendations for land uses and design.

Guiding Principles

The panel established several guiding principles to shape the land use and design plans for the property. A central tenet of the panel’s development strategy is maintaining a balance that attempts to address a variety of stakeholders. The panel suggests that a substantial portion of the campus remain as a park, while other portions of the property provide development opportunities through either adaptive reuse of existing buildings or new development with requirements for sustainability. Another tenet of the panel was providing connectivity between downtown, the Centennial Campus, and the adjacent neighborhoods. Also, some return on the use of the property for the Mental Health Trust Fund and the possibility of housing DHHS offices in a central location are important factors for the state of North Carolina. Finally, the panel thought providing a fitting memorial to Dorothea Dix was important to the community.

Land Use Recommendations

Following are the land use and design recommendations for each of the land components of the Dix Hospital site and surrounding area. The suggested land use plan is a guide. Given the short time frame within which the panel completed its work, variations to the proposal may be called for. However, the panel believes that the general mix and locations of the various land use components are appropriate.

Historic Core

The core area includes the main building complex, the main hospital building, and the support buildings east of the railroad along Biggs Ruggles and Whiteside drives. The panel’s evaluation of each building was too brief to make definitive recommendations about preservation, rehabilitation, or demolition. Clearly, significant buildings in the core area and those that contribute to the NRHP nomination will need to be preserved, but other buildings could provide a significant opportunity for rehabilitation or adaptive use as office space.

As noted in the recommendations and as defined further in the Implementation section of this report, the panel believes the portion of the site suitable for redevelopment should be sold to a master developer who can then lease the property back to the DHHS after space has been renovated. Buildings that appeared ripe for renovation include the Harvey Building and those along both Palmer

Conceptual memorial to Dorothea Dix.
Cemetery, Botanical Garden, and Amphitheater

Currently part of the Dix property, the cemetery includes approximately 93 acres north of the railroad. This area should act as a continuation of the park in its quest to link with the Centennial Campus and should be available for more-active recreational uses; perhaps a botanical garden, an amphitheater, and memorials could be added to the existing cemetery use.

Historic Buildings and Park

This area, currently part of the Centennial Campus, should be acquired as part of the larger park to complete the connection with North Carolina State University. A number of existing freestanding houses and buildings used by the state and by the university should remain, but the grounds around each should be transformed into the northwestern boundary of the park.

New Village Development

The New Village Development consists of two new housing areas and a village center. The first housing area is located on the Dix campus and consists of 50 acres behind the William Building. The second residential area is located adjacent to the first and backs up to Centennial Parkway. This parcel is approximately 95 acres and is currently owned by NCSU. The village center consists of approximately 58.5 acres and includes property owned by the state and allocated to the State Farmers Market and the Centennial Campus of NCSU.

Drive and Biggs Drive. The panel believes an entire core study should be completed before outlining the specific course of action. The panel recommends the removal of the Hargrove Building and its replacement by a memorial to Dorothea Dix, looking out on the Grove.

The Grove

Including all of the property south and east of the railroad outside the core area, the approximately 88 acres of the Grove will form the eastern portion of the larger park. The Grove is central to the history of psychiatric care at the hospital from its earliest days. This area should remain as envisioned by Dorothea Dix and her successors—as a place providing “clean air, advantageous views and plenty of sunshine,” as a means to restore patients to good health. This portion of the park should not only provide the edge or interface with the central downtown of Raleigh but also should provide a continuous public space along the various creeks and watersheds both on and adjacent to the site.
• Acting as a catalyst to help encourage development of other properties both on and adjacent to the Centennial Campus;

• Providing a world-class “sustainable” green community that collaborates with NCSU’s engineering schools as a classroom and laboratory for the Constructed Materials Laboratory located only one-half mile from the study area and other programs at the School of Engineering and College of Design;

• Providing needed housing near the university; and

• Facilitating a better link between the city of Raleigh, the downtown neighborhoods, and the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Grove</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery, Botanical Garden, and Amphitheater</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained NCSU</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Buildings and Park from NCSU</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Core</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing/Mixed Use from NCSU</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>522.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The panel was overwhelmed by the ground-swell of interest in the Dix property and the diversity of views maintained by the various groups. Part of the problem with any “public” piece of land located near the heart of a city is that nearby residents have one view (a local park, a botanical garden, or a development opportunity) and citizens from across town have another (a development opportunity, a place to deliver local mental health services, or a regional park). Still other groups from outside the immediate area view the land as something completely different.

Although all the groups are well intentioned, the panel believes that a serious lack of constructive communication among and between the groups hinders the planning process and, furthermore, that the leadership structure is not adequately empowered to make decisions to resolve these differences. One panelist described the situation as similar to a dysfunctional family at Thanksgiving time: “Everyone is talking and no one is listening,” and “there is no one there to tap on the wine glass to get anyone’s attention.”

In the meantime, the Dix Commission has been left holding the bag with multiple interest groups who apply chronic pressure to get what they want. More important, these groups display an absolute inability to compromise or even discuss one another’s position.

Ownership

The panel believes that to implement the plan it has outlined, the ownership of some of the existing and suggested acreage must be transferred to the city of Raleigh. A substantial portion of the property is designated for park, and the additional open space within the revitalized core and the new village area leaves substantial portions of the Dix property undeveloped.

Addressing the Issues of Funding

The panel believes that to successfully implement the land use suggestions, the property needs clear ownership and a clear centralized authority for implementing the plan. Moreover, the plan needs to maximize community values and the property’s revenue potential.

The panel recognizes that the financial burden of meeting state requirements for office space and funding a world-class park will need to come from a variety of sources. The funds received from the one-time sale of property to private interests should be used to support the mental health system, as recommended by the Dix Commission.

The local government’s ad valorem tax provides an ongoing source of revenue distributed between the county and city; however, this source will not pay for the land use suggestions and the development of a world-class park on the Dix Hospital site. The panel recommends a combination of public and private monies to help realize its land use suggestions.

One-Time Sale of New Village and Housing Areas

This area consists of just over 200 acres and can be developed as a traditional village with a variety of adjacent residential densities and housing formats. An initial agreement that recognizes the land use suggestions previously mentioned must be concluded between the various property owners. After the initial agreements between the state agencies are concluded, an early action that will keep the ball rolling is an accurate and timely valuation of the property. This appraisal will set the market value of the property and allow the state agencies to plan for its timely sale. The panel recommends that a master developer be selected to provide the leadership and continuity necessary to realize the land use suggestions for the housing and village center.
Proceeds from this sale should be dedicated to the mental health system, as recommended by the Dix Commission, and the costs incurred by the state. The master developer may also be the appropriate individual to revitalize the Historic Core. While tax credits for restoration of buildings will be one incentive to encourage investment, the DHHS must be willing to make a commitment to occupy revitalized buildings in the Historic Core.

**Solutions for Park Acquisition**

The panel estimated the cost of acquisition of the park areas and Historic Core at $40 million. This evaluation will need to be refined, but for the sake of this report, that number is used as a point of departure. A professional appraisal and evaluation of the property will need to be completed as part of the suggested strategy.

**Project Development Financing.** Project development financing is a constitutionally permitted method by which projects can be financed through the issuance of bonds that pay for a wide variety of “public” improvements, such as the acquisition, demolition, and infrastructure costs associated with redevelopment. As property rises in value, the amount of the increase, or tax increment, is captured by the municipal development authority and set aside to retire the bonds that funded the improvements. The panel recommends the creation of a project development financing district for the Dix Hospital site.

The overall managerial structure used to establish, manage, and eventually retire the project development financing district will be a public/private partnership referred to as the Dix Campus Development Corporation (DCDC). The city will take the lead in creating the DCDC. The board of the DCDC should comprise a broad spectrum of interested organizations, including members appointed by the General Assembly, the city, and the county. The city should have a plurality of the appointments because the project development financing district is ultimately under its jurisdiction.

**The Dix Park Conservancy.** This body would have responsibility for raising a minority portion of the cost of the campus acquisition. Like other philanthropic foundations around the county, the foundation will be responsible for the ongoing fundraising, awareness and docent programs, and advice to the DCDC. The composition of the foundation’s board should be entirely separate from that of the DCDC; however, the membership should be no less diverse. Again, the city should have a plurality of appointments. Although the foundation and DCDC will have different roles and responsibilities, the guiding principles of both organizations should be the same. Finally, proceeds from the sale of the campus could be used to support the Dorothea Dix Foundation.

**Dorothea Dix Foundation.** The concept of a Dorothea Dix Foundation should be explored. This nonprofit will have as its mission service to the mental health community, with a goal of preserving and enhancing the memory and history of Dorothea Dix.
Conclusion

The Dorothea Dix Hospital site, the city of Raleigh, and the surrounding communities are at a critical juncture in their histories. After 150 years of operation, the Dix Hospital will be closed. Its closing provides the community with an extraordinary opportunity to create a world-class park while still addressing various governmental needs at the state and local levels.

The panel recommends a bold alternative that includes a wide variety of land uses and a strategy to realize these land uses. With appropriate design, the city, the county, and the university can benefit from increased available open space, new development and tax revenues, a sustainable village initiative, and space for the state to centralize its health-related administrative functions. Created by a new park, the open-space link between the Centennial Campus and downtown will be strengthened and thereby bind more closely the two economic engines in the immediate area.

The state and especially the city must decide whether they are going to lead this process or allow the property to be divided and redeveloped in an ad hoc fashion. Implementing the panel’s recommendations will require careful coordination and teamwork among a wide range of stakeholders. To ensure successful implementation, the city and the state must provide this coordination and foster an environment of cooperation and communication.
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Ferguson is the director of Urban Living and the executive vice president of Sloss Real Estate in Birmingham, Alabama. His primary duties with Sloss include operating the residential and mixed-use real estate development and management division with a focus on urban mixed-use community development projects as a continuing part of revitalizing Birmingham’s Center City. Ferguson also managed Sloss’s participation as joint venturer in a $100 million dollar HOPE VI, mixed-income residential development.

Before joining Sloss Real Estate, Ferguson was president of Corker Group, Inc., where he managed an approximately 2 million-square-foot portfolio of office, commercial, and industrial properties; supervised all leasing, administrative, maintenance and financial operations; and prepared monthly and annual business plans, budgets, and reports to ownership. From 1991 to 1999, Ferguson was president of Chattanooga Neighborhood Enterprise, Inc. (CNE). At CNE, Ferguson managed lending, development, financial, and property management functions of approximately $30 million dollars per year. Previously, Ferguson was president and chairman of John Laing Homes, Inc.; vice president of development for the Van Metre Company; and in the same capacity for the Winkler Companies.

Ferguson studied chemistry and mathematics while at the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill and completed graduate-level studies in investment management and real estate at George Washington University.

Ferguson is a full member of ULI and a member of the Affordable Housing Council.

Dennis Carmichael  
Alexandria, Virginia

Carmichael is a principal and vice president with EDAW, Inc., and has been with the firm for 25 years. His focus is place making in the public realm. With dozens of built projects around the country, his work in public places is characterized by the use of narrative, cultural, and historical references in landscape solutions. Rather than a signature style, his approach to design is about revealing the special qualities of a given place, seeking to make the landscape visible, comprehensible, and valuable.

Carmichael’s work has given several cities renewed vigor as it created opportunities for new investment. In Louisville, Kentucky, $10 million worth of public plazas and streetscape has generated over $50 million in new housing, retail, office, and museum construction. In Chattanooga, Tennessee, Ross's Landing, a $9 million park, has helped stimulate over $100 million in a new riverfront neighborhood. And in Atlanta, the $25 million Centennial Olympic Park has become a catalyst for $500 million in reinvestment in the surrounding blocks of downtown. Carmichael has received dozens of design awards, and his work has been published in such magazines as Landscape Architecture, Urban Land, and Architecture.

Carmichael was elected president of the American Society of Landscape Architects and currently leads the 16,000-member organization. The focus for his term is sustainability, and the annual meeting this year has a theme titled “Green Solutions for a Blue Planet.” He will be a keynote speaker in July 2007 at Chautauqua Institution for the week centered on landscape architecture and community planning.
William G. Lashbrook III

East Brunswick, New York

Lashbrook began his career with the Bank of New York in 1973 and progressed through various management positions in the bank’s Commercial Lending and Real Estate divisions before becoming vice president and head of its National Real Estate Lending Division.

In 1993, Lashbrook moved to Midlantic Bank as senior vice president and credit officer for the real estate business and then moved to Pittsburgh as real estate credit officer following PNC’s acquisition of Midlantic in 1996. In 1997, he started the residential segment of PNC Real Estate Finance, a unit that focused on national homebuilders and multifamily development financing. Lashbrook assumed his present position in 1998, when acquisitions and other new business initiatives called for developing new tools to manage real estate finance as a business rather than the traditional loan orientation.

Lashbrook is a member of the board of directors of National Multi-Housing Council, the Urban Land Institute, where he chairs one of its Urban Development/Mixed Use Councils, and the Real Estate Roundtable, where he chairs the Basel II working group.

Lashbrook received his BA in economics and political science from Duke University and earned his MBA from Seton Hall University.

Logan McClintic-Smith

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

McClintic-Smith joined Powers and Company as an architectural historian immediately after graduating from the University of Pennsylvania in 2006 with an MS in historic preservation. Since joining Powers and Company, she has researched and written National Register nominations for districts and individual properties, Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentive applications, and Historic Resource Survey Forms.


Before completing her master’s degree, McClintic-Smith worked at a number of public and private institutions throughout the country, including the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, the Denver Art Museum, and Christie’s. At the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation, she completed applications to the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, and researched and participated in recommendations for and conditions assessments of historic structures owned by the Parks Department. While at the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation, she researched neighborhood, block, and building histories of New York City to determine eligibility for historic districts throughout the city.

McClintic-Smith received a BA cum laude in art history from Davidson College in North Carolina.

Thomas Murphy

Washington, D.C.

Murphy holds the Klibeih Family Chair for Urban Development at the Urban Land Institute. He has spearheaded ULI’s Gulf Coast program established in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Murphy has served on a number of ULI Advisory Panels and is an expert in downtown revitalization, economic development, government operations, and urban visioning.

Before his current position, Murphy was the mayor of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. When he first took office in January 1994, Pittsburgh had yet to right itself after wrenching changes in the steel industry that began in the early 1980s. Government finances were in a sorry state, with a $32 million deficit, and no serious plan existed for an economic turnaround. Younger, college-educated workers were leaving in droves, and older residents were pessimistic about the region’s future. Land on both sides of the city’s three rivers, the defining
boundary of downtown and the international symbol of the city, was an eyesore. The riverbanks were blighted by the rusting carcasses of abandoned steel mills and businesses that discouraged pedestrian access to the rivers. After Murphy’s two terms in office, the Pittsburgh that he inherited is a dim memory. Replacing it today is a high-energy, cosmopolitan city that glows with optimism about its future.

As an economic revitalization visionary, Murphy has directed more than $4 billion in new investment in the city—from office towers for two of the city’s nationally ranked banks to new world-class facilities for the city’s professional football and baseball teams to an expanded downtown convention center. City neighborhoods, tarnished from decades of neglect, have been refurbished through the mayor’s Neighborhood Needs Program, including improvements to basic infrastructure like streets and sidewalks. Nearly all of the city’s 169 neighborhood playgrounds have been renovated to meet or exceed today’s most stringent safety standards. That effort recently won Pittsburgh an award from the Consumer Products Safety Commission, the first ever given to a public body.

As a technology booster, Murphy has made Pittsburgh a model for northeastern cities transitioning from heavy industrial-based economies. The city is now experiencing an explosion of new economic ventures with anchors in high technology and Internet-based startup companies. Nationally known e-commerce startups like Freemarkets, technology heavyweights like Seagate, and venture capital investors like Red Leaf have committed to Pittsburgh. Murphy has encouraged government—higher education partnerships with world-class local universities, especially Carnegie Mellon and the University of Pittsburgh.

Before his tenure as mayor, Murphy was a state legislator for 18 years and ran a neighborhood advocacy group.
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As design principal of Design Team Limited (Landscape Architects and Planners), Núñez’s efforts are focused on the development and implementation of forward-thinking, realistic, and practical action plans. He has a multidisciplinary background and specializes in the fields of land planning, landscape architecture, and land development. Some of his achievements are establishing Design Team Limited in 1984 in Houston, Texas; and successfully designing, planning, and managing multimillion-dollar redevelopment projects.

His responsibilities have encompassed the master-planning of residential communities; park and recreation amenities; and commercial, industrial, office campus, and resort developments, ranging from ten to several thousand acres. Within tight time frames and budgets, he has brought complex projects on line for many large, nationally known organizations. He directed multidisciplinary teams in broad-based problem-solving assignments and has had significant personal involvement in the management and administration of large master plans throughout the United States and overseas.

Núñez was appointed by the governor of Michigan as chairman to the State Board of Landscape Architects. He received his BS from Pennsylvania State University in 1976 in landscape architecture and environmental planning.