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Tupelo, Mississippi

Claudette Jones, Research Associate
John C. Stennis Institute of Government
Mississippi State University
Hopefully, this guide provides ideas and information in identifying assets within your community. Often we overlook the most obvious and valuable asset we have — our residents.

Residents offer a wealth of information, particularly the history of our communities, as well as insight into what, where, when, how, and why development has taken place.

Residents enthusiastically participate in projects offering volunteer and in-kind services, materials, and resources that become an integral part of pursuing available funding.

This guide is a starting point. As a participant in the planning process, your suggestions and ideas are welcomed and valued in crafting better “game plans” for communities across Mississippi.

Tupelo’s Mill Village was chosen as the study area due to my familiarity with the City’s Department of Development Services, Neighborhood Development Corporation, and pursuit of atypical funding resources, as well as own my interest in historic preservation in Mill Village. Please help us come up with better ways to serve you. Send your suggestions the Stennis Institute by contacting me at:

Claudette Jones
caj127@msgovt.org
(662) 325-2136

Any and all of your suggestions, observations, improvements, criticisms, etc., are appreciated.

Special thanks to Sherrie Cochran and Pat Falkner of Tupelo Development Services, Judy Phillips of John C. Stennis Institute of Government, Ben Griffith, Starkville MS City Planner; and Edward Kemp, Starkville MS City Engineer, for the for their invaluable assistance and many contributions to this publication.

Also, thank you to Mr. Narvell Strickland for permission to use excerpts from his study, *A History of Cotton Mills and the Industrial Revolution*.
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PART I: Community Identity & Assets

Take Inventory of your community and it’s assets.

Who?

History— Written and Oral, Photographs, Publications, Celebrations, etc.

What?

Buildings— Courthouse, Churches, Private Homes, Railroad Depot, Parks, Battlefields, etc.

When?

Assets— Businesses, Churches, Civic Organizations, Neighborhood Groups, Individuals, etc.

Where?

Why?

Financial— Banks, Businesses, Churches, Grants: Resources Federal, State, and Local Funding, etc.

How?

Strengths & Weaknesses

What Are Your Goals?
Capacity Development Model

- Implementation
- Funding & Investment Sources and Structuring
- Market & Financial Feasibility
- Physical Infrastructure & Programmatic Requirements
- Initial Strategic Plan
- Community Asset Inventory informed by Community Planning Workshops
- Statistical Data & Information Gathering followed by Preliminary Analysis

## INTRODUCTION: Tupelo / Lee County, Mississippi

### Tupelo MS Census 2000 data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>34,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>13,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>9,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>669.4 per square mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial makeup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.4% White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.28% African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10% Native American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.88% Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01% Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.47% from other races</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85% from two or more races</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.41% Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of any race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income for a household</td>
<td>$38,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income for a family</td>
<td>$22,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below the poverty line</td>
<td>19.3% of families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.7% of the population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.census.gov
MAPS : Tupelo / Lee County

Highway 45 North-South
Highway 78 and 178 East-West
Memphis TN to Birmingham AL
Highway 6 East-West
Natchez Trace Parkway (headquarters) from
Nashville TN to Natchez MS
Railroads: BNSF & Kansas City Southern

SOURCE: http://maps.google.com
A Brief History of Mill Village

The City of Tupelo upgraded 2025 Comprehensive Plan stresses the importance of maintaining the integrity and character of the city. Tupelo has several older neighborhoods, but few have the history and character of Mill Village, a neighborhood developed for and populated by the textile workers of the Tupelo Cotton Mill (1900-1938).

“Mill Founder Joshua Ledyard believed that satisfied workers were efficient workers, and set about creating a community for his workers. Amenities included “a baseball field with bleachers, tennis and basketball courts, grandstand and an outdoor stage used for other public social events. The mill grounds were kept beautifully, as was the village. (Strickland, 1998)

A Brief History of Mill Village

“Tupelo Cotton Mill produced a product to be proud of, one that wore well and held its color. The mill's fabrics sold around the world. Business was booming, the owners were happy with earnings, and employees were content with their portion. Then in 1929, without warning, the Great Depression hit, and the mill would feel the full brunt of the Depression.

“Cloth could not be sold at its former value, and by 1935 the textile market bottomed out, and most earnings were severely reduced... Into this heartbreaking state of affairs came union leaders urging employees to demand higher wages. But there was simply not enough money to meet union demands and higher wages were out of the question.

“The union leaders made good on its threat in 1938 and staged the largest sit-down strike in the south up to that time. As a result of the strike, mill owners were faced with huge financial losses, leaving them no choice but to close Tupelo Cotton Mill. And so began the long, slow decline of Old Mill Village. (Strickland, 1998)

A Brief History of Mill Village

“Mill Village is a historic area south of downtown Tupelo. It is listed on the Mississippi State Archives Department and on the National Registry of Historic Places. It is a quaint area-characterized by homes built around the Tupelo Cotton Mill built in 1900. Residents are striving to restore the area to its original charm. The restoration of Mill Village's beautiful architecture, interior design and infrastructure is indeed a work in progress… Preservationists and architects have helped gain historic status.

“There are many benefits to the designation of a local historic district, the most obvious is to help retain the historic character of the buildings included within its boundaries… The Tupelo Development Services Department has much information beneficial to Mill Village and all neighborhoods… It is an economically viable vision compatible with emerging marketplace preferences and increasing anti-sprawl, energy-conscious, community-building development, Adjacent Downtown Tupelo will be alive with offices, restaurants, hotels, entertaining venues, green spaces and housing of many sizes and varieties.” (Strickland, 1998)

A Brief History of Mill Village

Mill Village is bordered by **Magazine Street** to the east; **Church Street** to the north; **Spring Street** to the south; and **Chestnut Street** to the west. The neighborhood borders light industrial districts to its north, south, and west, with small multi-family (maximum 8 units), several private businesses, a low/moderate income medical clinic, two churches, and a main branch bank to the east.

Green Street, a prominent secondary street, bisects the neighborhood from east to west, resulting in a speeding hazard as commercial traffic cuts through between major thoroughfares, Main and Gloster Streets. The BNSF forms an additional border along Spring Street to the south.

SOURCE: http://www.ci.tupelo.ms.us/planning/GIS.htm
## Tangible Impacts of Revitalization Drive in Mill Village

**Mill Village Improvements - City of Tupelo 2005-06 Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk improvements</td>
<td>$ 900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funds (Banners)</td>
<td>$ 3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings (City of Tupelo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mill Village improvements - City of Tupelo 2006-07 Fiscal Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk improvements 900-ft.</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer upgrades</td>
<td>$18,690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.O.W. Trees</td>
<td>$ 800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funds (Spring Street Park)</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Hours/In-Kind Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>$ 9,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings (City of Tupelo)</td>
<td>$19,630.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: [http://www.ci.tupelo.ms.us/planning/GIS.htm](http://www.ci.tupelo.ms.us/planning/GIS.htm)
Tangible Impacts of Revitalization Drive in Mill Village

Mill Village improvements - City of Tupelo 2007-08 Fiscal Year

- Sidewalk Improvements 450-ft. $7,500.00
- Water and Sewer upgrades $8,950.00
- Equipment and Labor $9,000.00
- R.O.W. Trees $800.00
- Total $26,250.00

- Grant Funds (Spring Street Park) $10,000.00
- Volunteer Hours/In-Kind Goods & Services $10,000.00
- Cost Savings (City of Tupelo) Total $20,000.00

Outside investment to date
- Landmark Group $9,400,000.00

Adaptive Re-use of Tupelo Cotton Mill: 64-unit loft-style apartments (affordable housing units). Plans to protect and restore buildings that are essential parts of local heritage, build local tax base, and generally help to spur economic growth.
Community Analysis

This analysis uses the 27 Principals of New Urbanism as a framework to discuss and develop community goals.
The Principles of New Urbanism

• The Region: Metropolis, City, & Town

• The Neighborhood, the District, & the Corridor

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

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

TUPELO TRIVIA

- In 1934 Tupelo was the first city electrified by the new Tennessee Valley Authority.
- Tupelo had the first Comcast cable system.
MAPS: Tupelo / Lee County Municipalities

Lee County and its municipalities with Tupelo identified as its largest city

Map Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tupelo,_Mississippi

SOURCE: http://www.ci.tupelo.ms.us/planning/GIS.htm
MAPS : Tupelo / Lee County

SUSPECT SOILS
TUPELO, MISSISSIPPI

CITY LIMIT ACREAGE 3055
SUSPECT SOIL ACREAGE 1112
36% OF TUPELO IS COMPOSED OF SUSPECT SOILS

SOURCE: http://www.ci.tupelo.ms.us/planning/GIS.htm
REGION: Metropolis, City, & Town

Lee County and its municipalities with Tupelo identified as its largest city

Map Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tupelo,_Mississippi

Lee County is part of Mississippi’s First Congressional District

Map Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mississippi’s_congressional_districts
REGION: Metropolis, City, & Town

109 miles

135 miles

SOURCE: http://maps.google.com
3. The metropolis has a necessary and fragile relationship to its agrarian hinterland and natural landscapes. The relationship is environmental, economic, and cultural. Farm land and nature are as important to the metropolis as the garden is to the house.

4. Development patterns should not blur or eradicate the edges of the metropolis. Infill development within existing urban areas conserves environmental resources, economic investment, and social fabric, while reclaiming marginal and abandoned areas. Metropolitan regions should develop strategies to encourage such infill development over peripheral expansion.
5. Where appropriate, new development contiguous to urban boundaries should be organized as neighborhoods and districts, and be integrated with the existing urban pattern. Noncontiguous development should be organized as towns and villages with their own urban edges, and planned for a jobs/housing balance, not as bedroom suburbs.

6. The development and redevelopment of towns and cities should respect historical patterns, precedents, and boundaries.
Industry
“In February 2007 Toyota Motor Sales (TMS), U.S.A., Inc., selected Blue Springs, MS as the site for its future automobile manufacturing facility.

“Tupelo is the headquarters of the North Mississippi Medical Center, the largest non-metropolitan hospital in the United States. It serves people in North Mississippi, northwest Alabama and portions of Tennessee. The medical center was a winner of the prestigious Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award in 2006.

“Tupelo is the headquarters of two banking institutions - BankcorpSouth, with approximately $11.8 billion in assets (2006), and Renasant, with assets of approximately $2.4 billion (2006).

“The city is a three-time "All-America City Award" winner and boasts one of the largest furniture manufacturing industries nationwide. As journalist Dennis Seid of The Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal noted in the February, 2006 edition of The Northeast Mississippi Business Journal, furniture manufacturing is crucial to the economy of Northeast Mississippi, "providing some 22,000 jobs, or almost 13% of the region's employment... with a $732 million annual payroll... producing $2.25 billion worth of goods."

“Tecumseh, Furniture Brands International, Hancock Fabrics Inc., Toyota Motor Manufacturing of Mississippi, H.M. Richards, JESCO Construction, MTD Products, Savings Oil Company (Dodge's Stores), and Cooper Tire & Rubber Company all operate or are headquartered in Tupelo & Lee County.”
7. Cities and towns should bring into proximity a broad spectrum of public and private uses to support a regional economy that benefits people of all incomes. Affordable housing should be distributed throughout the region to match job opportunities and to avoid concentrations of poverty. **Tupelo’s Neighborhood Associations, CHDO, Land Trust, and interest in forming a HUD HOME Consortium.**

8. The physical organization of the region should be supported by a framework of transportation alternatives. Transit, pedestrian, and bicycle systems should maximize access and mobility throughout the region while reducing dependence upon the automobile. **Addressed in Tupelo’s 2025 Comprehensive Plan.**
9. Revenues and resources can be shared more cooperatively among the municipalities and centers within regions to avoid destructive competition for tax base and to promote rational coordination of transportation, recreation, public services, housing, and community in situations.
10. The neighborhood, the district, and the corridor are the essential elements of development and redevelopment in the metropolis. They form identifiable areas that encourage citizens to take responsibility for their maintenance and evolution.

11. Neighborhoods should be compact, pedestrian-friendly, and mixed-use. Districts generally emphasize a special single use, and should follow the principles of neighborhood design. Corridors are regional connectors of neighborhoods and districts; they range from boulevards and rail lines to rivers and park ways.
12. Many activities of daily living should occur within walking distance, allowing independence to those who do not drive, especially the elderly and the young. Interconnected networks of streets should be designed to encourage walking, reduce the number and length of automobile trips, and conserve energy.

Walking Distance: Farmers Market, Tupelo Commons, Downtown Tupelo, Short Commute (less than one mile) Pharmacy and Grocery.

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

14. Transit corridors, when properly planned and coordinated, can help organize metropolitan structure and revitalize urban centers. In contrast, highway corridors should not displace investment from existing centers.
The socio-economic breakdown is long-term middle class, and moderate to low income residents. **Middle class** residents live on Church Street in larger homes. **Moderate and fixed income** residents live along Malone Blvd, and south of Green Street along Maple and Broadway.

Developers have recently moved and renovated older homes to the corner of Chestnut and Broadway.
15. Appropriate building densities and land uses should be within walking distance of transit stops, permitting public transit to be come available alternative to the automobile. **Addressed in Tupelo’s 2025 Comprehensive Plan.**

16. Concentrations of civic, institutional, and commercial activity should be embedded in neighborhoods and districts, not isolated in remote, single-use complexes. Schools should be sized and located to enable children to walk or bicycle to them. **A middle school, the City’s Main Library, and a branch bank are within walking distance, but not contained within Mill Village.**

17. The economic health and harmonious evolution of neighborhoods, districts, and corridors can be improved through graphic urban design codes that serve as predictable guides for change. **Addressed in Tupelo’s 2025 Comprehensive Plan.**
18. A range of parks, from tot-lots and village greens to ball fields and community gardens, should be distributed within neighborhoods. Conservation areas and open lands should be used to define and connect different neighborhoods and districts.
19. A primary task of all urban architecture and landscape design is the physical definition of streets and public spaces as places of shared use.

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

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

22. In the contemporary metropolis, development must adequately accommodate automobiles. It should do so in ways that respect the pedestrian and the form of public space.
23. Streets and squares should be safe, comfortable, and interesting to the pedestrian. Properly configured, they encourage walking and enable neighbors to know each other and protect their communities.

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

25. Civic buildings and public gathering places require important sites to reinforce community identity and the culture of democracy. They deserve distinctive form, because their role is different from that of Other. Buildings and places that constitute the fabric of the city.
26. All buildings should provide their inhabitants with a clear sense of location, weather and time. Natural methods of heating and cooling can be more resource-efficient than mechanical systems.

27. Preservation and renewal of historic buildings, districts, and landscapes affirm the continuity and evolution of urban society.
PART II:

Be Seen on GREEN

The Green Street Revitalization Project
in the HEART of Mill Village

The Green Street Revitalization Project
in Historic Mill Village — Tupelo, Mississippi

Suggested Multifamily Affordable Housing, Mixed Use Development, & Traffic Calming Initiatives
STUDY AREA

Historic Mill Village:
A Traditional Neighborhood

▲ North
Traditional Neighborhood Development

What is a TND?

The acronym TND stands for Traditional Neighborhood Development, a comprehensive planning system that includes a variety of housing types and land uses in a defined area. The variety of uses permits educational facilities, civic buildings and commercial establishments to be located within walking distance of private homes. A TND is served by a network of paths, streets and lanes suitable for pedestrians as well as vehicles. This provides residents the option of walking, biking or driving to places within their neighborhood. Present and future modes of transit are also considered during the planning stages.

Public and private spaces have equal importance, creating a balanced community that serves a wide range of home and business owners. The inclusion of civic buildings and civic space -- in the form of plazas, greens, parks and squares -- enhances community identity and value.

SOURCE: http://www.tndtownpaper.com/neighborhoods.htm
Historic Mill Village
Neighborhood Study Area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>No. of Parcels</th>
<th>GIS Parcel No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Digitized @ Street</th>
<th>Sold</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exhibit Code</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>Street Front</th>
<th>C-Rev</th>
<th>C-Sex</th>
<th>Ind-H</th>
<th>Ind-L</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Pub-Out</th>
<th>Sand T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-182-00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>60 - S Green</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>262 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td>208 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-183-00</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$15,060</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$22,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>278 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-184-00</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$19,370</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$26,870</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>288 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-185-00</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$18,180</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$25,680</td>
<td></td>
<td>298 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-186-00</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$13,580</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$21,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>306 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-211-00</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$20,550</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$28,550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>350 Elliot Street</td>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-187-00</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>Corner Lot 55 - S Green 105 - Elliot</td>
<td>$10,040</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$28,040</td>
<td></td>
<td>314 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-227-00</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$157,640</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$217,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>248 S Green Street</td>
<td>S Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td></td>
<td>$106,970</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$272,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-228-00</td>
<td>3.101</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>$275,140</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$400,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300 S Spring Street</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-251-01</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$51,900</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$63,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>502 S Spring Street</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-251-00</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$132,850</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$156,850</td>
<td></td>
<td>510 S Spring Street</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-255-00</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.566</td>
<td></td>
<td>$437,950</td>
<td>$289,000</td>
<td>$726,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-252-00</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>S Broadway</td>
<td>S Broadway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-255-00</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>Corner Lot 177 - S Spring 137 - Elliot</td>
<td>$10,490</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$34,490</td>
<td></td>
<td>511 S Spring Street</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-255-01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-254-00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>$27,350</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$41,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>516 S Spring Street</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-257-00</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>089P-31-253-00</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>Corner Lot 135 - S Spring 135 - S Broadway</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>S Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.972</td>
<td></td>
<td>$72,900</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
<td>$125,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DRAFT**
New Urbanism Principles in Small Historical Neighborhoods

Green Street Revitalization Study Area – Chestnut Street to Elliot Street

Mill Village Current Land Uses, Footprints, & Architectural Vernacular

- 6 Respect historic patterns, precedents, and boundaries
- 10 Citizen Responsibility for maintenance & evolution
Green Street Revitalization Study Area – Proposed Design

Green Street Traffic Calming utilizing On-Street Parking, Landscaping, Chicanes, & Truncated Domes

Five-foot wide sidewalks provide adequate walking area and remain in character with neighborhood vernacular.

On-street (5ft) parking on both sides of the street effectively narrowing driving lanes to 10 feet each to calm traffic. Sharrow designates car/bike lane sharing.

Crosswalks

Sharrows
Hazard Dimples
Truncated Domes for Traffic Calming
New Street Landscaping including chicanes and solar lighting

Examples of Possible Mixed Use Development based upon multi-residential development within Mill Village

Suggested Placement of Small Multifamily Apartments as Infill Affordable Housing

Transit Stop with Street Furniture

Placement of Mill Village markers recognizing historic designation
Green Street Revitalization Study Area – Revitalization Proposal

Green Street Revitalization

The Green Street Vitalization Project is the result of research and analysis of conditions in Tupelo, Mississippi’s historic Mill Village neighborhood. Distinctive in its history and housing vernacular, the area has fallen upon hard times as elderly residents have become less able to maintain their homes while adult children have relocated to other areas of the city, state, or country, making it difficult to assist their parents.

Another threat to the community is the possibility of gentrification. The community suffers from both geographic and socioeconomic division as the result of the traffic volume passing through daily on Green Street, which has become a secondary thoroughfare for the adjacent industrial and warehouse district. Green Street serves as a line of demarcation dividing the Mill Village community into African-Americans to the east and more affluent white residents to the west. Real estate values are low resulting in real estate speculation and “flipping” undervalued properties brought into compliance with codes.

Mill Village Strengths include a sense of history, natural landscape, an active neighborhood organization, local political support, and a strong neighborhood vernacular architecture to drawn upon. Weaknesses include the volume of commercial traffic bisecting the neighborhood, socioeconomic separation, substandard housing, lack of a focal point, and lack of employment opportunities. It is hoped that mixed use development proposed for the heart of Green Street will provide both a much need focal point as well as local employment opportunities for neighborhood residents.

The revitalization project is broken into three major components: sidewalk rehabilitation; landscaping, street furniture and lighting; and traffic calming through the implementation of on-street parking and narrower lanes. Sidewalk rehabilitation and the street striping to designate on-street parking and narrower lanes are covered in the Tupelo Public Works budget under maintenance and improvements and/or federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

Funding for landscaping is available through grant programs for neighborhood beautification offered by Lowe’s and Home Depot, Keep America Beautiful Grants, and CDBG and/or Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds for neighborhood revitalization. Lighting donations, sponsorship and/or grants may be available through Tupelo-based lighting manufacturers, Day-Brite Capri Omega Lighting, NESCO Electrical Distributors, and/or Electra Manufacturing. Street furniture and bus stops may be supplied cooperatively by Tupelo Parks & Recreation, Public Works, and Development Services.

The design has been developed with an eye to cost efficiency, sustainability, and neighborhood well-being.
“Tupelo typically identifies and addresses community issues as they occur. This is true of affordable housing and its accompanying urban design issues: transportation, education, employment, and leisure. Tupelo’s 2025 Comprehensive Plan addresses each of these concerns with a particular interest in neighborhood revitalization. The City has a history of successful community development. Jobs and affordable housing have been a major thrust for the city, county, and development organizations in the area.

“Tupelo adopted the 2025 Comprehensive Plan in December 2008. It remains to be seen if residents will oppose Smart Growth’s density, urban infill, and zoning changes to accommodate density. The City’s neighborhoods are well-organized under the umbrella of Tupelo’s Development Services Department. Mill Village is typical in its opposition to Habitat housing, as being inferior due to its identifiability as affordable housing.”

Green Street Revitalization Study Area – Mill Village Gateways

Mill Village Gateways at Chesnut & Elliot Streets
Green Street Revitalization Study Area – Multifamily Housing

Suggested Vernacular for Multifamily Infill
Green Street Revitalization Study Area – Mixed Use Development

Suggested Vernacular for Mixed Use Development

DRAFT Resource Identification & Development Guide for Small Towns
Green Street Revitalization Study Area –

Landscaping Materials & Street Furniture

Ten chicanes will be constructed to provide traffic calming and break up the monotony of on-street parking. The chicanes will be constructed of split-face block for its permanence, low maintenance, and sustainability. Solar ballards will provide lighting, eliminating the expense, difficulty, and timespan involved in retrofitting the street with underground electrical utilities.

In the service area, Serviceberry trees will be planted every 20 feet to provide canopy, shade, and a sense of place. The tree is native to Mississippi limiting costly maintenance. In addition, the tree both flowers and bears edible fruit for human and wildlife consumption. It is a favorite of migratory birds.

Indian Hawthorne, also a native plant, will be planted in the chicanes and along the service area, providing seasonal color and edible wildlife habitat. The Mill Village Neighborhood Association will be encouraged to plant colorful spring and summer annuals.

Street furniture will be purchased from Mississippi Prison Industries Corporation. The furniture is sturdy, attractive, and competitively priced.

Two benches and four waste receptacles will be used on the street, as well as two bus stops with benches, which be purchased from another vendor.

Typical Section of Sidewalk, Landscaping, & Street Design

SOURCE: http://www.solarilluminations.com/info_solar.htm
Green Street Revitalization Study Area

Proposed Design Costs per Project & Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of Proposed Street Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelanchier Arbore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Plantings: pansies and petunias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting beds 10ftx30ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Shelter Weathered for Two-Openings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Receptacles with Ashtray and Liner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Cost: $42,210

Add cost for 32 solar balls @ $275 each (Total $8,800). Eliminates need for utility hook-up.

Total Project Cost:
- $55,444 without speed tables
- $64,244 with solar ballards (no speed tables)
- $60,034 with three elevated speed table/crosswalks at curb grade
- $68,834 with solar ballards and three elevated speed tables
Response to Place: Vernacular

Existing Architectural Vernacular for Single & Multi-family Residential
Connection to Habitat: Preservation

- Heirloom Project for Tupelo K-12 School Students
- Community Participation
- In-Kind Services & Materials
- Grant Funding
- National KAB Recognition
- Unlimited Public Access
- Covered Space for Flea Markets & Fund-Raising Activities by Non-Profits
- Public Furniture including Grills, Tables, and Benches
- Community Garden Space
- Part of the Tupelo Green Space Project including the Farmers Market

Designed by TDS Environmental Coordinator Sherrie Cochran, The Tupelo Creative Commons pocket park forms the eastern edge of Mill Village. Situated between Spring Street and the B&N Railroad line, the park was built by volunteer labor including community services participants, boy scout troops, church groups, and individuals. In their art classes, Tupelo school children produced more than 4,000 pavers for the walkways.
Cotton Mill Lofts Project Abandoned

by Emily Le Coz/NEMS Daily Journal

TUPELO - A $9.4 million project to convert the vacant J.J. Rogers Building into loft apartments collapsed last month, the victim of a tough economy.

Developer Rex Todd, who heads the North Carolina-based Todd Development, said the tax credits he won for the project fell substantially short of the needed amount and that lenders wouldn't loan the difference.

It didn't matter anyway, he said, because no one was willing to buy the credits in the first place. "The tax-credit market situation is such that it's unfeasible right now," Todd told the Daily Journal on Monday. "I am really quite saddened about it. I had tried for two years."

Todd said he will not pursue the development deal again. The decision was news to city officials when questioned by the Daily Journal. "I had heard about a gap in funding months ago, but I hadn't heard anything since," Pat Falkner, the city's planner, said Monday. "With what's happening with development and leasing all over the country, it doesn't surprise me the money's not there to do this."

Todd, whose company is affiliated with another firm that rehabs historic properties, had first announced the project in 2007. He proposed renovating the aging structure along Spring Street and turning it into loft apartments for low-income residents. He had the support of the city and the Mill Village Neighborhood Association, in whose district the building resides. The project, though, hinged on getting funding through tax credits from the Mississippi Home Corp. After failing to get the credits in 2008, the project finally won them last year.

They were estimated to be worth more than $6.8 million, but apparently they fetched far less. "The amount of tax credits we were issued for the deal, taking into account the exchange program, were insufficient," Todd said, "so we stopped."

Upon learning the news, Mill Village Neighborhood Association President Jane Carruth said she's disappointed. "I think it's going to hurt the downtown area and the affordable housing market as far as this area goes," Carruth said. "But we're going to continue to push for Mill Village to improve. We're not going to let it get us down."

Contact Emily Le Coz at (662) 678-1588 or emily.lecoz@djournal.com.

Sustainability: Energy Efficiency

- Energy related costs paid by residents and businesses drain the local economy of dollars that could be spent within the local economy. For every dollar spent on energy, $.80 leave a state, compared to typical consumer purchases, for which only $.34 leaves (*The Hidden Link: Energy and Economic Development*, a report commissioned by HUD).

- East South Central Region (Mississippi) exhibits the highest total electricity BTU consumption per household (153.9) and the largest physical units of total consumption per household for electricity (14,890).

- The South Census Region consumes a disproportionate amount of total energy in the United States. The region represents only 35.4 percent of total U.S. households, but utilizes 47.1 percent of primary electricity BTU consumption.

- The two highest costs of homeownership are mortgage payments and utility bills.

- Low income housing that is not energy efficient places two burdens on homeowners – mortgage payments and high energy bills.

Sustainability: Energy Efficiency

Energy Investment & Savings

- Acclimate structures to take advantage of passive solar energy.
- Incorporate heat-saving windows into structural design to take advantage of passive solar.
- Plant trees and greenery to absorb and deflect heat. Consider using green roofs.
- Use insulated/insulating building and roofing materials.
- Use solar lighting for outdoor fixtures.
- Use public transportation or walk whenever possible.
- Participate in community garden program.
- Compost vegetable food waste, coffee grounds, egg shells, etc. for gardening.
- Recycle, reuse, or free cycle household goods and waste products.
- Recycle rain water, as well as gray and black water for landscaping & vehicle maintenance.
Use of Building Materials: SIPS

Structural Insulated Panels (SIPs)

• SIPs are a foam core sandwich that uses an oriented strand board (OSB) skin laminated to an expanded polystyrene (EPS) core
  – SIPs are a highly predictable building product that is resource efficient and cost effective.
  – SIP panel construction is stronger than stick frame construction. 3 5/8” SIPs meet 110 mph tests
  – Oak Ridge National Laboratory evaluates the whole wall R-value of SIPs to be 58% better than 2x6 stick construction
  – Window and door opening can be pre-cut at the manufacturing plant and panels arrive at the job-site numbered and loaded for efficient assembly in the field.
  – The use of SIPs decreases construction time and improves the quality of construction.

Use of Building Materials: Affordability

### Jackson - Meridian, MS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mat+Labor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation, Piers, Flatwork</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough Hardware</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP Envelope</td>
<td>$12,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Framing</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Insulation</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Trim</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Hardware</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing, Flashing, Fascia</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Carpentry</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Wall Finish</td>
<td>$1,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterline</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting Fixtures</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countertops</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinets</td>
<td>$2,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built-in Appliances</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Rough-in and Connection</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Fixtures</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating and Cooling Systems</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porch Addition &amp; Decking</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Direct Job Costs** $54,700.00

- Driveway: $1,250.00
- Final Cleanup: $500.00
- Permits & Utilities: $300.00
- Plans & Specs: $200.00
- Survey: $200.00

**Subtotal Indirect Job Costs**: $1,250.00

- Contractor Markup: $7,500.00

**Total Cost**: $60,000.00

**Overhead Costs**: $7,500.00

**TOTAL SALE COST**: $67,500.00

Use of Building Materials: Affordability

Use of Building Materials: Personalization

Reverse Logistics & Sustainable Design

1. Form a Neighborhood Maintenance Committee to Assist Residents
2. Recycle Building Materials
3. Establish Community/Victory Gardens & Composting
4. Establish Residential Recycling Program
5. Use Recycled Materials as a Source to Fund Community Projects
6. Sell Surplus Vegetables at The Farmers Market to Fund Projects
8. Work with Tupelo Development Services to Modify Zoning and/or Ordinances to Allow Alternative Practices
9. Resell or Free-cycle Unwanted Household Items rather than Disposing of them in the Landfill
Green Street Revitalization Study Area – Mixed Use Development

Suggested Vernacular for Mixed Use Development

In Progress
HUD HOME Consortium

Since 2007, the City of Tupelo Department of Planning and Community Development has been interested in forming a US Department of Housing and Urban Development Home Investment Partnership, better known as a HOME Consortium, to pursue federal Community Development Block Grant housing funds rather than relying on the state agency, Mississippi Development Authority, to approve projects and administer funds, effectively reducing the amount of the award.

In Summer 2009, Zell Long set about researching the feasibility of establishing a HOME Consortium. The Stennis Institute provided assistance in determining the most beneficial configuration of the participating jurisdictions, as the participants had to be contiguous geographically, as well as having the necessary population density to qualify for the program.
HOME funds can be used for a broad range of eligible activities, to include:

- Assistance with purchasing a home, including a down payment assistance grant
- Funds to rehabilitate existing housing
- Construction of new or rental housing
- “Other reasonable and necessary expenses related to the development of non-luxury housing,” including site acquisition or improvement, demolition of dilapidated housing to make way for HOME-assisted development, and payment of relocation expenses.
- HOME funds to provide tenant-based rental assistance contracts of up to 2 years if such activity is consistent with the Consolidated Plan
HUD HOME Consortium

Working Together

• The Consortium administers the HOME program as a Participating Jurisdiction (PJ).

• Member UGLGs must be able to establish a working relationship that meets the affordable housing needs of all members.

• The consortium must designate one lead entity, to assume the overall responsibility for the consortium’s compliance with the HOME program requirements.

• The lead entity must have a demonstrated ability to manage HOME funds and the Consortium members must trust the lead entity’s ability to assume this responsibility.

• All members must be committed to cooperatively achieve the objectives of the Consolidated Plan.
HUD HOME Consortium

Developing a Consolidated Plan

- Identify the start of the consolidated program year
- Determine the timeframe for developing the Consolidated Plan
- HUD Field Office notification of Participating Jurisdiction allocation amount
- Notice of Intent to participate allows enough time for the consortium to submit its Consolidated Plan. Formal notice starts the timeframe for the regulatory and statutory deadlines, determining the date that the Consolidated Plan is due.
- The Consortium submits a written notification of its intent to be a PJ within 30 days of notice of its formula allocation amount
- The consortium submits a Consolidated Plan to the Field Office within 90 days of providing notification of its intent to be a PJ
- Consolidated Plan for the entire geographic area encompassed by the consortium
- A new consortium must submit the complete Strategic Plan

If Joint Grant Agreement participants form a consortium for the HOME program, the Consolidated Plan submitted by the urban county will also serve as the Consolidated Plan for the HOME consortium, because the UGLGs in the consortium are the same as the UGLGs in the urban county Joint Grant Agreement.
• A consortium allows an area, which otherwise might not be assured funding, to plan and carry out an affordable housing program.

• Formation of a consortium enables neighboring (contiguous) units of local government to develop collaborative approaches that address regional housing needs in a coordinated way.

• Assessing housing needs and developing strategies regionally can assist jurisdictions in meeting their obligation to affirmatively further fair housing by expanding housing choice across jurisdictional boundaries for all low income households in the housing market area.

• HOME funds are distributed (after set-asides) by formula with 40 percent of the funds going to states and 60 percent of the funds going to UGLGs.

• Prospective Consortium members need to understand that the formation of a consortium could result in a loss of HOME funds to the state as a whole.
Creating a Home Consortium: An Overview for Decision-makers

Regional HOME Consortium

Annual Federal Grant Funding to Consortium = $854,934
Total Federal Grant Funding over 3-year period = $2,564,803
Annual Match requirement = $213,734
Match over 3-year period = $541,201
Total Funding to HOME Consortium over 3-year period = $3,206,003

HOME Consortium Consolidated Plan

The Consolidated Plan is a collaborative process whereby a community establishes a unified vision for community development actions. It offers local jurisdictions the opportunity to shape the various housing and community development programs into effective, coordinated neighborhood and community development strategies. It also creates the opportunity for strategic planning and citizen participation to take place in a comprehensive context, and to reduce duplication of effort at the local level. Each jurisdiction’s plan must state how it will pursue these goals for all community development programs, as well as all housing programs. These statutory program goals are:

DECENT HOUSING - - which includes:
• assisting homeless persons obtain affordable housing;
• assisting persons at risk of becoming homeless;
• retaining the affordable housing stock;
• increasing the availability of affordable permanent housing in standard condition to low-income and moderate-income families, particularly to members of disadvantaged minorities without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, or disability;
• increasing the supply of supportive housing which includes structural features and services to enable persons with special needs (including persons with HIV/AIDS) to live in dignity and independence; and
• providing affordable housing that is accessible to job opportunities.

A SUITABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT - - which includes:
• improving the safety and livability of neighborhoods;
• eliminating blighting influences and the deterioration of property and facilities;
• increasing access to quality public and private facilities and services;
• reducing the isolation of income groups within areas through spatial deconcentration of housing opportunities for lower income persons and the revitalization of deteriorating neighborhoods;
• restoring and preserving properties of special historic, architectural, or aesthetic value; and
• conserving energy resources and use of renewable energy sources.

EXPANDED ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES - - which includes:
• job creation and retention;
• establishment, stabilization and expansion of small businesses (including micro-businesses);
• the provision of public services concerned with employment;
• the provision of jobs to low-income persons living in areas affected by those programs and activities, or jobs resulting from carrying out activities under programs covered by the plan;
• availability of mortgage financing for low-income persons at reasonable rates using non-discriminatory lending practices;
• access to capital and credit for development activities that promote the long-term economic and social viability of the community; and
• empowerment and self-sufficiency for low-income persons to reduce generational poverty in federally assisted housing and public housing.
HOME Consortium Consolidated Plan

Forms of Matching Contribution

Matching contributions must be made from nonfederal resources and may be in the form of one or more of the following:

**Cash contributions from nonfederal sources.**
- A cash contribution may be made by the participating jurisdiction, non-Federal public entities, private entities, or individuals. A cash contribution made to a nonprofit organization for use in a HOME project may be counted as a matching contribution.
- A cash contribution may be made from program income
- The grant equivalent of a below-market interest rate loan to the project that is not repayable to the participating jurisdiction's HOME Investment Trust Fund may be counted as a cash contribution
- Proceeds of bonds that are not repaid with revenue from an affordable housing project (e.g., general obligation bonds) and that are loaned to a HOME-assisted or other qualified affordable housing project constitute a cash contribution

**Forbearance of fees.**

**State and local taxes, charges or fees.** The value (based on customary and reasonable means for establishing value) of State or local taxes, fees, or other charges that are normally and customarily imposed or charged by a State or local government on all transactions or projects in the conduct of its operations, which are waived, foregone, or deferred (including State low-income housing tax credits) in a manner that achieves affordability of HOME-assisted projects, may be counted as match. The amount of any real estate taxes may be based on post-improvement property value. For taxes, fees, or charges that are forgiven for future years, the value is the present discounted cash value, based on a rate equal to the rate for the Treasury security with a maturity closest to the number of years for which the taxes, fees, or charges are waived, foregone, or deferred.

**Other charges or fees.** The value of fees or charges associated with the transfer or development of real estate that are normally and customarily imposed or charged by public or private entities, which are waived or foregone, in whole or in part, in a manner that achieves affordability of HOME-assisted projects, may be counted as match.

**Donated Real Property.** The value, before the HOME assistance is provided and minus any debt burden, lien, or other encumbrance, of donated land or other real property may be counted as match. The donation may be made by the participating jurisdiction, non-Federal public entities, private entities, or individuals. Donated property not acquired with Federal resources is a contribution in the amount of 100% of the value; donated property acquired with Federal assistance may provide a partial contribution with specific stipulations.

**The cost, not paid with Federal resources, of on-site and off-site infrastructure** that the participating jurisdiction documents are directly required for HOME-assisted projects. The infrastructure must have been completed no earlier than 12 months before HOME funds are committed to the project.
HOME Consortium Consolidated Plan

Proceeds from multifamily and single family affordable housing project bond financing validly issued by a State or local government, or an agency or instrumentality of a State or local government or a political subdivision of a State and repayable with revenues from the affordable housing project financed as follows:

- Fifty percent of the loan amount made from bond proceeds to a multifamily affordable housing project owner may qualify as match.
- Twenty-five percent of the loan amount from bond proceeds made to a single-family affordable housing project owner may qualify as match.
- Loans made from bond proceeds may not constitute more than 25 percent of a participating jurisdiction’s total annual match contribution.

The reasonable value of donated site-preparation and construction materials, not acquired with Federal resources. The value of site-preparation and construction materials is to be determined in accordance with the participating jurisdiction’s cost estimate procedures.

The reasonable rental value of the donated use of site preparation or construction equipment.

The value of donated or voluntary labor or professional services in connection with the provision of affordable housing. A single rate established by HUD shall be applicable for determining the value of unskilled labor. The value of skilled labor or professional services shall be determined by the rate that the individual or entity performing the labor or service normally charges.

The value of sweat equity provided to a homeownership project, under an established component of a participating jurisdiction’s program, up until the time of project completion (i.e., submission of a project completion form). Such labor shall be valued at the HUD rate established for unskilled labor.

The direct cost of supportive services provided to families residing in HOME-assisted units during the period of affordability or receiving HOME tenant-based rental assistance during the term of the tenant-based rental assistance contract. The supportive services must be necessary to facilitate independent living or be required as part of a self-sufficiency program. Examples of supportive services include: case management, mental health services, assistance with the tasks of daily living, substance abuse treatment and counseling, day care, and job training and counseling.

The direct cost of homebuyer counseling services provided to families that acquire properties with HOME funds including ongoing counseling services provided during the period of affordability. These services may be provided as part of a homebuyer counseling program that is not specific to the HOME Program, but only the cost of services to families that complete purchases with HOME assistance may be counted as match.
In May 2010, Mayor Jack Reed, Jr. sent a letter to Dr. Jackie Williams, Acting Field Office Director at the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, withdrawing the City of Tupelo/Lee County's request to form a HOME Consortium. The decision was based on regional economic conditions and the concern of the partners’ ability to provide the 25-percent match, reflecting new dollars in a tight budget year.

Mayor Reed stated in the letter his hopes to pursue the formation of the Consortium in the future.

Though the Consortium initiative did not come to fruition, Tupelo’s active interest and investigation of HOME funds exhibits a proactive approach to funding for affordable housing.
Mill Village is a fascinating historical case study, having been established as self-contained community for the Tupelo Mill workers. Designed as a traditional neighborhood development, it offered easy access to employment, affordable housing, green space including sports fields, schools, churches, recreation, and social services, etc. For the duration of the Mill’s operation, Mill Village was a tight community protected and maintained by the Mill. After the Mill closed in 1938, the nature of the community began to change.

Over the years, Mill Village has evolved into a mixed race and mixed income neighborhood maintaining a great deal of its architectural character and green space, as it remains heavily tree’d. It has experienced property depreciation as elderly residents have become less able to care for their simple homes. Fortunately, it has not experience rampant gentrification. Revitalization of the area could be accomplished using federal grants for maintenance and painting, as well as the recycling of salvageable materials should structures prove too deteriorated for rehabilitation.
Given its size, demographic, and geography, Mill Village is a near ideal community to develop pilot projects for: neighborhood resident-driven renovation and rehabilitation, vocational training programs in construction and the skill trades; recycling; community gardens; alternative energy/conservation initiatives like green roofs, rain gardens, and water harvesting; solar street lighting; as well as small scale public transportation to determine cost/benefit, demand, and usage.

The City of Tupelo is very protective of Mill Village. Two distinctive historic properties remain intact: the Tupelo Mill and the Carnation Milk Factory. Despite difficult economic times, developers continue to be interested in the area.

In addition, Green Street the longest transportation corridor in the city bisects the area, creating both opportunity and division. The Lee County Health Department resides within the neighborhood perimeter. The Tupelo Medical Center and the City’s industrial corridor are adjacent to the area.
CONCLUSION

“Tupelo typically identifies and addresses community issues as they occur. This is true of affordable housing and its accompanying urban design issues: transportation, education, employment, and leisure. Tupelo’s 2025 Comprehensive Plan addresses each of these concerns with a particular interest in neighborhood revitalization. The application of HOME Consortium funds should the City opt to pursue them would be rehabilitation and revitalization of older, existing neighborhoods in an effort to maintain and preserve its sense of identity and community.

Tupelo has a history of successful community development. Jobs and affordable housing have been a major thrust for the city, county, and development organizations in the area. Even in a faltering economy, Lee, Union, and Pontotoc Counties (PUL Alliance) has a signed commitment with site development under way for the construction of a Toyota’ newest manufacturing facility. The construction of the facility, as well as the new jobs as the manufacturing facility comes on line will greatly benefit the region.

Tupelo adopted the 2025 Comprehensive Plan in December 2008. It remains to be seen if residents will oppose Smart Growth’s density, urban infill, and zoning changes to accommodate density. The City’s neighborhoods are well-organized under the umbrella of Tupelo’s Development Services Department.
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