

7/10

CITY OF ATLANTA



CITY HALL ATLANTA, GA. 30303

Tel. 522-4463 Area Code 404

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
COLLIER B. GLADIN, Director

June 2, 1967

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning and Development Committee
FROM: Planning Staff
SUBJECT: Notes and comments on workshop session No. 2 with
Candeub, Fleissig & Associates

The Planning Staff has not been satisfied with the work of Candeub, Fleissig & Associates who have been responsible for the following studies: Planning, Fiscal, Economic Base/Marketability, Equal Opportunity in Housing and Design. Although this firm enjoys a national reputation for its work in the field of planning and community development, we have found their work to suffer in Atlanta for the following reasons:

(1) Most of the interim and/or preliminary reports and memoranda submitted to date consists of a parroting back or rehash of locally available facts, statistics and data. Often the facts and information submitted to the consultant or generated and gathered by them have been either erroneously used or applied with little, if any, attempt made at verification prior to the incorporation in a report or memoranda. All of this appears to point to one or more of the following: inadequate research, local consultation, follow-up, and/or general negligence on the part of the consultant.

(2) Based on the reports and memoranda submitted thus far, little if any attempt has been placed on analysis of the facts, their implications or consequences, or to relate one report to another. Few conclusions and recommendations have been drawn. Where conclusions and recommendations have been drawn and set forth, it is difficult for the planning staff to see how, from whence, and on the basis of

what evidence, they were drawn. In short, the reader finds conclusions and recommendations drawn not predicated on facts or analysis of the facts. In reading the reports and memoranda, the planning staff has been constantly confronted by questions in his own mind of why, how and for what reasons - the answers to which are not forthcoming by reading further.

(3) In general, Items 1 and 2 apparently have led to the conclusion that many of the technical reports and memoranda could be applicable to any City USA. Most often the reader is left unconvinced that Atlanta is the City in question in each of the technical memoranda and reports. There is a general failure on the part of the consultant to relate what is being reported, discussed, concluded, or recommended with the physical, social, economic and political environment of Atlanta.

The staff has employed every known tactic to encourage and to literally force improvement in the quality of their work. But, we have not seen any appreciable improvement which we would call satisfactory.

Flat statements, sweeping generalizations, techniques, approaches, recommendations and assumptions made in today's meeting - all must be challenged by the staff and the Planning and Development Committee.

The Program for Improvement Action being recommended by the consultant is heavily weighted toward physical improvement. This is probably the strongest part of the Program and basically represents materials provided the consultant by the Planning Department. The Program is weak, shallow, sketchy and in some respects not feasible on the social and fiscal facets.

We have not seen much of the economic materials to date and thus cannot comment. Consequently, the Planning Staff along with the Planning and Development Committee should prod the consultant with the "Whys", "Hows", and "Wheres" until we get satisfactory answers and an acceptable Program for Improvement Action.

Set forth below are some examples of questions. These will give the committee some idea as the types of questions that should be asked the consultant:

PHYSICAL

- Shouldn't your recommendations for renewal treatment cover the entire City, particularly those areas to the extreme North and Southwest which apparently have been omitted?
- What are the side effects on adjacent areas of renewal treatment in any given area? How is this overcome?
- Define types of treatment; which renewal actions should be public, which private and in which areas?
- How did you determine priorities and how can we best make use of this priority classification system on a continuing basis?
- What is the value of your priority classification system to the Planning and Development Committee and how will it help us in making decisions for projects in various areas of the City?
- What are the alternatives of your priority classification system?
- What projections have been made on land needs and resources for the future development of the City? What policy implications are involved?
- How have you treated Rapid Transit and Interstate Highway Locations in this broad scale program? Should these facilities be planned to serve existing neighborhoods, commercial and industrial areas or should neighborhoods, commercial and industrial areas conform to the physical locations of these facilities?
- What additional physical planning should the City become involved in as a follow up to your broad scale program?
- What is the reasoning of the consultant in determining the scores assigned for each staging area?

SOCIAL

- What and how have social factors entered into your broad scale program?
- What are Atlanta's socio/economic problems and how have you approached them in this program?
- How do you go about getting citizen involvement in such a broad scale program? How will the citizens of Atlanta benefit from such a program? How can we best convince them of the need for such a program assuming we are in agreement with it?
- How do social problems relate to physical problems and how can the approach to both best be coordinated?
- What social costs, if any, are involved in such a large scale program? Are these social costs reflected in the overall program costs and how are they to be financed?

ECONOMIC

- Are your land use recommendations based on market factors, purely suggestions for development, or a combination of these two?
- What are the most potential markets for Atlanta, (Scientific research and other uses for example) and how can Atlanta best accomodate them within the existing City boundaries?
- Jobs, increasing individual income, housing and education are the City's most pressing problems. What approaches are you recommending towards resolving these problems?
- How can the City implement such a broad scale program with the apparent housing shortage and financial limitations which the City currently has?

- What is the relationship of the broad scale program to the City's overall capital needs?
- What sources of revenue (existing and potential) do you foresee the City using in financing its program?
- What alternative methods of funding this program are available? What, if any, financial limitations must the City overcome in financing this program? What changes in and what additional state enabling legislation will be required?

GOVERNMENTAL

- How do you foresee the City managing and coordinating this broad scale program? Who should be responsible for administering it and coordinating it?
- What staffing arrangements will be required at the sector and/or the staging area level? What will the administrative costs be?
- What, if any, other cities have tried this broad scale program approach? What administrative arrangements did they make?

GENERAL

- What is the logic behind or why the need for a broad scale urban renewal program in Atlanta?
- How should the City go about implementing such a broad scale program?
- What policy determinations (physical, social & economic) should the Mayor and Board of Aldermen consider in light of the future development and redevelopment of the City?

- In your opinion is the broad scale program practical and feasible?
- How does the City go about up-dating your broad scale program?
- What recommendations have you made for the City to carry forward what you have done in each of the studies on a continuing basis?
- What are the consequences of undertaking such a large scale program and what are the alternatives?
- Are the time periods being recommended, i.e., 1967-1970, 1971-1975, 1976-1983 realistic? Do you expect the City to accomplish the recommended actions of the first time period (1967-1970) on time? Would it not be more realistic to revise these time periods to say begin in 1970 instead of 1967?