

CNU IX: From Neighborhood to Region

REPAIRING THE URBAN FABRIC: DESIGNS FOR MAKING CITIES WHOLE AGAIN

June 8, 2001

Moderator: Stephanie Bothwell, Downtown D.C. Business Improvement District

Speakers: **Daniel Solomon**, Solomon E.T.C. Architects & Urban Design
John Ellis, Solomon E.T.C. Architects & Urban Design
David Dixon, Goody, Clancy & Associates
Matthew D'Amico, Design Collective, Inc.

Moderator:

My name is Stephanie Bothwell. I am the Director of Urban Design and Place Making for the Downtown D.C. Business Improvement District, so like many of you very involved in how we put the city back together again. Or take it apart and put it back together again as the case may be.

The fallen, abandoned and torn down pieces of the city that once represented a bold new image of the future (such as the highways that we had to plow through the center and around many of our cities across this country) are being replaced with new, great projects that are already being recognized for their greatness of vision. While being modest in many cases, yet powerful -- potentially powerful in their place making -- what is being planned and built neither replicates what was there before nor do they turn their back and go their own sometimes destructive way as the projects they replace once did. Instead, we have initiatives for rebuilding the city that respond to context and need in the truly unique 21st century way. These efforts may take a lifetime to fully realize. You all know how long it takes to plan and to actually build the dreams that we all are drawing and planning. But I think in the end it will result in extraordinary new public spaces, districts and neighborhoods which will rise in and around these new projects. It will help support the revitalization of our cities.

The first project is called Market at Octavia. It is a very new project unlike some of our other projects that have been underway in Boston now for -- how long has that been David -- since 1960 they have been trying to do the project in Boston that will be presented. So, we can just see how long those timelines can actually be.

I'd like to introduce our speakers: Dan Solomon and John Ellis who will be presenting the Market at Octavia. It's an urban design project, and it's part of a three neighborhood scheme that is being put together by the City as part of their Better Neighborhoods 2002 efforts. Dan is the principal of Solomon Architecture and Urban Design in San Francisco. Most of you know his work. His architectural practice of over 30 years has focused on residential architecture and the interaction between housing and urban design. He is an Emeritus Professor of Architecture at UC

Berkeley. The majority of Dan's work has consisted of urban design, multi-family housing and private dwellings. His many urban design efforts have been focused on creating urban structure, spatial coherence and townscapes ravaged by generations of segregated land use planning and dominance of the automobile. Dan's work has received over 60 design awards and he has lectured widely and written widely. He also received the Seaside Prize for contributions to American urbanism in 1998. He is co-founder of the Congress and provides us great leadership and is the author of the book Rebuilding.

John Ellis is also here from his firm. John received his M.A. from Cambridge University in England. He has over 28 years of architectural experience. Twenty of those years are years that he has spent here in the United States. He is the "E" in the name of the firm and has been there now three years I believe. John has been responsible for most of the large scale urban and campus planning work in the office including the UC Berkeley Section Plan. Prior to joining the firm, John was senior designer at Kaplan McLaughlin Diaz in San Francisco where he was responsible for the design of several large scale projects such as the one million square foot Oakland Federal Building project, Plaza Park Tower in Sacramento and the Reno Federal Courthouse. It's really great to have both of you here and they are going to tag team the presentation. Please join me in welcoming our speakers.

Daniel Solomon, Solomon E.T.C. Architects & Urban Design

I'm going to tell you a story about a neighborhood plan that we refer to as the Twelfth Map. The Twelfth Map is at the absolute geographic center of San Francisco which at least symbolically is the center of the Bay Region which by some cultural and economic measures can be called the center of the universe. So, it is possible (by some ways of looking at the world) to say that what we are going to show is very, very important. So, listen up.

The Twelfth Map actually deals with a part of town which for the most part is ugly, messy and unmemorable except for a few places which still have either sweetness or delicacy. This is crummy, ugly, unmemorable, except for a few places that have the sort of sweetness and scale that you associate with San Francisco or the civic grandeur of Civic Center which is also part of the neighborhood plan. It's where two very young developers bought a crummy piece of land next to the Central Freeway in 1989. Had the incredible fortune of having the freeway fall down a few weeks later in the Loma Prieta Earthquake. Our little project called Fulton Grove was the first act of neighborhood repair after this first part of the freeway disappeared. A sideways image.

A much larger and more important piece of neighborhood repair was initiated by our friend and colleague, Alan Jacobs, who worked with a coalition of neighborhood groups to propose an alternative to the plan that the state highway agency had to replace the freeway. Their plan to replace this section of freeway north of Market Street with a beautiful new street and

grade called Octavia Boulevard was the subject a city-wide referendum. The boulevard won in a city-wide referendum and is scheduled to be built shortly. The boulevard, however, as good as it is, leaves a whole series of planning questions unanswered including what happens to the abandoned freeway corridor which cuts right through the City. Our office joined forces with Alan Jacobs and his partner Elizabeth McDonald and wondrously we have ended up with the task of thinking about what to do with the center of San Francisco in the period after the era of the urban highway.

We have found the key to this task through a personal, somewhat neurotic quirk of my dear colleague, John, who is a hopelessly addicted architectural bibliophile. John's relationship to architectural books and to city maps, if I may say so, is like the relationship of some people to alcohol, to methamphetamines or to sex. And as soon as we started the work, John assembled a series of maps from his own library that revealed the story of this piece of City. Could we go to the first maps, John?

We have come to see in the story of these maps not just a story about this particular place, but also the genealogy of many American neighborhoods and cities. The grid story -- the story of the structure of this neighborhood -- begins with the Jasper O'Farrell map on the right of 1849. And in the very first marks that were made on the land by the first surveyor of San Francisco, the first planning of San Francisco, the seeds of the later problems of this neighborhood were already sown. Because as you see, this neighborhood which approximately encompasses the area of the slide is where three different city grids come together. Three different grids of different dimensions and different orientations. The classic north of Market San Francisco grid which was what people think of as south of San Francisco, the South of Market grid, Market Street itself, the great diagonal boulevard which was intended as the main street of the town, the Mission grid which grows northward from the 18th century Mission Dolores and then what was called the Mission Plank Road which was a road over swamps past Mission Creek linking the South of Market grid with the Mission grid.

The second great surveyor of San Francisco, Jasper O'Farrell, as we have studied his career. Excuse me, William Eddy, sorry. Thank you. That's why John's here. William Eddy seems to have spent most of his long career correcting the mistakes that Jasper O'Farrell made in the original map. And you see the connection of the South of Market grid to the Mission grid through an ingenious device of a hemicycle following the route of the original Mission Plank Road with a beautiful little park accommodating the shift in geometry. That little park is now an awkward building housing the San Francisco Planning Department and a rent a car lot. This rather elegant resolution of these two grids in the 1851 map of William Eddy.

Next two slides. The next map shows really the resolution of William Eddy's life work. The extension of the north of Market grid as Western Addition. The Western Addition which is a

series of blocks and beautiful mid-block lanes that to this day are the most habitable and delightful residential settings in San Francisco. Four major public squares and then a beautiful resolution of what was called the Valencia Railway where another little park -- the setting of a railway station -- joins to his original park. With City Hall located in a way that resolves the north of Market and South of Market grids and brings connection of the two parts of the City together.

The next map shows Daniel Burnham's proposal for San Francisco in 1905. Daniel Burnham came to San Francisco and thought what it really needed was a little Rome and a little Paris and a Farense pope or two and like a graduate student with a scanner dropped elements of Rome and elements of Paris onto the San Francisco map including Piazza de Popolo right at the end of Van Ness with a new trivium of Via Rapetta, Via Barbarino and Via Del Corso cutting through the San Francisco grid -- the Eddy grid -- very much like urban renewal and the highway interventions of the 1940s and 50s did much later.

The next pair of maps show the fire of the 1906. The fire and earthquake which destroyed the entire city fabric shown in red and then the rebuilding of the City between 1906 and 1920 where the City fathers (and mothers) had the very good sense to reject the Burnham plan entirely to put the William Eddy map back exactly the way it was with the exception of the Civic Center -- a 1920s Beaux Arts composition by Arthur Brown and others which abandoned the resolution of the connection across Market Street.

The next pair are an interesting pair because in 1931 the era of the automobile began in earnest as the WPA built San Francisco's two great bridges: the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay Bridge which linked the City to its suburbs north and east. At the same time, a less spectacular connection was made to the south as Highway 101 leading from Portrero Avenue in the south to Van Ness in the north with an alignment of a new street exactly like the version of Via Rapetta in Burnham's 1905 plan shattering Eddy's elegant resolution of the South of Market grid. So, this is where I think the story of this neighborhood plan intersects with the larger themes of this Congress -- in fact with the whole mission of the CNU. The transformations of San Francisco beginning in 1931 are the beginning of the interaction of the old economic unit -- the central city -- with the new economic unit, the city region. Any attempt at city repair today must, of course, deal with regional transportation, infrastructure in the city and regional destinations in the city that were not part of the 19th century world and the 19th century city. The extreme resolution of this phenomenon was the freeway map as it was proposed in 1965 with freeways running helter skelter everywhere through the City. Neighborhood fabric was completely eradicated by the initiatives of highway engineers. An upside down map of all the proposals of highway engineers at 1965 at which time there was a citizens' revolt that stopped highway building.

Next slides. Concurrent with the highways there was urban renewal. The scourge of urban renewal that eradicated urban renewal and public housing. Eradicating the city grid. Eradicating the Eddy plan and in one case taking 30 city blocks, subdivided by alleys and assembling them into seven super blocks. The map on the left then shows the resolution of all that. What was actually built out of urban renewal. What was actually built of highway planning. This is the condition in which San Francisco was left for 35 years. Partially an early 20th century reconstruction of a 19th century town plan, partially the intervention of highway engineers. Partially the intervention of post-war planners building what they could of urban renewal.

Now, the use of these maps has had two quite remarkable effects. First, it has enabled all sorts of people to see the City as a dynamic phenomenon and not a static phenomenon. Most people are amazed to learn that South Van Ness Avenue was not created by God along with the Bay and the hills, but it was in fact invented by some dimwitted highway engineers in 1931. And if dimwitted highway engineers could act so vigorously upon the City, perhaps they can too.

The second thing the maps have done is to build an extraordinary consensus. San Francisco is capable of producing an organized advocacy group with a membership, a newsletter and a website for any form of human behavior and every nuance of sexual preference that has ever been conceived of anywhere. So, all of these people are the constituency of the Twelfth Map. In the decades that populist militancy has been standard operating procedure in San Francisco, there has probably never been a situation like this one in which everyone, or virtually everyone, agrees. The maps have helped all sorts of people to understand what happened and why it happened. What is valued and loved about the center of San Francisco by the most wildly diverse group of citizens is the residue of the 19th century city plan. What is universally despised is what planners did to the City from the late 1930s to the 1970s. One lady at a community meeting may wear a Bonwit Teller basic black sheath with pearls. Another may wear combat fatigues with a femur through her nose, but their opinions about the City in this case are likely to be the same. John.

John Ellis, Solomon E.T.C. Architects & Urban Design

Along the approximate one and a quarter mile length of the freeway corridor are about 7.8 acres of land. At an early stage in the public discussions about what type of housing should be built there, a figure of 2,000 units was mentioned. And like so many situations like this, a number like that takes on a life of its own. We thought it was appropriate to indicate what 2,000 units would look like. It would actually be at a density of about 273 dwellings per acre in a neighborhood which is predominantly in the range of about 40 to 50 dwellings per acre. So, the image on your left shows what would happen if one were to build that enormous number. It

would require 30 story towers with eight story parking garages. There are also those who demanded that the 2,000 maximum density units should also be 100% affordable. Our experience has shown that there is an inverse relationship between density and affordability. The optimum height for affordable units that do not require [inaudible] subsidies is to build 50 foot high type five wood frame construction at a density of about 75 up to 100 dwellings per acre. And that's what the image on your right looks like.

Next please. The preferred alternative that we've started working on now looks at a combination of densities that would respond to the different sub areas that the freeway corridor passes through. To the north part of the site there are a series of blocks which are close to the foot of Cathedral Hill and which has a series of mid-rise towers. We thought it was appropriate to match the scale of those. Whereas in the central part of the neighborhood, up and down the freeway corridor through Hayes Valley, the scale is much lower. Mainly 40 foot high buildings, 50 foot high buildings in places and the density is correspondingly lower. So, our proposals now are to look at how best to adapt to the surrounding context and how to match the scale, texture and character of each neighborhood.

Next. The overall image. The overall map not only includes the freeway corridor, but it also includes this stretch of Market Street leading from the Civic Center here which is just off the map. Here is City Hall, Van Ness Avenue. The blue buildings are all Civic Center, and this is the area of South of Market which we shall come to later where we have looked at certain proposals to possibly close that and develop land in that part of the City.

Next. At the foot of Cathedral Hill up at the top of the site there is a building site that one finds all over San Francisco of what we refer to as the dumpy mid-rise: buildings which are not quite tall enough and rather fat and out of proportion. Our studies have indicated that maybe a more elegant solution in some locations might be to have slender towers with smaller footprints and to have a low-rise base condition of only 50 foot in height, combining the best of both streetwall buildings as well as towers where appropriate.

Next. There was one location in the site there where we thought it might be appropriate to look at the possibility of including a mid-block parking garage, screened from the surrounding context by housing in order to provide parking for both the Civic Center, cultural activities as well as some neighborhood parking. This is one of the options that's being considered.

Next. And in one particular location now, right on axis with City Hall, there are some very interesting buildings which are unique to this part of San Francisco -- very narrow, 25 foot wide, tall, seven story high buildings. We felt again that parcelization of how one might develop the corridor would be to try to match the scale of these buildings.

Next. These are some of the sketches that are being prepared for that. On the left, on your right, excuse me, the before picture or the after picture. On this side, the before condition.

Next. In Hayes Valley, now, where we've got a very delicately scaled mid-rise and low-rise condition of three story and four story wood framed buildings where the freeway passed through. We have looked at the possibility of matching the pattern that Dan had mentioned earlier of the Fulton Grove mid-block alley with conditions that would match that, increase the density where appropriate, but still maintain the scale of the surrounding neighborhood.

Next. And lastly, coming to the issue of South Van Ness. We have been able to propose how to untangle the great traffic mess that currently exists where traffic to and from the freeway collides in head on conditions with one way traffic and resolve it in a much more rational way where all the traffic is separated. We've looked at the possibility now that if South Van Ness were to be closed, one could reroute the traffic along twinned, one way streets and create a condition where that land that was occupied by South Van Ness could become useable for some form of development.

Daniel Solomon, Solomon E.T.C. Architects & Urban Design

These maps, then, show the possibility of actually restoring the 1870 William Eddy grid but in a way that the regional traffic and regional destinations of the Civic Center are served within the original grid -- not within the highway engineers' intervention of 1931 which in these proposed maps is removed, creating 10 acres of additional new development and land south of Market. The South of Market proposals are here. The existing condition on the right showing the fracturing of parcels and the creation of nominalist parcels by the South Van Ness corridor and then the creation of a major new development site with a transit corridor, transit atrium terminus and open space at the end of South Van Ness. The creation of a high-rise tower site at the termination of Van Ness and then a much more delicate series of interventions next to where new, spontaneous loft construction has occurred and where there is rather delicate new mid-block development that is respected and honored by this new configuration of regional traffic through the neighborhood. We like to think of this as urban repair as opposed to urban renewal. It does not consist simply of putting back the 19th century city just as it was. And this is for two reasons: first because the world is profoundly different from the way it was in 1870. Second, because it is possible to improve upon the City as it was while respecting it.

We like very much the term critical reconstruction as it is used by our honored guest of tomorrow Urban Development director, Hans Stimmann, in relation to Berlin. We like to think that our work in San Francisco is critical reconstruction in the same spirit as the critical reconstructions of Berlin which will be shown tomorrow. The result of closing South Van Ness and restoring the Eddy grid is this creation of a major development parcel at the very center of the City. This plan restores the historic structure of the City, it respects its scale, it displaces practically no one. But, at an appropriate place and in an appropriate way, it does not shy away

from a big and expensive, dramatic gesture and the participation of a big developer. The major development, taxes and revenues it generates will be the fiscal engine that helps fund a whole series of small scale street improvements throughout the district. And just as in our own work -- our own built work -- are many small, critical reconstructions that respect but do not replicate the buildings of the 19th century. This big plan attempts to find continuity with the historic City without attempting to thwart the pressures for growth and change which are the life force of cities. Thank you.

Moderator

Our next speaker is David Dixon. He is FAIA and principal in charge of planning and urban design at Goody, Clancy and Associates in Boston. The focus of his work is older cities, districts and neighborhoods. Work over the last five years includes plans to revitalize the main streets of Columbus, Ohio, university district and also transformation of public housing and mixed income neighborhoods in Chicago. In Cleveland, a plan to transform the office and research zone around MIT into mixed use. Urban design district with more five million square feet of housing and the first plan for Boston's Freedom Trail in 50 years. Today he is going to talk with us about his award winning project and very long project -- the civic vision for air rights over Boston turnpikes. Please join me in welcoming David Dixon.

David Dixon, Goody, Clancy & Associates

I will hasten to say that while I attempt to make the technology work, that while I was 12 in 1960 when the Turnpike was first envisioned, I wasn't quite involved. So, my own involvement is probably over the last three years, not the last 40. But, with that said, and while this keys up, as I hope it will, I am very excited to be here and to see so many of you. I'm going to be talking about a project that has certain elements of comparability to what Dan and his colleague have just talked about but is also in many ways very different. It's a project in a far more urban context. I was fascinated to hear the center of San Francisco referred to as the center of the world, because I think Boston unfortunately thinks of itself in the same sense of the universe. Boston would claim the universe. I think one of the real challenges for cities like Boston and San Francisco and others is to learn from the rest of the world. That is one of the challenges that is embedded in this effort.

A couple of years ago we were asked by the Mayor of Boston to take on this effort to create a civic vision. How many of you here know Boston? Most, but not all. I'll give you a quick context. This basically is the heart of Boston. This is Back Bay laid out about 1850 until about 1900. A wonderful Beaux Arts neighborhood. The edge of what were the initial generation of streetcar suburbs, an area called Allston-Brighton. The Boston Turnpike was built

in the 1960s, basically along the railroad corridor. Much of the shared history to the thinking that went on in San Francisco, and I'll talk a little bit more about this.

What is important to realize here is what a land starved city Boston is. So, the creation of 44 acres becomes hugely important. Those 44 acres have been there, clearly, but they haven't been obtainable, and the nature of Boston's real estate economy is such that they now are attainable. The process for this effort lasted about 18 months. Actually, it continues today and I'll talk about that in a minute. I often term this political urban design. I don't know how many of you come from cities in which there are lots of articulate neighborhoods who care very strongly about everything that is said and done as they do in San Francisco, but Boston is truly one of those places.

And, again, if we look at -- this is downtown, the historic Back Bay. This is the South End, Bay Village, a series of very active neighborhoods that cared a great deal about this effort. Well, it was launched not so much because Boston wanted a civic vision for the use of areas over the Turnpike. It was launched because Boston, which was a poor city when the Turnpike was built, is now a rich city. The per capita income in the Boston region has gone probably from two-thirds, three-quarters of the national median in the 1960s to 130%. A very rapid change. That's had a dramatic impact on real estate in Boston and on opportunities and challenges so that after the most recent boom, this land is now developable. It competes with land you might find elsewhere. In the best spirit of how not to get something done, a developer arrived from New York -- this blessed city -- with a proposal to build a 59 story tower right there. This is the Prudential Building which many of you may know. This building would have been right here and just about as tall. And it was Millennium. They have in many ways a brilliant marketing concept of retail on the ground floor, cinemas above that, a hotel above that, and housing above that. And the economics are all very reinforcing. But the furor over a 59 story building basically stopped the prospect of redeveloping air rights dead in its tracks. What was born was a civic vision effort which I like to think of as political urban design as much as anything else. And I'll sort of comment about this because I think in fact to the extent it has richness and nuance which are things that have been said, it is because politics were so integrally woven into -- inextricably woven together with urban design.

The process was actually led by a 26 member committee. These included members of the development community, elected officials and the sort of leaders of the various activist neighborhoods along the turnpike. It quickly became obvious that we were dealing with our own little House of Representatives or state legislature because these people left a meeting. They went back here or here or here or to their tower if they were down town developers and they had to justify what they had just done. Not only that, we have an open meeting law in Massachusetts which is a blessing in some sense, but not in others. It means that you can't meet and talk about

things privately. So, there were always 200 people watching. These were the same people who were the friends and neighbors of the members of -- what I tried to get people to call the SDS but we couldn't -- the SDSC. But this in its own sense was wonderful because more than anything else this was a process about civic education. It was a group of 26 people who really understanding what Boston needed, what their neighborhoods needed, how to bridge between the economics of development, the challenges of air rights, how to encounter the myths that many of them had about their own neighborhoods, fears about height that were unjustified in some cases, but perfectly reasonable in others. They emerged as a very educated group who then went out and educated their friends and neighbors and hence this is a process that has a lot of political power and is already enduring in ways that I'll describe in a couple of minutes.

The plan you see has been adopted by the city. It takes the place of zoning for turnpike air rights. The Turnpike Authority very cleverly avoided any zoning controls. What this means is that in a bad economy, they could build anything when they can't. But in a good economy, when there is a lot of political opposition to development, they have no rights to development. So in effect, the civic vision created zoning -- the sort of public contract with how this land should be used. We received lots of recognition which is wonderful. What is particularly most interesting, I had three phone calls today. One, the Mayor was upset about a column yesterday about our project I am about to talk about. Two, there were two meetings last night and this morning where people were upset. This is the politics of urban development because these first parcels are being developed right now.

This is the historic South End. Back Bay is over here. Bay Village, a series of historic neighborhoods. A developer is proposed. At this point it is probably about one and one-half million square feet. This is the first time I've gone to public meetings where pickets have been around this project because this is a large (of necessity) project, but it is being guided and shaped by this civic vision that I will talk to you about. And I think one of the real strengths of this process is that, for better or worse, Boston launched a planning process that was very participatory. It was very comprehensive and then is following up with a series of citizens' advisory committees and consultant assistance. In this case it's us. These CACs respond and really negotiate with the developers and shape developments that I think are really quite appropriate. The developer had originally proposed -- before the civic vision when he was thinking about this -- a 33 story tower right here. And you can get a sense of the fabric. This is the largest Victorian district in the country. The South End. Literally right next door. That didn't work. What is actually happening since this sketch was done is that this block is being developed. He is actually now looking to developing this block with townhouses and a variety of uses. There will be a tower someplace in this area, and I will talk about that. But in a way, that is

far more appropriate and balances the economics so that what emerges can really be city building and not a sort of the intrusion of a new era of urban renewal.

Why did the Turnpike appear? It appeared because Boston was a very poor city. No significant development as I think everyone has learned at some point from the Depression until the urban renewal era of the 1960s. The Turnpike basically followed this rail corridor. It brought vitality back into the city. The 59 story tower I talked about essentially was proposed for right here and you can imagine that since this neighborhood hasn't changed why the reaction arose. In the 70s and 80s there were a series of air rights developments. As soon as the Turnpike was built, the dream emerged of [*inaudible*]. The earlier efforts were subsidized. They had a very "urban renewal" quality.

The 1990s arrived. And suddenly the economy had come to the point where these were urban sites, not extraordinarily unusual urban sites. It cost the same to create the deck as it would to buy a comparable piece of land. So, this then set the stage for creating a real and valid vision. Now, one of the things that has always struck me in working in a city (which is where I love to work) is that when you create a vision there isn't one source to that vision. One of the advantages of the political world where we live is that many values are brought to the table. The result is a richer and more nuanced vision. In this case there were four principal sources: one is public transportation. Boston is a very congested city. Development, particularly on land over a highway, sponsored in part by a transportation agency -- the Turnpike Authority -- needs to be very responsive. So, all the uses that we will talk about are the lowest possible traffic generating uses. They have far lower parking ratios than would normally be allowed. Density is very much focused around transportation and things like that. And this has to be essential to this vision. This is about enhancing neighborhoods. The problem with the earlier generation -- the Prudential Center, the tallest building in Boston, was that it was alien to neighborhoods. It was the product of a city that had lost faith in itself and its neighborhoods. That's not the case any more. This new development in terms of use, in terms of character, in terms of streets needs to really be neighborhood building. But at the same time, 44 acres in Boston is no small and incidental consideration. This is a land starved city, and so when this land is developed, it really needs to respond to the city's needs for mixed income housing, for expansion, for Boston University Science and Research Campus and other things that simply can't happen if these air rights aren't used for this purpose. And, of course, we are putting back together. We're not actually putting back -- we are for the first time creating new connections in a public realm that weren't there. Because this isn't a rail corridor, there are more than 13,000 feet of sidewalks which amaze me. But these sidewalks without retail, without buildings that are appropriately designed, without the right kinds of open spaces are meaningless.

So, all of that is at the core of this vision. And I think no one in this room wants to spend time on paper visions, particularly when we're rebuilding our cities. This is meant to be a very real effort. A public realm that really works. A process that really understands the incredible complexity of building over a highway, particularly one that you can't shut down for a year while you develop over it. One that still needs to be lit and ventilated, etc.

Transportation I mentioned. Driving concerns. One of the things that is fascinating -- if you're going to generate a 100 cars in a peak hour, you can't get very much retail or office. But you can develop a lot more condominiums or hotels. And this became a -- no pun intended -- driving consideration in thinking about the kinds of uses that are appropriate given the fact that turnpike air rights of necessity need to be fairly large scale. When you create the deck for air rights, you are going to spend anywhere from \$350 to \$500, \$600, maybe \$700 per square foot of site of deck to create this. Now, in Boston land costs that much, but that means that whether you are building on land or turnpike air rights, when you develop in this part of the city you are developing a significant building. Hence, all of these things become more important. And then it comes to guidelines because the character and quality of this new generation is so important. One of the things that we paid a lot of attention to is the incredible span of eras on either side of the Turnpike and guidelines that really reflect the tremendous importance at street level and lower levels of continuity with the wonderful historic fabric and then, as one grows, the importance of creating the new symbols of this era, just as Boston has in the past.

So, I'll take you all on kind of a quick -- it won't be a walk, it will be a jog -- down the corridor to give you a sense of how this translates. This is Boston University. A couple of major messages here, some which I actually found very fascinating. Boston University probably has the worst political relationship of any major university with its neighborhood today. When you plan in this area, you have to schedule things so that representatives of the institution show up at one time and the community at another because they won't sit in the same room together. But, nevertheless, they say many of the same things, because they share an environment. So, here there is a chance to create a major new science and technology campus that no longer threatens to spill into adjacent neighborhoods, but in fact can be created and a new appropriate edge created by using air rights. Clearly, the sort of universal need to create continuity along streets (and I'll talk a little bit more about that particular civic opportunity at the river) may be a more subtle underlying message here is that Boston University which would have seen this as an endowment opportunity -- a chance to get a large mixed use development learned in this process that that doesn't make sense. For that endowment project to have made sense, we would be talking about 30, 40 and 50 story buildings in an area where that's clearly inappropriate. So, in this case, urban design has shaped use because the economics of research buildings are very different, and they can be created at an appropriate scale with an appropriate character. You can imagine the

inappropriateness and justly the politics of a major development here. The tremendous importance of creating continuity. In this case, the edge of the neighborhood -- actually a small park -- this will be a major science building that Boston University will build. What you can't see in the sketch is that the ground floor will be retail. Not only that. It will be designed so that retail is accessible even though the street is rising to cross over a bridge. Without doing those things, this isn't a new civic era for development.

Moving further towards Kenmore Square, closer to the heart of the city, similar kinds of issues. Again, the real stress on continuity. Here, there are some very interesting lessons. This is the sort of edge of the Audubon Circle neighborhood -- a neighborhood that's been encroached by Boston University and other uses. Here, there is a wonderful justice about creating some new housing to add to that neighborhood. Then you see what looked like sort of a cluster of blocks shown diagrammatically. Much of that actually is parking -- parking to serve the Red Sox. One of the lessons one learns is that parking turns out to be the most economical thing you could do with air rights because of the spans. Because in a city like Boston, people will pay \$200 or \$300 a month to rent those parking spaces, and you can cover the cost. But clearly, that isn't the appropriate use and so hence the very real need to make sure that that parking is veneered with other uses. And, in fact, any building has to have its parking up in the air. One of the things that we're debating with the developer I mentioned earlier and standing very firm on is that these buildings have parking on these levels, as does this building. In fact, this is probably mostly parking. It's absolutely critical that that parking be shielded by other uses, and I think you're getting two shows at once here.

A wonderful opportunity to create a new square is part of a new transit development. And here, one of the other lessons one learns is that public open space is hugely expensive. There was a lot of interest (as there is in any of the cities we live in) for public open space. And one of the real pieces of education. It probably took us years to realize that at \$600 a square foot or \$500, this isn't the best place to create open space except there are places where that open space truly becomes civic -- where a major new transportation center is being built. Where public open space needs to be part of the equation.

Then we come right to the edge -- this is historic Back Bay. This is the parcel in which the 59 story building was proposed and some more, to me, fascinating lessons. First of all, if we're really about creating a public realm, then we can't be about internalizing retail and the things that enliven it. And so, simple guidelines that take the form of zoning that says that not only should there be a lot of retail here. This is the Millennium Company's -- where their proposal was made. But this retail has to all front on the street. This is not the appropriate place to create malls. But, very importantly, there are real symbolic issues around height. In Boston this is a very emotional issue. It turns out that if you put a tower here, it tends to announce -- I'll advance for a second --

a sort of a new generation or a new approach to where density and our era assert themselves. Moved over a couple of hundred feet, at most, to this location, this same tall building is part of the accommodation that has been made for a new economy. Some have termed this the high spine. And what was interesting -- not only to me -- is the symbolism right but (and this is fascinating) the politics of this were right. This is a community that -- let's say with six months -- can understand that growth, jobs and investment are part of the dynamism of the city. They are not willing to pay this price, if one terms it that way. But, this is fitting. This is not sending a new message about the city's form but reinforcing an appropriate existing message. Again, the tremendous importance of shielding parking, of really stressing the civic qualities of what is being done in something that is really equivalent of zoning.

Here, we meet the parcels that are currently being developed. Tremendous opposition to tall buildings here too. The resolution of this is one of the things that I find most fascinating, and it's happening right now. Initial developer interest was for a 38 and a 33 story tower. To make the economics work, I think that's probably somewhat more than is required to make the economics work. But, the resolution that people developed among themselves and with us over time was, in this case, one of the sort of great, classic trades that public/private partnerships present to us. The tools of our era that are certainly worth debate, but in this case I think it's very appropriate. Here we have neighborhoods that are starved for public space. Well, with this height. Let's say it had to be this tall to make the economics work, but were this tall and create a significant public space. This is basically a diagram. Then a taller building here -- and this is the other end of that sort of high spine -- may be very appropriate. It's very interesting. You simply take this across the street to here in the same block with this historic neighborhood -- across the street from where this accommodation with height has been made and it becomes something that is violently objectionable to people. Gucci didn't work for people, but you know, if you put something on the ground floor that sells food. It may be a gourmet food shop. It can be wonderful and really bring meaning to people who live near and around air rights.

And then finally we come to one of the most intriguing sets of parcels next to Chinatown. Chinatown is Boston's most densely populated neighborhood. Here, height and density aren't an issue. They aren't an issue because they shouldn't be an issue because this is an urban neighborhood with an urban community in the truest sense that really wants to house as much of its own community as it can with as much mixed income housing as possible. And just as Dan Solomon talked about the importance of the relationship of density and affordability, that's very true here. There is a need for public open space no matter how much it costs because this neighborhood doesn't have any. And, so some is there. But, here, the intent is to really fill in -- create connections between one part of this neighborhood and the other -- with the kind of density and vitality that are perfectly appropriate to this community. And, hence, I think politics

helps create the very appropriate and sort of wonderful urban design resolution. So, it is a vision that is hopefully as complex and right for that reason, and thank you for your interest and look forward to your questions. Thank you.

Moderator:

Thanks, David. Our next speaker is Matthew D'Amico who is a registered landscape architect and Design Collective Director of Planning and Urban Design. Under his leadership the firm has completed several large mixed use master plans including TNDs, TODs and HOPE VI master plans. Also several urban design development plans including Central City, CBD plans, Brownfield redevelopment strategies and multiple neighborhood revitalization plans. Matt has spoken extensively on the subject of new urbanism and traditional neighborhood development at smart growth and planning conferences and is an adjunct professor at several universities. Additionally, he has assisted public planning agencies in developing parallel codes and legislation that encourages the principles of new urbanism. He is going to talk to us today about Historic East Baltimore's master plan. Please join me in welcoming Matt D'Amico.

Matthew D'Amico, Design Collective, Inc.

Thanks. I guess I have the pleasure of being the very last speaker of the day, and I appreciate everybody staying around for this.

Just a couple of quick opening remarks. I think it's tremendous that politicians, public officials and residents and citizens themselves are really thinking hard and showing a tremendous interest in revitalizing our cities and in this topic on repairing urban fabric. It's interesting to see some really tremendous projects that were presented before mine. Some that seem to have been triggered by pretty major events: a huge infrastructure project or public works project or collapsing of a bridge -- some kind of disaster. If you'll look around the country, you will find that in fact there are pretty significant events that spur this kind of urban redevelopment and repairing of urban fabric.

But, I think equally important is the fact that there are several cities -- Baltimore being one of them -- that have districts and whole neighborhoods in large areas of the city that have experienced significant decline and deterioration and loss of people, businesses and jobs. Not by some kind of significant event, but just incrementally over 30, 40 or 50 years have caused these areas of the cities to really become blighted and to have a negative impact on cities. These are not projects. East Baltimore is an area of about 500 acres of probably 300 or so city blocks which is just block after block after block after block of abandoned, torn down and vacant row houses like you see here. There is no significant event that has happened here. It just happened over time. There is not a lot of money or political will or tremendous amount of federal funds that are being

thrown at the project to revitalize it. But, to be able to revitalize 500 acres of vacant and abandoned row houses in the City of Baltimore would have a tremendous positive impact on repairing the city and on bringing new urban life.

So, that's what I'm going to talk about today -- our strategy for developing a revitalization plan for the 500 acre urban row house neighborhood in East Baltimore. Just a little bit of quick background. The neighborhood is actually about a mile from the CBD (?) and from the Inner Harbor and the areas you see up here. As part of the process, we looked at other urban neighborhoods in Baltimore. And notice that places like Mount Vernon, Seton Hill, Washington Village, Federal Hill, Canton and some other neighborhoods were of a more walkable scale. They were about 80 to 100 acres in size. An interesting thing was that each of them -- or not all of them but many of them -- had a central green or a neighborhood center -- a place where civic and social life would come together. A place where there is a mix of uses and shopping and retail. Historic East Baltimore really doesn't have that. As you can see, it is a neighborhood that's about five times the size of a typical neighborhood and has really no central or neighborhood identity. It's actually made up of six different neighborhoods. And the neighborhoods don't have any physical or visible identity. It's really just row house after row house after row house. The neighborhoods are largely defined by political boundaries. But nevertheless, they are six different neighborhoods.

Real quickly. Some of the existing weaknesses that we discovered have been evident. Obviously, the significant physical deterioration. The slide you see on the top is pretty indicative of virtually every single block of the 300 city block area. There are some pockets of housing where people are living there, but there's not a lot of it. The streets and the open spaces are equally as deteriorated as the building stock. Many abandoned and vacant sites. There is a tremendous amount of crime and grime. A lot of social problems. A lot of drug activity. The neighborhood really lacks adequate services. There is no grocery store. There is no pharmacy. There are no link services or neighborhood services that the neighborhoods need. They have to go quite some distance to get that. There is actually a traditional retail street called Monument Street which is this slide here on the right. It is about a four block main street shopping area which is largely beeper shops, nail shops, pawn shops and those kinds of things. Really not providing any real service to the neighborhood. The neighborhoods, like I said, really have no real visible identity, no unique character. Another one of the problems is the traffic speeds and volume. People commuting to the city just flying through this 500 acre area just to get from one side to the other as quickly as possible.

There are some strengths in East Baltimore. And as I mentioned, there are some areas where there is pretty decent housing stock and building stock. There are some old historic buildings and public works buildings like you see in the slide in the upper right. Some row houses

that have been rehabbed and people are living there like you see on the bottom left. There is not a lot of it, but there is some. The churches and the schools are probably the most significant asset of historic East Baltimore. There are several churches and almost a church on every block. It is the churches that provide the stable and the social anchor, the social heart, if you will, of the neighborhood. The neighborhoods rely on their church. They rely an awful lot on the services that the churches provide: the jobs training, day care, adult day care, drug rehab. All these things are provided by the churches. The churches are really the single most stabilizing element in the neighborhood. There is a lot of neighborhood pride in spite of the deterioration that you see. People love their neighborhoods. They love the City of Baltimore. They have been in the neighborhood for a long time and are blue collar people. A lot of them today don't have jobs. There's not a lot of jobs to offer in the neighborhood.

Another tremendous asset in Historic East Baltimore is Johns Hopkins University which is the slide on the upper left. It's almost remarkable to think that an institution like this with so much funds and so much resources can be located in a neighborhood with this kind of blight. But, nevertheless, having something like that as an anchor -- as a potential stabilizing force as well as a resource -- is a tremendous strength that needs to be built upon. Actually, in 1990 the Historic East Baltimore -- all 500 acres -- was identified as an Empowerment Zone which gave it access to federal funds and resources. And this has proved to be a pretty decent asset, although they haven't utilized that asset very wisely.

Before Design Collective got involved, let me talk a little bit about some of the efforts that had happened in East Baltimore. First of all, it was the creation of the Empowerment Zone which gave it access to funds and resources. Secondly, a couple of years later, was the creation of the Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition (HEBCAC) which was tasked with the job of coming up with the revitalization strategy in determining how to use these Empowerment Zone funds. In 1996, or thereabouts, they came up with what they coined the Million Dollar Plan. This was their grand plan for revitalizing 500 acres of abandoned row houses.

The key to their plan was acquisition and renovation of scattered site housing. The colors in orange that you see on the map are row houses that were to be acquired and renovated for new residents (primarily for rental but also some for sale). There's a huge problem with that, and I'll talk about that in a minute. There is very limited new housing. They did have a strategy for revitalizing their Monument Street retail which was the four block area with the beeper shops and the pawn shops to bring in some more appropriate neighborhood services. One of the things that they targeted a particular parcel for was a grocery store and a neighborhood center which is the three or four blocks in purple which are right here. There was a market study done that suggested there was a need for a grocery store, and there was a market to support such a neighborhood center beyond just East Baltimore. And the site, by the way, was also deemed to be a great site

because of the visibility and the amount of automobile traffic that passes through that site. They had very limited new land use.

Largely, it was a strategy of renovating row houses. And as part of that effort they created six different neighborhood development organizations. One for each one of the neighborhoods. Each tasked with developing a strategy for revitalizing their neighborhood, coordinating that with HEBCAC, which was the governing body. Although the entire neighborhood which in turn worked with the Empowerment Zone, Empower Baltimore Management Corporation was sort of a governing body of all of the Empowerment Zones. What happened here was that there were too many layers of politics. Too many different issues to deal with. Too many people involved. Too many layers. They started in 1990. Today if you were going to go out there, you'd think nothing at all happened. What did they spend all of this money on? But again, a lot of pride and the will of people and the stakeholders in the area to see things happen.

So, because there was really no significant visible change in the efforts that have happened over the last 10 years, that's when they decided they really needed to look at something a little more comprehensively than simply rehab row houses. So, what they are finding is for every row house they would rehab, another one would become abandoned. And over the course of time, they just really weren't getting anywhere. So, they needed to develop a more comprehensive approach. They needed to consider bolder changes. At first they thought demolition and relocation of residents would be resisted fiercely by the residents. People have lived here for 30, 40, 50 years. There'd be no way to convince them to leave their house and move somewhere else. So, that's why the renovation strategy. But they really needed to consider significant demolition. We were hired to come in and help synthesize the various unique goals to each neighborhood and develop a more comprehensive and cohesive plan that all of the neighborhoods could embrace. It was interesting to hear Ray Gindroz talk this morning about the concept of neighborhood. Because I was thinking when he was defining that, that's precisely what the neighbors here and the community of all of the six neighborhoods of Historic East Baltimore were looking for. They really weren't looking for some bold, new approach. They really just wanted a great neighborhood. They liked where they lived. They loved their neighbors. They like the City of Baltimore. They liked the convenience and access to transit and to the city. They just wanted to have in place the things that are typical of a really great neighborhood. So, that was our goal. It was to help them to determine what kinds of things need to be put in place in order for them to realize their vision of just simply creating a nice place to live -- a great neighborhood.

The methodology we used was to first critically evaluate their plan, their Million Dollar Plan. And let me point out a couple things. First of all, the renovation strategy was not a strategy that was getting anywhere, and we quickly let them realize that they had to come up with a significant demolition strategy which meant relocation of residents. Because the area had

experienced a decrease in population, they knew that they wanted to decrease density. So, their strategy was to demolish houses in the middle of a block, like you see here, here, here and here and turn that into open space. They actually tested one. They built it and it literally became a dumping ground because it wasn't part of the public realm. It was hidden behind houses in the back of blocks. It was very easy for someone to bring up their pickup truck and dump their... literally washing machines, appliances and one of them even had a car in it. They wanted to create new open space, but they knew they needed to decrease density, and this was their strategy for doing it. Very great, great goals and objectives, but the wrong way of achieving that. So, we had to critically evaluate their plan. This is something they had worked on for quite some time, and it was difficult for them to realize that they really were heading in the wrong direction.

We met individually with the neighborhood leaders of each of the different neighborhood groups. We identified some common threads. What was interesting to find out was that, as I mentioned, the churches were the stabilizing element in the neighborhood. And they were the ones providing day care, drug treatment, adult services, job training -- all these kinds of things. And each church thought that they needed to provide all of these services themselves. When we got them all together, we found that one church could provide day care. One church could provide jobs training. One church could provide drug rehab. And in that way, the resources could be more evenly distributed. You could get greater participation among all of the neighborhoods and end up having some social activity cooperation between the neighborhoods which hadn't happened before that. So we had to find these common threads and then examine what some of the impediments were which was difficult. And I'm not going to go into those in detail, but I think you can imagine that for a neighborhood like this, having resources, having political support behind the project, getting everybody together and agreeing to a common cause and a common vision and a common strategy. The traffic, the blighted houses and all of these things were major impediments to redevelopment.

Having done this initial evaluation and work with the neighborhoods, we then conducted a community wide charrette where (for the first time in that 10 year period when it was first established as an Empowerment Zone), where all of these neighborhoods came together and didn't meet about their neighborhood in the charrette but rather talked collectively about different issues in the broader neighborhood of the 500 acres of all six neighborhoods. And it was the first time that neighborhoods got together and really had a very meaningful dialog about what some of the opportunities and objectives needed to be. Out of that we were able to divine a broad revitalization strategy that received pretty decent consensus. Not 100% consensus, but enough. By the way, this study was just completed about a couple of months ago. So it's really kind of just getting started.

Some of the goals and objectives. I'll go through this quickly. First as I mentioned earlier, there was no real recognizable character or neighborhood centers. The first thing we talked about was creating a neighborhood center to provide each of the neighborhoods a unique identity. Secondly, was to create a network of meaningful and very defensible open spaces -- that being very important because the kinds of open spaces that they had proposed were not at all defensible. There was significant streetscape and open space improvements that were to be funded by the public sector, establishment of a community wide town center that would be central to all of the neighborhoods but would include the grocery store, the pharmacy, the neighborhood services and some public transportation improvements, a diversity of housing which was very important because there were families who lived here. There were elderly people. There were single parent families. There is a wide variety of people and it was important to provide a variety of housing. Recognizing that the institutions, the churches and the schools were the stabilizing influence, these needed to be strengthened and celebrated. In fact, many churches had goals for expanding, so we had to embrace that as one of the objectives. Calm traffic. Revitalizing Monument Street and encouraging adaptive reuse of some of the existing historic and architecturally significant buildings. These are some of the goals.

The land use strategy as compared to the Million Dollar Plan. The colors in solid here -- you see the blocks of different colors -- but all of the solid colors represent demolition. So, there are areas where there is pretty significant amounts of demolition which would offer new construction. This was a strategy that would be used to help create incentive and to encourage private sector reinvestment. Because up to this point, they had been relying primarily on public funds to rehab housing. Here was a strategy to help bring in private sector developers, private sector financing and investment and bring in some new people and some new changes that way. As I mentioned, this is the town center which had the grocery store, the retail, the town center and mixed use buildings in purple. The dark yellow blocks represent new residential housing. The light yellow which is (I can't even see it from here). There is some light yellow up along Broadway and along Caroline Street which were rehab housing. The blue is the Hopkins expansion. This is Monument Street -- a revitalization here. And all the green, of course, all new greens, parks and squares. So the strategy for developing a more mixed and more integrated land use and an open space strategy.

As I talked earlier about the importance of creating identity and character, this was our strategy for creating neighborhood identity. These are the six different neighborhoods: Oliver, Broadway, Collington, Middle East, Madison East and McElderry Park. Johns Hopkins is in the bottom left and the Old Town Mall which is an existing mall that serves some of the neighborhoods is in the very bottom left. These new neighborhood centers were located adjacent

to an existing church or an existing school where the green or the square would replace housing. Housing would be demolished and the new green would serve... I've got to wrap it up, okay.

Well, you get the idea. The neighborhood center, the connecting corridors and this is our central town center which is located adjacent to a rail corridor in which I will point out in a minute becomes an intermodal transit center. This is the character of some of the new neighborhood centers which would be a new central green with some rehab structures and some new construction. This is the central green for Middle East which is the neighborhood right here north of Hopkins. Gives you an idea of the scale of what some of these open spaces could look like. Significant streetscape improvements were part of the open space strategy. Narrowing the streets. Providing pedestrian [*inaudible*] street traffic to help calm the traffic. This is the town center. This would be acquisition and demolition of all four blocks, so largely everything you see here is all new construction. This is the grocery store here, the mixed use development, residential above retail. These are the public works buildings here, here and here which would be rehabbed for a new college -- Sojourner Douglas College. This is the existing rail corridor where we can provide a commuter rail station as well as an extension of the subway and light rail to provide an intermodal station. And then there are a series of design standards for the architecture to respect the existing character of the row houses. This is, I'm over. This is the last slide. The rehab houses, the new residential duplex townhouses, Monument Street rehab and new mixed use buildings. So, that's the end. Thank you.

Moderator:

May I ask the panelists to come up. We are going to take some questions. I think we're being taped, so I think we need to get you to a mike.

Question:

Hello. This is a question for Dan and John. My name is Ian Ross. I work with Freedman Tung & Bottomley. Can you hear me alright? You spoke of this area of San Francisco as the heart of the City and by extension the heart of the universe. And then spoke of your plan for revitalization with regard to the streetscape as being rather delicate. And I just want to ask you a question with regard to your proposed tower which in terms of context of Hayes Valley is for the most part a four story, three or four story and terminus of the Mission District which is also three or four story and as a terminus of Van Ness, I guess with Polk Street running the other way. I can see that as a visual element, but in terms of the context of the neighborhoods, can you describe who feels ownership for the tower and the uses therein.

Daniel Solomon:

The tower is a relatively unimportant element of the plan, a controversial one and one that may not live through the public process. We show it as an alternative for a tower. It is not a marked place where an office tower is appropriate. It may be a place where a residential tower is appropriate. The transit hub and the remainder of that block which is delicate and 40 and 50 foot buildings with an open space is really the essence of the idea. The tower has some economic benefit to the plan, maybe, but is not really an essential element of the plan. The whole idea of infill is a combination between density which is very needed and housing opportunity which is needed and affordability which actually works better as a smaller scale. The idea is to build some mid-rise and high-rise where the context accommodates it, but in the parts of Hayes Valley that are really sort of fragile with neighborhood stuff to build 35 and 40 foot buildings. So, the tower may or may not live through the public process, possibly not. We don't think it is an essential element of the plan. But if density needs to be accommodated, and there's a lot of pressure for density, it seem that's a reasonable place to do it at the very focal end of Van Ness Avenue. But it's not a big deal one way or the other.

Question:

Hi, my name is Jim Reed, and I live in Boston and this is a question for anybody here. Basically, I like multi-use, mixed use stuff that's happening in America, but I'm finding that the retail is very homogenous and I almost feel like I live in an outdoor shopping mall. And, you know, it opens at 10:00 and closes at 7:00, and it's becoming quite predictable and homogenous. And, is there any way to sort of zone or whatever you can do -- like Section 8 retail -- that's available just for neighbors to own small shops or whatever they want to do that brings character to the neighborhood and brings surprise and interest to the area and makes it less homogenous.

David Dixon:

That is a terrific question and the answer is no, no [laughter]. By and large we have to think of how development occurs. It occurs at a much grosser scale, and this is both part of the problem and also part of the solution. In other words, you don't do a building at a time. You develop a block at a time, and we all work very hard to introduce new urbanist principles to make those blocks have the qualities that a building in time had. What you can then do in turn is negotiate, particularly in cities where the issue is growth management, not revitalization, meaning where the public sector can be in the driver's seat and require back of the developer. This is central to a couple of projects we have been involved in. You can require 10%, 20%, 30% or 40% of the retail to be mom and pop, as it's called -- small local retailers. And I think, in fact, it

is a terrific thing to do and one finds that after getting over the initial hurdle, particularly with a developer who doesn't know how to do this or a retail planning consultant who doesn't know how to do this, that they find it's a terrific idea. I'm the reviewer for City of Providence for an area called the Capitol Center District where there is a 1.2 million square foot mall and a substantial amount of the peripheral retail for that is small, local retail and in fact, you know, it's a great sales piece for the rest of it. The Gap actually likes being next to the mom and pop, because the mom and pop does appeal to people. It does draw people.

Matthew D'Amico:

Just really quickly, I'd add one thing to that. I have been involved in a couple of developments with a particular developer who has structured the financing of his redevelopment project such that the retail is not an integral part of the financing that is the office or the residential and other uses. And what he does is that he does the retail last. That way he can get tenants or office users to help, you know, pay down his debt and he takes his time to find the kind of retail that he really, really likes that helps to support the project. So, that's an interesting strategy of not letting the retail drive it, but everything else and then pick the retail that you really want.

Question:

My name is Robert Miller from Denver, Colorado. Matt, this question is directed toward you, but maybe David can also jump in here. Was there any long term planning 20, 30, 40 years into the way you are looking at that part of Baltimore? And looking -- you were trying de-densify that population. Are there some plans to add density back in or to accommodate density if it does come back in the case of like Boston?

Matthew D'Amico:

Well, in case of the East Baltimore master plan, it clearly is a 20 or 30 year plan. It's a huge area and there is no way that a significant amount of this can happen in a very, very short amount of time. So, the strategy was to make visible change to the neighborhood centers first and then offer up parcels for redevelopment. And if it's phased correctly and over time, if there is a desire to bring in new types of development and higher density, the plan is flexible enough that it could accommodate that. So, the answer is yes. It is flexible to accommodate that because we are dealing with a large area, it's relatively easy to be flexible.

David Dixon:

I'd just add a couple of quick comments. In the case of the civic vision turnpike air rights, one of the statements of the plan is that air rights should only develop during good economies. And that's not meant to be silly or flip. It is because when the economy is strong and the public sector, the community and civic goals can drive the process, the results can be much better. Whether this happens in one, two, three or four business cycles, I think, is less important than the principles that underlie what happens. The only comment I want to come back to: this has to do with the last question. One of the things that we are very often engaged in is trying not to so much de-densify but re-densify older communities. And, if you think about it, it can take something like a million square feet of housing to support to 20,000 to 30,000 to 40,000 square feet of new retail these days. And so, in fact, when we're talking about bringing mom and pops back and restoring main streets and lining any street with active uses, it's difficult to do that with an approach that looks at de-densifying as opposed to re-densifying. And, in fact, one of the really central discussions around turnpike air rights was to sort of reintroduce people in Boston who are scared to death of the concept of density (if they live in the midst of it) of the values of density to produce the kind of environment that in fact they actually want to live in.

Question:

My name is Kevin Bord from Akron, Ohio. Another question for Matt. Explain, if you could, the partnership that is responsible for the plan in Baltimore. Who's going to execute that plan? And what do the individuals -- Johns Hopkins or the city or the neighborhood associations, local CDCs, what portions are they responsible for and how does that all come together?

Matthew D'Amico:

Well, it's an interesting question. It's a long answer, but I'll try to keep it short. Part of the difficulty is going to be that right now there -- you'll see on my slides -- that one of the challenges is to find a champion or a leader. Someone to take this project and run it through and make things happen. Right now there are way too many people involved. The organization we were hired by is called HEBCAC -- the Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition. They have a board of probably 30 people that represent various institutions. Clearly, Johns Hopkins is going to have to step up and play role in this. They've got the funding, the resources, the political will and the connections to make it happen. The city has to play a part and the state has to play a part. So, that's going to be probably the single most challenge to making this plan happen is finding someone to step forward and really just taking this by the bootstraps, so to speak, and making it happen.

Moderator:

Thank you so much. You've been a great audience and thank you to the panel.