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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Vine City/Washington Park Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) study is a collaboration between the Atlanta Regional Commission, the City of Atlanta, the office of Atlanta City Councilmember Ivory Lee Young, Jr., and area stakeholders to create a long-term vision for linking transportation and land use around the Vine City and Ashby MARTA stations. The plan is grounded in previous planning efforts and builds upon their recommendations.

The Vision

Vine City, Washington Park, and Ashview Heights are some of the most historic neighborhoods in Atlanta. Their human-scaled streets, proximity to downtown, and good transit access are assets that will become even more important in the future. The plan’s vision embraces these assets and strives to:

Respect the visions and accomplishments of previous plans. The many efforts of past decades have been preserved and incorporated into this plan, with updates as needed.

Prevent the displacement of long-time residents who want to remain. The plan must limit involuntary displacement of residents, and allow them to benefit from growth.

Concentrate growth along major streets and near transit. Development, particularly at MARTA stations, should offer shopping, restaurants, and entertainment for residents and visitors.

Preserve historic areas and ensure compatible development. New development must respect and respond to historic homes and businesses. Area history must also be protected.

Support economic development that benefits both large and small businesses. The growth of community-owned businesses and the hiring of local residents must be encouraged.

Improve options for walking and bicycling. New sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and better connections to downtown should unite the study area and discourage driving.

Increase neighborhood retail and services. Daily needs should be provided within the study area and close at hand.

Enhance safety. Safety must be improved by both physical and programmatic enhancements.

Provide housing that is accessible for everyone. Housing that serves a range of incomes, ages, and lifestyles must be offered.
Recommendations

The study includes projects and policies that support the plan’s vision. The following pages summarize recommended projects. The code in parentheses after each project is its identification number in the Action Plan. Please refer to Part 6 for details.

Land Use Projects

- Complete projects from the 2004 redevelopment plan that have not been implemented or updated by this study. (O-1)
- Redevelop the Magnolia Street at Vine Street retail node into commercial uses and above-shop housing. (O-2)
- Establish a senior citizen housing village along DeSoto Street east of the Washington Park YMCA. (O-3)
- Create a transit-oriented development (TOD) around the Vine City MARTA Station. (O-4)
- Develop senior citizen housing on Elm Street. (O-5)
- Develop a hotel, conference, and public parking facility at the rear of 569 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. (O-6)
- Build commercial and mixed-use buildings on auto-oriented commercial land at Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. (O-7)
- Convert the Wachendorff Estate into a bed and breakfast featuring meeting space and a small museum. (O-8)
- Amend the City’s Future Land Use maps to reflect the plan’s vision and recommendations. (O-9)

Figure 1.1: Future Framework Plan
• Encourage developer-led initiatives to rezone key properties to reflect the plan’s vision and recommendations. (O-10)

**Recommended Markets & Housing Projects**

• Organize an area business association. (O-11)
• Establish a business recruitment/retention committee. (O-12)
• Market the study area to new businesses and residents. (O-13)
• Establish a branding program for neighborhood businesses. (O-14)
• Market the catalytic redevelopment sites. (O-15)
• Develop business incubator space. (O-16)
• Promote awareness of existing small business programs. (O-17)
• Coordinate with non-profits to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed properties. (O-18)
• Work with the City of Atlanta Bureau of Housing to purchase and rehabilitate foreclosed properties. (O-19)
• Consider establishing a land bank to purchase, rehabilitate, and resell foreclosed and vacant properties. (O-20)
• Use community gardens for economic development. (O-21)
• Identify vacant properties for reuse as community gardens. (O-22)
• Organize a farmers market during growing season. (O-23)

**Urban Design & Historic Resources Projects**

• Establish a series of historic walking tours. (O-24)
• Install historic markers in the study area. (O-25)

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects**

• Advance the BeltLine’s multi-use trail component. (T-1)
• Restripe Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to include bicycle lanes. (T-2)
• Upgrade Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive pedestrian facilities. (T-3)
• Resurface and restripe Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard to include bicycle lanes. (T-4 and T-5)
• Upgrade Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard pedestrian facilities. (T-6)
New sidewalks and bicycle lanes along Joseph E. Lowery (shown here) and other streets could increase transportation options and support community-desired redevelopment along them.

- Resurface and restripe Joseph E. Boone Boulevard to include bicycle lanes. (T-7 and T-8)
- Restripe James P. Brawley Drive from Carter Street north to Joseph E. Boone Boulevard to include bicycle lanes. (T-9)
- Construct the Vine City Promenade. (T-10 and T-11)
- Convert Rhodes Street to a “Complete Street” and one-way eastbound operation. (T-12)
- Upgrade Sunset Avenue pedestrian facilities. (T-13)
- Repair neighborhood sidewalks. (T-14 and T-15)
- Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing on Northside Drive. (T-16)
- Upgrade Northside Drive pedestrian facilities. (T-31)
- Upgrade Joseph E. Boone Boulevard pedestrian facilities. (T-32)

**Vehicular Projects**

- Reconstruc the intersection of Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Mayson Turner Road. (T-17)
- Improve safety at the intersection of Marie Avenue and Washington Heights Terrace. (T-18)
- Abandon Rigdon Place if needed for redevelopment. (T-19)
- Construct the GWCC Parking deck. (T-20)
- Construct private parking decks. (T-21)
- Construct new streets with private development. (T-22)
- Conduct a signal warrant study on Northside Drive. (T-23)
- Install DRI-required signals on Northside Drive. (T-24)
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• Intersection capacity improvements at Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Joseph E. Boone Boulevard. (T-33)

Transit Projects
• Implement east-west bus service along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and Ivan Allen, Jr. Boulevard to Civic Center MARTA Station. (T-25)
• Consolidate bus stops to improve performance. (T-26)
• Establish a taxi stand at the Westside Village Publix. (T-27)
• Install new bus shelters. (T-28)
• Repair Ashby MARTA Station to prevent flooding and physically upgrade the station. (T-29)
• Pursue LCI Supplemental Study funds. (T-30)
• Advance the BeltLine’s transit component. (T-34)
• Evaluate the need for future BeltLine parking. (T-35)

Environment & Open Space Projects
• Plant trees throughout the study area. (O-26)
• Expand Vine City Park to the north. (O-27)
• Create a public plaza and gateway at the northwest corner of Northside Drive and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. (O-28)
• Establish community gardens on vacant lots and as shown on the Framework Plan. (O-29)
• Construct a new greenspace just south of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard on the site of the 2002 flood. (O-30)
• Construct a new playground or community garden in Charles Harper Park. (O-31)
• Restore the statue of Charles Harper. (O-32)
• Erect a memorial to Booker T. Washington in Washington Park. (O-33)
• Acquire land for the Vine City Promenade and adjacent community garden. (O-34)

Infrastructure & Facilities
• Install retail and informational kiosks at the Vine City and Ashby MARTA stations. (O-35 and O-36)
• Increase lighting, organized activities, and police patrols at existing parks. (O-37)
• Increase police presence to reduce crime. (O-38)
• Establish a Neighborhood Watch program. (O-39)
• Provide youth programming at Washington Park and/or J.F.
Kennedy Park. (O-40)
- Develop a central community center as a gathering space and potential museum. (O-41)
- Improve lighting on neighborhood streets. (O-42)
- As density increases, study the feasibility and need for a new fire station. (O-43)
- Rehabilitate aging water and sewer infrastructure where necessary. (O-44)
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LIVABLE CENTERS INITIATIVE STUDY
Part 2: Introduction

Prepared for: City of Atlanta Bureau of Planning
By: Tunnell-Spangler-Walsh & Associates, with The Collaborative Firm, Marketek Inc., Croy Engineering, and Contente Consulting
INTRODUCTION

This part of the study provides an overview of the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program and a summary of existing conditions in the Vine City/Washington Park LCI study area. Existing conditions and associated strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats are provided for the following categories: Land Use, Markets & Housing, Urban Design & Historic Resources, Transportation, Environment & Open Space, and Infrastructure & Facilities.

Purpose of the Study

The LCI program is intended to promote greater livability, mobility, and development alternatives in existing corridors, employment centers, and town centers in metropolitan Atlanta. The rationale behind the program is that directing development toward areas with existing infrastructure benefits the region and minimizes sprawling land use patterns. Less sprawl, in turn, could reduce the amount of vehicle miles traveled and the air pollution associated with those miles.

The LCI program uses the successful 1996 Olympics model to promote the concept that investment in public infrastructure will spur private investment. The program is a vehicle by which the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) seeks to direct mixed-use and mixed-income development near existing infrastructure by providing study and implementation dollars.

The City of Atlanta seeks to develop a vision for the future of the study area to encourage sustainable redevelopment around two under-utilized MARTA rail stations. By directing new growth into these station areas it is hoped that mass transit use will be encouraged, traffic growth will be reduced, neighborhood housing offerings will be increased, and improved neighborhood goods and services will be offered. Increased transit use can also lead to increased physical activity, which could raise the level of public health in study area neighborhoods.

It is also hoped that development near the stations will encourage the revitalization of the surrounding neighborhood in a way that improves public safety, minimizes displacement of long-time residents, and creates economic opportunity. Central to this will be a process that respects and builds upon the tremendous amount of planning work that has already occurred in the area, and creates an implementation-focused plan for change.
The goals of the Vine City/Washington Park LCI, as established by the ARC, are to:

1. Encourage a diversity of medium to high-density, mixed-income neighborhoods, employment, shopping and recreation choices at the activity and town center level.
2. Provide access to a range of travel modes including transit, roadways, walking and biking to enable access to all uses within the Study Area.
3. Encourage integration of uses and land use policies/regulations with transportation investments to maximize the use of alternate modes.
4. Through transportation investments, increase the desirability of redevelopment of land served by existing infrastructure at activity and town centers.
5. Preserve the historic characteristics of activity and town centers and create a community identity.
6. Develop a community-based transportation investment program at the activity and town center level that will identify capital projects, which can be funded in the annual Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
7. Provide transportation infrastructure incentives for jurisdictions to take local actions to implement the resulting activity or town center study goals.
8. Provide for the implementation of the Regional Development Plan (RDP) policies, quality growth initiatives and Best Development Practices in the Study Area, both through local governments and at the regional level.
9. Develop a local planning outreach process that promotes the involvement of all stakeholders, particularly low income, minority and traditionally under-served populations.

10. Provide planning funds for development of activity and town centers that showcase the integration of land use policy and regulation and transportation investments with urban design tools.

Regional Context

The Study Area is located in the City of Atlanta and Fulton County, immediately west of Downtown Atlanta. The Vine City MARTA Station lies in the eastern portion of the study area, while Ashby Station lies in the western end. The Study Area is less than a mile from the interchange between Interstate 20 and Interstates 75 and 85. The presence of the Georgia World Congress Center (GWCC) and the Georgia Dome at the eastern edge of the Study Area is also a significant connection between the Study Area and the region.

Study Area Boundaries

The study area includes, roughly, the area west of and including the Georgia Dome and the GWCC, east of and including Washington Park, north of Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, and south of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard. Detailed boundaries are shown in Figure 2.1.

The Study Area encompasses 534 acres of land. It takes 10 to 15 minutes to walk the study area from north to south, and just over 30 minutes to traverse it from east to west. Portions of the neighborhoods of Vine City, Washington Park, Downtown, Atlanta University Center, and Ashview Heights fall within the study area, as well as parts of neighborhood planning units K, L, M, and T.

The vast majority of the Study Area falls into Atlanta City Council District 3, except for two blocks south of Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and west of Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard near Booker T. Washington High School, which lie in Council District 4.
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3.1 PREVIOUS STUDIES

Over the last two decades, plans have been prepared for various parts of the LCI study area. Each plan and its specific focus is outlined here. The LCI study builds on these plans by reviewing their recommendations in light of current trends, and by focusing on issues that were given cursory review previously, including multi-use trails, parking, and station area land use.

**Vine City Redevelopment Plan.** This 2004 plan is the most comprehensive plan to-date for Vine City. It was a collaboration between the City of Atlanta, the Vine City Civic Association, and consultants to create a blueprint for the neighborhood. It focused on priority infill and rehabilitated housing sites, multifamily housing, economic development, institutions, parks, and streetscapes.

*Figure 3.1: The 2004 Vine City Redevelopment Plan Illustrative Diagram*
The BeltLine Redevelopment Plan recommends two potential transit stops at the western edge of the study area.

**BeltLine Redevelopment Plan.** This plan, sponsored by the Atlanta Development Authority in 2005, addresses the future development of the BeltLine, a 22-mile loop of historic railroads that circle central Atlanta and will be revitalized with trails, parks, new development, and potential transit.

The BeltLine would form the western boundary of Washington Park and have a significant impact on the study area. It would connect to the existing West Side multi-use trail and Ashby transit station. In addition, transit stops are proposed at Lena Street and at Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, just west of the study area. These would link Vine City with Bankhead to the north, the West End to the south, and dozens of other neighborhoods throughout the city.

**Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive Corridor Plan.** This plan, prepared in 2005 by the City of Atlanta, addressed mobility and accessibility along a 7.3-mile stretch of roadway and presented strategies to stimulate revitalization. The plan focused on maximizing the use of public transportation as well as broader redevelopment.

The plan recommended transit-oriented development at Ashby Station, within the purview of the current study. The Historic Westside Village development has begun to fulfill this recommendation.

**Simpson Road Corridor Redevelopment Plan and Update.** This plan, completed in 1995 and updated in 2006, focused on revitalization through thoughtful preservation and appropriate nodal redevelopment. Walking, improved traffic flows, and transit were also focus points.

This study included the portion of the current study area along and up to one quarter mile south of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard (formerly Simpson Street). Activity nodes were proposed at the intersections of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard with Northside Drive and with Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard. The latter node could accommodate 300 new housing units, 20,000 square feet of office space, and 50,000 square feet of retail space.

A streetscape improvement project and the addition of bicycle lanes to Joseph E. Boone Boulevard was recommended. No specific land use or zoning changes were recommended inside the study area of the current plan.
English Avenue Community Redevelopment Plan and Update. This plan, developed in 1998 and updated in 2006, took a proactive step to encourage redevelopment just north of Vine City. It laid out guidelines to ensure appropriate development, promote diverse and quality housing, encourage economic growth, create quality community facilities, improve infrastructure and circulation, and promote public safety. A redevelopment node was recommended at Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and James P. Brawley Drive. Streetscape improvements were also recommended along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard at the edge of the study area.

Northside Drive Corridor Plan. This plan, adopted in 2005, included nearly the entire study area. It evaluated existing transportation infrastructure and presented alternative land use and transportation scenarios for the corridor. The plan recommended redeveloping the parking lots around Vine City Station into a mix of residential, office, and retail buildings up to seven stories high. Northside Drive was proposed to be converted into a boulevard, with wide sidewalks, trees, a median, and better transit service. Intersection improvements were also recommended at Northside Drive and Joseph E. Boone Boulevard.

Imagine Downtown. This 2005 plan for downtown included the eastern edge of the study area, adjacent to the Georgia Dome. It contemplated a revitalized city center, with focus on Centennial Hill redevelopment, overcoming the I-75/85 barrier, improving Peachtree Street, constructing a multi-modal station at Five Points, invigorating Auburn Avenue, redeveloping around Garnett MARTA station and south of North Avenue, and supporting Centennial Park.

Its recommendations relevant to this study included a traffic circle at Centennial Olympic Park Drive and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, new multi-use buildings, street-level retail, and residences.

Connect Atlanta Plan. This plan, adopted in 2008, was Atlanta’s first citywide comprehensive transportation plan. It addressed all modes of transportation citywide and presented projects, ranked according to how effectively they meet the goals of the plan. The first two projects below are ranked high on the list, while the last ranked lower.

- Reconfigure intersection of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and Sunset Avenue
- Reconfigure intersection Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard
- Convert Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive from four lanes to two vehicle lanes, two bicycle lanes, and a center turn lane
Georgia World Congress Center (GWCC) Long-Range Master Plan. This comprehensive look at the future of the Congress Center and Georgia Dome campus proposed several alternatives for expansions and renovations. Proposals west of Northside Drive included a parking deck north of Thurmond Street and a private plaza or park to relate to the GWCC plaza east of Northside Drive. Beyond these two items, the plan specifically excluded recommendations within the Vine City neighborhood.
3.2 DEMOGRAPHIC & SOCIOECONOMIC PROFILE

This demographic and socioeconomic profile explores the study area’s residential population growth, age, income, race, employment, and other relevant factors. Data are provided by ESRI Business Information Solutions.

Population Growth

Over the past eight years, the study area’s population grew at an average annual rate of 0.7 percent to reach 4,736 by 2008, a rate below the citywide average annual rate of 3.45 percent between 2000 and 2008. Current population density in the study area is 8.87 persons per acre.

While population growth in the metropolitan area is projected to slow slightly over the next five years, it should accelerate in the study area. From 2008 to 2013, the study area is expected to grow by an average annual rate of 1.49 percent, or 71 residents per year, while the city should average 2.34 percent per year (see figure 3.2).

Study area population projections for 2008 to 2013 are essentially “no build” scenarios, which assume that no redevelopment occurs. With anticipated redevelopment, population growth in the study area will undoubtedly increase.

Figure 3.2: Comparison of Area Population Growth Rates

For a more in-depth demographic and socioeconomic analysis, please see Appendix C: Market Analysis.
Age, Household Income, & Racial Composition

The study area has a higher proportion of young adults compared to the city as a whole and the metro area. Just over 20 percent of residents are between the ages of 15 and 24, compared with 16.3 percent in the city as a whole and 13.8 percent in the metro area. Senior residents (those age 65 and over) make up 10.8 percent of the study area population, compared to 8.5 percent in the metro area.

As shown in Figure 3.3, households in the study area have significantly lower average incomes than the city and the metro area. Median household income in the study area is estimated at $24,117 annually. The comparable figure is $48,967 for the city and $69,239 for the metro area. The study area population is 97.7 percent African-American, 1.1 percent Hispanic, and 0.9 percent White.

Employment

The service sector, at nearly 56 percent, represents by far the largest share of jobs for employed residents of the study area ages 16 and older. This figure is only slightly higher than the same percentage for the city of Atlanta as a whole and for the metro area. Public administration and retail trade represent the second and third largest sectors, with 8.9 and 8.7 percent of the jobs for employed residents, respectively.

In general, the study area has a smaller share of residents employed in white collar positions such as management, professional jobs, sales, and administrative support compared to the city and region. Service occupations make up a larger share of jobs for the study area than for the city and region.

Within one mile of the study area, there are over 800 businesses with 12,760 employees. At a mile-and-a-half radius, there are more than 6,700 businesses and 101,400 jobs. Within this area, educational institutions and libraries account for 26.6 percent of employment and government accounts for 25.4 percent, although these employees do not necessarily live in the study area.
3.3 LAND USE

Land uses and the relationship between them impact the quality of life in a community. Different land uses have varying impacts on transportation and utility systems. The arrangement of land uses and their proximity also support or discourage different modes of transportation, including bicycling and walking; this can directly impact the vehicular system by increasing or reducing traffic.

Traditional towns and cities were mixed-use places with housing, shops, offices, religious institutions, schools, parks, and industry within walking distance of one another. As the benefits of such mixed-use patterns are rediscovered, it is important to understand the types of uses that can operate within a close range. Many uses are compatible, including retail, office, open space, civic, and residential uses. Others, such as industry and transportation services, are harder to reconcile in a mixed-use setting.

Existing Land Use Patterns

Due to its urban nature, the study area contains a mix of land uses, including single-family homes, apartments, businesses, churches, schools, public facilities, and offices. The amount of land dedicated to each use is shown in Table 3.1 on the following page. The patterns of land use are shown in Figure 3.4.

Office/Institutional, the most prevalent study area land use, includes churches, colleges, and the massive Congress Center campus.

Single-family residences, the second largest land use by area, are found throughout the cores of the Vine City and Washington Park neighborhoods. Scattered among these primarily single-family areas are clusters of multifamily buildings (residential 1 to 4 stories), most of which date from after the neighborhood's original development.

Commercial uses are concentrated along major streets, including Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Joseph E. Boone Boulevard. At the heart of Vine City, a small neighborhood commercial area is found at Vine and Magnolia Streets. This land use pattern is due to the area's development along trolley lines and the tradition of placing commercial uses at stops.

A unique land use feature of Vine City is the large amount of vacant land, particularly on its east side. Approximately 460 parcels, or 14.5 percent of the total acreage, is vacant due to recent or historic demolitions. Vacant land does not include public parks, which occupy around 5 percent of the study area.
The immense Congress Center campus represents 15 percent of the study area.

New and old apartment buildings dot the study area.

Strengths
- Clustering of varied land uses along major streets, which can minimize travel distances and support walking
- Variety of housing options
- Accessible, interspersed open space
- Single-family neighborhoods with a historic character
- Lack of industrial land that could detract from quality of life

Weaknesses
- Extremely high number of vacant properties
- Lack of vertically mixed uses, which prevents higher density and shopping convenient to residences
- The financial climate, which has contributed to foreclosures and declining home values, and may hinder redevelopment
- Lack of transit-supportive land uses at MARTA stations

Opportunities
- Vacant land that could be used for new houses, open spaces, or other development
- Redevelopment of under-utilized properties along corridors
- Vacant historic structures that could be renovated for reuse
- Land around the MARTA stations that could be used to revitalize the station areas and establish transit villages

Threats
- Housing that is falling into disrepair or is not built to last
- Land speculation, which could stifle redevelopment

**Table 3.1: Existing Land Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office/Institutional</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Right-of-way</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 1-4 Stories (multifamily)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Commercial</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Communication/Utilities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,593</strong></td>
<td><strong>534</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Land Use Classifications

The future land use plan for the study area is taken from Atlanta’s Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP). This plan is the guide for municipal decisions such as zoning changes and public investments. Its land use classifications do not necessarily correspond to existing land uses because they reflect the desired land uses over the next 15 years.

The future land use plan for the study area, shown on the previous page, calls for a mix of uses in some places that are now primarily residential, such as the properties along Northside Drive, some areas along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard, and some blocks in the interior of the neighborhood.

The comprehensive plan suggest that most single-family areas in the study remain residential. Parks, institutional properties, and commercial areas are also designated to remain as such.

Strengths

• The single-family designation for the historic residential core of the neighborhood, which can preserve local identity
• Expanded mixed-use designations in some areas to allow more concentrated, multi-use nodes of redevelopment

Opportunities

• Use of multiple mixed-use classifications, which could provide a more refined land use policy

Zoning Regulations

Zoning is the legal framework that regulates private development. It directly shapes the form, placement, and design of buildings, and therefore affects the future of how a community feels and functions more than any other single element.

The study area has newer and more sophisticated zoning regulations than most Atlanta neighborhoods. The regulations allow development that is compatible with historic precedent, is sidewalk-oriented, and provides a mix of activities and building types. The part of the study area east of Northside Drive is within the downtown zoning district (SPI-1), which allows for a wide array of high density uses. However, because all of the land is publicly owned, any public development here would be legally exempt from its regulations.

The majority of the study area is a part of SPI-11, the Vine City and
Ashby Station Special Public Interest zoning district. This district is divided into subareas to more finely regulate development.

- Subarea 7 includes most land in the center of the study area and allows only those uses compatible with residential uses, such as houses, parks, schools, and churches with special permission. New houses must be built in line with existing ones on the block, must not exceed 35 feet in height, and must provide a sidewalk.

- Subarea 6 governs development in the portion of the Washington Park neighborhood within the study area; its regulations are similar to those for subarea 7.

- Other subareas, such as 1, 2, and 9-12, allow for a mix of residences, shopping, and offices. Building size is limited through a combination of floor area ratio, lot coverage, open space requirements, and height limits. The focus is on creating buildings that engage the street, provide neighborhood services, promote economic growth, and respect area history.

- Subarea 8 allows multifamily uses in several areas where apartments, townhouses, or condominiums have been constructed or could be accommodated in the future.

**Figure 3.6: Current Zoning**
Finally, some small areas near the intersection of Northside Drive and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive still retain their original zoning designations from the 1970s and 1980s. Zoning districts O-I, C-3, and C-5 allow for a mix of uses, but require buildings to be separated from the street, without respect for sidewalk life or local context.

**Strengths**
- Existing zoning regulations, which allow a wide range of uses in appropriate locations
- Design standards in zoning that encourage historically compatible, human-oriented buildings
- Parking requirements that address small business needs, the presence of transit, and the historic form of the area

**Weaknesses**
- Regulations that may increase the cost of development or discourage redevelopment
- Current density restrictions along Northside Drive may not be high enough to justify development, given land values

**Opportunities**
- Zoning changes could be requested by developers to support the land use recommendations of this plan

**Threats**
- Remaining patches of C-3, C-5, and O-I zoning, which could allow development inconsistent with the area
3.4 MARKETS & HOUSING

The character of study area neighborhoods varies. Despite infill housing and other new residential redevelopment, the Vine City neighborhood continues to face crime, substandard housing and property, poverty, and numerous foreclosures. Although it faces some of these problems, Washington Park is a more established neighborhood with a significant number of longtime residents.

Most recent development in the study area has been along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and includes the Historic Westside Village. The study area is sandwiched between two areas that have seen considerable redevelopment in recent years. To the north is the Upper Westside district and to the southeast lies the Castleberry Hill neighborhood.

Figure 3.7: Retail and Residential Market Areas
The study area has not yet been able to capitalize on this development energy, although access to downtown, transit, freeways, and relatively affordable, but increasing, land prices with clear market voids are just some of the indicators of the area’s potential.

**Market Areas**

Retail and Residential Market Areas (shown in Figure 3.7) are the geographic areas from which the majority of potential customers and residents of new housing emanate. They are based on drive time estimates, geographic or man-made boundaries, and the location of existing competitive supply.

Residents of new study area housing will be drawn largely from the Residential Market Area, defined by a 7-mile radius from the Sunset Avenue/Foundry Street intersection, and shown as a red circle on the map.

**Residential Market**

Residential markets in Atlanta are responding to recent economic conditions that have caused stagnating home prices, stricter lending practices, fewer sales, and increasing numbers of foreclosures. The cooling for-sale market, however, should increase the demand for apartments as former owners who overreached and now face foreclosure return to the rental market.

As the Georgia economy begins to turn around, Atlanta property values likely will be the first to rise, based on the metropolitan region’s continuing population growth.

**Local Housing Supply**

According to ESRI Business Information Solutions data, there were an estimated 1,812 housing units in the study area in 2008. The majority of occupied housing units in this year were renter-occupied (78%). In the year 2000, single-family houses made up the largest share of units (38.1%).

These statistics, along with visits to the study area, indicate that a substantial proportion of single-family housing is renter-occupied. Apartment buildings with ten or more units made up 22.5 percent of occupied housing units in the year 2000.

The median owner-occupied house value in the study area is $59,741. This figure is just over a third of the value in the city as a whole and in the metro area. It is indicative of several housing issues. While the Vine City and Washington Park neighborhoods...
contain many attractive, well-kept single-family houses, vacant housing, homes and lots in need of repair and clean-up, and foreclosed houses are also common.

Sales data show that the average sales price for single-family houses has fallen significantly in the past two years in and around the study area. The number of houses sold, on the other hand, has increased. The vast majority of houses within the 30314 ZIP code (85%) sold for less than $60,000.

**Competitive Rental Market**

Newer, well-maintained apartment communities located in and near the study area command higher rents and often include either public housing or tax credit units. Market rate rents for a one-bedroom unit range from $610 at Northside Plaza to $1,090 at Icon at Atlantic Station. Most are concentrated from the mid $700s to high $800s.

Rents for two-bedroom apartments range from $710 at Northside Plaza to $1,410 at Icon (Atlantic Station). Square footages from the low 700s to high 800s for one-bedroom units and from the mid 900s to mid 1,200s for two-bedroom units yield value ratios ranging from $0.80 to $1.59 and $0.59 to $1.33, respectively.

The occupancy rate at apartment complexes near the study area is high – typically above 90 percent. Occupancy at complexes with a mix of public housing, tax credit, and market rate units is frequently higher and reaches 100 percent in several communities.

**Retail Market**

According to statistics from Dorey Publishing and Information Services, the “West Atlanta” submarket retail vacancy rate was 14 percent as of fall/winter of 2007. Available rents ranged from $9 per square foot to $24 per square foot triple net.

Retail development is limited in the study area; most is concentrated along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard in the north and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive in the south. On the former, aging neighborhood strip centers provide the bulk of retail space. These include local restaurants, barbershops/hair salons, laundromats, and small food marts. High vacancy rates are typical and a few centers are in disrepair, completely vacant, or abandoned.

The southern part of the study area along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive provides the bulk of retail development, including several restaurants, barbershops and a market. Additionally, the Historic Westside Village offers a grocery store, a restaurant, a bank, a
cellular phone store, and an accountant.

The limited supply of existing retail establishments in and around the study area indicates that the area is not presently meeting its retail potential.

**Office Market**

While not an established location for major offices, the study area is within easy access of other office sub-markets. Combined with quick access to transit and highways, this location helps provide some opportunities for limited office development over time.

Within the study area itself, a small amount of office space has been redeveloped in recent years. Professional and service-oriented office uses along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive make up the majority of office space within the study area.

**Strengths**

- Easy access to MARTA, downtown, interstate highways, and the Atlanta University Center
- Established neighborhoods within the study area
- Successful large-scale rental and for-sale residential projects within a short drive
- Presence of some well-maintained retail buildings

**Weaknesses**

- Existing under-supply of retail and neighborhood-serving office uses
- Abundance of rental housing
- Lack of diverse retail mix
- Barriers between study area and downtown

**Opportunities**

- Growing population base will provide a market for small office uses
- Potential for office development in a mixed-use setting
- Land is relatively affordable for an urban setting
- Multiple target markets including residents, students, visitors, and employees

**Threats**

- Perception and reality of crime
- Blighted areas
- Deteriorated multifamily and retail buildings
- Closing of existing businesses due to economic conditions
3.5 URBAN DESIGN & HISTORIC RESOURCES

The physical structure of a neighborhood is defined by the patterns of its streets, blocks, lots, and buildings. How they fit together determines the feel of a neighborhood as one travels through it, how easy it is to get around, how buildings and the people in them relate to one another, and how land can be used. The following sections address the urban design patterns in the study area to better understand their implications for everything from transportation to land use and economic development.

Street & Block Patterns

Streets and blocks are the most physically defining characteristics of a community. While buildings and land uses often change, the platting pattern of a community can remain unchanged for centuries.

The study area is characterized by an interconnected street system made up of small and medium sized streets arranged in a grid or modified grid pattern. This provides small blocks, ensuring many possible routes and reducing the need for wide streets. This system balances pedestrian, ensuring many possible routes, shorter distances, and more direct trips are available.

The interconnected street pattern encourages walking, bicycling, and other forms of non-motorized transportation because it increases the likelihood of being able to make a trip without being forced onto a high-speed, high-volume corridor. It also tends to support pedestrian-oriented land uses by allowing

Figure 3.8: Existing Street and Block Pattern
uses to be closer together, thus increasing opportunities for shared parking and pedestrian-oriented streetscapes.

However, there are barriers in the study area formed by the institutions along its perimeter and gated areas in its interior. These include Kennedy Middle School and the Magnolia Park apartments. Streets are also not well linked with downtown to the east or Hunter Hills to the west, but the MARTA rail line and West Side Trail bridge these gaps to some extent. The future BeltLine promises to increase connectivity for walkers, bikers, and transit riders.

The most connected area lies east of Sunset Avenue, north of Rhodes Street, west of Northside Drive, and south of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard. Here, blocks are small and streets are human scaled. Some blocks are less than 300 feet long, which allows for easy walking and multiple route options.

Blocks elsewhere are larger. The block housing the GWCC campus has a perimeter of nearly two miles. The Morris Brown campus fronts Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive with a 2,000 foot block, Kennedy Middle School occupies a 1,200 foot block, and blocks in Washington Park run up to 1,000 feet. These exceptions are due not only to the needs of institutional facilities, but to the time in when they were constructed; post-World War II blocks are the largest.

**Strengths**
- A grid of streets that is largely intact and benefits walking, cycling, and vehicular circulation
- Pedestrian-scaled streets, which calm traffic, are walker-friendly, and support socialization
- Ease of crossing most major streets, except Northside Drive
- Lack of many dead-end streets or cul-de-sacs

**Weaknesses**
- GWCC, which forms a barrier to downtown for vehicular, walking, and bicycle traffic
- Other large blocks, which present an interruption to connectivity

**Opportunities**
- The creation of new connections with redevelopment

**Threats**
- Cut-through traffic, which could burden existing streets if new connections are created in a piecemeal manner and without attention to design
Lot Patterns

Lots are the second major element in shaping communities. Like streets and blocks, parcel lines tend to be fixed for long periods, regardless of land use.

Historic residential and commercial development in the study area divided the land into small parcels. Today, with the increasing scale of redevelopment economics and the large amounts of capital needed to finance infill, the tradition of small urban lots is no longer universal. Financiers often demand that development occupy an acre or more, presenting a challenge to neighborhood revitalization.

Nevertheless, diverse ownership of small properties can be beneficial to revitalization because it preserves neighborhood character and allows for incremental improvements through smaller projects that enhance a sense of place.

Existing Conditions

The historic nature of the neighborhoods in the study area means that many lot sizes remain small. There are around 1,590 properties within the study area, and nearly 87 percent are less than one quarter of an acre. Many single-family lots, some as little as 80 feet deep and 30 feet wide, have remained small as they redevelop.

Strengths

- The intact pattern of small historic lots
- Small residential lots, which allow for infill houses that respect the scale of the neighborhood
- Wide mix of house lot sizes, which can allow for a mix of housing prices

Weaknesses

- Small commercial lots may be a barrier to redevelopment

Opportunities

- A significant number of small vacant lots, which are an attractive option for new houses

Threats

- The large number of small-lot property owners could make reaching consensus on redevelopment difficult
Building Patterns

The third element of a community’s physical pattern is its buildings. The placement and massing of buildings can work together to form spaces greater than the individual parts. These different spaces have different impacts on human psychology and the ability of places to support certain activities.

For example, most people like to feel protected while walking. This is best achieved by making people feel enclosed. From a psychological point of view, a street with a height to width ratio of no more than 1:3 provides the necessary enclosure. To create an environment where walking is encouraged, the street should respect these ratios, particularly in commercial or mixed-use areas. Enclosure also has a direct impact on driver behavior. All else being equal, buildings placed close to the street psychologically narrow it and result in a decrease in vehicle speeds.

Existing Conditions

The historic building patterns in the study area contribute to its distinct character and will help ensure its future viability. Human-scaled streets lined with closely spaced houses and porches define the public realm and contribute to a sense of place. Historic commercial buildings also have a good sidewalk presence and enhance the street. These advantages will remain a significant part of the competitiveness of Vine City, Washington Park, and Ashview Heights over newer, more suburban districts of Atlanta.

Despite the presence of historic commercial structures in some locations, spatial definition is weakest along the corridors of Northside Drive, Joseph E. Boone Boulevard, and Martin Luther
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King, Jr. Drive. In many areas, gaps between buildings, frontal parking, and buildings that are only one story tall contribute to a lack of spatial definition.

The large amount of vacant land in the study area is also a challenge to its urban form. Even one or two vacant lots can destroy the architectural rhythm of a street and create a barren citiescape.

Strengths

- Historic residential streets that provide a sense of enclosure and connections between neighbors through close spacing, porches, and adequate windows
- Intact traditional commercial buildings, such as those along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard, that help define a pleasant and lively sidewalk

Weaknesses

- Vacant lots or parking lots that create gaps in the urban fabric
- Modern commercial development that detracts from the street environment
- The immense GWCC complex, which dwarfs the street and forms a barrier
- New residential and commercial developments that are gated or inward-facing rather than street facing

Opportunities

- New, appropriately scaled commercial or mixed-use buildings, where desired by the community, could strengthen the spatial form of existing centers and define new ones
- New tree plantings could help provide additional shade and further enclose and define the street
- More infill housing, which could be appropriately scaled to fill in breaks in the neighborhood fabric

Threats

- Commercial strip development, which could eliminate the area’s historic feel, and result in a poorly defined and aesthetically unpleasant space
- New auto-oriented development, which could continue to degrade the area’s sense of place and scale
- New single-story commercial buildings on key streets, which could fail to provide the height necessary to define the street as an outdoor room
Historic Resources

Until the early twentieth century, architecture defined and dignified the public realm. Most buildings in towns and cities came up to the sidewalk and fronted it with entrances. Commercial buildings typically incorporated awnings, storefronts, and space for goods or outdoor dining. Residential buildings had stoops, porches, balconies, green courtyards, or sidewalks bordered by a low garden fence or knee wall. This created buildings oriented toward the street and with a clear division between public and private space.

Over time, deeper building setbacks were used. In the streetcar suburbs of the early 1900s, houses were usually between ten and 30 feet from the sidewalk. As with older cities and towns, most early suburbs were within a five-minute walk of a small commercial center or a trolley stop.

Style variations notwithstanding, building design remained stable from 1900 until World War II. This all changed after World War II, when the car became the primary transportation mode. With it, commercial and residential environments changed from pedestrian-oriented to vehicle-oriented. Highway standards and codes sympathetic to drivers were enacted, and architecture and building placement became focused on the car’s needs. The speed at which people experienced communities increased and buildings were placed farther from the street to accommodate parking. As a result, building details became less important than rapid identification. Architecture became secondary to recognition; a few shrubs, trees, flowers, and large signs became more important than respect for neighborhood character or the public realm.

Today, American architecture is still defined by recognition. Chain stores look the same everywhere, and houses are sold based on “curb appeal.” The exteriors of buildings are now insignificant. As a result, most newer areas are visually monotonous. This proliferation of “cookie-cutter” buildings means that historic buildings have become critical to preserving local identity and a sense of place. Historic structures are resources that must be preserved and protected. Not only does the preservation of historic structures preserve an architectural legacy, it also preserves the buildings and places that represent a community’s collective memory.

There is also an economic benefit to preservation. Many places have found that the best way to promote future growth is by preserving the past. This is particularly true where historic buildings are of a quality that is financially prohibitive today. People are increasingly drawn to communities with a sense of character and history. In
addition, “place-oriented” retail has become one of real estate’s hottest commodities, with many new “Main Streets” emerging across the nation. Given this demand, authentic historic areas can be positioned to capture this growing market.

**Existing Conditions**

The study area is rich in history. Community institutions such as the Magnolia Ballroom, Atlanta’s first park for African Americans, and the old Paschal’s Restaurant are among its historic assets, as are former residents such as Maynard Jackson, Julian Bond, Alonzo Herndon, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Coretta Scott King.

The historic houses, churches, shops, and schools in the study area tell its history. Early century development subdivided the land and produced a grid of streets lined with houses that is still intact in many places. Shops and churches tended to locate along streetcar lines. More elaborate residences were constructed on the high ground, while low areas saw the development of working-class houses.

The area was served by three trolleys: one on Joseph E. Boone Boulevard (then Simpson Street), another on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive (then Hunter Street), and a third on Magnolia Street. Commercial nodes, such as that found at the corner of Magnolia Street and Vine Street, are remnants of the former system, in which shops and public buildings were clustered around transit stops, with houses a short walk away. Thus the trolley was both a connection to the rest of the city and a framework for providing residents’ daily needs, including groceries, shops, and churches.

The historic fabric of the study area remains more intact than some other Atlanta neighborhoods that have been scarred by inappropriate infill housing, urban renewal, or commercial encroachment. Its dignified traditional architecture continues to contribute to the public realm. Traditional buildings front the sidewalk with doors if they are public buildings, or with steps and porches if they are houses. Commercial buildings may provide awnings or places for outdoor displays or dining.

With time, design practices changed, resulting in buildings that cut off streets, provide blank walls to the sidewalk, and lack the details that provide interest and beauty. While the majority of the study area has avoided this fate, some newer developments are separated from the community fabric, disrespecting the urban tradition.

Street names call to mind earlier times, whether through such memorable historic names as Ollie Street, Sciple Terrace, and Thurmond Street, or through streets that have been renamed to
honor civil rights leaders, such as Martin Luther King, Jr., Joseph E. Lowery, and Joseph E. Boone.

The Herndon Home and Gaines Hall are the only two buildings in the study area listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Washington Park Historic District is also listed, and is home to dozens of historic houses.

The Herndon Home and Museum, located at 587 University Place, was home to Alonzo Herndon, founder of the Atlanta Life Insurance Company and a real estate investor who owned more property than any other African American in the city in 1900.6

Gaines Hall, built in 1869 on the campus of Morris Brown College, is the oldest building in the study area and one of the oldest in Atlanta. It was designed by architect William H. Parkins,7 who is known for the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, the original Kimball House Hotel, and the now lost Fulton County Courthouse.

The Washington Park Historic District is located in the western end of the study area; part of it lies outside the boundaries of this study. A portion of the neighborhood was the first planned African-American neighborhood in the city. Other portions were laid out by black developer Herman Perry. The park itself was the first in Atlanta to be open to African Americans.

Many other buildings are over 50 years old and could be considered historic. They are concentrated in the central and western portions of the study area, where fewer buildings have been lost.

---

7 Atlanta Preservation Center, http://www.preserveatlanta.com/endangered07_09.htm

![Figure 3.9: Existing Historic Resources](image-url)
Houses from the past century in a variety of styles flank the grid of streets with a variety of setbacks, heights, facades, and lots. Most lack driveways and instead provide pathways directly between the street and the front porch or entryway. Prominent styles include:

- **National Folk** (after ca. 1850-1890), defined by simple massing, usually simple single-gabled roofs, simple shed porch roofs, and uniform roof heights. Buildings are usually clad in horizontal clapboard siding and have vertically proportioned windows. This style represents an interpretation of traditional local housing types utilizing mass-produced materials transported from other parts of the nation. As such, this style exhibits some geographic variations.8

- **Folk Victorian** (1870-1910), defined by the presence of Victorian decorative detailing on simple folk house forms, which are generally much more less elaborated than the Victorian styles that they attempt to mimic. The primary areas for the application of this detailing are the porch and cornice line. These houses usually have symmetric facades with full porches.9

- **Craftsman** (1905-1930), defined by low pitched, gabled roofs (occasionally hipped) with wide, unenclosed overhanging eaves, beams and exposed rafters. Porches are always provided and are usually full or partial width and with roofs supported by tapered, square columns. These houses usually have a one story or bungalow form, although examples of two story craftsman houses may be found.10

- **Minimal Traditional** (1935-1950), defined by a reference to earlier styles, but lacking decorative detailing and exhibiting close, rather than overhanging, eaves. These houses usually include a large chimney and at least one front facing gable. Most are one story, but two story examples exist.11

Newer houses often do not reflect the historic styles found within the study area. Although vaguely inspired by Atlanta-area historic styles, they generally lack the detail, urban feel, and craftsmanship that mark the original. Additionally, their form is often out of scale with adjacent houses. One of the most prevalent instances of the latter is the two-story, vaguely craftsman house with two-story porch that has appeared throughout the study area in recent years, often on streets where all other houses are one story.

---

8 A Field Guide to American Houses, Virginia & Lee McAlester, page 88
9 McAlester, page 309
10 McAlester, page 453
11 McAlester, page 478
Some infill homes are out of scale with one-story neighboring houses

Modern commercial buildings mix with traditional structures along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive

**Strengths**

- Rich African-American history
- Large number of historic houses in a variety of styles
- Historic churches, commercial buildings, and educational buildings
- Mixed-use, historic development patterns

**Weaknesses**

- Loss of a significant number of historic houses and businesses in recent decades
- Lack of maintenance of some historic buildings
- Vacant historic buildings that could be reused
- Some newer buildings that are out of character

**Opportunities**

- Various historic architectural styles that could be used as a model for future development
- Historic markers or walking tour to help raise awareness of neighborhood history

**Threats**

- Incompatible infill development, which could be out of scale with adjacent structures
- Deteriorated or unappealing architecture, which could detract from the area
- Lack of maintenance, which could cause historic buildings to be lost due to neglect
- Rehabilitation costs, which could make it more expensive to renovate a building than to demolish it
- Historically insensitive rehabilitation, which could erase historic features
3.6 TRANSPORTATION

The transportation network in the study area includes vehicular, pedestrian, transit, and bicycle components. While all are interrelated, the particulars of each are discussed separately on the following pages for the sake of clarity.

Vehicular Facilities

Street Configuration

Within the Vine City/Washington Park study area, the street network is configured in the traditional urban grid system. With the exception of Mayson Turner Road, which runs at a diagonal, streets are oriented north-south and east-west. However, not all are continuous from one end of the study area to the other. Although this may pose a minor inconvenience to motorists, these discontinuities contribute to overall lower travel speeds.

Street widths are also variable throughout the study area. This can present challenges on streets that are narrow, have two-way traffic, and have on-street parking. While such streets do prevent high-speed cut-through traffic, they can also present challenges for emergency vehicle access. Vine Street and Delbridge Street are the only one-way streets within the study area. On-street parking is a significant issue identified by some neighborhood residents.

Classification

Most streets in the study area are classified as residential local streets. Those along its edges have a higher classification, reflecting their function of providing through travel rather than access to neighborhood housing, schools, and churches. The designated classifications are shown in Figure 3.10.

From a vehicular traffic perspective, the commercial arterial streets are Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Northside Drive, which is also US 41/US 19. Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard is the only street in the core of the study area that is classified other than residential local; it is a residential collector street. Each of these roadways, as well as Joseph E. Boone Boulevard, is also classified as a truck route.

Designated truck routes are for those heavy vehicles traveling through the area. This does not, however, preclude trucks from using local streets for local deliveries. The loading dock for the Historic Westside Village Publix, for example, is off of James P. Brawley Drive.
The City of Atlanta recently completed a year-long process to develop a Comprehensive Transportation Plan to guide the next 25 years of transportation policy and investment. This effort is known as Connect Atlanta. An essential component of it is the Street Design Guide, which relates the functionality of a street to its land use context and presents associated recommended design dimensions.

As one example of this approach, a roadway classified as a collector should offer different opportunities for bicycle lanes, transit accommodations, and pedestrian walk zones, depending on whether it is located in a downtown area, a commercial area, or a residential area. As described above, in the study area, there are a limited number of roadways classified arterial and collector; the vast majority are local. In addition, the context of the study area is primarily residential with a few commercial areas, plus educational and institutional uses sprinkled throughout. The recommendations presented in this study mirror the tenets of the Connect Atlanta Plan.

**Road Diet**

An additional example of coordination with the Connect Atlanta Plan is its proposal for implementing a “road diet” on Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive (Project RD-006). A road diet reduces the amount of asphalt for vehicular traffic and reconfigures it to accommodate non-vehicular traffic (e.g. wider sidewalks or bike lanes). The project description is “Restripe MLK from HE Holmes to Northside Dr from four-lane undivided roadway to three-lane (two travel lanes with center two-way left turn lane and 5-foot bicycle lanes.”
There are sections of Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive in the study area where implementing this plan can be accommodated, particularly on the eastern end. However, in the area of the Historic Westside Village, from Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard east to Joseph P Brawley Drive, Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive has one lane in each direction for through traffic and metered parking on both sides of the street. Reducing asphalt would impact the on-street parking on which businesses rely. Detailed streetscape design is beyond the scope of this study, but a design must be developed that is sensitive to this area.

**Traffic Control**

The Vine City/Washington Park study area exhibits typically urban neighborhood traffic control with regards to posted speed limits, stop controlled intersections, and speed humps. The location of the signalized intersections, multi-way stop intersections, and speed humps are shown below.

**Speed Limits**

On residential streets in the interior of the study area, speed is limited to 25 miles per hour (mph). Speed limit signs are missing from a number of the streets. This does not pose a significant problem because, as described earlier, narrow streets and on-street parking regulate the operations of the drivers. Non-residentially classified streets such as Northside Drive, Joseph E. Boone Boulevard, and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard are all posted at 35 mph. Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive is posted at 30 mph.

---

*Figure 3.11: Traffic Control Devices*
**Intersection Control**

Most indicative of the residentially classified streets within the interior of the Vine City/Washington Park neighborhood is that all of the intersections are controlled by stop signs. The majority have the side street traffic stop while the other street’s drivers have the right-of-way. There are also a few intersections where there is a multi-way stop; refer to the figure above. There is a series of three all-way stop intersections on Carter Street which is adjacent to the Ashby MARTA Station and the new Liberty Commons townhouses. There is also a series of three all-way stops on Magnolia Street.

**Speed Humps**

Speed humps are installed in the streets to provide a physical impediment to driving faster than the posted speed limit. Most speed humps are designed and constructed such that they can be traversed at 25 mph without causing discomfort to the driver or passengers. Invariably motorists drive even slower.

In the Vine City/Washington Park study area, the only streets that have speed humps are adjacent to the schools. For J.F. Kennedy Middle School the speed humps are on Griffin Street from Foundry Street to Joseph E. Boone Boulevard. For Bethune Elementary School, the speed humps are on Thurmond Street from Vine Street to Northside Drive.
Part 3: Existing Conditions

Pedestrian Facilities

Because every trip begins on foot, the walking experience is critical to understanding the transportation system. Pedestrian trips are also important because they promote physical health, do not require high cost public facilities, allow for human interaction, and pose little threat to others’ physical safety.

Existing Conditions

The walking experience in the study area is generally positive, apart from public safety issues in some areas. Adequate sidewalks, a variety of shops, parks, and other destinations within a short distance of homes and transit, an interconnected street network, and shade trees combine to create a great walking environment.

The presence of transit stations and bus stops in nearly every corner of the neighborhood also brings the rest of the city within walking distance by effectively extending the pedestrian's range. Few parking spaces are available at Vine City Station, and parking is also limited at Ashby Station, so most MARTA patrons walk or take the bus in order to catch the train.

Currently Proposed Projects

Several projects involving pedestrian improvements in or near the study area exist. These include streetscape improvements along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard, Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard, and Northside Drive. Please see the following project numbers in the City of Atlanta Comprehensive Development Plan for more details: AT-AR-247, DPW-05-0029, DPW-05-0302, DPW-05-0318, DPW-05-0376, DPW-05-0377, DPW-05-0452, DPW-05-0472, and DPW-07-0006.

Sidewalk Conditions

During the sidewalk survey conducted in the area in the fall of 2008, the following categories were used to rank the condition of each stretch of sidewalk within the study area. The map on the following page shows the results.

- **Standard**: Sidewalks that are continuous, passable, and require no repair.
- **Sub-Standard**: Sidewalks that require minor repair with a focus on continued maintenance.
- **Deteriorated**: Unusable or unsafe sidewalks that require significant repair or replacement.
- **No Sidewalk**: Areas without sidewalks.
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Strengths
- The concentration of houses, parks, shops, churches, schools, and transit makes walking viable
- Zoning regulations require new buildings to be pedestrian oriented

Weaknesses
- Street width, speeding, and heavy traffic on commercial arterials make crossings difficult and walking unpleasant
- Buildings separated from the sidewalk by parking lots discourage walking
- Some intersections lack adequate crosswalk markings, signals, and ramps
- Some sections of sidewalk need repair or replacement

Opportunities
- Plantings or bulbouts could slow traffic, make crossings easier, and provide more greenery
- New crosswalk markings, ramps, signals, and paving could improve the pedestrian environment
- Targeted repairs could improve sidewalk quality
- Planned streetscape improvements along major roads could improve the walking experience
- Extension of the West Side trail could provide access to the future BeltLine trail

Threats
- New development that is parking-oriented, inward-oriented, or gated could decrease walkability
- Further degradation of sidewalks could decrease safety and discourage new investment

Figure 3.12: Existing Sidewalk Conditions
Transit Facilities

While public transportation accounts for only 2.5 percent of trips made in the Atlanta metropolitan region, travel by rail and bus is a convenient option in the study area.

As previously noted, the study area was once served by a series of streetcars around which its neighborhoods were built. Although these facilities are now gone, some of the transit-supportive land use patterns they generated still exist.

Today, two rapid transit stations, Vine City station and Ashby station, provide easy access to downtown Atlanta and other points in the regional transit network. Bus stops are also conveniently distributed throughout the area, allowing easier access to transit stations and to other destinations served only by bus.

Existing Conditions

The two transit stations in the study area are among the least utilized stations in the MARTA system. This is in part due to years of disinvestment and demolition that have erased the transit-supportive land use patterns created by the former trolley system.

The Vine City transit station has one of the smallest footprints of any MARTA station. Located along Northside Drive across from the World Congress Center, it provides two bus loading areas, 27 customer parking spaces, and sees 1,805 train boardings on an average weekday.

The Ashby transit station provides entrances on both sides of Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard. Buses stop either along Lowery or in the bus loading area. There is a parking lot with 156 spaces. Average weekday boardings number 2,235. The station is the only one in the city where the train platforms are located one above another rather than side by side. Ashby Station serves as the transfer point for the Proctor Creek line to Bankhead Station.

Both stations are located on the east-west line and provide direct connections to HE Holmes, West Lake, Bankhead, downtown, Georgia State University, downtown Decatur, and many other destinations. A transfer at Five Points station connects passengers to the north-south line. Trains run every 10-15 minutes on the east-west line and every 10-15 minutes on the Proctor Creek line, so wait time for a train to downtown is usually less than 8 minutes.

12 Atlanta Regional Commission, Household Travel Survey, (2002)
13 Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority. Average data based on numbers collected April-July 2008.
The study area is also served by six bus routes. All routes either connect to a rail station or stop near one. Route specifics are described in Table 3.2, but in general they provide transfer-free connections to adjacent neighborhoods such as English Avenue, Hunter Hills, the Bankhead area, and downtown. They also serve destinations like the West End commercial district and Atlanta University Center campuses.

All buses accommodate bicycles and passengers in wheelchairs. Modern bus vehicles are low-emission and provide air conditioning, route information, and television screens. Bus service to Downtown, Midtown, and other major destinations and employment centers may seem lacking on the bus map, but is very convenient by rail.

Other than the buses themselves, facilities in the bus system are poor. Of the approximately 55 bus stops in the study area, only seven have bus shelters, and all lack trash cans and route schedules. Many stops are so closely spaced that buses take an excessively long time to complete their route because of constant stops. Furthermore, service is infrequent, with no bus arriving more than once every half hour.

The cumulative effect of these poor waiting conditions, delays, and infrequent service is a bus system that is far less convenient than driving, bicycling, or taking the train, particularly when it is raining, hot, or when somebody is in a hurry. Frequent bus riders may have grown accustomed to current conditions, but potential new riders or those with more transportation choices would be quickly deterred.

**Strengths**

- Existing rail service, which is within walking distance of most of the study area and provides quick, easy access to downtown and much of the city
- Existing bus service, which serves areas not immediately adjacent to transit stations and connects to neighboring areas
- Land use patterns that support commercial nodes and walking to facilitate transit ridership
- Decorative bus shelters along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, unique in Atlanta
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Weaknesses

• Low bus frequency and lack of information at stops deter new riders
• Some developments that do not support transit, because of low density and separation from the street
• Lack of an east-west connection along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard between the study area, Centennial Park, and the north-south rail line
• Unnecessarily close spacing of bus stops in some areas contributes to slow service
• Lack of shelters at most bus stops exposes patrons to the elements and discourages ridership

Opportunities

• Low-cost bus service improvements, such as informational signs at stops
• Future transit service along the BeltLine adjacent to Washington Park

Threats

• Transit service cuts due to low revenue

Bus stops are ubiquitous within the study area, but most lack amenities
Bicycle Facilities

Bicycles are non-polluting means of travel that promote physical health, do not require large parking spaces, are inexpensive to buy and maintain, and can promote compact and interesting urban spaces. Any well-balanced transportation system must take bicycles into account to ensure a range of mobility options.

There are four kinds of bicycle facilities:

- **Multi-use trails** are generally 10- to 15-foot-wide paved areas that permit travel in two directions. Lanes may or may not be striped. Often, these facilities are built in conjunction with greenways and include adjacent open space.

- **Bicycle lanes** can be painted on any street with sufficient right-of-way. They are usually located next to the curb and designed so that cyclists move in the same direction as traffic. Bicycle lanes usually have a minimum width of five feet, but four feet is appropriate in constrained conditions. Lanes are most useful on streets with design speeds above 25 miles per hour because cyclists can safely ride with traffic on slower streets.

- **Shared street pavement markings** are usually provided on streets where there is not enough space for a dedicated bicycle lane, but where some level of bicycle facilities are desired.

- **Bicycle routes** do not necessarily involve lanes, street markings, or multi-use trails, but are simply streets that are designated as suitable for cycling. Bike routes indicate to riders the best path to their destination. The Connect Atlanta Plan defines two types of bicycle routes (core and secondary routes) and includes recommended facility types for each in a variety of space constraints.

**Existing Conditions**

Bicycle facilities in the study area are limited, but because most streets have little traffic or relatively slow traffic, biking is safe throughout the study area, except along busier streets.

The only multi-use trail in the study area is the West Side Trail, which runs along the south side of Lena Street from the Ashby Station parking lot to the western edge of the study area and beyond. The trail looks like a wide sidewalk and functions like one. It connects to Anderson Park and runs south to the Lionel Hampton Trail.

Other than the West Side Trail, the only other existing bicycle facility in the vicinity is the bike lanes along Ivan Allen, Jr. Boulevard east...
of Northside Drive, which provide access between the study area and the northern edge of Downtown.

The Connect Atlanta Plan has identified core bicycle routes along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard. Secondary routes are recommended for James P. Brawley Drive and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. These corridors are ideal long-term candidates for bicycle lanes.

Both the recommended primary and secondary routes, however, are geared towards serving bicycle commuters and may not be ideal facilities for less experienced or timid bicyclists. Therefore, opportunities may also exist to improve bicycle connectivity on internal neighborhood streets.

**Strengths**

- The West Side Trail, a dedicated bicycle route connecting the study area to points west
- Neighborhood streets with bicycle-friendly low traffic volumes and speeds
- Recently completed bike lanes along Ivan Allen, Jr. Boulevard

**Weaknesses**

- Dangerousness of biking along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Joseph E. Boone Boulevard
- Lack of bicycle provisions along some secondary streets
- Lack of bicycle racks in some areas
- Topography that proves a challenge to less experienced riders

**Opportunities**

- Bicycle lanes on Joseph E. Boone Boulevard
- Alterations to secondary streets to make them more bicycle friendly
- BeltLine trail, which would connect the West Side Trail and the study area to the rest of the city
- Identification of and signage for bicycle routes

**Threats**

- Right-of-way limitations that may hamper providing space for pedestrians and bicycles along major streets
Parking Facilities

Parking is an important consideration in any urban neighborhood, but particularly in the study area for two primary reasons. First, many houses and business were constructed before on-site parking was customary, so their users count on street parking. Second, visitors to the Georgia Dome and GWCC create significant parking challenges along neighborhood streets.

Existing Conditions

There are currently two parking decks in the study area: the International Plaza deck, which serves the Georgia Dome and GWCC with 2,000 spaces, and a much smaller deck serving the condominiums at Historic Westside Village. More than 40 parking lots also serve the commercial and institutional buildings throughout the study area.

The remainder of parking in the study area is provided on-street, either in marked or unmarked areas. An existing parking permit program attempts to prevent Dome and Congress Center visitors from parking in the neighborhood so that spaces are preserved for residents, but it is not always effective.

Well planned on-street parking has historically been an efficient and safe means of providing space for automobiles. On-street spaces require the least pavement of any type of parking, and they do not require driveways that can degrade the pedestrian experience. Parked cars also slow traffic and improve pedestrian safety.

Parking requirements in the area’s zoning regulations are generally reasonable. Single-family houses are not required to provide off-street parking, nor are offices or small restaurants near transit stations. Parking requirements for businesses and other uses are generally less than elsewhere in the city.

A field survey was performed to determine where on-street parking exists in the study area; Figure 3.13 summarizes the results. In some cases, no signage is present and precedent was used to determine the location and extent of parking. The lack of on-street parking along major streets is conspicuous.

Strengths

- Significant amount of on-street parking spaces throughout the study area, particularly in residential areas
- Transit service, which lowers the need for car ownership and parking
• Zoning regulations that do not require excessive amounts of off-street parking

Weaknesses
• Unclear or absent parking signage on some streets
• Inefficient use of parking lots and on-street spaces, due to lack of a cohesive parking plan
• Lack of parking for events at Herndon Stadium

Opportunities
• New parking decks could serve the Georgia Dome and GWCC, Herndon Stadium, and the neighborhood
• Better management and enforcement could make existing parking more efficient

Threats
• Continued encroachment of vehicles during major events
• New development dominated by parking or separated from the street by parking lots
• Redevelopment of parking on Northside Drive without a mitigation plan could increase parking on nearby streets

Figure 3.13: Existing On-Street Parking
3.7 ENVIRONMENT & OPEN SPACE

Within the Vine City/Washington Park study area, the natural environment has been modified and impacted over the years by human activity. In the twentieth century, the area experienced an abundance of residential development, with commercial development concentrated along the major corridors. This development pattern has impacted the natural landscape in a number of ways.

Existing Conditions

The study area consists primarily of residential areas, with the exception of Northside Drive, Joseph E. Boone Boulevard, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, which include non-residential uses. Current and historic development patterns have only moderately impacted the environment in the study area. There are no sites in the study area for which permits have been issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to handle hazardous materials.

There is a very limited number of potential brownfield or greyfield areas in the study area; however, there are a number of areas that may be available for future redevelopment. A number of parking lots are located along the Northside Drive corridor to serve patrons of the Georgia Dome and the GWCC. These lots may contribute to a number of environmental concerns, including a loss of trees, litter, increased noise while the lots are in use, as well as non-point-source pollution from parking lot stormwater runoff. In the years to come, modifications to the Dome and the GWCC, as well as changing uses of these facilities, may result in changes to parking needs to serve the facilities, making existing parking lots and nearby vacant properties available for assemblage and redevelopment.

Other environmental concerns include illegal dumping, particularly on vacant lots, littering along major corridors such as Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, air pollution, and noise due to traffic along major corridors in the area.

Strengths

• Few brownfield, greyfield, and EPA permit holder sites
• Lack of industrial polluters
• Existing tree canopy in much of the study area, which cools in the summertime and cleans the air

Weaknesses

• Noise pollution along major streets and the MARTA line
• Illegal dumping, which has occurred on many vacant lots
• Stormwater runoff from Dome parking lots
• Lack of tree cover in the blocks near Northside Drive

Opportunities
• Redevelopment of vacant lots, perhaps into pocket parks or other greenspace areas that will serve the community
• Redevelopment of Northside Drive parking lots
• New street and yard tree plantings with redevelopment

Threats
• Loss of tree cover with further development
• Future diminishing of tree canopy due to lack of a good mix of tree ages

Open Space

In a world where individuals are isolated by technology and fast-paced lifestyles, people are increasingly recognizing the value of places that allow them to connect with others and nature. The most popular neighborhoods are those in which people can enjoy a wide variety of open spaces on a daily basis. Many people no longer want to drive long distances to play in a park with their children or relax on a summer evening; they prefer their neighborhoods to provide these opportunities.

There are four major categories of open spaces in the United States, each with their own distinct definition and applicability:

**Plazas** are hardscaped gathering spaces located in a town or city center and surrounded by commercial, mixed-use, or civic buildings. Plazas often include fountains, benches, art, and similar elements. Their entire surface is accessible to the public and consists of stone, concrete, or other durable pavement interspersed with trees and limited plant materials.

**Parks** are landscaped recreation and gathering places that can be located in any area of a town or city. They may be surrounded by residential or commercial buildings, and are often the focal points of neighborhoods. Parks often include picnic areas, drinking fountains, benches, and playgrounds. Larger parks may include ponds, sports fields, and courts. Well designed parks are defined at the edges by streets. Their accessible landscape consists of paths, trees, lawns, shrubs, and other plant materials.

**Greenways** are linear parks that can serve as corridors for
transportation, wildlife migration, or protection of key habitats that occur in a linear manner, such as the riparian zones along creeks and rivers. Greenways can also connect plazas, parks and conservation lands. Because of this, they can be located in virtually any setting with varying sizes.

**Conservation lands** protect and enhance areas of environmental and historic significance. They are usually located at the edge of a village, town, or city. Because their primary purpose is the protection of environmental resources, they can include camping sites and trails.

**Existing Conditions**

A variety of open spaces exist in the study area. The largest is the 20-acre Washington Park, which was Atlanta’s first park to be open to African-Americans. Today, the park provides many amenities and serves as a focus for the Washington Park neighborhood. Other parks within the study area are described in Table 3.3.

Apart from public parks, there are two private plazas adjacent to the Georgia Dome which are open to the public. The GWCC West Plaza and the International Plaza offer no significant amenities, but provide public art, a fountain, shade, and places to sit or play.

While the existing West Side multiuse trail is not considered a greenway according to the above definition, the BeltLine will constitute such a facility and is proposed to skirt the western edge of the study area.

**Strengths**

- Parks are within a short walk of most of the neighborhood
- Diverse passive and active recreation amenities in parks
- Buildings front most parks, providing de facto supervision

**Weaknesses**

- The West Side Trail does not extend east of Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard
- Crime or its perception, which may deter park users

**Opportunities**

- BeltLine multiuse trail, which will provide new open space and recreational opportunities
- Vacant land at site of 2002 flood could be improved as a potential greenspace
- Introduction of new walking routes or trails to emphasize
neighborhood history and connect to downtown

- New open space could be provided as part of redevelopment along Northside Drive
- Community gardens, which could be created in existing parks and on vacant building lots throughout the study area

**Threats**

- Under-funding of parks and open space could contribute to their decline
- The development of blank, windowless walls facing existing and new parks could minimize their use and inadvertently make them less safe

**Table 3.3: Park Facilities in Study Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashby Circle Play Lot</td>
<td>Playground</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles L. Harper Park</td>
<td>Seating plaza, memorial statue, passive recreation area</td>
<td>1 acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Kennedy Park</td>
<td>Recreation center, basketball court, playground</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine City Park</td>
<td>Lawn, small amphitheater, seating areas</td>
<td>0.9 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>Recreation center, tennis courts, baseball field, picnic shelters, paved trail, indoor swimming pool, playground, pavilion, grills</td>
<td>20 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 INFRASTRUCTURE & FACILITIES

A community’s infrastructure and public facilities are key components of the framework around which the community will develop. Often, public facilities such as parks, schools, and libraries are at the heart of the community, providing gathering spaces for residents.

Facilities

A number of public services and facilities serve the Vine City/Washington Park LCI study area, including City of Atlanta fire and police service. Currently, there are no fire stations within the Study Area, but it is served by two nearby stations: Fire Station 1 (71 Elliot Street) and Fire Station 16 (1048 Simpson Road). The area is located within the Atlanta Police Department’s Zone 1, and includes the Magnolia Street Mini Precinct, situated in Vine City at 612 Magnolia Street.

Emergency medical service is provided by the Grady Health System. Grady Memorial Hospital, located at 80 Jesse Hill Jr. Drive, is the nearest hospital. Additional health services are provided to area residents at the Neighborhood Union Health Center, operated by the Fulton County Department of Health and Wellness, at 186 Sunset Avenue.

Residents of the Vine City and Washington Park neighborhoods have access to the Washington Park Branch Library, located south of the Study Area at 1116 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, as well as an array of recreational facilities. The Joseph B. Whitehead Branch YMCA at 101 Ollie Street is available for use by area residents and Fulton County’s New Horizons Senior Center, located at 745 Orr Street, serves area senior citizens.

The study area is also home to three public schools, including a charter school.

- **Bethune Elementary School**, located at 220 Northside Drive, serves approximately 475 students in grades K through 5. The Bethune student population is 100 percent African-American, with 100 percent of students qualifying for free/reduced price lunches.

- **J.F. Kennedy Middle School**, located at 225 James P. Brawley Drive, serves approximately 418 students in grades 6-8. At Kennedy Middle School, 99 percent students are African-American, with 95 percent qualifying for free/reduced price lunches.

The mini police precinct headquarters on Magnolia Street

The Vine City Neighborhood Union Health and Community Center

The Washington Park YMCA is a significant amenity for area residents
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- **KIPP (Knowledge is Power Program) WAYS (West Atlanta Young Scholars) Academy**, located at 80 Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard, is a public charter school serving approximately 320 students in grades 5 through 8. KIPP WAYS provides a college-prep program for students in low-income communities.

In addition to the public educational opportunities provided by the Atlanta Public School System, the Vine City/Washington Park Study Area is home to Morris Brown College, a private liberal arts college founded by the African Methodist Episcopal Church in 1881.

The Vine City/Washington Park Study Area is located within the Chattahoochee Watershed. FEMA flood maps indicate that none of the study area is located within an area that faces a high risk of flooding, defined by FEMA as an area with a 1 percent annual chance of flooding.

The study area is located within the Proctor Creek Basin. A portion of the study area near the Ashby MARTA Station is situated within a sub-basin of the Proctor Creek Basin, within which there are 249,643 gallons of sewer capacity available. The remainder of the study area is located within a non-capacity limited area of the Proctor Creek Basin. A number of recent sewer separation projects and improvements in the area should accommodate new flows of capacity for future development.

![Figure 3.14: Existing Water and Sewer Lines](Image)

The KIPP WAYS Academy is a private school open to study area residents
A flood following a major rainfall in September of 2002 resulted in the declaration of a state of emergency and the flooding of 169 homes in and around the study area. Some residents were evacuated by boat. As part of the response to the disaster, the city purchased land south of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and demolished the houses in that area.

**Strengths**

- Adequate water and sewer capacity to serve future development
- Access to parks and recreational facilities to serve current and future residents
- Availability of community facilities to serve residents of all ages, including children and seniors
- Various educational opportunities to meet the needs of area children and families

**Weaknesses**

- Aging infrastructure citywide
- Crime problems at area parks, including Charles L. Harper Memorial Park
- Overhead utilities detract from street character
- Vandalism of public art at Charles L. Harper Memorial
- Under-utilization of the aging YMCA

**Opportunities**

- Infrastructure available to support future development
- Enhance area parks with additional lighting and facility upgrades so that they are more interactive and inviting
- New development could generate support for improved public facilities

**Threats**

- Aging infrastructure may lead to increased maintenance costs
- Perception of Atlanta Public Schools in the area may deter young families from moving to the area
Vine City/Washington Park
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4.1 PUBLIC PROCESS

The Vine City/Washington Park LCI team utilized a number of public participation tools and techniques to solicit active community involvement throughout the study process. Outreach efforts included mailings, a community workshop, public presentations, steering committee meetings, and a website.

Steering Committee

In order to guide the planning process and to further facilitate community participation, a Steering Committee of key stakeholders was established early in the study process. The Steering Committee consisted of local elected officials, city staff, business owners and area employers, neighborhood leaders and residents, and organizations within the community. More than 40 people expressed interest in the Committee or were invited to participate.

On January 15, 2009, the Steering Committee gathered for its initial meeting at Hagar Palace (19 Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard). At this meeting committee members were introduced to the planning process and their role in it, and suggested specific matters that should be evaluated and addressed through the study.

A second Steering Committee meeting was held on March 3, 2009 at Hagar Palace to discuss specific points of concern identified by community members at the Draft Plan Presentation meeting. Committee members provided feedback on various alternatives to address matters such as Georgia Dome parking, the proposed multi-use trail, and recommended land uses surrounding the Vine City MARTA Station. The preferred alternatives identified through this discussion were incorporated into the final plan.

Kick-off Meeting

On November 19, 2008, a public meeting was held at Hagar Palace to commence the public portion of the planning effort. At this meeting, attendees were introduced to the project team, the goals of the LCI program, the planning process, and previous planning efforts. As the meeting closed, residents were given an opportunity to visit different stations to share their thoughts on transportation, housing/marketing, land use, and general issues. They were asked to tell the project team what they liked most and least in the study area, as well as specific needs for change.
Community Workshop

Through a community workshop held at Morehouse College on January 31, 2009, the Project Team shared the results of the initial inventory and analysis of existing conditions within the study area with workshop attendees, and conducted breakout sessions to further define the community’s specific desires for four geographic sub-areas: the Washington Park neighborhood, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive corridor, the core of the Vine City neighborhood, and the Northside Drive corridor.

Specifically, workshop attendees identified areas for preservation, rehabilitation, specific land uses, transportation improvements, and preferred building scale for each sub-area. At the conclusion of the breakout sessions, a representative for each sub-area presented the highlights of the table discussions for their respective areas. The feedback gathered through this exercise was incorporated into the implementation plan for the study area.

Public Presentations

At various points throughout the study process, feedback on the proposed plan was solicited from the community. On February 19, 2009, the draft plan was presented at Hagar Palace, and area stakeholders offered feedback that was instrumental in refining the plan. Based on this feedback and further analysis, the final plan was presented at Hagar Palace on March 19, 2009.

Following completion of the planning effort, the plan was presented to area NPUs for adoption.

Neighborhood Meetings

Two meetings with study area neighborhoods were also held to allow area residents to review the draft plan recommendations prior to the Final Plan Presentation.

On Saturday March 7, 2009, consultants and city staff met with leaders of the Vine City Civic Association to review the draft plan and answer questions. At the meeting, several outstanding land use issues were resolved, particularly as related to differences between the proposed LCI plan and the previous redevelopment plan.

The draft plan was also presented to the Washington Park neighborhood on March 9, 2009. Generally speaking, the plan’s recommendations were endorsed at this meeting. The only concerns from this meeting focused on whether or not a MARTA and BeltLine commuter parking deck was appropriate on Lena Street. The master plan was updated to address this.
Individual Interviews

Throughout the study process, stakeholders were offered the opportunity to participate in individual interviews with representatives of the Project Team to share their specific vision and recommendations for the study area. Interview participants included residents, community leaders, City officials, and representatives of other key organizations within the study area.

Communication Tools

Recognizing the importance of communication to the public involvement efforts, the Project Team utilized a number of tools to keep stakeholders informed of upcoming meetings and project information. One critical tool was the project website, which provided access to the project schedule, maps, and other documents and information pertaining to the LCI Study.

Stakeholders participate in a dot exercise at the kickoff meeting

Results of the dot exercise conducted at the kickoff meeting on November 19, 2008, showing problem areas (red dots) and places where something positive is happening (green dots)
In addition to the project website, various print media were distributed to inform residents and property owners of upcoming meetings. Two direct mail postcards were sent to each property owner within the study area. The first mailing notified them of the Kick-off Meeting, while the second listed the three additional public meetings. Also, flyers were distributed at City Hall, area community centers and senior centers, businesses, and other key points in the Vine City, Ashview Heights, and Washington Park neighborhoods to inform the community of upcoming meetings.

In order to keep the Steering Committee engaged, e-mail meeting announcements were sent to Committee members to notify them of upcoming Steering Committee meetings. Many Steering Committee members also were contacted by phone regarding key meetings.
4.2 VISION

Vine City, Washington Park, and Ashview Heights contain some of the richest history and best known historical figures in the Atlanta region. Their human-scaled streets, proximity to downtown, and good access to transit are unique assets that will become even more important in the future. The future vision of this plan builds on these assets and focuses on the following aspirations:

Respect the visions and accomplishments of previous plans. The many planning efforts of the past decade should be retained and incorporated into this plan, with updates as needed.

Prevent the displacement of long-time residents who want to remain in the area. The plan must limit involuntary displacement of residents, and allow them to participate in the benefits of growth.

Concentrate growth along major corridors and near transit. New development, particularly along Northside Drive at the Vine City MARTA station, should provide shops, restaurants, and entertainment to serve residents and draw visitors.

Preserve historic areas and ensure compatible new development. The significant development anticipated in the study area must be implemented in a way that respects and responds to historic homes and businesses. An emphasis on promoting the history of the area is crucial.

Support economic development that benefits both large and small businesses. The growth of small, community-owned businesses and the hiring of local residents must be encouraged.

Improve options for walking and bicycling. New sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and better connections to downtown should unite the study area and encourage people to walk and bike.

Increase neighborhood retail and services. Shops, restaurants, and services for residents should be provided so people can meet their daily needs without having to leave their neighborhood.

Enhance safety. Safety must be improved by both physical enhancements, such as sidewalks and lighting, and programmatic enhancements, such as increased policing.

Provide housing that is accessible for everyone. Housing that serves a range of incomes, ages, and lifestyles must be offered.
5.1 OVERVIEW

Introduction

This section includes recommendations for the study area that define its future character and provide short and long-range actions to address the challenges identified during the planning process.

Recommendations are a synthesis of the desires and work of residents, businesses, property owners, the City of Atlanta, MARTA, and others, coupled with sound planning. They build on existing planning efforts and offer a visionary yet achievable blueprint for change that reflects the study area’s development potential, transportation needs, and regulatory framework.

To this end, the recommendations are consistent with the goals of the LCI program to enhance the land use and transportation relationship because they:

- Calibrate use, building height, and density to transportation accessibility, with more intensity in areas with high accessibility, and less intensity in other areas.
- Recognize the important role that the study’s area two MARTA rail stations play in its future, and direct development into areas with the greatest transit access.
- Strengthen historic neighborhood commercial centers and use them to lay a framework for redevelopment.
- Connect existing and new development with multi-modal transportation facilities, including streets, sidewalks, multi-use trails, bike lanes, and vehicular upgrades.
- Balance all modes of transportation equally, and design facilities to reflect the land use vision.
- Locate housing whose occupants are not likely to own cars in areas that are well served by transit, and where daily needs are within walking distance.

With time, these recommendations will guide redevelopment in a way that respects the study area’s rich history, but also recognizes its well-situated location and accessibility.

Two types of recommendations are provided: Policies and Projects. Projects are followed by a project number as identified in Part 6, which contains an implementation strategy, including cost, funding, and responsible parties.
5.2 GUIDING PRINCIPLE: SUSTAINABILITY

All of the recommendations in this document will guide the neighborhoods of Ashview Heights, Downtown, Vine City, and Washington Park toward sustainable urban redevelopment. The concept of sustainability is broad and difficult to define, because it touches on all aspects of life. An ideal plan for sustainability benefits the environment, improves the lives of humans, and is profitable at the same time.

Sustainability can be distilled into three broad components:

- **Environmental sustainability**, which strives to reduce the impacts of human activity on the earth’s natural systems, remedy previous damage, and make use of natural resources in a way that will not deplete or harm them in the long run.

- **Social sustainability**, which strives to move toward the resolution of social problems, create a strong and inclusive community, and allow multiple generations to live in proximity.

- **Economic sustainability**, which strives to provide a decent or improved standard of living for all, amid economic systems that can continue to operate profitably for generations.

It is upon these three components that the recommendations of this study are based.

Historic neighborhoods are, in many ways, the ideal model for sustainability. Older neighborhoods were built before cars became the dominant form of transportation, and are therefore walkable and provide many daily needs within a short distance of home. As a result, the environmental impacts of driving and parking are reduced, and significant financial savings can be realized if families own fewer cars.

The traditional neighborhood was also mixed-use and mixed-income. It featured different housing types, sizes, and costs to serve the range of incomes and ages that make up our society.

Lastly, the traditional neighborhood often featured locally owned businesses and strong social institutions, which invested in the neighborhood and helped its less fortunate residents.
All of the recommendations in this document will guide the study area toward becoming sustainable. A sustainable community is defined by the relationship of three elements: environmental, social, and economic. A balance of the three is the guiding principle of this study.

The following is an overview of how the various recommendations of this study will work together to promote sustainability.

- **Land Use Recommendations** will encourage higher density, mixed-use development in appropriate places to promote walking, biking, and use of public transit.

- **Markets & Housing Recommendations** will provide economic and housing opportunities for a broad spectrum of people. They will minimize the potential for displacement and strengthen community bonds.

- **Urban Design & Historic Resource Recommendations** will build upon the area’s rich history to create an urban form that supports walking, community life, and aesthetics. They will create beautiful places that will instill civic pride and order.

- **Transportation Recommendations** will reduce and, in some cases, eliminate the need to drive. This will improve air quality, promote public health, and allow residents to have more disposable income. New trees along both major and neighborhood streets will also clean the air, capture carbon from the atmosphere, and reduce the urban heat island effect.

- **Environment & Open Space Recommendations** will improve the environmental quality of the study area and reduce the negative impacts of new development. New greenspace, both public and private, will enhance community life. Community gardens will allow residents to grow food while keeping food dollars in the neighborhood.

- **Infrastructure & Facilities Recommendations** will enhance community life by increasing public safety, community programs, and infrastructure to serve future generations.
5.3 LAND USE

The study area’s land use plan must be able to accommodate growth, while making sure it happens in appropriate locations and with good design. Growth must occur in a way that increases the area’s mix of uses and allows the daily needs of residents to be met locally, while still preserving neighborhood character. Directing development onto underutilized land around transit stations and along major corridors accomplishes this goal, while also allowing the neighborhoods’ historic cores to retain their character.

The Framework Plan on the following page embodies the land use vision for this study. It utilizes land use categories that are more specific in terms of building height and scale than the official city land use categories in order to serve as a more accurate guide for neighborhood development.

Updates to the city’s official land use plan are needed to support the Framework Plan. These may be found in Part 6: Action Plan.

Land Use Policies

*Encourage a mix of land uses.*

The study area is envisioned as having a fine-grained mix of uses. Central to this are opportunities for diverse building types ranging from single-family houses to mixed-use structures.

People of different incomes and ages must be able to live, work, and play in the study area, with all the necessary supporting services such as schools, parks, and places of worship within a short walk.

*Preserve single-family and neighborhood commercial areas.*

Historic single-family and neighborhood commercial areas should be preserved. The study area has too much vacant or marginal commercial land that must be developed instead.

*Concentrate intense development around transit stations.*

Land uses within a half mile walk of MARTA stations should be denser and more mixed-use than on land further away. This will enhance opportunities to live, work, and shop convenient to transit.

*Ensure appropriate transitions between single-family areas and new, higher intensity development.*

The existing zoning code’s Transitional Height Plane provides a
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transition in height where zoning districts of different intensity are adjacent, but does not apply if a street exists between the two districts. To ensure the best transition, streets should be scaled so that the buildings on both sides are similar in height.

Where higher intensity uses are proposed across a street from existing houses, the higher intensity uses should take the form of a single-family house, townhouse, or two-to-three story building.

Support the conversion of large historic houses into owner-occupied bed and breakfasts.

Atlanta zoning permits up to six unrelated persons to live in a house. This provision has supported small bed and breakfasts in other parts of the city.

Ideal locations include along Sunset Avenue and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard. The latter location is well situated near the Ashby MARTA station and could attract guests without cars.

Land Use Projects

Complete redevelopment projects from the 2004 Vine City Redevelopment Plan that have not been implemented or updated by this study. (O-1)

These important projects include:

- Single-family infill and rehabilitation (projects H1-H8 on 2004 plan)
- Magnolia Terrace redevelopment (project H10 on 2004 plan)
- Historic Westside Village (project E1 on 2004 plan)
- Simpson Street mixed-use (project E2 on 2004 plan)
- Northside Drive Mixed-Use North (project E3 on 2004 plan)
- Northside Drive Mixed-Use South (project E4 on 2004 plan)
- Light Commercial Adaptive Reuse (project E6 on 2004 plan)
- Church Expansions (project P3 on 2004 plan)
- Morris Brown College (project P4 on 2004 plan)
- Flood Recovery Area Open Space (project P6 on 2004 plan)
- Vine City Park (project P7 on 2004 plan)

Redevelop the Magnolia Street at Vine Street retail node into a mix of commercial uses and above-shop housing. (O-2)

See the Magnolia Street Neighborhood Commercial Concept Plan.
Magnolia Street Neighborhood Commercial Concept Plan

The corner of Vine and Magnolia Streets, a former trolley stop, was once a commercial center for Vine City. The concept plan envisions recapturing this role by adding new commercial, mixed-use, and multifamily buildings, and by renovating surrounding single-family houses. It also includes sidewalk and on-street parking upgrades to promote walking and provide guest parking.

Introducing new and renovated housing to this area will provide customers for businesses and increase the range of housing choices in the neighborhood. Proximity to the new Vine City Park also makes housing desirable.

Right: Potential plan of the intersection
Below: A potential mixed-use building
Establish a senior citizen housing village along Desoto Street east of the Washington Park YMCA. (O-3)

Please see the Desoto Street Senior Village Concept Plan below.

Create a transit-oriented development (TOD) around the Vine City MARTA station. (O-4)

Please see the Vine City MARTA TOD Concept Plans on the following pages.

Develop senior citizen housing on Elm Street, just west of the potential greenspace. (O-5)

The location next to the potential greenspace makes the site ideal for older residents. It should be designed so that the buildings face both the greenspace and Elm Street. This will ensure a pedestrian-friendly experience along Elm Street, while also allowing residents to informally supervise the greenspace. Parking should be located mid-block so that it is not visible from the street or the greenspace.

Desoto Street Senior Village Concept Plan

This site, the current location of two apartment complexes, could be rehabilitated or redeveloped into housing targeted toward the aging. Its location near the YMCA, Washington Park, existing transit services, and the future BeltLine makes it ideal for older residents.

The concept plan below shows one option for how the site could be developed with a mix of townhomes, duplexes, and multifamily units. It includes new, pedestrian friendly streets through the site, and small greenspaces throughout. The design strives to reintegrate the site into the Washington Park neighborhood rather than be separated from it.
Vine City MARTA Transit-Oriented Development Concept Plan A

Concept Plan A locates the highest density of development along Northside Drive and immediately adjacent to the rail station to promote convenience and transit ridership.

Existing homes west of Electric Avenue are preserved and complemented by new small scale residential buildings such as townhouses, live/work units, and small apartment buildings. This preserves the historic pattern of small buildings, but also concentrates growth near transit.

A public common is proposed at Magnolia Street and Northside Drive to provide greenspace for existing and new residents and to create a neighborhood focal point. It should be surrounded with shops and restaurants.

South of the station, the long-term vision includes redevelopment of the existing apartments into a higher density mix of uses with new interior streets.

A new plaza is envisioned at the corner of Northside Drive and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. It could be a gateway to the neighborhood and a gathering place.

Above top: A small apartment building
Above bottom: A common near Washington, DC
**Vine City MARTA Transit-Oriented Development Concept Plan B**

Concept Plan B reflects the vision shown in the 2004 Vine City Redevelopment Plan Illustrative diagram.

Like Concept Plan A, it too concentrates the highest density development along Northside Drive and immediately adjacent to the station.

Along Electric Avenue, development transitions down to townhouses to create a more pedestrian-scaled street. The station itself, as in Concept A, benefits from a small retail building and an improved plaza next to the existing parking area.

In this concept, much of the area is left in its current state, except for some low-density infill housing on vacant lots.

New sidewalks and street trees throughout help to beautify the area.

Above top: The 2004 Northside Drive vision
Above bottom: Townhouses
Develop a hotel, conference, and public parking facility at the rear of 569 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. (O-6)

The land behind historic Jordan Hall is today the site of an athletic field, but could potentially be developed into a hotel with conference space and public parking. Its location adjacent to the proposed promenade (see Section 5.6) makes it well situated for such uses.

Construct new commercial and mixed-use buildings on auto-oriented commercial land at Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive. (O-7)

The current automobile-oriented land uses at this historic intersection, including fast food restaurants and gas stations, could one day redevelop into more architecturally compatible mixed-use or commercial buildings.

The block on the southwest corner of this intersection is large enough that development could also include public parking if it were needed in the future. Liner buildings could ring the parking deck to screen it from view.

East of Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard, small mixed-use or commercial buildings could be oriented to the sidewalk, with small parking lots to the rear. Development scale throughout the entire node would be respectful of existing historic homes.

Convert the Wachendorff Estate into a bed and breakfast hotel with meeting space and potentially a small museum. (O-8)

The Wachendorff Estate on Sunset Avenue features some of the oldest buildings in the neighborhood. Its state of disrepair and the high cost of renovation make it unlikely that it will ever become a single-family residence again. However, a bed and breakfast or other low-impact commercial venture may be an economically viable way of preserving this important site.

Amend the Future Land Use Plan map to reflect the plan’s vision and recommendations. (O-9)

Please see Part 6 for details.

Encourage developer-led initiatives to rezone key properties to reflect the plan’s vision and recommendations. (O-10)

Please see Part 6 for details.
5.4 MARKETS & HOUSING

Study recommendations must be implemented in a way that strengthens and sustains local markets. Area neighborhoods should draw on the resources of the region, but must not forget their own residents, businesses, and potential employees. Economic development should build on the talents of local residents and businesses, so that they too benefit from growth. The strengthening and preservation of diverse housing types, and the creation of a supportive climate for small businesses is crucial.

Markets & Housing Policies

Prevent the involuntary displacement of existing neighborhood residents.

Residents who want to remain in the neighborhood must be able to do so. The City of Atlanta, local community development corporations, for-profit developers, churches, and others whose decisions have a direct impact on affordability must strive to ensure that their actions do not jeopardize long-term residents.

Strive for a community that allows residents to age in place.

The study area must provide housing types and amenities for people of all ages. This “womb to tomb” approach allows a person to be born, live, and grow old within the area because of the availability of the variety of housing types that are needed at each life stage.

Encourage senior housing.

New senior housing should be spread throughout the area, within walking distance of shops and services. Locations could include:

- East of the YMCA on Desoto Street
- East of Elm Street, adjacent to the potential greenspace
- On the block east of Elm Street and south of Thurmond Street
- Within the Vine City MARTA Transit-Oriented Development

Please see the Framework Plan for details.

Encourage a mix of housing price points.

Housing should be provided at a variety of price points to attract a diverse range of new residents and allow existing residents access to new housing. This will have the effect in the long term of preserving economic diversity in the study area.
Encourage local businesses to hire locally.

To maximize the benefits of new businesses expected to locate in the study area, those businesses are encouraged to offer jobs to local residents before advertising to other areas. This will help dollars stay in the neighborhoods and benefit residents.

Ensure that public projects hire workers and contractors from within the community.

The significant number of projects proposed by this study will have a large impact on the community. If the City and other public and private entities make an effort to hire contractors and workers from within the community, more of the benefits can be captured locally.

Markets & Housing Projects

Organize area businesses into a business association. (O-11)

Many of the market-related recommendations of this plan require a business organization to bring them to fruition. Such an association is essential if the small businesses in the study area are to thrive and grow.

Establish a business recruitment/retention committee. (O-12)

One of the first tasks of the proposed business association should be to establish a committee focused on identifying resources to help existing business grow and to help recruit new ones. Partnerships with the Atlanta Development Authority should also be explored.

Market Vine City and Washington Park to potential businesses and new residents. (O-13)

Establish a branding program for the neighborhoods’ businesses. (O-14)

Other Atlanta neighborhoods, including the Old Fourth Ward, Westview, and East Atlanta Village have shown the value in creating a “brand” for themselves. The study area has just as much to offer as these places; it only needs to determine how to promote itself.

Market the catalytic redevelopment sites to prospective developers. (O-15)

Many incentives exist to promote growth in the study area, yet redevelopment has been slow. The Atlanta Development Authority should prepare information packets for each site and market them to developers willing to develop according to this plan’s vision.
Develop business incubator space. (O-16)

Business incubators provide low-cost space and support facilities for small, start-up businesses. Nationwide, such facilities have created thousands of jobs and allowed communities to grow from the bottom up. Incubator space would be ideal in the study area because of its proximity to the Atlanta University Center and downtown. Potential locations include Pascal’s Motel and other underutilized buildings along Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive.

Promote awareness of existing small business programs at the Atlanta Development Authority and elsewhere. (O-17)

These include existing “one-stop shops” designed to help start-up businesses prosper.

Coordinate with non-profit entities to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed properties. (O-18)

Work closely with the City of Atlanta Bureau of Housing to utilize Neighborhood Stabilization funds to purchase and rehabilitate foreclosed properties. (O-19)

Consider creating a land bank to facilitate the purchase, rehabilitation, and resale of foreclosed or vacant properties. (O-20)

Promote community gardens as an economic development tool. (O-21)

Agriculture is experiencing a resurrection in America’s cities. Urban neighborhoods with large amounts of vacant land, such as Vine City, can capitalize on this trend by organizing non-profit groups to grow vegetables for sale to local restaurants. This not only creates income for residents—it also improves public safety, encourages physical activity, and instills neighborhood pride.

Identify vacant and/or dilapidated sites suitable for community gardens. (O-22)

In addition to the locations identified on the Framework Plan, vacant lots may be ideal community garden locations until there is a need to develop them.

Organize a farmers market during growing season. (O-23)

In conjunction with community gardens, a local farmers market could be organized to sell produce. Ideal locations include the MARTA stations or in parking lots along major streets.
5.5 URBAN DESIGN & HISTORIC RESOURCES

Study area neighborhoods have an uncommonly high quality of urban form and history. The preservation and promotion of these assets will continue to set the area apart, but it is crucial to ensure that new development and public improvements are in character with and support historic urbanism.

Urban Design & Historic Resources Policies

Preserve, protect, and encourage the rehabilitation of historic buildings in the study area (those over 50 years old).

The 19th and early 20th century buildings of a variety of types, from homes and churches to retail and institutional buildings, should be preserved as reminders of the past and irreplaceable assets.

Allow architectural variety for commercial and mixed-use buildings, but require quality building materials.

A variety of styles are encouraged, but quality materials should be required throughout. Brick, terra cotta, stone, masonry, true stucco, poured-in-place rubbed concrete, and hardiplank are acceptable, but the use of exterior insulation finishing systems (EIFS) is not. Facades should have no more than two primary materials or colors per building. Materials should only change vertically, with visually heavier materials below visually lighter ones.

Utilize local traditional architectural styles, material, and scale in new infill single-family houses

New houses should respect neighborhood architectural traditions and be built to standards that will allow them to avoid rapid deterioration; this will allow them to one day be historic. Brick, terra cotta, stone, masonry, and hardiplank are desirable.

Require good urban design for safety.

Public safety requires an effective combination of a number of factors, but cannot exist where a poor relation between public and private space precludes a feeling of safety. Parks, streets, and other public spaces must be fronted by buildings that engage them with windows, doors, stoops, or porches.

Encourage adaptive reuse of abandoned buildings.

The uniqueness of historic buildings can be an asset to attract residents and businesses into the neighborhood that would not
be interested in new buildings for economic or aesthetic reasons. Reuse of historic buildings also preserves a sense of history and the past.

Support public historic preservation efforts along Sunset Avenue.

The beautiful houses and well-known former residents of Sunset Avenue have created an area of influence that extends far beyond the street. This character should be honored by official historic efforts that will recognize and protect existing houses and ensure that alterations and new construction are compatible.

Urban Design and Historic Resources Projects

Establish a series of historic walking tours. (O-24)

The rich history of the study area’s neighborhoods is not well known beyond their boundaries. Historic walking tours, designated with special pavement markings and new historical markers for sites, homes, churches, and businesses of significance could emphasize that history. Partnership with the proposed Center for Civil and Human Rights or the Atlanta Preservation Center could help draw visitors into the area via the walking tours. Potential routes for the walking tours are shown on the following pages.

Install historic markers at significant sites in the study area. (O-25)

The historic homes, churches, businesses, and sites throughout the two neighborhoods could be better emphasized by the installation of unobtrusive but informative historical markers.
Historic Walking Tours Map

The following historic sites, homes, and churches are shown on the fold-out map at right. The map is not a comprehensive catalog of the historic places in the study area, but highlights major points of interest along significant corridors and near transit stations. This makes them easily accessible to visitors arriving by train.

Historic Sites

1. Washington Park - first recreational park in Atlanta for African-Americans
2. Booker T. Washington High School - first public high school for African-Americans in Georgia
3. Atlanta Inquirer offices - African-American newspaper founded in 1960
4. Bronner Brothers site - African-American owned beauty supply company
5. Frasier’s Cafe site - Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee gathering place
6. Sellers Brothers Funeral Home site
7. Paschal’s Motel & Restaurant site - Civil Rights and Southern Christian Leadership Conference gathering place
8. Alex’s BBQ site - restaurant and gathering place
9. Gaines Hall - oldest building on Morris Brown campus
10. Sunset Park site - African-American amusement park
11. Magnolia Ballroom site - entertainment venue
12. Davis Street School site
13. Historic Georgia Power site

Historic Homes

14. Wachendorff - significant landowner, site of greenhouses
15. Julian Bond - civil rights leader, NAACP chairman
16. King - civil rights leader, Nobel Peace prize winner
17. Candler - Coca-Cola owner
18. Dorothy Bolden home site - civil rights activist
19. Herndon - businessman

Historic Churches

20. Greater Macedonia Baptist Church (former)
21. Simpson Street Church of Christ
22. West Hunter Street Baptist Church (former)
23. Beulah Baptist Church
24. Cosmopolitan AME Church
25. West Mitchell CME Church
26. Central Methodist Church - J. E. Lowery former preacher
27. Mt. Vernon Baptist Church

Historic markers such as this one could identify the sites listed here

Kiosks or other signage could match existing historic markers in the area
**Walking Routes**

- **Purple Route: Washington Park Neighborhood Loop**
  - Begins: Ashby MARTA Station
  - Ends: Ashby MARTA Station
  - Total Walking Time: 30 minutes

- **Pink Route: Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive Historic Area**
  - Begins: Vine City MARTA Station
  - Ends: Ashby MARTA Station
  - Total Walking Time: 30 minutes

- **Green Route: Sunset Avenue Area**
  - Begins: Northside Drive and Boone Boulevard
  - Ends: Ashby MARTA Station
  - Total Walking Time: 30 minutes

---

**Proposed Historic Walking Routes**
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5.6 TRANSPORTATION

Transportation recommendations for the Vine City/Washington Park study area are divided into the following categories: pedestrian and bicycle, vehicular, and public transit.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Recommendations

Sidewalks exist throughout the study area neighborhoods. However, there are some locations where they are missing and others where they are in disrepair. Also, along a number of streets, utility poles are placed in the middle of the sidewalk, making them difficult to navigate. It is not uncommon to see people walking in the street instead of on the sidewalk. Few intersections have Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant crosswalk ramps.

The following recommendations were developed to enhance the pedestrian experience for area residents and make walking safer.

Much bicycle usage in the Atlanta region is for recreational purposes. There are a number of contributing factors that discourage the use of bicycles for commuting and other trips. One of those factors is a lack of adequate facilities, both on-street and off-street.

Bicycle recommendations were developed to achieve two general objectives. The first objective is to provide infrastructure so that study area residents can connect to existing and planned nearby facilities, such as the West Side Trail on Lena Street and the bike lanes on Ivan Allen, Jr. Boulevard. This will allow residents to bike to downtown and midtown and reach points to the west.

The second objective is to complete connectivity to existing facilities, so that visitors can bike into the community to take advantage of the historic and cultural amenities that it has to offer.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Policies

As sidewalks are built, meet current standards, particularly width, and comply with ADA requirements.

Focus bicycle improvements on the Core and Secondary routes identified in the Atlanta Bicycle Network Plan.

Ensure that road improvement projects which identify bicycle enhancements, such as separate bike lanes and signage, are incorporated into the design and are constructed.
Establish regular field investigation of designated bicycle routes to determine that signs and pavement markings are present and operational.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Projects

Advance the BeltLine’s multi-use trail component (T-1).

The multi-use trail will run the length of the BeltLine. It will connect to study area neighborhoods via the West Side Trail on Lena Street, allowing residents and visitors access to BeltLine parks and amenities.

Restripe Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to include bicycle lanes. (T-2)

Near Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard, Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive has one vehicle lane in each direction and on-street parking on both sides. This is appropriate given the pedestrian activity and crosswalks in this area. There is space, however, to introduce bicycle lanes by reducing vehicle lane widths.

Further east, starting at Morris Brown College, there are two vehicle lanes in each direction. There are three lanes in each direction near Northside Drive. Ample pavement in these areas would allow for lane reconfiguration to introduce bicycle lanes, a project consistent with road diet RD-006 from the Connect Atlanta Plan.

Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive pedestrian improvements. (T-3)

Wider sidewalks, new street lights, new street furniture, repaired City of Atlanta bus shelters, and new street trees will enhance the pedestrian experience in areas where they are not already present.

Resurface and restripe Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard to include bicycle lanes. (T-4 and T-5)

The street should be milled and repaved. It should then be restriped to allow two bicycle lanes and two vehicle lanes. Turn lanes are to be provided at intersections according to AASHTO standards. See proposed street section on the following page.

Upgrade pedestrian facilities along Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard. (T-6)

Rebuild broken sidewalks, bring all sidewalks and ramps up to ADA standards, improve crosswalk markings, add pedestrian lighting, and plant new trees where feasible.
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MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. DRIVE

JOSEPH E LOWERY BOULEVARD
Resurface and restripe Joseph E. Boone Boulevard to include bicycle lanes. (T-7 and T-8)

The street should be milled and repaved. It should then be restriped to allow two bicycle lanes, two vehicle lanes, and one center turn lane. Please see proposed street section on the previous page.

Upgrade pedestrian facilities along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard. (T-32)

Rebuild broken sidewalks, bring all sidewalks and ramps up to ADA standards, improve crosswalk markings, add pedestrian lighting, and plant new trees where feasible. Encourage developers to move in the curb with redevelopment to create on-street parking.

Restripe James P. Brawley Drive from Carter Street north to Joseph E. Boone Boulevard to include bicycle lanes. (T-9)

James P. Brawley Drive is a secondary bicycle route in the Connect Atlanta Plan. It runs adjacent to Kennedy Middle School and a park, and could improve bicycle access to these centers plus provide a connection to Joseph E. Boone Boulevard, a core bicycle route.

Construct the Vine City Promenade. (T-10 and T-11)

Please see the Vine City Promenade Concept on page 98.

Convert Rhodes Street to a “complete street” and one-way eastbound operation. (T-12)

Rhodes Street is a narrow, two-way street where parking is allowed. Due to the restrictive width, circulation is impeded and emergency vehicle access could be compromised. The project would reconstruct Rhodes Street as a “complete street” that allows for use by vehicles but is primarily for pedestrians and bicycles.

To preserve sufficient space for on-street parking, it is recommended that Rhodes Street be converted into one-way eastbound from Sunset Street to Walnut Street. To reinforce the narrowing effect, bulb-outs with mountable curbs could be constructed at intersecting streets and a different pavement treatment, as opposed to asphalt, could be installed.

Upgrade Sunset Avenue pedestrian facilities. (T-13)

Bulbouts at intersections and new plantings could help slow traffic and build on the signature historic feel of this premier street. Bioswales could help control stormwater runoff.
The Vine City Promenade would create an important pedestrian and bicycle link between Vine City MARTA Station and the existing West Side multiuse trail near Ashby Station.

Despite having a well-connected street grid, there is no continuous east-west street between Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Northside Drive within the interior of the Vine City neighborhood. Additionally, there is no dedicated walking or cycling link between downtown, the Georgia World Congress Center, and the existing West Side Trail. The 12 to 16-foot wide facility would create this link and provide room for walking, bicycling, rollerblading, baby strollers, and other activities.

From the current end of the West Side Trail on Lena Street, the Promenade would run east along the south side of Carter Street to Griffin Street. From here, a bridge would run north of the MARTA line to the rear of Herndon Stadium at Rhodes Street, where it would become at-grade again. It would then run mid-block from Magnolia Street east to the Vine City Station.

New development would address safety concerns along the bridge by providing direct access to the trail, to increase supervision and safety. The remainder of the trail would be lined with trees and lights, and a proposed garden at Vine Street would green the trail.

Historic information could help make the trail an educational experience for visitors and tourists.
Upgrade Northside Drive pedestrian facilities. (T-31)

Wider sidewalks, new tree plantings, improved pedestrian lighting, and space for outdoor dining should be implemented according to the Northside Drive Corridor Study, and could be funded in part by private developers.

Neighborhood sidewalk construction/repairs Phase I. (T-14)

Priority repairs and construction bridge gaps in the existing sidewalk network, repair extremely degraded sidewalk sections, and focus on areas around schools.

Neighborhood sidewalk construction/repairs Phase II. (T-15)

Further repairs and construction focus on completing the neighborhoods’ sidewalk system and bringing all sidewalks up to current standards.

Install an enhanced pedestrian crossing on Northside Drive. (T-16)

The GWCC and Georgia Dome are regional attractions. With the regular introduction of large numbers of people into the area, very few take advantage of the cultural, historic, and retail opportunities in the Vine City/Washington Park area. There are a number of factors that contribute to this condition.

One factor is that Northside Drive is not easy to cross on foot. One technique for lessening the barrier that Northside Drive presents is to install a signalized intersection to include pedestrian signals and actuation and crosswalk striping at the GWCC Plaza.
Vehicular Facilities Recommendations

The study area’s street network is a typical urban grid. Interior streets tend to be narrow and the majority are posted with a 25 mph speed limit. Classified streets that carry other than neighborhood traffic are Northside Drive, Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard, and Joseph E. Boone Boulevard. Within the neighborhood there are a number of intersections controlled by an all-way stop. This contributes to low vehicle speeds and discourages cut-through traffic.

The vehicular facility recommendations were developed to enhance safety primarily for pedestrians in areas where more pronounced conflicts with vehicles occur and to improve circulation.

Vehicular Facilities Policies

*As redevelopment occurs, require developers to convey right-of-way to the city to allow streets to be widened.*

*As redevelopment occurs, limit the number of curb cuts and encourage joint access as well as access to minor streets.*

*As redevelopment occurs, encourage the provision of new on-street parking. This can be accomplished on narrow streets by moving the curb closer to the buildings.*

*As redevelopment occurs, especially near the Vine City station, support creating new blocks no more than 600 feet in length.*

*Continue to monitor on-street parking operations as redevelopment occurs.*

*Encourage future parking at Morris Brown College.*

Vehicular Facilities Projects

*Reconstruct the intersection of Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard and Mayson Turner Road. (T-17)*

Mayson Turner Road intersects Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard at an angle that makes some turns difficult. In addition, some pedestrian crossings are uncomfortably long. The proposed intersection reconstruction shown on the following page would realign the intersections with Desoto Street and Elijah Street.

These two reconstructed intersections would be approximately 270 feet apart and would operate as interconnected signals, with preemption for potential BeltLine transit vehicles. Each
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intersection would meet current standards regarding pedestrian accommodations with pedestrian signals and actuation, crosswalk striping and signing, and ADA requirements.

A secondary benefit of this project is that new public space is created. On the south leg of Mayson Turner Road, a new pocket park can be implemented. On the north leg, the old road bed can become a transit plaza for potential use by BeltLine transit.

*Improve safety at the intersection of Marie Avenue and Washington Heights Terrace.*  
(T-18)

This could include improved signage, bulbouts to further slow traffic, or pavement markings.

*Abandon Rigdon Place if necessary for redevelopment.*  
(T-19)

The block bounded by Rigdon Place, Electric Avenue, Magnolia Street, and Maple Street is very small. Closing Rigdon Place would create a more efficient redevelopment site.

*Construct GWCC Parking deck.*  
(T-20)

The State of Georgia should fund the long-planned parking deck.

*Construct private parking decks.*  
(T-21)

Please see the Framework Plan for potential sites.

*Construct new streets with private redevelopment.*  
(T-22)

Recommended locations include:

- Rock Street to Sciple Terrace
- Magnolia Park
- Desoto Street Senior Village
- Griggs Street to Rhodes Street
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive at Northside Drive block

*Conduct a signal warrant analysis for Northside Drive intersections.*  
(T-23)

This should occur during future Development of Regional Impact (DRI) traffic analysis. Proposed density makes such review likely.

*Install DRI-required signals along Northside Drive.*  
(T-24)

*Improve capacity at the intersection of Joseph E. Boone and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevards.*  
(T-33)
Transit Facilities Recommendations

The study area is unique in that it contains two MARTA stations, several bus routes, and will one day have the BeltLine along its western boundary. Even with all of these transit options, recommended projects were developed to facilitate the door-to-door experience for transit riders and encourage additional patronage from local residents.

Transit Facilities Projects

Advance the BeltLine’s transit component. (T-34)

Transit is a key part of the BeltLine vision. Connectivity will be provided to the study area where the facility connects with the Ashby MARTA station. At this time, the exact route for this connection has not been determined. One route would run and return along Lena Street. The other would run along Lena Street, then follow Mayson Turner Road. The final location remains to be determined.

Implement east-west bus service along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and Ivan Allen, Jr. Boulevard to Civic Center MARTA Station. (T-25)

Today, those who use MARTA’s north line must walk, bike, or take a bus to the Ashby or Vine City stations, then take the east-west line to Five Points Station. When headways are long (nights and weekends), this can significantly slow a trip. Direct service along Joseph E. Boone Boulevard to the north-south line would provide more convenient service.

Consolidate the number of bus stops to improve on-time performance. (T-26)

Easy bus stop access is a convenience that supports transit use, but too many stops can degrade the service. Reducing the number of bus stops to key locations, typically one-quarter mile apart, and providing shelters at these stops would make schedules more reliable and shorten travel times. This would make the use of transit more competitive with automobile travel.

Evaluate the need for future parking facilities as a part of BeltLine planning efforts. (T-35)

Potential users of the BeltLine walking and biking path, as well as potential BeltLine transit riders, might be served by the provision of public parking within the study area.
Establish a taxi stand at the Publix in Historic Westside Village. (T-27)

A number of elderly citizens who no longer drive live in the study area. Taxis should be allowed to pick them up at the entrance to the Publix grocery store, rather than forcing them to walk the length of the parking lot to reach Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive.

Install new bus shelters. (T-28)

Four locations are recommended for new MARTA bus shelters to accommodate the high numbers of bus patrons at those stops and to increase convenience at major stops:

- Southwest corner of Joseph E. Boone and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevards, near shopping
- Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and James P. Brawley Drive, near the Neighborhood Senior Center and Kennedy Middle School and park
- Northside Drive at Thurmond Street, adjacent to Bethune Elementary School
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive at James P. Brawley Drive, convenient to Publix supermarket and shopping

Repair Ashby MARTA Station. (T-29)

Improvements should focus on addressing water intrusion and repair of the station plaza.

Pursue LCI Supplemental Study funds. (T-30)

This study should examine the impacts of transit on housing affordability. It should define mechanisms to promote affordable housing near transit, including reduced car ownership rates. Attention should also be given to location efficient mortgages, and the impacts of the current housing crisis on station area housing.
5.7 ENVIRONMENT & OPEN SPACE

As an area that urbanized in the 19th and 20th centuries, many of the initial environmental impacts of development have passed, but ecological concerns and open space are still important today. A healthy natural environment will not only benefit the region but will allow places for neighborhood residents and children to gather and enjoy nature.

Environment & Open Space Policies

*Improve stormwater facilities in the area of the GWCC to better accommodate runoff.*

The significant amount of roof area and impervious paving on the GWCC campus creates a large quantity of stormwater runoff that could be more effectively accommodated on site rather than allowing it to fill sewers and storm drains.

*Encourage parking lots along Northside Drive to redevelop in ways that reduce stormwater runoff.*

The western side of Northside Drive now consists mostly of parking lots. As these lots are repaved or redeveloped, options such as garden roofs, cisterns, bioretention, and pervious pavement should be considered to improve the quality and decrease the quantity of runoff.

*Encourage the redesign of existing parking lots to maximize water infiltration.*

This could include regrading, pervious paving materials, bioretention, or an aggregate base to provide interim storage capacity while water is infiltrating.

*Increase code enforcement to address issues, particularly on vacant properties.*

Litter and potentially hazardous dumping occurs in several places within the study area. Diligent code enforcement can help stop these problems before they become a serious threat.

*Partner with non-profit organizations and city government to organize community clean-up days.*

Clean-ups improve the natural environment and neighborhood perceptions, raise property values, and connect neighbors.
Encourage the creation of privately funded pocket parks as land redevelops.

Privately owned and maintained pocket parks, plazas, and the like will green the area and provide accessible public space for every neighborhood resident.

Encourage a neighborhood square on Magnolia Street at Northside Drive.

Private redevelopment of this site should include open space. One possibility is shown on the Framework Plan, but other options should be explored to create a publicly accessible open space along Northside Drive that emphasizes Magnolia Street.

Include trash receptacles in sidewalk improvement projects.

Trash receptacles can decrease litter, which can beautify the neighborhood, avoid harming wildlife, and increase the quality of stormwater runoff.

Environment & Open Space Projects

Plant trees throughout the study area. (O-26)

Trees can help beautify the area, increase property values in the long run, decrease the urban heat island effect, improve air quality, capture carbon from the atmosphere, and make streets more pleasant and inviting.

Expand Vine City Park north onto adjacent properties. (O-27)

The future expansion of the recently completed Vine City Park will further expand an important community amenity.

Create a plaza and gateway at the northwest corner of Northside Drive and Martin Luther King Jr. Drive. (O-28)

As the corner property and abutting apartment complex redevelop, space should be set aside to serve as a gateway into the area. This will help brand the study area as distinct and provide public space.

Establish community gardens on vacant lots and at the locations shown on the Framework Plan. (O-29)

Community gardens can provide healthy vegetables for community residents, beautify park space, and create opportunities for socializing among neighbors.
Improve the greenspace just south of Joseph E. Boone Boulevard on the site of the 2002 flood. (O-30)

This potential greenspace should be improved and maintained in cooperation with the Department of Watershed Management. It should include a demonstration stormwater management project, community garden, and passive open space.

Construct a playground in Charles Harper Park. (O-31)

The playground could be an amenity for residents. It could also increase users in the park to help discourage less desirable activity.

Restore the statue of Charles Harper. (O-32)

Recent vandalism will require restoration work, which should include measures to discourage future defacement of the memorial.

Erect a memorial to Booker T. Washington in Washington Park. (O-33)

The contributions of Booker T. Washington to American culture could be memorialized in the park that already bears his name. A memorial, historical exhibit, or art project could beautify the park and educate the public about Mr. Washington’s legacy.

Acquire land for public use as the Vine City Promenade and adjacent community garden. (O-34)

The construction of the section of the Promenade over the MARTA tunnel just east of Vine Street would require the acquisition of a small plot of land. A portion of it could be used as a community garden.
5.8 INFRASTRUCTURE & FACILITIES

Much important infrastructure and many facilities are already in place in the Vine City, Washington Park, Downtown, and Ashview Heights neighborhoods. The goal of the policies and projects below is to improve on what exists, increase the degree to which infrastructure and facilities serve the neighborhoods, and provide for the next generation.

Infrastructure & Facilities Policies

*Encourage developers to bury utilities with redevelopment.*

Unsightly utility wires can make streets less desirable places to live and do business. When redevelopment occurs, utilities should be buried or relocated behind buildings where feasible, as currently recommended by the zoning ordinance.

*Support the efforts of the Neighborhood Union Health Center.*

*Build on and expand existing youth mentoring programs.*

*Expand police presence in the area, through possible increased use of the mini precinct building or potential new facility.*

*Ensure that space is provided for a new post office within the neighborhood as the site of the existing post office develops.*

Infrastructure & Facilities Projects

*Install informational kiosks near the Vine City and Ashby MARTA stations.* (O-35)

These should include bulletin board space for residents and businesses to post information, such as upcoming events, job openings, and public service announcements.

*Install retail kiosks or retail space at the Vine City and Ashby MARTA stations.* (O-36)

These modular or permanent facilities should be privately run, staffed businesses selling convenience goods. They could include newsstands, sundry shops, to-go foods, and similar uses.

*Increase lighting, organized activities, and police patrols at existing parks.* (O-37)

Additional lighting, activity, and supervision can help improve safety at public parks.
Increase police presence to reduce crime. (O-38)

Establish a Neighborhood Watch program. (O-39)

Coordinating the efforts of and communication among neighborhood residents could help discourage crime and decrease negative perceptions by potential property owners.

Provide youth programming at Washington Park and/or J.F. Kennedy Park. (O-40)

Develop a central community center as a gathering space and potential museum. (O-41)

Improve lighting on neighborhood streets. (O-42)

As density increases in the future, study the feasibility of and potential need for a new fire station in the area. (O-43)

Rehabilitate aging water and sewer infrastructure where necessary. (O-44)

Use green methods for stormwater infiltration where possible.
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6.1 ACTION PLAN

This Action Plan outlines the next steps after the Vine City/Washington Park LCI is adopted by Atlanta City Council. The Action Matrix, provided below, lists all projects along with timelines, the parties responsible for implementation, and cost estimates. The matrix is intended to serve as a blueprint for achieving the community’s vision for the future.

In order to ensure implementation, continued diligence will be required on the part of neighborhood residents, local businesses, relevant NPUs, city government, and other organizations. These groups must monitor private development and public improvements in the study area to ensure that they are consistent with the community vision embodied in the LCI. Specifically, stakeholders must cooperate with city government and private developers to ensure that land use and zoning changes that support the vision are implemented satisfactorily.

Most recommendations are provided on an aggressive five year timeline, although some clearly extend beyond this time period as funding becomes available. Projects in the near future represent those addressing areas with the most critical need for public improvement or those where public investment can spur private investment. Longer-term projects are less urgent, but equally key to the ultimate success of this study.

Through LCI studies the ARC has committed to making funding available for the implementation of plan elements related to transportation and to pre-qualify a limited number of transportation projects for funding. Their expressed desire is for public infrastructure improvements to spur private investment in existing activity centers. Transportation projects may also be funded through a variety of other sources administered through the ARC. The City of Atlanta should work with ARC staff to ensure that projects requiring transportation funds are included in future Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), which are revised every five years. Most transportation funds administered by the ARC will require a 20 percent local match.

Sources for the local match funds could include:

- **Westside Tax Allocation District (TAD):** Bond funds can be used to pay for eligible public and private improvements within the district. The Westside TAD includes portion of the study area north of Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and east of Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard.

- **BeltLine Tax Allocation District (TAD):** Bond funds can
be used to fund transportation and park improvements in the BeltLine greenway that forms the western boundary of the study area, and in Washington Park.

- **Development Impact Fees**: As new development occurs citywide, impact fees are generated to fund transportation, parks, and public safety improvements. These could be used to leverage federal funds in the study area.
- **Private donations**: Local matches could be obtained by soliciting area property owners, businesses, residents, and institutions. Private funds may also be used to fund specific "special interest" projects. For example, the PATH Foundation funds multi-use greenway trails, while the Trust for Public Land and the Blank Foundation sometimes fund park projects.

Without a detailed analysis that is beyond the scope of this study, the ideal source for local match funds cannot be determined. However, all available options should be carefully explored.

**Steps Toward Implementation**

This LCI contains an aggressive but achievable plan for growth in the Vine City/Washington Park study area. For the vision to become a reality there must be both short and long-term commitments to its principles. The following steps are intended to guide the short and long-term implementation processes.

**Short Term**

Short term implementation should strive to remove regulatory barriers to the vision contained herein.
Legislative approval of this plan should be accompanied by updates to the official Future Land Use maps as outlined below. After approval by Atlanta City Council, the plan is officially adopted into the City of Atlanta Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP).

Consistent with established practices, other short-term implementation steps are as follows:

- The City of Atlanta pursues funding from the ARC to implement the supplemental study shown in the Action Matrix.
- Public projects are incorporated into the CDP as a part of the Short-Term Work Program, which is updated yearly, including status reports.
- Short term public projects with allocated funds will be identified in the official Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which has high visibility and yearly status reports.
- Projects within specific city council districts are reviewed at least once annually by council members for funding and priority-setting.
- Each relevant NPU is provided a copy of this document, including the Action Matrix. NPUs provide ongoing accountability and review, and can request project status as needed from the Bureau of Planning and City Council members.
- The preliminary zoning recommendations, provided below and reviewed by the community, are to be implemented by developers and with NPU approval.

**Long Term**

The realization of the Vine City/Washington Park LCI vision will also require a long-term commitment. The plan’s aggressive long-term vision cannot be achieved overnight, and if it is not consulted and reviewed regularly, it risks becoming obsolete.

As the City of Atlanta moves forward with implementing the vision of this study, it is critical that the following be kept in mind:

- **The Vision:** Of all of the components of this study, the vision should represent its most lasting legacy. The ideas contained in Part 4: Visioning represent the results of an inclusive public involvement process. It is unlikely that the general vision and goals resulting from this process will change significantly, even though the steps to achieving them may.
- **Flexibility:** While the vision is unlikely to change in the near
future, it is critical that the community recognize that the ways in which the vision is achieved can and will change. The future addition or subtraction of policies or projects should not be viewed as a compromise of the study, but rather its natural evolution in response to new conditions. Many of the assumptions used to guide this process, including the economic climate, land costs, transportation costs, transportation funding programs, and development trends, are never fixed. The City of Atlanta must be prepared to respond to changes in order to ensure a relevant plan.

- **Redevelopment Guide:** One of the greatest long-term values of this document, in addition to its role in procuring transportation funding, is that it lays out a detailed land use framework. All future development proposals should be reviewed for compatibility with the framework.

By being mindful of these three concepts, the Vine City/Washington Park LCI Study can guide positive change in and around the area for years to come.

**Transportation Project Map**

The map below shows all proposed transportation projects that have a specific location within the Vine City/Washington Park study area. Project numbers refer to the Action Matrix on the following pages. Some projects without a specific geographic location, such as neighborhood-wide sidewalk repairs, are not shown on this map.

Map showing location of proposed transportation improvement projects. Project numbers refer to the Action Matrix below.
### Five Year Implementation Plan

**Vine City/Washington Park LCI: Transportation Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Previous Plans</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Engineering Year</th>
<th>Engineering Costs</th>
<th>ROW Year</th>
<th>ROW Costs</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Local Source &amp; Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>BellLine multi-use trail</td>
<td>BellLine</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>City, TE, City</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Drive restriping for bicycle areas</td>
<td>CTP, MLK Study</td>
<td>Road Diet</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$53,160</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$602,000</td>
<td>$665,160</td>
<td>City, LCI, City</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$120,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard milling and repaving</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$8,460</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>City, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-4</td>
<td>Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard restriping for bicycle areas</td>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>Road Diet</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>City, TE, City</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>Joseph E. Boone Boulevard sidewalk improvements</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Resurfacing</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$8,460</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>City, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-6</td>
<td>Joseph E. Boone Boulevard restriping for bicycle areas</td>
<td>Simpson Rd. Study, CTP</td>
<td>Road Diet</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>City, TE, City</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-7</td>
<td>Joseph P. Brewley Drive bicycle lanes</td>
<td>VCRP</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>City, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-8</td>
<td>Vine City Promenade Phase I</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>City, LCI, TE, Private</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-9</td>
<td>Vine City Promenade Phase II</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$2,165,000</td>
<td>City, LCI, TE, Private</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$665,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-10</td>
<td>Rhodes Street &quot;complete street&quot; conversion</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Shared Road</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>City, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-11</td>
<td>Sunset Avenue pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>VCRP</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$128,800</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
<td>$1,388,000</td>
<td>City, TE, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$396,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-12</td>
<td>Neighborhood sidewalk repair/upgrade: Phase I</td>
<td>VCRP</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$8,694</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$72,450</td>
<td>$81,144</td>
<td>City, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$23,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-13</td>
<td>Neighborhood sidewalk repair/upgrade: Phase II</td>
<td>VCRP</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$82,802</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$523,350</td>
<td>$586,152</td>
<td>City, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$187,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-14</td>
<td>Northside Drive pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>City, GDOT, Safety</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-15</td>
<td>Mayson Turner Road at Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard intersection improvements</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$604,000</td>
<td>City, LCI, GDOT, City</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-16</td>
<td>Ridge Place abandonment (if necessary for redevelopement)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>City, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-17</td>
<td>Georgia World Congress Center Parking Deck</td>
<td>GWCC Plan</td>
<td>Parking Deck</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$26,500,000</td>
<td>$28,000,000</td>
<td>GWCC State</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-18</td>
<td>Private parking lots on Framework Plan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Parking Deck</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-19</td>
<td>Privately-built new streets with sidewalk widening</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>New Street</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-20</td>
<td>Northside Drive intersection signal warrant study</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-21</td>
<td>Northside Drive intersection signals</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Private, General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-22</td>
<td>Bus service to north line along JE Boone Blvd</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Admin Time</td>
<td>Admin Time</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-23</td>
<td>Consolidated bus stop</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-24</td>
<td>Taxi stand at Publix in Historic Westside Village</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-25</td>
<td>New bus shelters (4 locations)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-26</td>
<td>Repairs/Upgrades to Ashby Station</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>MARTA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-27</td>
<td>Supplemental study: transit and housing</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>City, ARC, LCI</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** $2,571,816 $275,000 $37,237,216 $3,166,596 $3,166,596

**Engineering Costs:**

- **Total:** $2,571,816
- **Vehicular:** $275,000
- **Construction Costs:** $37,237,216
- **Total Project Costs:** $3,166,596
- **Responsible Party:**
  - General Fund, Impact Fees
  - MARTA
  - City
  - ARC, LCI
  - Private

**Funding Source:**

- General Fund, Impact Fees
- MARTA
- City
- ARC
- LCI
- Private

**Local Source & Match Amount:**

- General Fund, Impact Fees
- MARTA
- City
- ARC
- LCI
- Private

**Note:**

- See Beltline Urban Redevelopment Plan
- See O-34
- See Beltline Urban Redevelopment Plan
- Totals reflect combined local match amounts for the projects.
### Pedestrian & Bicycle

- **T-31** Pedestrian upgrades to Northside Drive
  - Previous Plans: Various
  - Type of Improvement: Pedestrian
  - Engineering: 2014
  - Costs: $148,800
  - ROW: n/a
  - Construction: 2015
  - Costs: $1,291,310
  - Responsible Party: City
  - Funding Source: General Fund, Impact Fees
  - Total: $1,430,110

- **T-32** J.E. Boone Blvd major pedestrian improvements (Northside to Lowery)
  - Previous Plans: None
  - Type of Improvement: Pedestrian
  - Engineering: 2015
  - Costs: $247,500
  - ROW: n/a
  - Construction: 2015
  - Costs: $1,650,000
  - Responsible Party: City
  - Funding Source: General Fund, Impact Fees
  - Total: $1,897,500

- **T-33** JE Lowery Blvd at JE Boone Blvd
  - Previous Plans: Various
  - Type of Improvement: Intersection
  - Engineering: 2013
  - Costs: $101,250
  - ROW: 2014
  - Costs: $57,332
  - Construction: 2015
  - Costs: $675,000
  - Responsible Party: City
  - Funding Source: Westside TAD, BeltLine TAD
  - Total: $834,000

- **T-34** BeltLine transit component
  - Previous Plans: BeltLine
  - Type of Improvement: Transit
  - Engineering: n/a
  - Costs: $0
  - ROW: n/a
  - Construction: TBD
  - Costs: $0
  - Responsible Party: ADA
  - Funding Source: ADA
  - Total: n/a

**TOTALS:**
- Pedestrian & Bicycle: $497,550
- Transit: $57,332
- Total: $5,655,000
- Total Costs: $4,120,300
- Responsible Party: City
- Funding Source: General Fund, Impact Fees
- Total: $1,857,800

### IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

#### Vist City/Washington Park LCI: Existing Study Area Currently Planned Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>City ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Base Unit</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP-1</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>James P. Brawley Drive sidewalks, street lights, street trees, and bike lanes</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-2</td>
<td>PLN-2005-MLK</td>
<td>MLK Jr. Dr. and James P. Brawley Dr. pedestrian crossing improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>QOL, Impact Fees, City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-3</td>
<td>PLN-2005-MLK</td>
<td>MLK Jr. Dr. from J.E. Lowery Blvd. to Northside Dr. sidewalk improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>QOL, Impact Fees, City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-4</td>
<td>PLN-2005-MLK</td>
<td>MLK streetscape improvements from J.E. Lowery Blvd to Northside Dr.</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>QOL, Impact Fees, City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-5</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Drive streetscape/median improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Vehicular</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>$1,160,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-6</td>
<td>PLN-2006-SRC</td>
<td>Joseph E. Boone Boulevard lane reconfiguration, curbs/gutter upgraded from Northside Drive to Joseph E. Lowery Blvd.</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-7</td>
<td>PLN-2006-ENG</td>
<td>Joseph E. Boone Boulevard lane reconfiguration, curbs/gutter upgrade from Northside Drive to Joseph E. Lowery Blvd.</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td>$86,000</td>
<td>Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-8</td>
<td>PLN-2006-ENG</td>
<td>Joseph E. Boone Boulevard and Joseph E. Lowery Boulevard intersection reconfiguration</td>
<td>Vehicular, Bike, and Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td>$833,000</td>
<td>Westside TAD, BeltLine TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-9</td>
<td>PLN-2006-SRC</td>
<td>Joseph E. Boone Boulevard sidewalk widening/utility pole relocation</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TE, QOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-10</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Vine City - Northside Dr. streetscape improvements and median</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-11</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Walnut Street streetscape improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-12</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Carter Street PATH improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-13</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Sunset Avenue street lights and landscaping</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-14</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Magnolia Street streetscape improvements and bike lanes</td>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-15</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Crosswalks at MARTA &amp; Northside Dr. Magnolia &amp; Vine, Lowery &amp; Simpson, Simpson &amp; MLK, Northside Dr. &amp; MLK</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-16</td>
<td>PLN-2006-ENG</td>
<td>English Avenue/Vine City local traffic operations evaluation</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>QOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-17</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Vine City sidewalk repair/construction</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>$1,762,500</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-18</td>
<td>PLN-2004-VIN</td>
<td>Vine City street improvements</td>
<td>Vehicular</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>$890,000</td>
<td>not determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** $13,068,500

**Notes:**
- TAD: Tax allocation district
- TE: Federal transportation enhancement funds
- QOL: Quality of life bonds

---

**LOCAL SOURCE & MATCH AMOUNT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Previous Plans</th>
<th>Type of Improvement</th>
<th>Engineering Year</th>
<th>Engineering Costs</th>
<th>ROW Year</th>
<th>ROW Costs</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Construction Costs</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Local Source &amp; Match Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T-31</td>
<td>Pedestrian upgrades to Northside Drive</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$148,800</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,240,000</td>
<td>$1,388,800</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees, QOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-32</td>
<td>J.E. Boone Blvd major pedestrian improvements (Northside to Lowery)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$247,500</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,850,000</td>
<td>$1,897,500</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees, QOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-33</td>
<td>JE Lowery Blvd at JE Boone Blvd</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Intersection Capacity</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$101,250</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$57,332</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$834,000</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Westside TAD, BeltLine TAD</td>
<td>General Fund, Impact Fees, QOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-34</td>
<td>BeltLine transit component</td>
<td>BeltLine</td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-35</td>
<td>Evaluate need for future BeltLine parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>TAD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Staff Time</td>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>ADA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**
- Pedestrian & Bicycle: $497,550
- Transit: $57,332
- Total: $3,565,000
- Total Costs: $4,120,300
- Responsible Party: City
- Funding Source: General Fund, Impact Fees
- Total: $1,857,800
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## IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

### Vine City/Washington Park LCI: Other Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1</td>
<td>Projects from 2004 Redevelopment Plan not included elsewhere &amp; not implemented</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>see 2004 Vine City Redevelopment Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>Magnolia/Vine mixed use node</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>VCHHM, private developer</td>
<td>Private, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>Desoto Street Senior Village</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Private developer</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4</td>
<td>Vine City Station transit-oriented development</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Private developer, MARTA</td>
<td>Private, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5</td>
<td>Elm Street senior housing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>TPCDC, private developer</td>
<td>Private, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-6</td>
<td>Hotel, conference, and parking facility behind Jordan Hall</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Private developer</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-7</td>
<td>New mix used node at southwest corner of MLK and Joseph E. Lowery Blvd.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Private developer</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-8</td>
<td>Wachendorff Estate conversion to bed &amp; breakfast and meeting space</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-9</td>
<td>Future Land Use Plan amendments</td>
<td>Admin. Time</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-10</td>
<td>Zoning amendments</td>
<td>Admin. Time</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>Private/City</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Markets & Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-11</td>
<td>Organize local business association</td>
<td>Admin. Time</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City, local businesses</td>
<td>ADA, private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-12</td>
<td>Establish business recruitment/retention committee</td>
<td>Admin. Time</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City, local businesses</td>
<td>ADA, private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-13</td>
<td>Market the area to potential businesses and residents</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-14</td>
<td>Establish a branding program for area businesses</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-15</td>
<td>Market catalytic development sites to prospective developers</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Private, ADA</td>
<td>Private, ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-16</td>
<td>Develop business incubator space</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-17</td>
<td>Promote awareness of existing small business programs</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>City, ADA</td>
<td>City, ADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-18</td>
<td>Coordinate with non-profit entities to acquire and rehab foreclosed properties</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Non-profit organizations</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-19</td>
<td>Use neighborhood stabilization funds to acquire/rehab foreclosed properties</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-20</td>
<td>Consider establishing a land bank</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Non-profit organizations</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-21</td>
<td>Promote community gardens as an economic development tool</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-22</td>
<td>Identify vacant properties for reuse as community gardens</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-23</td>
<td>Organize a farmers market during growing season</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Implementation Plan

#### Vine City/Washington Park LCI: Other Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Urban Design &amp; Historic Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-24</td>
<td>Establish a series of historic walking tours</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City, CCHR</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-25</td>
<td>Install historic markers at significant sites</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Environment &amp; Open Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-26</td>
<td>Neighborhood tree plantings</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City, Trees Atlanta</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-27</td>
<td>Vine City Park northward expansion</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-28</td>
<td>Gateway and public plaza at Northside Drive and MLK Drive</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-29</td>
<td>Establish community gardens</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Private, City</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-30</td>
<td>Improve potential greenspace south of Boone Boulevard</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-31</td>
<td>New playground and community garden in Charles Harper Park</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-32</td>
<td>Restore statue of Charles Harper</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-33</td>
<td>Erect memorial to Booker T. Washington in Washington Park</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-34</td>
<td>Acquire land for Promenade and community gardens</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
<td>City, Westside TAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure &amp; Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-35</td>
<td>Informational kiosks near Vine City and Ashby stations</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City, Private, MARTA</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-36</td>
<td>Retail kiosks at Vine City and Ashby stations</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>City, Private, MARTA</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-37</td>
<td>Increase lighting, organized activities, and police patrols at existing parks</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>City, Private, Police Department</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-38</td>
<td>Increase police presence to reduce crime</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>City, Police Department</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-39</td>
<td>Establish a neighborhood watch program</td>
<td>Admin. Time</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>City, Private, Police Department</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-40</td>
<td>Provide youth programming at Washington Park and/or Kennedy Park</td>
<td>Admin. Time</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>City, Private</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-41</td>
<td>Construct central community center/museum</td>
<td>see 2004 Vine City Redevelopment Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-42</td>
<td>Improve lighting on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-43</td>
<td>Study need for future fire department facility</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-44</td>
<td>Rehabilitate water and sewer infrastructure where necessary</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
- All cost estimates are in 2009 dollars
- ADA: Atlanta Development Authority
- CCHR: Center for Civil and Human Rights
- MARTA: Metropolitan Atlanta Regional Transit Authority
- TAD: Tax Allocation District
- TPCDC: Tyler Place Community Development Corporation
- VCHHM: Vine City Health & Housing Ministry

---

**NOTES**

---

122
Cost Assumptions

As with any macro-level planning process, it is impossible to assign exact costs to future projects. However, it is possible to produce cost estimates based on standard unit cost assumptions. The following unit cost assumptions are used in the Action Matrices. Where project costs have already been estimated by another study, the other study’s costs are used. All costs are in 2009 dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit of Measurement</th>
<th>Cost per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle lane markings</td>
<td>linear foot</td>
<td>$4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulbouts at intersections</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried utilities</td>
<td>linear foot</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community garden</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk (thermoplastic)</td>
<td>segment</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs (concrete)</td>
<td>linear foot</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical marker</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational kiosk</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>square foot</td>
<td>$2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping strip</td>
<td>square foot</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median construction</td>
<td>square foot</td>
<td>$7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiuse trail (12 feet wide, concrete)</td>
<td>linear foot</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New street (36 feet wide)</td>
<td>linear foot</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park improvements (major)</td>
<td>per acre</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park improvements (minor)</td>
<td>per acre</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian light</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian promenade bridge</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared street markings</td>
<td>linear foot</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks (new, concrete)</td>
<td>linear foot</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street trees (3.5 inch caliper)</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street trees (crape myrtle)</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 LAND USE AND ZONING UPDATES

Significant improvements to the future land use and zoning designations for the Vine City/Washington Park study area were made in conjunction with the Vine City Redevelopment Plan of 2004. Those updates will continue to serve the community well and were the basis for the framework plan for this current study.

The changes outlined below will allow study area neighborhoods to more fully achieve their vision and will promote a high-quality, pedestrian friendly, mixed use environment that will serve the neighborhood and make best use of public infrastructure such as transit.

The zoning changes shown on the following page are consistent with the Framework Plan, and are intended to guide the private sector toward achieving the plan’s vision rather than being immediately enacted by city government. They balance the community’s desires, market opportunities, and rights of land owners. They are intended to maintain property values, while expanding support for better design.

Where increases in density are recommended, potentially harmful effects on nearby properties are reduced by significant investment in public infrastructure, such as wider streets, better sidewalks, and better access to public transit. These investments will enhance these areas by improving traffic flow, access, aesthetics, and walkability.

Public and private investments can ultimately enhance property values by raising the bar for new development and protecting existing neighborhood residential fabric. They can also help the Vine City/Washington Park area achieve a more competitive position among Atlanta’s inner neighborhoods.

15 Year Future Land Use Plan Amendments

A number of updates to the city’s official land use maps are necessary to fully achieve the vision of the plan. They are shown on the foldout map below. Generally, they reflect a move toward a neighborhood-scaled mix of uses and more dense residential development in areas approved by the neighborhood.

Zoning Amendments

The zoning changes provided in the table on the following page more specifically embody the intent of the land use amendments shown on the map below. They are intended to be developer-initiated at the appropriate time.

Affordable Housing

Affordable or workforce housing is critical to the diverse, inclusive atmosphere envisioned for the study area. However, because of land costs and the nature of development, the private sector has often failed to meet the demand for affordable housing. Given market conditions, imposing mandatory affordable housing requirements will only drive developers to other areas where such requirements do not exist. Fortunately, the Westside and BeltLine TADs can support workforce housing in parts of the study area.

It is an expressed recommendation of this study that a minimum of 20 percent of new housing units within the TAD meet the city’s criteria for affordability. However, this 20 percent need not occur in each project
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or within a given geographic area. Citywide, many local non-profits have shown their expertise in providing quality affordable housing, while for-profit developers are often incapable of doing the same. Therefore, it may be more appropriate for individual projects to have higher or lower percentages, provided the 20 percent is maintained for new multifamily and mixed-use developments overall.

As the city implements zoning changes, the BeltLine TAD, and the MLK Jr. Drive TAD should consider allowing affordable housing requirements to be transferred. By doing so, those builders capable of taking advantage of federal tax credits for workforce housing can do so, while those builders who would otherwise have too few units or too little experience, could purchase “credits” from them.

Sustainable Parking Standards

Excess off-street parking is one of the greatest challenges to affordable urbanism. To reduce the supply of parking it is recommended that the City of Atlanta enact unbundled residential parking requirements around the study area’s two MARTA stations.

Under such a program, the inhabitants of a building are required to contract separately for parking spaces, rather than having them included in rent by default. Those who do not want a space are not required to contract for one. The result is a decrease in subsidies for car ownership, and lower housing costs for individuals and families who do not own a vehicle.
## Proposed Changes to 15-Year Land Use Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number on Map</th>
<th>Current Designation</th>
<th>Proposed Designation</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Medium-density residential</td>
<td>Allow for senior housing village, property already medium-density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Low-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Mixed use most appropriate near transit station, already a mix of uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low-density commercial</td>
<td>Low-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Low-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium-density residential and Single-family residential</td>
<td>Low-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>Surrounding property already designated mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>Open space</td>
<td>City-owned land designated for potential greenspace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Single-family residential and Medium-density residential</td>
<td>Low-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Community-supported increase in density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Medium-density residential</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Low-density commercial</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Office-institution</td>
<td>Low-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Office-institution</td>
<td>Medium-density residential</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Medium-density residential</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Low-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>High-density commercial</td>
<td>Medium-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Low-density commercial</td>
<td>Low-density residential</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Low-density residential</td>
<td>Medium-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Low-density commercial</td>
<td>Medium-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Single-family residential</td>
<td>Medium-density mixed-use</td>
<td>Bring plan into conformity with existing zoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed Changes to 15-Year Land Use Plan**

**Note:** Changes in black text are necessary for implementation of the LCI study. Changes in blue text are necessary to bring the existing land use plan into conformance with the existing zoning.

**Legend**
- Area of Land Use Change
- Study Area Boundary
- Building

1. From: Single-Family Residential To: Medium-Density Residential
2. From: Single-Family Residential To: Low-Density Mixed Use
3. From: Low-Density Commercial To: Medium-Density Mixed Use
4. From: Single-Family Residential To: Low-Density Mixed Use
5. From: Medium-Density Residential and Single-Family Residential To: Low-Density Mixed Use
6. From: Single-Family Residential To: Mixed Use
7. From: Mixed Use To: Open Space
8. From: Single-Family Residential and Medium-Density Residential To: Low-Density Mixed Use
9. From: Single-Family Residential To: Medium-Density Residential
10. From: Low-Density Commercial To: Single-Family Residential
11. From: Office-Institution To: Medium-Density Residential
12. From: Office-Institution To: Medium-Density Residential
13. From: Single-Family Residential To: Medium-Density Residential
14. From: Single-Family Residential To: Low-Density Mixed Use
15. From: High-Density Commercial To: Medium-Density Mixed Use
16. From: Low-Density Commercial To: Low-Density Residential
17. From: Low-Density Residential To: Medium-Density Mixed Use
18. From: Low-Density Commercial To: Medium-Density Mixed Use
19. From: Single-Family Residential To: Medium-Density Mixed Use
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Deviations from Framework Plan

Although the land use recommendations herein have attempted to take economics into consideration, there may be cases where a developer requests rezoning to a density, height, or use that is different from what is recommended. In these cases the applications should only be approved when they express exceptional commitment to the policies of this study.

Items that should be considered when granting deviations could include, but not be limited to:

- **Job creation** which considers both the number of new jobs and any commitments to hire locally.
- **Affordable housing** above the recommended 20 percent neighborhood-wide standard.
- Housing that serves a **range of age groups**, including the elderly.
- Housing in which at least **five percent of units are three bedrooms** or larger.
- **Publicly accessible open space**, provided such space exceeds the zoning-required public open space or usable open space.
- **Preservation of historic buildings** on a site.
- **Brick or stone** on all portions of building facades.
- **Unbundled residential parking**, in which inhabitants of a residential building are required to contract separately for parking spaces, and in which those who do not want a space are not required to contract for one.
- **LEED Silver** or better certification in building construction.
- **Architectural excellence**, which is an ambiguous and variable term, but should mean that the building design meets or exceeds the aesthetic standards of the approving neighborhoods.
- **Green roofs** on buildings which minimize stormwater or provide vegetable gardens.
- **Public parking decks or underground parking** that are intended to minimize the negative impacts of parking on the surrounding community.
- **Neighborhood goods and services** such as pharmacies, theaters, retail, and business services.

The provision or any of all of these or other elements should not guarantee rezoning unless agreed to by the affected neighborhoods and NPUs M, L, K, and/or T.
6.3 POPULATION & EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS

As established in Section 3.2: Demographic & Socioeconomic Profile, a modest amount of demand for retail, residential, and office space exists within the study area.

Current five-year demand for new housing units totals 127 units and for retail totals 81,500 square feet; longer term, the figures are higher. Yet, as with any planning study, the amount of theoretical demand does not necessarily indicate the amount of new development that will be built in the study area. The actual amount of new development built will be that portion of demand that is achievable within the land use recommendations of this study. This said, it is projected that the built-out framework plan will add jobs and population in the study area as outlined below.

Methodology

Population and employment projections are calculated by using current study area population and employment data and factoring growth based on the recommended land use program.

Growth is determined by first establishing today’s baseline. Lots with redevelopment potential are then identified, including vacant lots, parking lots, and vacant or marginal lots along mixed-use corridors. Areas where no change is envisioned, such as parks, schools, churches, neighborhoods, and historic structures, are excluded.

An average residential and commercial density is then assigned to each property based on the recommended land use, and the overall number of housing units and commercial square feet that is physically supportable at build-out of the framework plan is determined. These figures are converted to population and jobs based on household size and employees per floor area unit estimates. This shows the growth envisioned 25 years into the future.

Estimates for 2014 and 2019 are determined by assuming an incremental build out of each of the concept plans; assuming that all vacant single-family lots will be developed; and assuming a modest capture of redevelopment on other sites. This is then compared to projected demands, to ensure that they are not exceeded.

Longer-term population projections are determined based on a likely growth rate to achieve an incremental build out of the framework plan. They are less accurate, due to their long-term nature and uncertain future market conditions.
2019 Population and Employment

It is estimated that 4,736 residents currently live within the study area. The recommended land uses will increase the number of residents to 5,090 by 2014 and 6,882 by 2019. Residential density will increase from the current 3.39 gross units per acre to an estimated 5.07 gross units per acre in 2019.

Currently, 1,386 employees are estimated to work within the study area. When the recommended land uses are factored in, 286 new jobs could be added by 2014, with 348 more jobs by 2019.

### Population: 2009-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Townhomes</th>
<th>Multifamily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2009</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>4,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2014 Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Units</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Population</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>5,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2019 Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Units</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Population</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>6,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment: 2009-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2009</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2014 Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Square Footage</td>
<td>166,500*</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>201,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Employees</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan - 2019 Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net New Square Footage</td>
<td>187,100**</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>237,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Employees</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employment</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes 81,500 sf of retail/restaurant space and a 150 room hotel

**Includes 87,100 sf of retail/restaurant space and a 200 room hotel
2034 Employment and Population

Estimating employment and population growth beyond 10 years is difficult on the micro-level. Real estate and economic trends are complex and subject to change. Because the framework plan is based on a 25-year build-out, longer-term forecasts can be made based on this plan, real estate cycles, and the assumption that some facilities will be redeveloped.

### Estimated Change in Employment From 2009-2034

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>1,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>2,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024*</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>2,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029*</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>2,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034*</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>2,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumes a 20% increase from 2019 to 2024 and a 5% increase every five years thereafter. Growth rates are based on long-term forecasts prepared by RCLCo for Atlanta BeltLine Inc.

### Estimated Change in Housing Units From 2009-2034

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Townhomes</th>
<th>Multifamily</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>2,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024*</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029*</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>3,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034*</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>3,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumes an 8% increase every five years in townhomes and multifamily based on forecasts prepared for Atlanta BeltLine, Inc.

### Estimated Change in Population From 2009-2034

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single-Family Residents</th>
<th>Townhome Residents</th>
<th>Multifamily Residents</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2,572</td>
<td>4,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>5,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>7,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024***</td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>4,107</td>
<td>7,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029**</td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>4,436</td>
<td>8,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034**</td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>4,791</td>
<td>8,583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Assumes a 20% increase from 2019 to 2024 and a 5% increase every five years thereafter. Growth rates are based on long-term forecasts prepared by RCLCo for Atlanta BeltLine Inc.
6.4 CONSISTENCY WITH LCI COMPONENTS

The Vine City/Washington Park LCI Study and its recommendations are consistent with the LCI program components as outlined below:

1. Efficiency/feasibility of land uses and mix appropriate for future growth including new and/or revised land use regulations needed to complete the development program.

   The study calls for an increase of density and an increased mix of uses adjacent to the Vine City and Ashby MARTA stations. Exclusively residential areas in the heart of the neighborhoods are complemented by convenient retail nodes and commercial development along neighboring corridors. Residential uses are integrated throughout.

   This new pattern is largely feasible given current land uses and efficient because of the proximity of homes, shopping, jobs, and transit. Several incremental changes to the city land use plan are necessary to fully achieve the vision. Existing zoning regulations in the area are consistent with the vision, and require only slight modification.

2. Transportation demand reduction measures.

   A reduction in the demand for vehicular trips is proposed via a combination of road diets, improved sidewalks, more compact development, a greater mix of uses, new bicycle facilities, and a focus on transit station areas.

3. Internal mobility requirements – traffic calming, pedestrian circulation, transit circulation, bicycle circulation including safety and security of pedestrians.

   Streetscape improvements along major corridors include traffic calming measures, and those elsewhere focused on pedestrian and bicycle circulation. Significant investments near transit stations and separate bicycle and pedestrian facilities in most areas ensure safety.

4. Mixed-income housing, job/housing match and social issues.

   The study recommends encouraging a variety of housing types and sizes to preserve a mix of incomes and ages. The program includes apartments, condominiums, townhomes, detached homes, rehabilitated historic residences, and senior housing.

   Additional retail and office space, combined with better access to transit and local business incubator space will improve the mobility, vehicle trip reduction, and connectivity are key foci of the study.
jobs/housing balance by providing locally accessible jobs.

5. Continuity of local streets in the study area and the development of a network of minor roads.  
   The study area neighborhoods possess one of the most connected and intact street grids in the city. Several new streets are proposed with redevelopment to improve connectivity, in addition to a proposed multi-use path that will bridge some gaps in the network.

   The study area is very transit rich compared to most of the Atlanta region, but room for improvement remains. Improved facilities at bus stops such as shelters, schedules, and trash cans could improve the transit experience, and a proposed direct bus connection to downtown could simplify transfers. The study also recommends implementation of the BeltLine transit component and includes one of the few connections between existing MARTA rail and the BeltLine.

7. Connectivity of transportation system to other centers.  
   The street grid already successfully connects the study area to downtown Atlanta, and is complemented by a direct rail link. In addition to a direct bus link to the north MARTA line, new multi-use trails will connect the study area to the BeltLine and downtown, while new bike connections will also provide ties to downtown. Pedestrian connectivity to the Georgia Dome and World Congress Center are also a key recommendation.

8. Center development organization, management, promotion, and economic restructuring.  
   More effective organization, management, and promotion of existing and proposed assets within the study area is greatly needed. Recommendations in the areas of marketing, small business promotion, and economic development begin to address these needs and move toward a more sustainable economic structure.

9. Stakeholder participation and support.  
   Public participation was solicited throughout the five month process through a combination of in-person interviews, public meetings, neighborhood meetings, a community workshop, and stakeholder committee sessions. Meeting announcements were distributed to all property owners by mail. Additional stakeholders were contacted by electronic mail or telephone. Consultants also met individually with numerous groups with an interest in the area. A web site provided details and updates on the study process.

   Successful implementation of the plan depends on a marriage of public and private investment policy, in which significant public investments in streetscapes, parks, transportation improvements, and other areas are complemented by private investments in development, streetscapes, new streets, and more. Both public and private projects may draw from a variety of funding sources, including tax allocation district monies; city, state, and federal dollars; non-profit investment; and private sources.
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