

COMMENTS ON MODEL CITIES LAND USE PLAN

I. Observations which may be of assistance.

A. ALL NEIGHBORHOOD AREAS - GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The overall residential densities have been measured anticipating development slightly above average for the density range indicated, i.e., if range is 5 - 10, the 8 unit per acre has been used. This plan can be expected to accommodate the existing resident population. There have been some minor adjustments that will improve the situation. However, care must be taken not to arbitrarily change the present proposed density ranges unless compensations are made in other locations. This means no single family areas should be inserted where high density is now proposed unless densities are increased in another location. An alternative to this is to abandon the no-displacement goal.
2. Some deficiencies still exist in park areas and to overcome this and provide space, obviously densities will have to be increased somewhere also.

B. MECHANICSVILLE

1. In the area bounded by the Expressway, Bass Street, Formwalt, Dodd and Pryor Streets, the plan proposes high density and mixed commercial in the next five years; however, redevelopment is not proposed until after 1974 and the present use is mostly single family and vacant. It will be difficult to accomplish the proposed land use in the proposed time period without a program of treatment.

2. In the area bounded by the South and West Expressway, Bass and Formwalt Streets, the plan proposes large areas of commercial and high density residential; however, no treatment is called for prior to 1974 and the present use is now equally divided between vacant, commercial and single family residences.

C. SUMMERHILL

1. Between the Expressway and Fulton - Glenwood Streets, the plan calls for high density residential; however, the treatment plan only calls for activity after 1974 and the present use is mostly vacant, duplexes and single family residences. This area also extends into the Grant Park neighborhood.

Obviously some development of this type will occur, but not enough to achieve the expected population density.

D. PEOPLESTOWN

1. It is recommended that the frontage along the west side of Washington between Atlanta and Ridge Streets be devoted exclusively to high density residential which is in accord with the present uses there.
2. In the block between Washington and Crew Streets from Weyman to Little Streets, high density residential is called for; however, the treatment plan calls for action after 1974 and present use is primarily single family with some apartments making it medium density overall.

E. GRANT PARK

1. To compensate for the two proposed block parks redesignated for school purposes, the recreation planners propose that one-half of the block bounded by Ormond, Grant, Atlanta and Hill Street be made a block park. The majority of the structures in this block are substandard and slated for clearance in the period 1971-73.

2. The block bounded by Hill Street, South Avenue, Primrose and Little Streets is proposed for commercial use. There appears to be some doubt that the topo of this block is suitable for any kind of unified commercial development.
3. In the blocks bounded by Grant, Sydney, Orleans Streets and Cherokee Avenue, high density residential is proposed. However, present use is predominately single family and the proposed treatment is rehabilitation in the period 1971-1973.
4. In the area between the Expressway, Grant, Sydney Streets and Park Avenue, the proposed use is high density residential. This area is for rehabilitation in 1970 and the present use is primarily single family. To achieve the indicated high density, a significant number of high rise units must be built.
5. The area just west of Grant Park Elementary School is proposed for high density residential. However, no redevelopment is proposed prior to 1974 and the present use is mostly single family or vacant.

## II. Errors of Fact

### A. MECHANICSVILLE

1. The plan calls for a government center use in the triangle between the railroad, the Expressway and the Pryor Street School. Since most program administration is to be accomplished at two other locations, there appears to be no justification for this center area. It is recommended that this particular area be used for medium density residential.

B. GRANT PARK

1. The Boys' Club is located in the block bounded by Killian, Marion, Burn and Eloise Streets. In the Model Cities plan this has been indicated as single family use which is a mistake and should be changed.
2. The recreation planners have indicated that the area south of Jerome Jones School designated for park purposes should be changed to school use.
3. The industrial use existing at the corner of Boulevard and the railroad has been omitted and single family residential use substituted. This should be changed to industrial use.
4. On the east side of Hill Avenue between Grady and the railroad medium density residential is indicated. This is presently good single family residential use at low density and no clearance has been proposed. This area should be indicated as low density residential.
5. The recreation planners have indicated that the block park to the east of Slaton School should be used instead for school expansion purposes.
6. The block of the proposed educational park bounded by Hill, Primrose Streets, Georgia Avenue and Cherokee Place is in reality intended for another use, that of some sort of private welfare type activity, either profit or non-profit, and should be indicated as such and not as an educational use.

C. SUMMERHILL

1. An expansion of the small commercial area at the southeast corner of Atlanta and Capitol is proposed for expansion north and west. The condition of the major structures in the northwest portion is fairly good and there is no program of treatment slated prior to 1974. This would indicate that such a change in use is not indicated nor does there appear to be a need for additional commercial use when there are other commercial areas nearby.

III. Conflicts With Adopted Plans and Policies

A. SUMMERHILL

1. This item concerns the park proposed in the blocks bounded by Georgia, Capitol, Little and Crew Streets. The entire Summerhill area needs two twelve acre or more neighborhood parks.

The recreational facility proposed at Hoke Smith is not a neighborhood type development and will not serve the neighborhood needs north of Georgia Avenue. This facility south of Georgia Avenue is proposed to be a "central park" type facility and, therefore, would not seem to meet the neighborhood recreational needs of the area south of Georgia Avenue.

The northern block of the park is obviously more suitable for commercial development in conjunction with the other blocks along Georgia Avenue immediately adjacent to the stadium. The other two blocks contain a number of substantial standard apartment buildings whose removal would be expensive and undesirable.

The main justification that appears for this site is its proximity to the Capitol Avenue School; however, the long range future of this school is questionable in terms of its site and its location relative to the existing and proposed population to be served.

A better park location would be next to the proposed K,1-3 school mentioned earlier especially if the Capitol Avenue School could also be relocated to this site. The area adjacent to the new school site is proposed for clearance in the period - 1971-1973 - while no treatment is proposed for the park site adjacent to the present school until after the 1974 time period with the exception of the block immediately adjacent to Georgia Avenue.

2. The plan calls for a school site in the two blocks bounded by Martin, Little, Ami and Kenneth Streets. The school planners reveal this is only to be a K, 1-3 school requiring only three acres at maximum; therefore, without further justification, for example, a new grammar school to replace Capitol Avenue, this site appears to be excessively large.
3. In considering the land use aspects of the Hoke Smith Educational Park, it is our understanding that the Parks Department is highly reluctant to buy and develop any large recreational facilities directly abutting a high school as it feels the facility will be monopolized by the school to the detriment of the rest of the community.

The School Board, on the other hand, believes that the Parks Department should acquire the portions of the educational park allocated for recreational use.

The resolution of this problem is not in the province of the land use planners; however, the graphic expression of proposed land use should show a solution that either indicates all educational facility reduced in size to what the School Board would acquire or a recreation use area that is situated to the satisfaction of the Parks Department.

One glimmer of hope is that the school planners used \$80,000 per acre as an acquisition cost; however, the land is slated for clearance in 1970 and hopefully the land could be sold to the School Board at cleared land prices of about \$20,000 - \$30,000 an acre.

B. PEOPLESTOWN

1. Neither the recreation planners nor the city wide Land Use Plan and Parks Plan call for a block park to be located at the end of Linam Street just south of Vanira Avenue.

C. PITTSBURGH

1. In this area, there appears to be only one major comment to be made. This is that in comparison with the city wide Land Use Plan which proposes a uniform medium density throughout the neighborhood, the Model Cities proposal indicates two high density areas...one at the northwest, the other at the southeast. The high density area at the southeast can be adequately served by the existing Pittman Park; however, the high density area to the northwest will provide a large concentration of people who will not be conveniently served by an adequate recreation facility.

D. MECHANICSVILLE

1. All plans call for a community facility to be located in the block just east of Dunbar School, and it is my understanding that social programs are expected to be administered from here; however, the Land Use Plan does not indicate a space for this facility.
2. Since one block of land that was to be used for park purposes in our city wide Land Use Plan has been pre-empted by the school board for a second school in the area according to the Model Cities Land Use Plan, it will be necessary to add the block now occupied by the Atlanta Transit System to the park proposed in the Model Cities plan in order to get adequate space to serve this large population concentration.