

June 2, 1967

File

A special meeting of the Planning and Development Committee was held on Friday, June 2, 1967 at 2:00 P. M. in Committee Room #1, Second Floor, City Hall.

The following members were present:

Rodney Cook, Chairman
E. Gregory Griggs
John M. Flanigen
Q. V. Williamson
Jack Summers

Absent: Charlie Leftwich
George Cotsakis

Also in attendance were:

Collier Gladin
William F. Kennedy
George Aldridge
Izadore Candeub
John Brown

Also at the meeting were various representatives of the press.

The Chairman called the meeting to order and the following business was considered:

Mr. Cook stated that the purpose of this meeting is to continue the discussion of the Community Improvement Program, which is to be completed shortly. He then presented Mr. Candeub who stated that the following points, which were raised at the last meeting, would be discussed in detail:

1. Details of individual program sectors.
2. Priority system methodology.
3. Background material on development of land use allocations.

He then presented John Brown. Mr. Brown first presented a chart entitled "Residential Construction by 1983". The chart showed the total number of existing housing units in the City, based on a 1965 CIP field survey; total inventory was also shown by standard and substandard units and the number of new units to be constructed by 1983 was indicated. The projected housing inventory for 1983 is 217,370 units - 121,470 white occupied units and 95,900 non-white occupied units.

Mr. Flanigen asked Mr. Brown how the housing projections had been derived and did the consultants have a high and low projection of total city population for 1983. Mr. Brown explained that this background information was included in previous economic reports. He then presented a second

chart entitled "Residential Land Needed by 1983" and stated that his firm has assumed one of the objectives of the City of Atlanta is to continue to provide a large amount of land for detached single family dwellings. He pointed out that one of the alternative program actions that might be followed by the City is to decrease the amount of land that is being used for medium density apartments and to increase the number of high density apartment developments. He stated further that if present low and medium density development trends continue there will not be enough land in the City to accommodate the projected number of housing units. He stated this was, of course, a policy decision to be made by the City of Atlanta.

Mr. Aldridge asked if these figures assumed any annexation by the City within the time period, to which Mr. Brown stated they did not; that their allocation is based on present land area, which is either vacant or to be redeveloped, within the present corporate limits.

Mr. Flanigen asked if it is logical to base the projection on the assumption that no additional area will be annexed to the City.

Mr. Brown stated this was the only basis on which they could work; that it is impossible to speculate on future bounds of the City.

Mr. Flanigen commented that if the city limits stay the same, instead of getting high density development, people will move out of the city and the population will not grow as much as Candeub has projected.

Mr. Brown stated if you propose to contain the population growth that is projected and also carry out the program that is projected, this ratio, or something similar to it, must be accommodated in the city.

Mr. Flanigen said the only way to do this would be to have tenements, which Atlanta doesn't want.

Mr. Brown stated this is a policy decision for the committee's consideration; that they have done their program on the assumption that growth will be contained.

Mr. Cook asked if there was any basis for the ratio of 40% low density; 40% high density and 20% medium density.

Mr. Brown stated there are two bases, one of which is the amount of land available, including vacant land and land to be redeveloped. The total projected units for 1983 were fitted into that land. The other base was the economic study that showed certain types of units to be needed by 1983. He stated these were very rough approximations but indicate a fairly large need for high density units, based on the type of families that will be living in Atlanta - families without children, an aging population and other family characteristics which might require high density units.

Mr. Candeub stated they projected Atlanta as a complete regional center, and in connection with that kind of growth in the future, that there would be a substantial increase in the white collar population, the executive category, and a large number of young people coming in, indicating a very definite, strong apartment market; that this is where Atlanta will likely have its major growth in job types in the next decade or more.

Mr. Brown emphasized their projections are not binding; it is just one way of accommodating the city's growth. A small contingency of undesignated land (2,700 acres) is available which provides flexibility for growth in any of the three density categories.

Mr. Flanigen asked about the population figure per acre for 1983, compared with the data on the map.

Mr. Brown stated they had not computed this figure.

Mr. Flanigen stated he felt this was the problem; a projection has been made but has not been tied in with the end of the time period; that he did not see Atlanta getting the projected density because it would mean slums, which Atlanta doesn't want.

Mr. Brown agreed this was a good point of view to bring out and would require a policy decision on the part of the City.

Mr. Candeub then made the following comments. We have made market projections of growth and we have been getting a feed-back on a relocation analysis in terms of housing needs. The city had certain land within its boundaries. Certainly we can say these needs can only be met by going beyond its boundaries by going into a policy of aggressive annexation. On the other hand, let me say that Atlanta will also have a responsibility in meeting its relocation needs in the face of continued growth and that it has the resources and a policy to meet the housing needs by utilization of its resources. You have a number of elements to keep in balance. The factor of growth and where it will occur in terms of market considerations; the factor of relocation in terms of continued programs; a question of size of families and need in terms of what kind of housing can, will and should be built. The question of single family housing or multi-family, high rise is a question that has to be looked at differently that has been done in the past. In the past, the high rise was built as a tenement structure to house immigrant workers who came to the large cities. It was built as a low rental form of transient housing which was initially, or rapidly, became a slum. This pattern is most typical of the northeast and other parts of the central area of the U. S. What we are talking about today is really entirely different because the typical high rise is built for a different population and built on a different order. It is built for people that can afford to pay a good rent; a low

land coverage with a high level of facilities is incorporated, with adequate setbacks so that one building is not blocking another in terms of light, etc. Certainly Atlanta has the power to erect the type residences it wants. We are not talking about the old type tenement structure. The new national figures from the census in terms of the effects of the post-war birth rate indicate that we are now getting into a period where you will have a lot of new family formations and you will have people seeking apartments because they don't want the burden of free standing housing. We feel the best manner in which Atlanta can maintain its character, and we want Atlanta to have more single family homes, and in order to get more single family homes in face of the total demands, instead of utilizing the land area for garden apartments exclusively, we are suggesting we want to hold more land for single family homes and the only way to do this is to squeeze down on the garden apartment developments and increase the higher densities under strong controls. Otherwise, you will have little land you are able to hold for single family housing. The housing picture is a changing market picture in terms of population, income and the demand of the kinds of people that Atlanta is drawing.

Mr. Gladin asked how to encourage this type of development activity; "what is the route to follow?"

Mr. Candeub replied "not to permit a tenement type development". The way to do this, he suggested, might be to go to a design control on high rise, which they recommended in the Design Report; perhaps establish a minimum size on the lot.

Mr. Gladin then asked "how do you solve the economics of high rise development?"

Mr. Candeub stated they are not trying to do all this at one time; density patterns will have to be revised to allow high rise. You may have to get into zonal determinations, establishing a maximum density in certain areas. The city has the power to draw the line where it wants to draw it. You might have a high density in the center and a lesser density on the peripheral areas. The cycle is beginning to change because the population figures are changing. It might take time to prove out our projections, but they will be.

Mr. Cook stated "you mean by 1983 we will have a need for 31,000 high rise units when today we have 1,000 which it took five years to fill and some are still vacant".

Mr. Brown answered affirmatively, stating the smallest amount of land was left for high rise (690 acres). This land will accommodate a large number of housing units, which is another way to look at it.

Mr. Cook asked "will the city absorb this and will it be feasible by 1983 and if we do will it be slum development, or should we go on a real strong push for annexation. We would like your recommendations? It is

not a question of dividing the acreage on a breakdown of percentages. It is how you think it should be. There is the question of the contingency of 2,700 acres."

Mr. Candeub stated if high rise developments become slum tenements, then the City doesn't want any high rise, to which Mr. Cook agreed. Mr. Candeub in turn stated if you accept this as a premise, then we will eliminate all high rise; that he is saying across the country we are getting into higher densities in urban areas and the idea is to provide it in a large building complex.

Mr. Cook stated he was not accepting that high rise, per se, is slums but he would like to know the basis of the percentages; that he did question the need for more high rise when we can't fill our present high rise developments.

Mr. Candeub stated he was not saying it is good or bad. If you control it it can be good. If you don't control it, it can be bad. This lies within the power of control. There is a certain number of units that will have to go into apartments when you project the total population to 1983. We are saying you do have a choice of what density you want it in. This determination will dictate what is left for single family housing. I have a preference for high rise. I have discussed this problem with many builders who tell me you cannot build quality into a garden apartment, whereas you can in high rise because you have a different level of standards and maintenance. Again, this is a policy question. We are trying to put it into focus. Our objectives here is to create optimum space for single family homes. Within the city's total envelope of needs, we have tried to maximize the amount of land available for single family homes. We have also tried to be realistic and leave some land not categorized because we realize some land will not be developed, but for the most part we are saying the city will have to make the decision as to whether or not it will all be low rise, or will it be balanced with some high rise.

Mr. Gladin said "you have described the reasons why we should start seeking high rise. How do we start a program of encouraging high rise and how can this committee move in that direction?"

Mr. Candeub stated that Atlanta has better builders than most other areas he has seen and he suggested one way is to meet with the builders and discuss problems with them.

Mr. Flanigen stated you have to consider the difference in rentals of high rise and garden apartments.

Mr. Mahony cited one case in which a high rise was competitive with garden apartments.

Mr. Howland pointed out that the building was a considerable distance from the downtown area.

Mr. Cook asked Mr. Candeub "do you think Atlanta can handle 31,000 high rise units by 1983?"

Mr. Candeub replied "we see a market for it".

Mr. Brown stated that in order to continue land for single family, you will have to change from low density to high density with 20% left over for garden apartments.

There was a general discussion of each of the eight improvement sector maps, with considerable emphasis on the Buckhead sector. It was generally agreed that the treatment recommended for this sector was not reflective of the high quality housing existing in the area.

Mr. Brown pointed out that factors other than housing conditions were considered in the designation of treatment areas. As an example, he cited traffic and street conditions. Following this discussion, Mr. Brown then explained the priority system methodology. He stated one of the most important features of the CIP program is what should be done first and the only way to determine this was through the development of a priority rating system, which he explained as follows: There were five major elements in the rating system, i.e., (1) social implications - areas in which programs for improvement are presently needed to supplement social action agency programs; (2) resource areas - where better utilization of land might relieve pressure for land resources; (3) relation to public programs - the total program should be financed through the building of public facilities which are presently needed by the city, however, when you have a public program for which you do not get any sort of federal credit, you have a changing economy (example, auditorium complex) and this gives a further sense of urgency for treatment; (4) planning objectives - a tool for carrying out the city's comprehensive plan through the CIP; and (5) areas characterized by change - some areas, regardless of whether they met any of the other criteria, were in need of immediate attention.

Mr. Brown then discussed Ansley Park as an example of the priority rating system, stating the neighborhood was measured against each of the five elements and scored from 0 through 2 points based on each of the five elements.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Candeub and Mr. Brown for their presentations, and it was unanimously agreed that the Committee would meet again on Friday, June 9 at 2:00 P. M. to discuss the fiscal and administrative portions of the Community Improvement Program.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved:

Respectfully submitted:

Collier B. Gladin

Collier Gladin
Planning Director

Joanne Parks

Joanne Parks
Secretary

mc