The Rehabilitation of a Central Business District: The Richmond (Indiana) Promenade (II)

Kenji K. OSHIRO
(大 城 謙 治)

The revitalization of any section of a city requires the cooperation and contribution from all parties concerned. The role of the downtown merchant association in rebuilding the downtown area was discussed in another paper (Oshiro 1975, pp. 141-145). However, equally important is the role of the city government in redeveloping the central business district; thus, it will be the principal topic of this paper.

The participation of the city government is crucial in this type of large undertaking because it is the public organization which can fulfill functions such as rerouting of traffic, the construction and location of public services, and the purchases of land for public use. Inevitably, the local government unit becomes the planning and developmental agency. Also, the improvement of the downtown area is in the best interest of the city government because the tax base will be affected.

The City of Richmond and Redevelopment

The city officials of Richmond were confronted with the problem of redeveloping two areas within the city prior to the disaster. One of their primary concerns was adequate housing in certain areas of the city. Another concern was the redevelopment of the downtown area which had been losing businesses steadily to two shopping centers on the outskirts. For these reasons, a redevelopment commission was established by the Common Council (City

Council) in 1965. In fact, city officials were scheduled to go to Washington, D.C. for a meeting with federal officials on the matter of funding for urban renewal when the April 6th disaster occurred. As a consequence, the previously established priority for the initial redevelopment of adequate housing was set aside for the reconstruction of the downtown area.

When the city officials conferred with federal officials, they appealed for aid for the reconstruction of the downtown area. In response to the request, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provided fund for a market feasibility study. Consultants were hired to recommend a suitable course of action in the future to attract potential customers. This market feasibility study and plans for a downtown shopping mall developed by Downtown Richmond, Inc. were incorporated into a general redevelopment plan. This plan was submitted to the City Planning Commission by the Redevelopment Commission. Then a public hearing was conducted and the plan was sent to the Common Council for approval. It was approved in December, 1968 (*Proceedings of the Common Council of the City of Richmond, Indiana*, December 2, 1968). The plan was submitted to the regional office of HUD in Chicago for review during the same month. Thirteen months later, HUD gave its approval for the downtown redevelopment for \$1.8 million in federal funds for the overall downtown area development. As indicated in the earlier

paper, a part of the \$1.8 million (\$300,000) along with another \$100,000 from HUD was expended for the construction of the mall which meant that 53 per cent of the construction cost was federally aided.

The Redevelopment Plan

The basic objective of any downtown rehabilitation plan is to increase the attractiveness of the area to draw potential customers by improving or alleviating certain obstacles. In order to achieve this objective, the process of rehabilitation must be advanced along two lines: (1) facelifting of the establishments and (2) the alleviation of traffic congestion and parking inadequacies. These two aspects can be incorporated into a rehabilitation plan depending on the characteristics of the area and the type of financing. There are three possible general plans which can be used for the rehabilitation. The first is the so-called "perimeter plan". The perimeter plan is originally a proposal of the Chicago Plan Commission, a redesigning scheme which can be used for some intersection types of shopping districts with limited parking. The second type of plan calls for the extensive redevelopment of downtown areas or near downtown areas containing obsolete or dilapidated buildings. An example is the "Golden Triangle" area in Pittsburgh which was developed by the Mellon interests (Nelson 1958, p.306). The third type of redevelopment plan is the development of a detailed and complete downtown plan, representing the ideal in what a downtown might or should be in the future.

The perimeter plan was accepted as the planning guide for the general development of downtown Richmond. Because of the blighted condition and the physical

layout of the downtown area, the perimeter plan was ideal. Generally, this plan attempts to correct the existing conditions by: (1) providing adequate parking, (2) relieving traffic congestion and minimizing hazards to pedestrians, (3) eliminating non-shopping land use within the downtown area, (4) improving the blighted areas and open space, and (5) protecting the adjacent neighborhoods from the development within the perimeter.

This plan is implemented by: (1) re-routing all through traffic in a smooth flow pattern on a perimeter roadway or roadways around the development area, (2) clearing out non-retail buildings inside the perimeter roadway and creating parking facilities on the cleared land behind the stores fronting on the major street, (3) limiting traffic on the main frontage street by encouraging use of the perimeter road for through traffic and restricting the main street to local traffic and mass transit vehicles. The attraction of the downtown area is further enhanced for the shoppers and pedestrians by: (4) building a cantilevered canopy along the older parking lane to provide an all weather walk, (5) widening the sidewalk and eliminating the parking lane on the frontage street, (6) beautifying the rear of the stores and creating some entranceways from the rear parking lots directly into the stores, and (7) transforming the intersecting older streets and alleys into lighted arcades leading from the parking lots into frontage streets (Nelson 1958, p. 299). In the case of Richmond, some of these steps were inapplicable because of the plan to construct a mall.

The Implementation of the Plan

The first step was accomplished by

re-routing the traffic on U. S. 40 around the mall area (Figure 1). The through traffic on U.S. 40 was re-routed so that all east-bound traffic travelled on a street south of the mall, while the westbound traffic travelled on a one-way street north of the mall (Photo 1). However, vehicles can still travel through the mall area by way of one-way streets. Also, certain streets and alleys behind the stores fronting on the mall were designated as service drives for the delivery of goods to the stores (Photo 2).

The adequacy of parking areas around the mall is considered to be one of the critical aspects in the rehabilitation of the downtown area (Gist 1968, p. 51). Consequently, the City of Richmond, through its Department of Redevelopment, purchased about \$900,000 of land in the downtown area after the disaster. For example, a parcel of land for a 200-car parking lot was purchased north of the mall initially. Eventually, the land cost and improvements on this lot meant an investment of \$387,000 by the City of Richmond (Figure). In addition

to the city parking lots, some of the private businesses also established their own parking lots for their customers (Photos 3 and 4). In some instances, private businesses have constructed parking lots which can be used by the public for a fee (Photo 5).

The City also hired a consulting firm to conduct a parking survey and feasibility study to determine available parking spaces, the areas of need, and to furnish a projection of needs. According to the report of the consulting firm, a total of 2,148 spaces was needed in 1972 (Table 1). The total demand for parking spaces is generated by the demand for space imposed by all-day or employee parking and the transient or shopper-visitor parking needs. The parking space requirements for each of these categories as well as the type of activity are different (Table 1). For example, the space demand per 1,000 sq. ft. of office space is 2.00 spaces for all-day parking, while it is 0.50 for transient parking. On the other hand, the space demand per 1,000 sp. ft. of

Photo 1 Through Traffic on the Perimeter Road

Photo 4 Signs indicating a Private Parking Lot and a Public Parking Lot.

Photo 2 A Service Drive for the Delivery of Goods to Stores

Photo 5 A Privately Owned Parking Lot for General Parking

Photo 3 A Private Parking of an Establishment for its Customers only.

Photo 6 A Public Parking Lot with a Large Department Store in the Background.

Table 1 Parking Space Requirements-1972

Land Use	All-Day Parking		Transient Parking		
	Square Footage	Space Demand Per 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Number of Spaces Required	Space Demand Per 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Number of Spaces Required
Retail	376,867	0.50	188	2.25	848
Office	226,686	2.00	453	0.50	113
Services	41,565	1.00	42	2.00	83
Food and Drink	44,870	0.50	22	1.50	67
Education	4,927	1.00	5	1.00	5
Storage	66,168	0.25	17	—	—
Non-Detached Residential	202,352	0.50	101	0.50	101
Non-Commercial	148,625	1.50	223	0.50	74
Vacant Retail and Office	114,277	—	—	—	—
Vacant Non-Detached Residential	125,855	—	1,051	—	—
				Deduct 15% for Overlap-	1,291
					194
Sub-Total			1,051		1,097
TOTAL					2,148

Source : Carl Walker and Associates, Inc., *Parking Survey and Feasibility Study, Richmond, Indiana* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, January 21, 1972), p. 20.

retail space is 0.50 space for all-day parking; however, the transient parking is 2.25. Since retail activities occupy the largest amount of space in the downtown area, it requires the largest number of parking spaces.

A second study of the parking requirements indicated that there will be a projected deficit of 355 spaces in the central business district because of the addition of more sales area such as the opening of a department store on the mall. The demand for parking spaces was estimated to be 2,340 spaces (Table 2) and a high demand will exist between 8th and 10th Streets. Consequently, the consultant recommended that the City of Richmond construct a multi-level parking structure on a parcel of land between 7th and 8th Streets south

of the building fronting on the mall (Carl Walker and Associates, Letter to the City of Richmond, September 2, 1975).

The City intends to implement this recommendation by constructing a 400-car parking structure. This parking structure will be constructed on land which will be acquired through outright purchases and condemnation proceedings. Generally, the City has attempted to purchase necessary land for the construction of parking lots at convenient locations to the establishments on the mall (Photo 5). But, occasionally it is not possible to purchase the desired site because of the landowner's desire to hold the lot for his own use. In such a situation, condemnation proceedings or eminent domain is utilized to secure the land for public use¹⁾.

1) Eminent domain is defined as "the right of a sovereign State to appropriate private property to particular uses for the purpose of promoting the general welfare." (Lewis, 1906, p.1).

Table 2 Parking Space Requirements-1973

Land Use	All-Day Parking		Transient Parking		
	Square Footage	Space Demand Per 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Number of Space Required	Space Demand Per 1,000 Sq. Ft.	Number of Spaces Required
Retail	481,767	0.50	241	2.25	984
Office	238,686	2.00	477	0.50	119
Services	41,565	1.00	42	2.00	83
Food and Drink	44,870	0.50	22	1.50	67
Education	4,927	1.00	5	1.00	5
Storage	66,168	0.25	17	—	—
Non-Detached Residential	196,252	0.50	98	0.50	98
Non-Commercial	148,625	1.50	223	0.50	74
Vacant Retail and Office	107,877	—	—	—	—
Vacant Non-Detached Residential	125,855	—	—	—	—
			1,125		1,430
				Deduct 15% for Overlap-	215
<i>Sub-Total</i>			1,125		1,215
<i>TOTAL</i>					2,340

Source : Carl Walker and Associates, Inc., *Parking Requirements Updated for Richmond, Indiana* (Letter to City of Richmond dated September 12, 1973).

For example, when a property owner refuses to accept an offer from a public agency, the agency submits its reason for the necessity to acquire the property and request to a court for approval of purchase. If the court accepts the request, a fair and best market price is affixed for the lot and that amount is paid to the landowner. In august, 1974, one case was pending in the county court.

The parking structure is vital in correcting the shortage of parking spaces in the area between 8th and 10th Streets. The construction of this structure will rectify the spatial imbalance of parking spaces in the mall area. The locations of the parking lots indicates that there are more parking lots in the 5th to 7th Streets area than in the 8th to 10th Streets area. In addition, there are other advantages for the

construction of the parking structure at the recommended site. It is a prime location because of its close proximity to two large traffic generators (department stores). Second, it is situated about the middle of the mall. This location would also mean that the longest distance a shopper would have to walk is approximately 182 meters (600 feet) which is considered to be the maximum distance that a shopper is willing to walk to a store. Furthermore this area is already being used as parking lots, but the construction of a parking structure will add more parking spaces than the present lots.

Summary

The importance of the City of Richmond in the redevelopment of the downtown area is evident in this study. As can be seen by

this example, the city government served as the overall planning agency. As a planning agency, the City of Richmond established the basic plan which included the provisions for alleviating traffic congestion and improving accessibility to the downtown area. In addition, the adequacy of the parking has been examined to reflect the changes in the demand for parking spaces as a result of the expansion of the sales areas of establishments on the mall. Finally, the important steps to make the perimeter plan successful has been implemented.

The writer would like to acknowledge the generous assistance of Mr. Matt Napote, Head, Department of Redevelopment, City of Richmond in examining the various aspects of the role of the City of Richmond in the redevelopment of the downtown area.

This paper is dedicated to Professor Toshio Noh on his retirement.

(1975.10.21 受理)

References

- Gist, R.R. (1968): Retailing: Concepts and Decisions John Wiley and Sons, Inc. N.Y.
- Lewis, J. (1909): A Treatise on the Law of Eminent Domain in the United States 1 Callaghan and Co. Chicago.
- Nelson, R.L.: (1958) The Selection of Retail Locations F.W. Dodge Corp. N.Y.
- Oshiro, K.K. (1975): The Rehabilitation of a Central Business District: The Richmond (Indiana) Promenade (I) Tohoku Chiri 27 141-145
- Proceedings of the Common Council of the City of Richmond, Indiana December 2, 1968
- Urban Research Associates (1968): Market Feasibility Study: Central Core Area Washington, D.C.
- Carl Walker and Associates, Inc. (1972): Parking Survey and Feasibility Study: Richmond, Indiana Kalamazoo, Michigan
- Carl Walker and Associates Inc. (1973): Parking Requirements Updated for Richmond, Indiana (Letter to the City of Richmond, September 12, 1973)

CBD の復権 : リッチモンドプロムナード (II)

Kenji K. OSHIRO

(大 城 謙 治)

インディアナ州リッチモンド市においては、その CBD の再生にあたり、市当局がいろいろの部局を通じて、計画・開発機関としての役割を演じた。市当局の尽力により CBD 再建の全体計画が策定されたが、交通混雑を排除し、駐車場をつくるための諸計画はとりわけ重要であった。ダウンタウン地区をとりまく環状道路を建設して、CBD に出入する交通を容易にし、かつ通過交通のためのルートとすることによって、交通混雑を除こうとする計画はなかでも重要な側面であった。同様に重要なのは、適切かつ便利な顧客用の駐車場を作る計画であった。事業所のなかには、その顧客のための駐車場を作ったものもあるが、大部分の駐車場は市によって作られた。市は最近の企業活動の増大に応じて、駐車場数をさらに増やそうと計画している。