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This thesis confronts the reduction of public space in recent urban design as promoting social inequity. In addition to studying Transit Oriented Development principles, I analyze urban design theories to shape the relationship between architecture and public space. This thesis uses the movement patterns of people as a tool for the creation of new public space in the form of a Movement Center to promote social interaction, in turn reviving the common identity of the stagnant urban community.
This thesis asserts that the greater opportunity for people to interact socially, the greater sense of identity a community has. Over time, as historically defined public space has been in decline, so has the level of common knowledge about other cultures and people. A healthy sense of community goes hand in hand with good urban design to promote health, safety, and warm spirits in a neighborhood’s inhabitants.

The goal of this thesis is to increase communal interaction by (re)introducing public space within the contemporary American neighborhood, by way of a hybrid program of public transit, community center, retail and green space. The respectful relationship between public space and the surrounding architecture becomes a catalyst for similar relationships formed by the users in casual meetings, impromptu games, or organized get-together times.

This site of this study is within the limits of the Grant Park neighborhood in southeast Atlanta, Georgia. This area of the city is one of much potential, but has been overlooked in recent development for the more wealthy areas north of downtown. With historic Grant Park and Zoo Atlanta within its borders, this inner ring community has potential as being a model of diversity, but its pockets of uses are separated by lack of uniting common spaces in which to

Abstract

“…the interweaving of human patterns. They are full of people doing different things, with different reasons and different ends in view, and the architecture reflects and expresses this difference...Being human, human beings are what interest us most. In architecture as in literature and the drama, it is the richness of human variation that gives vitality and color to the human setting…” – Raskin (Jacobs 229)
Abstract

move about and interact.

This proposal stresses that recognizing the daily patterns of life, the ways at which people move throughout their day, is essential to developing more productive urban design. Nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences (Lynch 1). Comparative analysis of historic and contemporary urban plans provides a framework to design the Movement Center. By diagramming the characteristics of movement through the site, we can look to develop ways to maximize opportunities for people to intermingle in their paths through public spaces at a pedestrian scale.
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Age + Class + Racial Differential

A study completed in Orange County California ten years ago found that children in their automobile-dependant suburbs watched television four times more than children of the same age in a small Vermont town, despite more favorable weather in California. What is the level of maturation of children who cannot leave the house on their own until they are sixteen? (Corbett 9). The lack of opportunity to interact with other children helps mold how we as adults are not more open to communication with those outside of our family. Children certainly thrive in a neighborhood where they can get around on their own.

A similar issue comes into play when considering the senior citizens in our cities (Figure 1). When they come of age where driving is no longer safe, should the opportunities of older persons to interact with their peers end as well? Walkable places with interesting activities and available services may help to grant them a rich public life.

According to Jane Jacobs, sidewalk public contact and sidewalk safety together bear directly on our nation's most serious social problem – segregation and racial discrimination (71). I do not wish to allude that improving a city’s planning systems and design is a means to end the country’s prejudice, but it is assisting in alleviating some symptoms. For example, Jacobs goes on to tell a story of a woman from Los Angeles who stated while she knew there was a very high Mexican population in the city, she had
never laid eyes on a Mexican person or Mexican goods, much less exchanged words with a Mexican resident in her ten years of living in the city (72). Lack of adequate public space gives Americans reason to remain ignorant to other cultures and live their private lives tight within the boundaries of their home’s walls (Figure 2).

The Grant Park community is somewhat diverse in the ethnic makeup of its residents, types of businesses, and has the Grant Park, Zoo Atlanta, and Cyclorama as city landmarks. But what it does lack in relation to Jacob’s theory is an adequate amount of public space for the interaction and learning opportunities I strive for. For example, the immediate area of my site includes five different zoning uses, but no direct pathways to them through the site; travelers are forced to use Cherokee and Boulevard Avenues as main lines on travel, where sidewalks are sparse (Figure 3).

In neighborhoods where people walk and bicycle, social interaction is increased and neighbors are more likely to be friends (Figure 4). This is in sharp contrast to automobile dependant communities where people spend wasted hours every day driving to and from work, then get in their car again to visit friends or to make a trip to the store. Close proximity to services, as well as recreation would also decrease the alienation of the elderly, children, physically challenged, and the poor, all of who are at a disadvantage because they lack mobility without a car.
Pedestrian Traditions

History of Walking

Walking is a form of motion, the action of moving. Movement is the result of moving. Here, in the study of movement at a pedestrian scale, is where the heart of this thesis lies. The word movement can be used to describe a particular style or manner of moving. It also implies the rapid progress of events or the abundance of incidents. I seek to unravel the potential of commuting, the daily pattern of life for people of differing lifestyles. How do local residents leave to work outside of their community? Using what forms of transportation do edge city inhabitants use to travel to my site? Are there people who live and work within my site's community boundaries? The solutions to these questions and more lead to the formation of my Movement Center. Here, commuters are given opportunities to interact socially through pedestrian traffic around the open public space of a light rail station, the sculpted form of the commerce area, and youthful atmosphere of a Boys and Girls Club.

Since the beginning of time, humans have been walking as a means to survival. On foot, they carried children, hauled goods, herded animals, hunted and gathered, traveled, played, danced, and courted (Amato 19). Over time, modern improvements have made it easier to travel by other means than by foot. First the invention of the wheel, then cart and carriage, the train, then finally the car have slowly spoiled humans and caused them to walk less and
therefore communicate with each other less, diminishing identity within the communities they travel to and from everyday. Figure 5 on page 17 is an example of the lack of interaction on my site, the color groups are forced to the few fringe streets.

Decreasing Outdoor Opportunity
Ironically, at the same time as advancements are being made in mechanical travel, improvements are being made in making walking healthier for humans. Advanced plastics and metals are being employed in shoes, canes, and crutches; smoother flooring, roads and sidewalks are made for safer and easier walking in an attempt to create a more pleasant pedestrian experience. At the same time, physical movement is being diminished and economized in most of our daily activities. Architecture designs for commercial and public buildings alike aimed at ease and efficiency of movement (Amato 231). This thesis serves to provide unorthodox paths to pique curiosity and ample outdoor areas giving people accustomed to operating in their tight private space box an opportunity to move through new enjoyable spaces and gain a desire to explore and commune with their neighbors.
Figure 5
Existing Movement Patterns
by Author
Public Spaces

What is Public Space?

People of diverse backgrounds came to, and lived in, the city, knowing that this conglomeration of people and interaction offered by it would enrich their lives (Safdie 13). Even when housing was segregated along class or ethnic lines, public spaces were where people from all kinds of different backgrounds were exposed to each other. City streets, parks, and public transportation were melting pots of cultural differences, places where one would encounter people with various style of dress and speaking foreign languages, hear people expressing opinions that one would never hear amongst their peers, see other people engaged in activities never before witnessed. Over time, as historically defined public space has been diminishing; so has this phenomenon of public knowledge about other cultures and people.

What makes a place feel public (Safdie 39)? In cities before the automobile, public funds were spent to build post offices, courthouses, libraries, and places of governance and to maintain streets, parks, plazas, and markets. These were places for spontaneous interaction, a distant realm maintained by the public. In contemporary times, this has changed. Streets of shops and local business deteriorated while being challenged by super-block (Safdie 40) commercial towers, parking and interior oriented shopping malls. Streets devoid of pedestrians and street level interface became increasingly unsafe and added to the
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social divergence by making the public realm appear less attractive, comfortable, and commercially desirable.

Public Space + Social Interaction

Our built environment serves to dictate how humans behave and communicate with one another and treat our landscape, shaping our identity and views of community. Architecture cannot determine the behavior of the people experiencing it, but it can enable certain behavior to occur such as positive social interaction based upon its composition. For example, in the design of Pershing Square in Boston, Massachusetts, the park is hardly occupied because of its non-pedestrian configuration (Figure 6). It contains an immaculate central lawn edged by banana trees, stone walls, and busy downtown streets, a seemingly enjoyable urban green space. In reality, it became an unpleasant place because of its lack of paths to walk across the lawn and sparsely placed benches, which unevenly disbursed its users to the crowded outside sidewalk ring, neglecting the center. Laurie Olin’s recent installation into the park helped alleviate this problem by giving the center of the park a location and purpose, drawing people across the invisible boundary of the perimeter sidewalks (Figure 7).

Diversity in the Creation of Public Space

Diversity within the given public areas is vital to maintain an inviting presence. Colors can symbolize the character of urban space (Turner 189). For example, red space (Figure 8) becomes the exciting areas that contain entertainment
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venues (Figure 9), blue spaces are the cool areas where people can experience a connection to water, brown space connects people to the raw earth, etc. These different colors of space also relate to differing levels of public space, from public to semi-public to private, and how they connect to how people move through and around a building. Just as I aim to commingle diverse groups of people, I will be designing public space at an equally diverse level. The buildings that shape the boundaries of these open spaces are just as important as the spaces themselves, but the overlap of pedestrian patterns and needs of the users will determine their form. Passages for automobiles in comparison to pedestrian paths are also considered. Circulation patterns for automobiles become greenways in order to not completely isolate users of the community, and also be multi-colored in coordination with the other public spaces.

Public Space Design in History
Camillo Sitte discusses the positive relationship between buildings and their plazas through examples in history. His emphasis is on public space in the form of plazas, which typically formed around religious structures in his time period and earlier in Eastern Europe. In his book, City Planning According to Artistic Principles, he uses four chapters to discuss positive arrangement and operation of successful plazas. Imagine the open square of a small market town in the country, covered with deep snow and crisscrossed by several roads and paths that, shaped by
the traffic, form the natural lines of communication (Sitte 159). This statement leads to the advice that centers of plazas, or any other open space, should be free of obstacles such as fountains and monuments (Figure 10). The plaza is intended for the congregation of people, and that focus should occupy the center. Monuments then belong on the edges of these spaces, forming visually pleasing points off of the axis of movement into and through the place. Sitte also discounts the modern notion of square or rectilinear public space, stating that oblong shapes or groupings of plazas add to their charm.

I agree with Sitte’s use of varied scales of space interconnected. Public space should exist in many levels, large spaces with transitory areas leading to small spaces. A major portion of the Movement Center’s site will be dedicated to public green and plaza space. Sitte’s work serves as a historical precedent to lead to quality communal architecture. The ideal space must be a clearly defined unit (Sitte 199). A person feels more comfortable in a space where his gaze does not lead to infinity, meaning he has a grasp of his surroundings and feels secure. Sitte offers suggestions to end vistas (Figure 11) that tend to occur endlessly in modern gridiron city street patterns found in most American cities. The design of the Movement Center will incorporate new green and hard-scaped public space and use Sitte’s theory to mold their arrangement with lessons in improving the existing, yet under utilized spaces.
Urban Design Examples

Physical City Image
How we perceive our environment is important in considering how we desire to connect with it. The right mix of diversity and continuity in a city’s elements is important to our positive perception and memory. The physical characteristics and general organization of communities shape the behavior of people. I have taken into account ideas by Kevin Lynch and Jane Jacobs to conceptualize the best way to organize the vast space of my industrial site.

In the path, streets that suggest extremes of either width or narrowness attract attention (Lynch 50). Characteristic spatial qualities are able to strengthen the image of the path. Variation and special façade characteristics are also important in reinforcing the identity of a path (Figure 12). A path can be a narrow sidewalk, a passageway across a wide green space, or a pedestrian way along a busy thoroughfare.

The path leads us to the edge of a district. Kevin Lynch tells us that edges are lateral references, boundaries between two kinds of areas. They are typically seen as railroads lines, shores, walls, or end of a development. My site is bounded on the north side by private residences, on the east and west by other light commercial sites and to the south with the Beltline rail. This boundary is important to the community as a visible line of territory. If arranged at a pedestrian scale and fully walkable, the area of the community becomes
something fully tangible, not overwhelming to the resident. It is important for the user to appreciate their community in relation to other neighborhoods as well as a sense of belonging to the city as a whole. I envision a mixed scale of immediate urban buildings, but never at a height where they may block out sweeping views to the city’s downtown core from the ground level.

Landmarks are those elements that give a city its character and recognition from outside users. Spatial distinction can establish elements as landmarks by setting up a contrast with adjacent elements or by making the element visible from many locations. This Movement Center will become a new landmark for the Grant Park and adjacent Chosewood Park areas.

Location at a junction involving path decisions strengthens a landmark (Lynch 81). Path junction points become nodes, places where this thesis plans to build relationships between the commuters and residents of the project (Figure 13). These nodes may range in size, like a small corner where two sidewalks merge, or a large square in the center of a highway interchange. Because decisions must be made at these junctions, people heighten their attention at such places and perceive nearby elements with more than normal clarity (Lynch 73). I would like to take advantage of this heightened awareness to maximize social interaction at these points. The spatial relationships of the
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Movement Center’s program components are designed to maximize the number and frequency of nodes for these choice encounters.

Social City Image
Jane Jacobs also gives a theory on the proper formation of cities to foster improved community identity. She maintains an emphasis on diversity, within the people of the district, uses of buildings, and ages of buildings. There is also the importance of the sidewalk in socializing, protecting the neighborhood, and rearing the children. She maintains four main conditions for generating lively diversity in a city’s streets and districts: that the district must contain more than one primary function, short blocks and frequent opportunities to turn corners on streets, variety in age of buildings, and that there needs to be a dense concentration of people for whatever the purpose of the district (Figure 14). The half mile local radius of context for the site of this thesis has more than one function, and a variety of aged buildings, but lacks the other recommended elements. The density is low scale suburban, and has short blocks in the residential areas, but is in need of more cross streets or walking paths around the industrial sites.

A high percentage of Americans currently view the act of hanging outside of stores, lingering on stoops, or loitering on busy corners as appalling. This judgment represents a profound misunderstanding of cities. It makes no more
sense to drop in at a testimonial banquet and conclude that if these people had wives who could cook, they would give their parties at home (Jacobs 55). The streets are public spaces intended to be inhabited with people. They are places meant to bring together persons who do not know each other and probably would not associate in this manner in alternate occasions. Consistent contact on a sidewalk or street over time leads to trust and a common sense of identity and support which is necessary in vibrant communities. Figure 15 is an example of the potential for interaction on the site after the development of the Movement Center.
Transit Oriented Development

Major Principles
This community design project proposes a hybrid program including community, education, commercial, and open public space with a focus on pedestrian elements and mass transit options. Because of their emphasis on pedestrian movement and the preservation of open space, this thesis explores methods utilized in Transit Oriented Developments (TODs) in a few major cities. The majority of construction spurs occurring today have to do with the housing market, density in urban centers as well as single family communities in the sprawling suburbs. Populations around America are changing and need the housing industry to follow suit. There are higher numbers of single parent families, unmarried couples, and single persons which require diversity in housing offerings to accommodate them. Transit Oriented Developments make efforts to include housing options of varying scales, from one person loft spaces to three bedroom town homes and single family lots on the outskirts. The intent is to provide a more dense community concentrated around recreational amenities and retail businesses for everyday needs and connected by forms of mass transit to decrease our dependency on automobile vehicles (Figure 16-17).

The urban design principles associated with Transit Oriented Development’s are:
- Organizing growth on a regional level to be more compact and transit-supportive
Transit Oriented Development

- Placing commercial, housing, job parks, and civic uses within walking distance of transit stops
- Create pedestrian friendly street networks that directly connect local destinations (Figure 18)
- Provide a mix of housing types, densities, and costs
- Preserve sensitive habitat, riparian zones, and high quality open space
- Make public spaces the focus of building orientation and neighborhood activity
- Encourage the infill and redevelopment along transit corridors within existing neighborhoods (Figure 19)

The Transit Oriented Development concept is a modern improvement on Lynch’s city image. His edges relate to the TOD principle of placing community program components within a reasonable walking radius. Protected open spaces become his Nodes, those spaces as a neighborhood focus become the Landmarks and pedestrian friendly street networks relate to his Paths. An example of urban infill TOD is the Holly Street Village in Pasadena, California. The site was previously a parking lot adjacent to freight tracks, not unlike the monotonous industrial area of this project’s site on the Beltline. The compound included apartment units, with commercial space on the ground floors and other amenities within a few blocks. The new rail station is an example of how to integrate the tracks
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with the building design, allowing one of the apartment blocks to form a bridge over the tracks.

The Pedestrian Pocket

Peter Calthorpe’s concept of the Pedestrian Pocket is closely related to that of the TOD (Figure 20). Defined as a balanced, mixed-use area within a one-quarter mile walking radius of a light rail station, the Pedestrian Pocket can be applied to already existing neighborhoods, as well as new developments. This planning concept does not eliminate the car but rather offers transportation alternatives, primarily walking, biking, and transit. Its focus is on connecting people with the services they need without reliance on the automobile. The vision for Pedestrian Pockets is that the tightly knit form, the orientation toward public outdoor space, and the provision of retail and business services in the community would enable people to live more of their lives within one locale (Girling 40). Moreover, the coordination of streets, parks, playgrounds, walkways, bikeways, and community centers can encourage more walking and outdoor activity, thereby increasing social interaction.

The Pedestrian Pocket borrows ideas from the Garden City movement. In the plan of Radburn, New Jersey for example, the objective was to build a self sufficient community with a heavy emphasis on pedestrian paths and outdoor park activity. The concept of large open green
spaces was replaced by activity oriented spaces that ranged in size from small private yards to larger public gathering spaces. What differs in Radburn from the Transit Oriented Development ideals is the separation of motor and foot traffic. This can lead to a sort of isolation of people within the community from block to block by discontinuing direct connections to nodes of interaction (Figure 21).

Calthorpe also touches on points about social integration by stating that the issue of gentrification must be addressed along with the hope of enticing the middle classes from the suburbs back into the city (Dittmar xiii). He goes on to talk about displacing whole communities by neglecting to provide an appropriate mix of affordable housing is a mistake.

In his book, The Next American Metropolis, Calthorpe expresses belief that the rise of the modern suburb is in part a manifestation of a deep cultural and political shift away from public space (85). As I have described previously, this movement is circular; the more private our technology and social forms become, the more isolated, defensive, and virtually unaccepting we become. Calthorpe also reinforces my opinion that increased public space should be available to more people and at the pedestrian scale of movement through it, thus human lives will be more fulfilling.
Design Themes
Positive moments like existing park spaces, consistent grid patterns, and other elements that promote social activity and movement within the site are mapped to contrast against the existing conditions to create a harmonious solution. The figures produced in this study of regenerating community connectors and social public space along and through movement patterns of people are what give form to the Movement Center (Figures 22-24). Earlier in this discussion, I diagrammed the lack of movement opportunities, other than by automobile, around the site except for a few street sidewalks along Boulevard and Cherokee Avenues. Here, with schematic volumetric diagrams, I show the interaction potential of a barren industrial site. The three line colors represent the user groups moving to, from, and around the Movement Center (Figure 25).

The following abstract timeline charts the three main users groups of the site against their most common routine as well as their occasional occurrences (Figure 26). Recognizing the regular activity patterns of people helps to understand how to order the spaces in which they move. I focus on the youth, seniors, and working adults (parents and singles). The chosen program components are a response to the needs of these groups of people. The light rail station is a benefit to all involved. The community center is geared towards the youth to give them organized learning and entertainment options after school. The
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Figure 25
New Movement Patterns + Parti
by Author
Figure 26
Movement Patterns Timeline
by Author
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center also supports working parents in the community and those that use the transit option for day care needs of younger children. The meeting rooms and computer lab in the community center as well as in the mobile library branch will be used for club meetings and adult education classes for seniors. A restaurant, grocery, and retail spaces give shopping, dining and entertainment alternatives to the workers and residents within the vicinity.

The process of instilling the thesis ideas into architectural design began with a concept collage that drove the design direction of my Movement Center (Figure 27). Chipboard represents the boundaries existing in the site: zoning uses, physical barriers, and unfriendly walking surfaces. The colorful ribbons are the circulation patterns implemented to break up those boundaries and connect uses and people. The photography under and overlays show the before and after effects of the new development.

The Master Plan

The various forms of vehicular movement that will be added to the site area are a bus parking lane, taxi parking lane, passenger drop-off, short and long term parking. The Movement Center will also attract other visitor and commuters who will need bike and skate paths, sidewalks, and sitting areas. Figures 28 and 29 show what occurs in the existing and proposed context of the site for this project.
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Following Transit Oriented Design and successful urban design principles discussed earlier, some major changes were made to the site and immediate surroundings to assist in producing a more continuous flow of traffic for the residents, commuters, and surrounding businesses. A new street is introduced from Boulevard Avenue eastward to Cherokee Boulevard, along which low to mid-rise multifamily housing is proposed to face the new Movement Center. Cherokee Boulevard, an existing dead end street, is continued southbound to connect across the imposing berm to the Chosewood Park development. This new housing works to add a more public face and foster building to building interaction for the new architecture, and break down the scale of the new buildings in relation to single family homes in the surrounding community.

Changes were made to the large earth berm separating Grant Park and Chosewood Park communities within my site area. The section between two new north-south drives in the Movement Center to Chosewood Park development was excavated down to lowest common elevation point of the two developments. The existing heavy rail line is elevated and bridged across at this point to accommodate the change in grade.

Outdoor park and plaza spaces vary per location; some are to be quiet and shady, the central space at the intersection of landforms is bustling and opens for people watching
and quick conversation, and the café plaza is a steady paced transition off of the fast paced rail line (Figure 30).

The main organizers for the site’s circulation are green landforms that traverse across it in both directions. These landforms show the action of movement in sculptural physical form and provide users with different walking surfaces, shade in some places, and various places to sit or play (Figure 31).

Parking is addressed within the landforms made by the ribbons of circulation. The lot within the same block as station is contained partially submerged underground with pedestrian bridges to the second lot which is terraced to transition itself into the berm.
Station Design

The ideas discussed in this thesis culminate in the creation of a rail station, better tying Grant Park and Chosewood Park communities into the Atlanta city transit system. The station design is led by the circulation grids imposed upon it by the master plan scheme and lines of elevated rail. Orientation of the building is guided by the required length and width of the platform needed to house an eight car train, the peak number of cars used during any given day, and runs parallel with the existing heavy rail line. The main entry for the station occurs in the space at ground level at the intersection of line of elevated rail above and the central landforms which flows uninterrupted through the open air atrium of the building. The majority of the station is open to the air to allow for various interaction forms and to maintain views and encourage pedestrian movement through the building, even if they are not planning to ride the train (Figure 32).

An early circulation concept was the idea of main pedestrian movement along the two east-west corridors with places for pause in the central space (Figure 33). These pause points became the rail fare and information booth, convenience store and newspaper stand, restaurant, and retail units. This idea is expressed using the materials and form of the building. Areas of constant movement are open to air and natural light, while areas of pause are enclosed. Because wood siding is prominent in the surrounding residential
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neighborhood, wood slat siding is used for the station's enclosed spaces to allow some light and the option to view glimpses of people moving on either side of the walls.

Movement is also shown with in the structure of the building. The new rail lines require a regular and linear heavy concrete structure. The station’s structure is lighter, and detached from the heavy rail column grid. Slender steel columns come from the ground in a playful slant and connect to unevenly spaced steel trusses that span across the rail platform and support a lightweight fabric membrane roof canopy (Figure 34).
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Site Studies

The site for this investigation is in the southeast quadrant of Atlanta, Georgia (Figures 35-9) nestled along the Right of Way of a very rarely used rail line called the Beltline. The Beltline is a loop that encircles the city and contains nearly three thousand acres of underutilized land (Figure 36). The City of Atlanta is currently engaged in assembling development proposals and studying how to successfully revitalize these areas. Funding is already in place to begin redeveloping infrastructure and brownfield and environmental cleanup. Work along the Beltline will help rejuvenate industrial sites and traditionally neglected areas throughout the city. I have narrowed the loop down to the southeastern quadrant because it is the one presently being developed the least and has much potential in its existing uses. It is important to not overlook the existing community and positive qualities it may contain that are not immediately apparent to the average visitor, but maintain that charm to not repel existing users from the new development.

From the southeast district scale, I studied roughly three acres of open land across from several light industrial properties amidst single and multifamily homes along the rail line. In a one-fourth mile radius, I propose a Movement Center, using Transit Oriented Development principles, and connecting green and public space as the central focus. The site is nestled between the Beltline to the south, Georgia Power substation to the west, single family
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Figure 37
Atlanta Skyline Beyond Site
by Author

Figure 38
Southeast Quadrant of Atlanta
by Google Maps with overlay by Author

Figure 39
Map of 1/2 Mile Site Radius
by Author
homes to the north and has direct access off of Boulevard Ave to the east (Figures 40-41). There is currently a light industrial business at that corner, but I am taking into consideration the knowledge that most of those businesses will be relocating when the Chosewood Park development occurs as a basis for including it into my plan.

This area of the city suits this project because it has diversity in place within its residents, types of businesses, and attractions. But what it does lack is the number and diversity in public spaces for interaction and learning that I argue for. For example, there are four to five differing zoning uses allowed adjacent to my site, but no direct pathways for movement to or though the site; the diverse uses are segregated.

Within a one-half mile radius are pockets of different land uses as well as a major landmark in the historic Grant Park, Atlanta’s oldest and largest park. Zoo Atlanta and the Cyclorama, a civil war museum, are contained within the boundaries of Grant Park. My site is exactly three blocks from the southern edge of the Zoo. The Park is surrounded with single family homes, sprinkled with a few duplexes and all of varying ages intermingled (Figure 42). Sidewalks are sparse in the area, mainly on the streets closest to the park; disappearing from one side of the street as you move south into the light industrial areas (Figure 43). Alternate forms of public space are fairly minimal in this
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Figure 42
View of adjacent Residences
by Author

Figure 43
View of adjacent Businesses
by Author
area outside of the actual Grant Park, mostly occurring in open housing lots that may be used for informal gathering or play area for children until sold for new housing construction. The diversity in surrounding land uses leads to the opportunity to introduce new pathways to the site, potentially as transitory public space; possibly in a similar fashion to the Galleria Victor Emanuel, one of the case studies to be explained later in the appendix.

Existing movement patterns, in terms of traffic, are relatively simple: heavy motor traffic with little pedestrian use occurs on Boulevard and Cherokee Avenues down to the industrial sites. Most of the intermediate residential cross streets contained sidewalks on at least one side, but were not being used often from my observation. The Marta bus lines only travel from the north down a portion of Boulevard past Grant Park and turn on Edgewood Avenue to the west.

Directly south of the Grant Park neighborhood parameters I work within is the community of Chosewood Park. The city of Atlanta recently commissioned a group of students at the Georgia Institute of Technology to complete a redevelopment study of that area of the city with regards to the Beltline Project. I have used my site in connection to their proposal to have some framework for how to tie the surrounding communities into my Transit Oriented Development. The Georgia Tech proposal demolishes
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the existing low income housing projects to provide increased density using mixed-use and commercial plots around the edges of Chosewood Park, along the Beltline and Boulevard. The authors of that study appear to have similar beliefs about the importance in public space, for their master plan includes expanding the existing central green space, Chosewood Park, and creating a green trail along a creak leading up to new green space parallel to the rail lines.

Figures 44 - 55 are diagrams and site photos that further explain and support the dialogue in this section.
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Figure 44
Zoning Uses on Site
by Author
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Figure 45
1/4 + 1/2 Mile Walking Radii
by Author
Site Studies

Figure 46
View down Boulevard Avenue
by Author

Figure 47
View down Cherokee Avenue
by Author

Figure 48
Chosewood Park Concept Map
by Georgia Tech Beltline Studio with overlay by Author
Figure 49
Movement Methods Map
by Author
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Figure 50
View of nearby Industrial Sites
by Author

Figure 51
View of nearby Luxury Condos
by Author

Figure 52
Connectors to Chosewood Park
by Author
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Figure 53
Proposed connectors on Site by Author
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Figure 54
Existing Park Spaces
by Author
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Figure 55
Movement + Public Space Synthetic Map
by Author
Precedent Studies

At a similar scale to my site area is the Holly Street Village in Pasadena, California (Figure 56). The catalyst for the Village was the construction of the Memorial Park Metro light rail station in 2003. The site was previously a parking lot adjacent to freight tracks and a few other nondescript buildings that were demolished. The compound includes three hundred fifty rental apartment units, another 16 loft units in the rehabilitated Hall of Justice, with commercial retail on the ground floors of the apartments and also access to more buildings within a couple blocks (Figure 57). The total area of impact was just over five acres and reserved twenty percent of the rental units for low income residents (Figure 58). The distance from both the commercial activity and transit station is only two hundred feet (Figure 59). Other close amenities are the City Park and a senior center.

Within this project, I am interested in the use of public space. A central courtyard runs through the middle of the complex which is open to the public. Also to note is the equal emphasis on the relationship with the Memorial Park across the rail tracks.
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Figure 58
Holly Street Village City Context
Author Unknown

Figure 59
Pasadena Metro Map
Author Unknown
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**Spring Valley Area Plan** is an urban revitalization master plan study designed by Peter Calthorpe Associates for the City of Richardson, Texas. This Transit Oriented Development plan examines links between land uses and transportation from the city and regional levels. It also works to provide recommendations on how to create a more walkable environment (Figures 60-62). Spring Valley Station, the first stop just north of Dallas, is the city’s only elevated station.

The majority of the proposed development is within a quarter mile walking radius from the station. The existing study area contains a mix of employment campuses, manufacturing, and housing uses, similar to the Grant Park neighborhood study area of this thesis.
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Figure 61
1/2 Mile Radius Connections
overlay by Author

Figure 62
Before + After Renderings
Author Unknown
I also have examined familiar city plan examples from the City Beautiful Movement. **Radburn, New Jersey**, a planned community, was started in 1929 by the City Housing Corporation from the plans developed by Clarence Stein and Henry Wright. The intent was to build a community which made provisions for the complexities of modern life, while still providing the amenities of open space, community service and economic viability. The community was intended to be a self-sufficient entity, with residential, commercial and industrial areas each supplementing the needs of others. The residential areas include every type of housing unit with a wide range of cost. The basic layout of the community introduced the “super-block” concept, cul-de-sac grouping, interior parklands, and separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic to promote safety. Every home was planned with access to park walks (Figure 63). There are extensive recreation programs planned for the entire community.

What stands out in this plan is the emphasis on homes literally turning their backs to the car and industrial ideas. In a society so dependent on technology, this creates a disconnect with the outside world by separating uses. Also, the super block and cul-de-sac concept physically separate blocks within the community and discourage movement into new areas and socialization outside of one’s own block (Figures 64-65).
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Figure 65
Radburn City Plan
by Girling
The McCormick Tribune Campus Center, designed by Rem Koolhaas, is a one-story building which serves a wide variety of student activity functions that include a welcome center, coffee bar, auditorium and meeting rooms, university bookstore, post office, convenience store, and computer room.

I am intrigued with the interior layout which was inspired by pre-existing footpaths, that criss-crossed under the train tracks, formed by students walking back and forth between residence halls and classroom buildings on the IIT Main Campus during the past 70 years (Figures 66-68).

This project is successful in addressing some of the same questions that arise on the Grant Park site of this thesis. How does this project address the barren industrial areas to either side of the existing rail line as well as interface with the residential areas? To solve the IIT dilemma, Koolhaas captures the sum of the student flows, using the web of lines that connect the eastern and western campus destinations organized through the campus centre to differentiate activities into streets, plazas and urban islands.
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Figure 67
Building to Terminal Interaction
overlay by Author

Figure 68
Pedestrian Paths generate Plan
overlay by Author
A cohesive mixed-use development should include transitory public spaces inclusive of all people. The **Galleria Victor Emanuel**, also known as Galleria Vittorio Emanuele, is a collection of arcades in cruciform plan that extends directly from one street to a public square through a city block, acting as an enclosed courtyard space to a corridor of local business and shops forming the link between the Piazza del Duomo and the Piazza della Scala (Figures 69-70).

It is often referred to as the Salon of Milan because, with its elegant cafés and shops, it is the place where people traditionally converge. Built between 1865 and 1867, in Renaissance style, the glass-roofed arcade resembles a grand old train station. I also look for inspiration in the threshold condition from the plaza to an interior space, across a threshold back out onto the street (Figure 71). The structure of the arcades sets a rhythm which also invokes forward movement (Figure 72).
Precedent Studies

Figure 71
Intermediate Threshold to Plaza
overlay by Author

Figure 72
Rhythm of Structure
overlay by Author
The **TourBus Hotel** by Lewis Tsurumaki Lewis is a project that also focuses on the movement of people. This presentation for the 2004 Venice Architecture Biennale is meant to accommodate the European Bus Tour, between Venice, Italy and Munich, Germany. The TourBus Hotel is a prototype structure for the accommodation of the bus tour, situating itself at the junction of coming and going.

Like the selection on my site along Atlanta's Beltline, the TourBus Hotel plugs into the existing routes of European bus tours, located opportunistically on the highways between major tourist sites. The functions of the hotel are structured according to this directional split coming from Venice and going to Munich, for example, and vice versa. The second floor of the hotel is designed to provoke the interaction of the two types of people coming into the space from two countries (Figure 73-74). I also enjoy the form of the facility, straddling the street instead of ordinarily situating itself on either side (Figure 75).
The process of commuting leads to the discovery of regular patterns of movement by a variety of people to many places around Atlanta. I have broken the users of my site into three categories by age and activity: Commuters, Senior Citizens, and Youth. By observing existing movement patterns and identifying what attractions are lacking around the site, the resulting program is as follows:

The central focus and main enclosed public space of the Movement Center is a transit station. The platform for the train and surrounding plaza becomes the public space where commuters and visitors of the Grant Park move about and intermingle. Other components in this area include Kiss and Ride, Park and Ride, bus loading and bicycle parking areas to accommodate the many methods of travel to the site. This piece is the common route of travel and connector of all the types of public space.

Retail components are included in the proposal and are necessary to help sustain the train station economically and for the benefit of daily errands by the users of the site. Morning commuters might want to grab a cup of coffee or a newspaper before riding the train to work. Upon returning, they may need convenience shopping options within walking distance. Employees of the surrounding industrial businesses can enjoy close places to eat lunch and outdoor sitting space. Singles would appreciate an entertainment locale that does not require traveling to other
Program Studies

parts of the city. Increasing pedestrian options around a new commerce area draws people to the site who were previously segregated by poor circulation and no popular destinations other than Grant Park.

In order to keep all ages and types of activities in consideration, the Center houses a community center with a Boys & Girls Club theme. This allows constructive activity for older children and supervised activity for younger ones. This concentration of younger people balances with the higher population of older adults using the light rail train service. Grant Park, being only 3 blocks from the site, will supply the outdoor activity space that the Club will need, allowing the youth the opportunity to move outside of the building and observe daily neighborhood activity.

The following diagrams (Figures 79-84) are a preliminary view of how the diverse multi-uses in the program elements and how they can be arranged on site based upon movement patterns and time. The program on site, further broken down in terms of routine usage patterns, are of varying heights to maximize points of interaction in both horizontal and vertical circulation. Landscaped paths cross the Beltline tracks and connect to proposed green spaces sequences in the Chosewood Park community.
Figure 79
Waiting Area as Gallery
Author Unknown

Figure 80
Rail Platform as Concert Hall
Author Unknown

Figure 81
Zones of Program on Site
by Author
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Figure 82
Abstract Site Section
by Author

Figure 83
Zoning Regulations in Section
by Author

Figure 84
Abstract Circulation Sketches
by Author
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daily Ritual</th>
<th>Weekly Habits</th>
<th>Occasional Fun</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Station</strong></td>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Center</strong></td>
<td><strong>Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platform Area</td>
<td>Green Space</td>
<td>Lobby/Reception</td>
<td>25% Service Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger waiting area and Train lanes</td>
<td>Grass areas for play and leisure</td>
<td>Information services</td>
<td>Circulation, MEP, construction excess, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service Kiosk</td>
<td>Plaza Space</td>
<td>Large Multi-use Room</td>
<td>Short-term parking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information services and Purchase of fare</td>
<td>Paved areas for walking and play, contains seating</td>
<td>Tables and seating for indoor activities</td>
<td>Kiss and Ride Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Fare Machines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>Long-term parking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manned fare sale location</td>
<td>Supervised play area for small children</td>
<td>Game Court</td>
<td>Car Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>Game Court</td>
<td>Indoor sports area</td>
<td>Bus Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to ground level Retail Units</td>
<td>Administration Area</td>
<td>Staff offices and equipment</td>
<td>Passenger pick-up and drop-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>Equipped with diaper changing tables</td>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to second level Retail Units</td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>Shower and changing facility with lockers</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Units</td>
<td>Convenience Store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The International Building Code, 2003 Edition is the applicable code to the Movement Center, which is considered a mixed-use type building. Below are the basic regulations for all components of the project program. Due to my desire to keep the Movement Center at a pedestrian scale and not overpower the adjacent residential areas, no portion of my buildings will exceed double the maximum height allowed by the residential zoning regulations, or 70 feet. From this I have decided to research building codes using Type I-B – 2 hour Noncombustible rating which allows a maximum un-sprinkled height of 75 feet. As the design progresses, some of this information may change.

Occupancy Group A-2: Assembly, Food and Drink Establishments

- Sprinkler systems is required when floor area exceeds 5000 square feet, occupancy load exceeds 300 persons, or in a basement greater than 1500 square feet in an area with no openings to the exterior.
- The maximum height in stories allowed is 11.
- The maximum floor area allowed on any single floor is 55,000 square feet.
- Maximum travel distance to the nearest exit enclosure is 200 feet or 250 feet for sprinkled buildings.
- Maximum travel distance to two independent egress paths is 75 feet.
- Maximum length of a dead-end corridor is 20 feet.
Program Studies

- Minimum corridor width is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants.
- Minimum clear egress door width is 32 inches.
- Minimum width of stairs is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants.

Occupancy Group E: Educational
- Sprinkler system is required on a floor below the level of exit discharge, with a floor area exceeding 20,000 square feet.
- The maximum height in stories allowed is 5.
- There is no restriction on floor area on any single floor.
- Maximum travel distance to the nearest exit enclosure is 200 feet or 300 feet for sprinkled buildings.
- Maximum travel distance to two independent egress paths is 75 feet or 100 feet in sprinkled buildings.
- Maximum length of a dead-end corridor is 20 feet or 50 feet if sprinkled.
- Minimum corridor width is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants.
- Minimum clear egress door width is 32 inches.
- Minimum width of stairs is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants.

Occupancy Group I-4: Institutional, Child Care
- An approved sprinkler system is required for all Group I-4 occupancies.
The maximum height in stories allowed is 6.
The maximum floor area allowed on any one single floor is 544,500 square feet.
Maximum travel distance to the nearest exit enclosure is 150 feet or 200 feet for sprinkled buildings.
Maximum travel distance to two independent egress paths is 75 feet.
Maximum length of a dead-end corridor is 20 feet.
Minimum corridor width is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants.
Minimum clear egress door width is 32 inches.
Minimum width of stairs is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants.

Group M: Mercantile
Sprinkler system is required in areas with a floor area exceeding 12,000 square feet or more than 3 stories in height or where storage is in high-piled or rack storage arrays.
The maximum height in stories allowed is 11.
There is no restriction on floor area on any single floor.
Maximum travel distance to the nearest exit enclosure is 200 feet or 250 feet for sprinkled buildings.
Maximum travel distance to two independent egress paths is 75 feet.
Maximum length of a dead-end corridor is 20 feet.
Minimum corridor width is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants.
Program Studies

- Minimum clear egress door width is 32 inches.
- Minimum width of stairs is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants.

Minimum width of stairs is 44 inches for more than 50 occupants, 36 inches for less than 50 occupants

Groups A-3 and E are within the list of mixed-use exceptions that do not require separation of uses by firewall.
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