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Introduction
No community in the City of Pittsburgh is richer in assets than Oakland. It has cultural institutions, two universities and a women's college, seven regional hospitals, historic residential neighborhoods, one of the most beautiful urban parks in the world, schools, a Cathedral and several venerable churches, and neighborhood shopping precincts.

However, Oakland has had severe problems and conflicts. Institutional expansion during the nineteen fifties and sixties has placed enormous pressures of density and traffic on the community so that today the daily commuter population (40,000) exceeds the resident population (30,000).

**Previous plans**
In view of these pressures, it is hardly surprising that during the past twenty-five years there have been several plans for Oakland.

**Why another plan?**
One thing all the previous plans had in common was that they were drawn up by professional planners and architects working in the traditional way: that is, either for public or civic agencies or for one of the institutions, but without major inputs from the people who live and work in the Oakland community.
This plan is the citizens' plan

This plan is different. It is the citizens' plan. The authors are you, the people of Oakland.

The plan reflected in this report is a policy document based on innumerable meetings with individuals and in an attempt to hear the people's views and incorporate their inputs.

It was developed, step by step, over a period of 28 months through tireless work by the Citizens Planning Committee and its consultants, citizen and inter-agency sub-committees, and a series of public forums and workshops involving citizens, the Mayor and Council agencies, and representatives of the institutions and businesses of Oakland.

Planning by consensus

Perhaps the main difference between this plan and previous plans for Oakland is that this is the first serious attempt to get all interests into a planning process together in a climate of mutual determination to discuss the difficult problems and conflicting issues comprehensively and arrive at agreed goals and strategies for dealing with them.

Another difference is that this plan does not seek to alter Oakland. There are no sweeping changes or major dislocations. Oakland is accepted the way it is and the plan attempts to overcome Oakland's problems by working within its existing scale, making it function better and use its qualities.

Of course one hundred percent consensus on every issue and every recommendation is virtually impossible to achieve in a context as complex as Oakland, and in a process as long as this one has been. But after many months of work and discussions drafts of this report have been circulated and commented upon by citizens, and it is evident that with a few exceptions noted in the report, a remarkable consensus on the way ahead has been achieved.
Who coordinated the planning process?
The coordinator is Oakland Directions, Inc. (ODI). ODI is
a non-profit umbrella organization made up of representatives
from community groups, institutions, the commercial areas,
and the City. It was formed in 1972 with the specific
intention of resolving the conflicts that had arisen between
the institutions and the residents during the 1960's and
early 1970's. And the means of resolution was to be joint
planning.

Following four years of preparation, ODI asked its Planning
Committee in 1976 to engage consultants with experience in
participation processes. After screening several firms
nationally we selected a Pittsburgh firm, Urban Design
Associates.

The Planning Committee and Urban Design Associates have
worked together throughout the process, and they have
coordinated the inputs, not only of the citizens, but of
the specialized consultants also in such areas as traffic,
parking, market economics, and housing.

How to use the plan
This report is intended as a policy workbook. It attempts
to respond directly to the concerns and issues raised by
the participants during the planning process, and to do
so with serious and practical recommendations. The document
has three purposes:

To set guidelines for revitalization and development for all
areas of Oakland, both for short and long ranges.

To make detailed recommendations for early action.

To set out the mechanisms to implement the recommendations
and to continue detailed planning and issue resolution.
We recognize that our document is comprehensive in the sense that every recommendation is in some way interrelated within the whole picture. And we also recognize that our report is but the first step in achieving our goal.

We therefore suggest that it is the responsibility of every citizen to continue the process. We propose that those who wish to develop projects for implementation be named in this report, and contact ODI as early in the design process as possible to ensure the compatibility of the detailed proposals with the goals of the overall plan.

Because Oakland is alive and perpetually changing, the publication of this document is by no means the end of the process. In fact it is only the beginning. The real challenge lies in turning comprehensive policies and guidelines into commitment by all parties to improve the quality of life in Oakland to make our community a joy to live in and a pleasure to visit.

James Ray, President, Oakland Directions, Inc.
Kathy Boykowycz, President, People's Oakland
Armistead L. Guthery, University Health Center of Pittsburgh
Sandra Phillips, Coordinator, People's Oakland
John Portello, Chamber of Commerce
Raymond Reaves, Department of City Planning, City of Pittsburgh
Jay Roling, University of Pittsburgh
Henry Schwartz, Businessman
Edward Smuts, Consultant/Developer

The Planning Committee of Oakland Directions, Inc.

It must be noted at this point that there are several proposals in this report, either specifically delineated or generally referred to, for which there is not now, nor likely to be in the future, unanimous support by ODI member organizations, such as:

Darragh-Terrace parking garage
Sticker parking
Parking access
Location of student housing.

A process is described in the Implementation Section of the report which will be followed in every instance of the beginning of a project or the emergence of a problem needing ODI's attention, regardless of whether or not there is apt to be unanimous support by the ODI board.
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Pittsburgh has, not one, but two metropolitan centers.

The Golden Triangle is world-renowned as the third largest concentration of corporate headquarters in the nation: U.S. Steel, Westinghouse, Gulf, Alcoa, Koppers, Dravo, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, and many others.

Oakland, four miles to the east, is the region's educational, cultural, and medical center. Here are the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie-Mellon University, Carlow College, the Carnegie Institute, the Mellon Institute, the Phipps Conservatory, and the seven great regional hospitals which together make up the University Health Center of Pittsburgh, to mention a few of Oakland's many institutions.
But Oakland is also a residential community. Compact residential neighborhoods cluster around the institutional and commercial core. Built on a sloping plateau between a ridge of hills to the west and a steep canyon-like (Panther Hollow) to the east, the community has a remnant clear physical form. Its visual center is the Cathedral Learning, a 42-floor Gothic skyscraper and the nation’s tallest educational building, soaring upward like a gilded axe around which the institutions, the commercial district and the residential neighborhoods are grouped. However, the activity or social center of Oakland is the Forbes Avenue Commercial District.

Much of the city’s most venerated architecture is not simply the great institutional buildings, but also the tree-shaded residential streets interspersed with Gothic and Romanesque churches including St. Paul’s Cathedral and St. Peter’s Church. And Schenley Park, surely one of the most beautiful urban parks in any city in the world, penetrates into the very heart of the community. Tru’s Oakland is a place to live, work and learn in, and to
Yet all is not well in Oakland. For more than a decade the community has been in conflict. Angry confrontations involving the residents, the institutions, and city officials have occurred on innumerable occasions. In the periods between these confrontations mutual suspicion is constantly below the surface.

If at sunrise on a summer morning you walk through the streets of Oakland you may wonder what all the fuss is about.

Rows of peaceful townhouses provide vistas of the park, the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute offer grandiloquent architectural statements set among trees and green lawns, the early sun touches 19th century Gothic and Egyptian Revival with gold, there are plenty of parking spaces, and no traffic jams.

But then walk the same streets at midday when Oakland is full of people, traffic, noise and litter and you will immediately grasp the intensity, tensions, and claustrophobia.
Since World War II, the rapid growth of the health educational institutions has increased the density of Oakland to saturation, not simply in terms of land, but in terms of people, cars, and services. The following statistics suffice to show the pressure which the fragile residential and neighborhood core areas of Oakland have been subjected to in recent years:

Today, 14% of all the jobs in the city are here. University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie-Mellon University, and Carlow College have a combined enrollment of 31,600 students, and they employ 3,800 faculty and 5,250 staff. Oakland's seven regional hospitals employ 8,500 in-patients and 790,000 out-patients. In addition, there are the Carnegie Institute, the Institute, the Board of Education, and several other institutions representing over one billion dollars of public and private capital and generating almost $35 million in purchasing power.

The 40,000 daily commuters into Oakland now outnumber the 30,000 residents. The streets are clogged with parked cars. The compact and traditional residential streets in the University area are being bought by real estate interests for conversion to apartment houses or rooming houses for students. The traditional neighborhood commercial areas are being invaded by fast food and discount chains.

Over the past two decades, sociological change, n development, and lack of an agreed comprehensive plan to accommodate the new population have placed the residential neighborhoods, institutions, and businesses under such pressure that further growth is almost impossible without major impacts. At the heart of the planning process which has produced this report is the very clear fact that what is most needed is not a piecemeal or major changes, but one which accepts Oakland as it is today, and with careful and sensitive readjustment, eases its problems and makes it work better.

And that is what this workbook attempts to do.
Oakland's Background

It is ironic that the twin phenomena of high densities of land development and commuters should be such basic components of today's crisis since it was the extension of a horse-drawn commuter service from downtown Pittsburgh in 1859 that set in motion modern Oakland as we know it today.

We tend to associate suburbs with our own century. Oakland is a classic case of 19th century suburbanization. Almost immediately after the horse-drawn commuter service went into operation, the farms and big estates began to be developed. By 1870 streets and townhouses along Craig and Atwood were being built. By 1890 faster electrically drawn cable cars from downtown to East Liberty accelerated new developer-built housing estates in Italianate, Romanesque and Colonial Revival styles, together with churches and shops, many of which still stand today.
1880-1920 were the boom decades of Pittsburgh's industrial growth. Leading citizens at the turn of the century had romantic plans. They wanted to see Oakland, on its plateau above the mills and smoke in the river valleys, grow into a gracious, even idyllic, community with fine cultural institutions and open spaces of unrivaled beauty to be enjoyed by residential neighborhoods for all income groups.

In 1889 Mary Schenley Croghan donated a huge tract of rolling meadows and woodlands as a park. In 1882 Andrew Carnegie gave to Pittsburgh the first phase (the Music Hall and Library) of the great Carnegie Institute; and in 1900 he began the Carnegie Institute of Technology, now Carnegie-Mellon University, on Schenley Park's northern edge. And Franklin Nicola, who put together a development company to acquire the remainder of the Schenley Farms uphill from Panther Hollow, envisioned an ideal "parnassus" of stately treeshaded streets with churches, clubs, a luxury hotel, around the base of a series of terraces of university buildings, rising up the hill like an "Acropolis" of higher learning.
Several of the buildings conceived by Nicola an
temporary enthusiasts were designed by a prolific
Henry Hornbostel. Hornbostel's grand plan for
Institute of Technology and his buildings on th
remain the basis of Carnegie-Mellon University,
although his grand plan for the University of P
as an acropolis was never totally realized, man
buildings he designed as components for it were
continue in use today.

Exciting though these buildings are architectur
contrast in scale between their classical and p
grandiloquence and the intimate scale of the re
neighborhoods, particularly in the "working cla
of Middle and South Oakland and Robinson/Dunsei
already apparent. But it was intentional. The
institutional beaux arts compositions among law
trees. Around them were peaceful residential n
And between them there was space. There was no
shortage -- yet.
Older inhabitants recall the Oakland of the first decades of this century. They speak of the band shell and casino in Schenley Park; they speak of electric trolleys on the residential streets of Middle Oakland; of the construction of Forbes Field where Honus Wagner and other baseball greats from the early Pirate years played; and of Duquesne Gardens where the old Hornets played ice hockey. They speak of a more settled time; a time before today's tensions and pressures.
But over the years, as high density institutional development continued unabated and filled up the important open spaces which insulated the large from the small-scale and intimate residential the contrast of scale and usage turned into ever pronounced conflict. The period of large hospital construction began with Magee Hospital in 1915. Twenties and Thirties saw huge hospital construction on sites adjacent to Fifth Avenue: Eye and Ear, Women's, Children's, Montefiore, and Presbyterian in Italianate or Renaissance styles.

At the same time, in the 1920's, the arches of P Stadium were poured into molds to resemble the C The classical Mellon Institute was built with a of reputedly the largest stone columns in the wo the Board of Education building covered an entire Bellefield. The Philadelphia architect Charles designing for "Frick's Acres" acquired by Chance John Gilbert Bowman, conceived the University's of Learning, a 535 foot high, 42-story Gothic sk and the nation's tallest educational building, a climax of Wagner's "Die Walküre" in 1927; and his Chapel came to him in a dream.
The University of Pittsburgh had another "building" Chancellor in the 1950's and 60's. Edward H. Litchfield set out to transform the University from a "streetcar college" to a campus of national, even world, stature. Although Litchfield's aspirations outran the University's financial capacity to keep pace, he and his successor, Chancellor Wesley W. Posvar, expanded the University and its branch campuses from 20,000 students in 1967 to a total enrollment of 35,000 and 2,900 faculty by the mid-1970's.

Expansion meant more buildings; from 23 to 40 in Oakland. Among the new buildings since 1964 were the Hillman Library, the Law School Building, David Lawrence Hall, the Learning Research and Development Center, the Litchfield Towers dormitories, the Benedum Hall of Engineering, the Graduate School of Public Health, the Scaife Hall of Medicine, the Trees Physical Education Building, and several others.

The University Health Center also expanded, and the Veterans Hospital was built. The combined University Health Center, topping 83,000 in-patients and 790,000 out-patients a year and 8,500 staff on the payroll of its member hospitals, became the City's largest employer.
But expansion meant more than buildings. It meant The University expanded from 64 to 110 acres. Partial expansion was facilitated by the relocation of the field from Forbes to the new Three Rivers stadium; other expansion occurred through the clearance of residential and commercial blocks. Expansion also increased the density. New construction went up cheek by jowl with old beaux arts buildings of the 19th century, filling compositional spaces and vistas until all semblance of the idealism of Nicola and Hornbostel disappeared. Oakland was reaching saturation.

To the residents of Oakland the crisis of saturation had different meanings than it has for the institution: Modernization and expansion are facts of life to the residents and educational institutions in an increasingly commercial world, but to the residents these meant policies and decisions developed in board rooms from which they excluded. Yet the fall-out of these policies was more pronounced, transients, traffic, parking, crime, and blight. By 1967 there were already some 40,000 commuters compared with a 30,000 residential population, which under the pressures was steadily declining. The residential population declined, student apartment roominghouses proliferated in the townhouse streets, large real estate interests replaced single-family owner-occupiers; and fast food operators and discount chain stores replaced the old family-run shops.
After it became a state-related university in 1966, enrollment in the University expanded rapidly, outstripping available student housing and academic facilities. To meet its public obligations and to relieve the pressures on the residential community created by the growing demand for student housing, the University proposed to build a $13 million dormitory project on University-owned property on the hillside between the Stadium and Schenley Farms. To serve its growing student body, the University also proposed to build a new School of Law and a Professional Quadrangle complex in a four-phased project. Both projects were part of a master plan by the University which proposed construction of housing on the University's upper campus and purchase of properties adjacent to the University's lower campus for construction by the General State Authority of needed academic facilities, including acquisition of Forbes Field and property along Bouquet Street down Joncaire into Boundary Street.

During the early development of these plans, agencies of city government were consulted and extensive opinion sampling in the community by the design architects was conducted. Community reaction followed the publication of the plan and led in due course to the formation of community organizations, such as People's Oakland, to express the community's concerns. This led to more direct relations between the University, city government, other Oakland institutions, and community groups.

This resulted in many conflicts of interests and perceptions which were not easily resolved, leaving a residue of mutual suspicion and some bitterness. But there were benefits too. In the aftermath of confrontation, it became clear that a comprehensive planning vehicle had to be formed so that all parties could plan for the future of Oakland together. From this crucible Oakland Directions, Inc., was born; and the community was invited to become involved in the redesign of the Professional Quadrangle complex on the Forbes Field site in such a way that residential areas along Joncaire and most of Bouquet would not be demolished. Gradually the politics of confrontation eased, and the joint planning process involving all interest groups in Oakland began.

and the old peacefulness was gradually replaced mounting tensions and open conflict...
so in 1977 the people of Oakland got together....

The ODI planning process illustrated below be fall, 1977. It is the first of its kind in t metropolitan area. Hundreds of citizens, ele officials, representatives from public agenci institutions, and organized interest groups h participated.

Essentially the process, illustrated in the d is very simple. It starts with an inventory problems which the community perceives and ra importance. And it uses design as a means of

The diagram shows three lines.

The middle line is the development of the pla shows a sequence of steps. The common factor through is, of course, the ODI Planning Commi is made up of representatives of each of the groups.
The top line is the citizens' line. The word "citizen" is used in its broadest meaning: anyone who lives or works in the Oakland area. The process starts with establishing perceptions of Oakland's problems and its resources from all points of view, and these perceptions are gathered through lengthy face-to-face interviews or through meetings with groups (residential groups, groups within institutions, etc.). Farther along the line, workshops of citizens study in detail clusters of the problems they have earlier helped to identify (viz. traffic problems, residential problems, institutional growth and change).

The bottom line is the "data bank" line. Here basic statistics about traffic volumes and flows, building conditions, valuations, ownerships, densities, etc., are collected and fed into the central line as the planning proceeds.

---

...and an open plan process began, in which all the conflicting issues and goals could be dissected and mutually resolved by everyone working together.

---

The diagram illustrates the flow of recommendations through Forum 2 to a draft report, then to a report, and finally to a two-year plan. The flow includes review and revision meetings, feedback from civic leaders, city agencies, businessmen, institutions, and community groups, as well as detailed data and projections.
As the diagram shows, the planning process is complex and balances. At the first public Forum, the citizens were asked to develop goals for Oakland, and set out to prioritize these goals in priority. The results of this Forum were discussed in the Analysis section of this work.

Following the first Forum and the citizens' workshops, a series of alternative plans and designs were developed. In the course of developing these alternatives, the forum for improving the quality of life in Oakland became even more inclusive.

...hundreds of citizens, from every walk of life, participated....
By the time the second public Forum was held, the ODI Planning Committee was able to present a series of recommendations accompanied by strategies for implementing them, and a comparison of how these recommendations responded to the goals and priorities of the first Forum could be made.

Following the second Forum the Planning Committee began the intensive work of amending and refining the recommendations in detail and ensuring their practicality.
The purpose of the process is, of course, to develop which responds to the problems and issues identified the citizens. This is by no means an easy thing to with such a broad constituency, and against a hist background of conflict and suspicion, many perceptio goals, and issues are bound to be in conflict with another.

The planning process, including the design process, therefore one of patient negotiation. All the way, have been achieved by the Planning Committee through exploring ways to get things done. Sometimes these have involved trade-offs and concessions; this is inevitable if conflicts are to be resolved.

The planning product avoids deep surgery. There are grandiose developments, no spectacular relocations, pie-in-the-sky. The plan takes Oakland as it is, at attempts to make it work better and upgrade the qual its life. The plan is therefore a workbook setting series of guidelines aimed at achieving practical improvements. As time goes on and achievements are the guidelines will become obsolete and new guideli will be needed. This workbook is intended as a sta continuing community process.

and what began to emerge was the kind of plan that takes the good things and makes them better

and takes the bad things and finds ways of improving them
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Our analysis of Oakland involved the examination of two types of data:

**Hard data:** the physical data normally associated with planning studies: land use, population, employment, transportation, housing, economics, etc.

**Soft data:** data derived from individual interviews, small group meetings, and large public meetings. Personal perceptions and impressions of Oakland were carefully collected and analyzed.

In the following pages we have briefly summarized our analysis of the "hard" and "soft" data. There are, however, hundreds of pages of technical reports, statistical data, interview summaries, and memoranda which are the basis of the analysis. These documents are listed at the end of the report, on page 112. Copies may be obtained or borrowed either from ODI or from the Department of City Planning.
Oakland has a flowing topography of hillslopes and valleys.

The plan at the right shows the physical and man-made features of Oakland.

The physical form of Oakland has the following characteristics:

- Boundaries defined by a "ring" of wooded steep slopes.
- Entry into Oakland at only a few narrow valley "portals".
- Penetration into the heart of Oakland by a "wave" of green space from Schenley Park to the Cathedral and up to Pitt Stadium.

The man-made features of Oakland include:

- Small-scale residential neighborhoods butting up against large-scale institutional uses (note the relative size of individual houses compared with the large institutional buildings).
- Ragged "edges" where large-scale and small-scale forms come together.
- "Holes" or vacant land which interrupt the buildi
Physical Geography and Man Made Features

- Building Coverages
- Steep Slopes
- Open Space
- Main Entrances
Land Use Categories

Its assets are rich and beautiful....

Zoning, historic patterns of use, and market pressures have over the years divided Oakland into four recognized land use categories: residential, commercial, industrial, and open space.

As the plan at the right shows, these four land use categories form a fairly well-defined series of "zones of use." However, when the pattern is examined in more detail, it becomes apparent that some uses appear throughout Oakland, not just in a conglomeration of zones above the shops on Forbes Avenue. For instance, there are residential and institutional facilities located within commercial areas. In some cases these "non-conforming" uses may be beneficial; in other cases, they are seen as intrusions, many of which were illegal and not established. Conflicts over parking, noise, and accessibility often accompany land use conflicts.
Land Use

- Commercial
- Institutional Land
- Institutional Building
- Residential
- Open Green Space
- Steep Slope
- Parking
...but the pressures of density are apparent everywhere.

Even more likely causes of conflict are the so-called "boundaries" of the land use zones, where competition for vacant land, parking lots, deteriorated or neglected commercial buildings and land speculation create ragged "edges". Residential neighborhoods in Oakland, traditional softest and least defensible land uses, have been encroached upon by encroaching commercial institutional expansion, usually accompanied by need for off-street parking. Likewise, the institutions and businesses in Oakland, facing pressures for re-use and revitalization, have felt "land-locked" within their own precincts and have looked in the past to these areas to relieve the pressure.

...family houses converted to apartments and "rooms" for students, and to commercial uses.

...unsightly surface parking lots.
In open space land use, Oakland is both rich and poor. The wealth of recreation and green space provided by Schenley Park is unmatched, as are the gracious lawns and courtyards of Pitt, Carlow, and Carnegie-Mellon. The residential neighborhoods, however, with the exception of those south of the Boulevard of the Allies (Frazier Street and Lawn Street) are almost devoid of neighborhood-scale open space, such as tot lots, parklets, and playfields.
Nearly 30,000 people live in the nine neighborhoods in the plan at the right. The neighborhoods are diverse, from the dense ethnic neighborhoods of South Oakland to the public housing of Terrace View to the family housing of the Robinson/Dunseith/Chap area to the single-family environment of Schenley. The high-rise apartment buildings of Bellefield. Irish, Greeks, and Blacks comprise the largest ethnic groups. In addition, among the 2,000 college students living off-campus in the community are many foreign students who add to the cultural richness and give a decidedly international or cosmopolitan atmosphere.
...Traditional porches are filled in to provide extra rooms...
The physical problems of the neighborhoods, however, are quite apparent: lack of parking, too much traffic, deteriorating housing stock, lack of public open space, absentee landlords, increasing density due to apartment conversions, high level of transience, loss of families, insufficient neighborhood shopping, and in general noisy and dirty streets.

The concentration of students and young professionals, especially in Middle Oakland, has brought about a major change in the Oakland housing market. Since the early 1960's when the University of Pittsburgh began its rapid expansion, the number of owner-occupied housing units has declined to 23.3% compared with 50.3% for the City of Pittsburgh (1970 figures). This figure may be slightly misleading in Middle Oakland, however, where many owners of housing converted to apartments occupy the ground floor apartment. Also, the turnover rate of households (41% of the households in 1973 changed place of residence) far exceeds the rate for the City of Pittsburgh (27%). Enrollment in the public and parochial schools has declined with fewer and fewer houses available for raising families. At the same time, the percentage of one-person households has increased (40.6% in 1970 compared with 25.4% for the City).

Except in the Bellefield neighborhood, where condominium construction has occurred, little new housing has been built in Oakland for decades because of the lack of good building sites and the pressures of the lucrative market for converting existing houses and apartments to smaller and more expensive rental units. Many apartment buildings and single-family homes are in need of major rehabilitation to halt deterioration and to meet minimum building codes.

What were once strong and stable neighborhoods a generation ago are now fragile and rapidly changing neighborhoods, pressed on their edges by encroaching commercial and institutional land uses and threatened from within by social and economic forces which force out families and encourage real estate speculation and neglect.
There are six commercial districts in Oakland.

**Forbes-Fifth:** The main concentration of stores, restaurants, and offices.

**Centre-Craig:** A neighborhood retail area with a focus on small businesses undergoing revitalization (including sidewalk and graphics).

**Forbes-Craig:** A neighborhood district which is undergoing a change to an arts-oriented, boutique market.

**Semple:** A neighborhood commercial district.

**Atwood:** A small specialty restaurant zone in the neighborhood.

**Boulevard of the Allies:** An unplanned assortment of freestanding commercial buildings mixed in with residential areas.

Of the six commercial precincts in Oakland, one — Forbes/Fifth — presents special and difficult problems.

1 Forbes-Fifth
2 Centre-Craig
3 Forbes-Craig
4 Semple
5 Atwood
6 Boulevard of the Allies
Nearly 7,500 employees work in the stores, restaurants, and offices of Oakland. The Forbes/Fifth business district alone has over 172,000 square feet of occupied retail space, 55,000 square feet of service establishments, 220,000 square feet of office space, and 250 hotel rooms. Yet market studies show that the retailers are only capturing a portion of their potential sales, and that there is a demand for up to 150,000 square feet of additional office space and for an additional 250 hotel rooms.

Despite this strong demand, surprisingly little new commercial development has taken place in the Forbes/Fifth area. However, the use of the existing space has changed dramatically. Where once there were family-owned stores, neighborhood shops and bars, and little congestion, now there are franchise stores, fast food outlets, student-oriented bars, crowded streets and sidewalks, litter, noise, and parking problems. Add to that the visual clutter of paste-on store fronts, flashing and glaring signs, and deteriorating buildings and it is no wonder old-time residents hardly recognize Oakland’s business district. No stores sell furniture and only two stores sell children’s clothes or shoes. Although the store mix has turned toward students and institutional employees, these markets are not being properly served either, as is evident in the market studies.

The growth of the student-oriented market on Forbes Avenue can be traced to the lack of adequate on-campus services, such as a student union, which can provide both service and social functions. The high rents which result on Forbes Avenue can only be met by large-volume franchise stores, which further distort the market. But this activity is concentrated between McKee and Bouquet, although the area between McKee and Craft has very little commercial despite vacant buildable sites. All of this has led to a disorganized business community of embattled small merchants and uninvolving franchise operators and landlords who have no plan for its future.

All the commercial districts in Oakland are badly in need of a coordinated business development and revitalization program which can clean up the dirt and deterioration and serve all the people of Oakland.
Institutions

Oakland is primarily known for its major institutions. Seven regional hospitals of the University Health Center of Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie-Mellon University, Carlow College, Carnegie Institute and Library, and Phipps Conservatory.

But there are many others, such as the School for the Deaf, Board of Education, Pittsburgh Plan for Art, Syria Mosque, St. Paul's Cathedral, Heinz Chapel, Jewish Community Center, Soldiers and Sailors Memorial, and many private organizations and clubs which, combined with the major institutions, make Oakland one of the country's major concentrations of cultural, religious, medical, and recreational resources. This concentration of cultural attractions, a large number of employees, students, and visitors, make the area a vibrant and exciting place.

Over 28,500 people visit the Health Center every day, including 8,500 employees and over 4,200 students. There are 3,000 beds in the seven hospitals, which treat over 63,000 inpatients and 790,000 outpatients each year.

Pitt, Carlow, and CMU have a combined enrollment of 26,000 full-time students and employ 3,800 faculty and 5,200 staff.

The 124 other institutions in Oakland (excluding UHC) have a combined enrollment of 3,238 employees and thousands of daily visitors.

The institutions are largely housed in buildings built before 1940 and are faced not only with costly maintenance projects, but also with changing technology and climate which have forced major restructuring or replacement of facilities. As described in the History section, the University of Pittsburgh and the Health Center have continuously changed, renewed, and expanded over the two decades, sometimes involving expansion into the neighborhoods. The Pitt expansion has resulted in a fragmented campus of three parts with the recreation center remote from all three. Other institutions, such as Institute, Carlow College, and the Western Pennsylvania Blind Association, have also renewed.
The Health Center is planning a new Eye & Ear Hospital, additions to Children’s Hospital and Magee-Women’s Hospital, a new ambulatory care facility, and major new parking facilities. The University of Pittsburgh needs more student housing spaces, as well as an addition to the field house, an expanded and renovated student union, and minor modifications to the Medical School.

In addition to problems with older buildings and scarce land, the institutions have major parking and traffic problems. Employees, patients, students, and visitors come up against daily problems of traffic congestion, parking shortages, and inadequate transit services, including crowded buses, which they of course share with the residents of Oakland.
Transportation

The plan at the right summarizes the major traffic parking problems in Oakland: congested inter-truck routes through residential neighborhoods, on-street parking shortages, off-street parking shortages, poor access, and inadequate flow.

All geographic areas of Oakland are involved, sectors including residents, businessmen, and The severe transportation problems must be so comprehensively for all users in order for it for any one group.

There are 17,899 parking spaces in Oakland (9 and 12,195 off-street) for 30,000 residents a commuters. Residents need to park near their are often unable to, while in central Oakland major shortage of short-term parking spaces f the Health Center and commercial stores. Emp institutions and businesses, seeking long-term parking, are forced to pay high rates or to p their destinations.

The 800 buses which pass through Oakland betw and 5:30 p.m. each weekday are usually crowded "off-peak" hours.

All day long, traffic backs up on Forbes and f as through-traffic competes with traffic attem park and buses picking up and discharging pass Forbes and Fifth Avenues each carry nearly 25, per day, with many neighborhood streets carryi overload as drivers seek shortcuts around the arteries. School children, shoppers, transit college students, and employees crowd the side they wait to cross at dangerous intersections inadequate bus stops.
A number of intersections, such as Forbes/Craft, Forbes/Atwood, Forbes/Bigelow, Fifth/Bigelow, Fifth/Craig, and Centre/Craig average nearly one traffic accident per week throughout the year. One-third of the accidents involve pedestrians.

The transportation problems of Oakland are severe, and the need to solve them comprehensively is one issue on which all segments of the community agree.
Interviews and meetings

Through the efforts of the ODI Planning Commi 300 interviews were conducted by the consulta separate questionnaires were developed: resi commercial, institutional. The questions dealt issues: what are the assets and problems of do you or don't you live in Oakland; what sho to improve Oakland; etc. Among those inteven the cop on the beat, housewives, store owners doctors, landlords, custodians, college presi homeowners, renters, teachers, ministers, sec even the Mayor and members of Council.

Two major public Forums were held (February 1 February 1979), each attended by over 120 peo Between the two Forums, dozens of Task Force and other group meetings with neighborhood or institutional trustees, businessmen, and othe furnished additional input to the "soft" data

All the interview sheets, notes from the Foru minutes from the other group meetings have be maintained and analyzed.

to ensure that every point of view could be heard in the planning process, free bus trips were provided to bring citizens to forums and workshops
Consensus on Assets and Problems

It became apparent very early in the planning process that there was extraordinary consensus on Oakland's assets and problems despite the wide range of points of view, special interests, and needs of the participants. They are quite easily summarized as follows:

**Assets**
- Convenience
- Urban Character
- Diversity of People
- Cultural/Educational/Medical Center

**Problems**
- Dirt and Deterioration
- Traffic and Parking
- Crime

An example of how and why each group agreed on assets or problems can be seen in the issue of housing deterioration. Obviously residents are concerned about their own deteriorating environment, including problems of safety and declining property values. The institutions are also experiencing difficulties in recruiting staff and students because of the lack of nearby adequate housing and a wholesome environment. Businesses likewise are affected by the health of the adjacent neighborhoods. Parkinn offers a similar comparison, with residents unable to park at their front doors, employees and visitors to the institutions faced with a daily search for an inexpensive convenient parking space, and businessmen losing customers who cannot find a place to park.

*first we had to unders...
From the questionnaires and meetings we were classify the problems into 5 categories: residential deterioration, shopping area deterioration, traffic and parking, and crime and safety. The major issues within each category below:

**Residential deterioration**
- There has been a decline in home ownership.
- Too many students are overcrowding parts of the neighborhood.
- Absentee landlords and speculation are causing deterioration.
- There has been a decline in young families.
- There are no parking places.
- There is too much non-neighborhood traffic.
- Streets are in a shabby condition.
- No recreation areas exist in the neighborhood.
- There is a lack of code enforcement.

**Shopping area deterioration**
- The commercial areas have a shabby appearance.
- There is no place to park.
- There are too many fast-food franchises.
- The area is too student-oriented.
- There are too many bars and discos.
- Family-owned businesses have declined.
- The shopping area has a bad image.
- The area does not attract users of health insti
Institutional problems
- Parking and traffic problems hurt daily operation.
- Students have no place to live and feel exploited by landlords.
- Students feel hostility from community.
- The campus is split into disconnected parts.
- Parts of the hospital complex are obsolete.
- The hospital complex as a whole is disconnected.
- There is a lack of space.
- There is not enough appropriate housing for all classifications of institutional employees.

Traffic and parking
- There is congestion in center.
- Short-term parking is inadequate.
- Long-term parking is inadequate.
- Parking is too expensive for most commuters.
- On-street parking is uncontrolled.
- There is too much non-Oakland through-traffic.
- Commuter traffic and parking congests neighborhood streets.
- Transit service is irregular and overcrowded.
- Conditions for waiting for buses discourage transit use.
- There is too much truck traffic.
- There are problems with traffic access and flow.
- Enforcement of parking and traffic laws is inadequate.

Crime and personal safety
- Streets are perceived to be unsafe.
- "Shady" characters exist in the business district.
- Edges of institutional areas are perceived to be unsafe.
- Crime rate is not as high as the perception of crime.
Development of Goals and Objectives

...then we had to develop our goals and objectives....

From the interviews, group meetings, and discussions, we were able to formulate five broad goals to address problems. These goals are to be used to evaluate proposals as they are developed. There is a high degree of opinion among all segments of Oakland with regard to these goals.

Goal One: Stabilize and upgrade residential communities.

Goal Two: Upgrade business districts.

Goal Three: Facilitate institutional self-renewal and growth and change.

Goal Four: Develop a comprehensive transportation system.

Goal Five: Improve public safety and create a sense of personal security.
Within these five broad goals, particular objectives were set which were revised throughout the planning process by the participants to their present form:

**Goal One: Stabilize and upgrade residential neighborhoods.**
- Provide affordable quality housing for all income levels.
- Provide student housing mutually acceptable to community and institutions.
- Encourage more and new owner-occupied housing.
- Encourage family housing (single and multi-family).
- Provide housing for senior citizens and the handicapped.
- Control and resolve the problems of people with special needs.
- Control and regulate off-campus student housing.
- Enforce building, occupancy, zoning, liquor, traffic, and health codes.
- Encourage rehabilitation of existing structures.
- Protect residential neighborhoods from large-scale uses.
- Improve quality of schools.
- Provide more parks and playgrounds.

**Goal Two: Upgrade business districts.**
- Diversify market and types of stores.
- Clean up the streets, sidewalks, and buildings.
- Make physical improvements to the public space (lighting, trees, benches, paving, etc.)
- Create the image of entering a special place for shopping and business.
- Encourage and coordinate rehabilitation of buildings.
- Create better links between the shopping areas and the neighborhoods and institutions.
- Explore the use of upper floors of commercial buildings for mixed or multi-use, including residential.
- Encourage and coordinate appropriate private development.
- Enforce building, occupancy, zoning, liquor, traffic, and health codes.
Goal Three: Facilitate institutional self-renewal to growth and change.
- Provide adequate land and facility space from deliver educational, research, and clinical fi
- Minimize negative impact of institutional dev adjacent residential areas and business distr:
- Maximize benefits of institutional development residential areas and business districts.
- Resolve parking and access problems.
- Reflect and incorporate in the schools the ric of the area.
- Encourage joint development efforts between in and community to accommodate shared needs.
- Maintain the role of Oakland's institutions as employers in the regional economy.
- Encourage the development of a new conference

Goal Four: Develop a comprehensive transporta
- Accommodate access and parking needs of variou residents, employees, medical, commercial, oth and students (commuter and resident).
- Protect residential areas from non-residential through-traffic.
- Improve public transit and encourage its use.
- Support the development of a rapid transit link Pittsburgh.
- Develop pedestrian networks to interrelate resc residential areas.
- Improve access and traffic flow.

Goal Five: Improve public safety and create a s of personal security.
- Enforce codes (liquor, health, building, traffi
- Encourage police/citizen joint involvement in p
- Provide good youth recreation facilities.
- Provide physical improvements to public space ( increased streetlighting).
- Encourage neighborhood and commercial organizat
- Provide more adequate services, housing, and sur for people with special needs.
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It soon became clear that Oakland has two kinds of areas:
- "fixed areas", which are areas of conservation;
- areas of change and opportunity for new developments.

Areas of conservation

Areas of opportunity

Areas of conservation
The map on the opposite page illustrates the over concept on which all of our recommendations are based. The concept has two parts.

**Fixed Areas: Continuity and revitalization**

The concept recognizes that there exist firm anchor zones in Oakland which must be stabilized and maintained.

The large colored areas mark the zones in which large-scale changes in land use are recommended. Instead of a series of programs to be concocted by these zones aimed at stabilizing and upgrading these programs respond directly to the issue identified in the previous section of this report. Therefore, term these zones "Oakland's Fixed Areas of Opportunity".

Areas of Opportunity

The concept recognizes at the same time that the current thing as "no change". Change is inevitable. Institutions, commercial facilities, and residents have to be in a perpetual process of self-renewal to survive. But we recognize that renewal must be such a way that it does not damage, but rather enhances the special qualities of Oakland which are to be preserved and upgraded.

Much of this self-renewal will undoubtedly occur within the Fixed Areas themselves. But opportunities for new development occur, particularly between the Fixed Areas, where the uses of the adjacent zones (such as homes and offices) can be brought together in comprehensive multi-usage designs in such a way that the new is an amenity for and a reinforcement of the adjacent areas.

On the map opposite, the zones identified with open circles in which opportunities for new development term them "Areas of Opportunity". Many of the principles recommended for the Areas of Opportunity, I believe, will be applied to the Fixed Revitalization Areas, issues and goals identified in the interviews, workshops, and forums.
Fixed Areas and Areas of Opportunity

1-14 Areas of Opportunity
- Institutional Land
- Institutional Buildings
- Residential
- Commercial

[Map with areas marked 1-13]
The following pages articulate these recommendations in greater detail. First will be discussed the Fix (residential neighborhoods, commercial areas, or institutional areas), followed by guidelines for Opportunity.

**Recommendations for Oakland’s Neighborhood Fix**

Oakland has a number of residential neighborhoods (map at left), each with its own history and character, and its own special problems and opportunities.

Before addressing these specifically, there are recommendations common to all of Oakland’s neighborhoods.

---

Recommendations for neighborhood conservation are based on understanding the transitions from home to the neighborhood of the block.
Owner-occupied housing
Owner-occupied housing should be encouraged through zoning, code enforcement, public subsidy low-income loan programs, and the construction of on-campus student housing to reduce the number of students living in the residential neighborhoods.

New infill housing
New housing, to respond to special markets, such as young professionals, faculty, graduate, married or older students, and senior citizens, should be inserted on scattered sites with special attention to the scale, vernacular, cultural character and materials of the neighborhood.

Neighborhood shops
Most neighborhoods in Oakland have neighborhood shops. Attention should be given to upgrading them and emphasizing and encouraging the special services they provide the neighborhoods.

Landscaping
Most of Oakland's residential streets require the unity, scale, and identity provided by the sensitive use of trees, streetlights, signs, sidewalks, ramps, benches, trash cans, totlots and play areas.

Block clubs
Every neighborhood should encourage street and block clubs, to work with the City in determining detailed landscape programs and schedules, and to work with the police to establish better security.

Sticker parking
A sticker parking program is essential to ensure that priority for on-street parking places is given to residents rather than commuters. This program should be coordinated with solutions for institutional and commercial off-street parking.
Traffic
A new system of traffic flows to discourage thru (including truck and commuter), thus promoting neighborhood streets for neighborhood users.

Bus loops
Bus loops to relate neighborhoods to shops, health services, education, recreation, and to transit transfer to other parts of the City are included in Transportation Recommendations.

Neighborhood planning
Neighborhood planning should be supported with private funds to enable the neighborhoods to plan themselves and carry out the recommended programs projects.

Detailed proposals related to these general recommendations can be found in the recommendations for specific neighborhoods (pages 62-68), in Transportation Recommendations (pages 91-98), and in the Implementation section (pages 99-111).
In addition to the general recommendations for any neighborhoods listed above, the following specific recommendations are made. These recommendations be carried out with Federal Community Development Grant Funds and other public funding. It is essential that all these programs and projects be worked out through neighborhood planning as to their priorities, phasing, and level of investment.

1 Middle Oakland above Bates

Louisa Street should become a landscaped pedestrian cross-axis from Halket to Atwood. The cross-axis should continue from Atwood to the park on the old Fort site as shown on the Neighborhood Recommendations. A parklet between McKee and Coltart for tots and children is recommended, including benches and nighttime lighting. The existing steps are to be rebuilt. The pedestrian cross-axis should continue across Halket and the site to Craft Place, to connect South and Middle Oakland.

A neighborhood community center is recommended. It should include social service agencies, counseling programs for youth, facilities for the elderly, and recreation. The site should be landscaped with trees, and nighttime lighting. A possible location is a white "farmhouse" type house on Oakland Avenue, back from the street.

Portals to neighborhood streets (see Urban Design) should be at each end of Atwood, Oakland, Meyral, McKee, Coltart, and Louisa at Halket.

2 Panther Hollow

Scattered non-conforming industrial uses should be converted to attractive landscaping, and new housing development.

Boundary Street is to be cleaned of all refuse, reconstructed as a local street, and landscaped along it for new housing should be identified.
3 Middle Oakland below Bates

Parkview should be landscaped with upgraded sidewalks to facilitate pedestrian access to Holmes School, including a traffic light at the Boulevard. Similarly, Atwood and Oakland should be landscaped to facilitate pedestrian access to Forbes.

Oakland Square should continue to be upgraded with reseeding and tree planting and lighting, including blockstone paving and signing.

Bates should continue to be landscaped with upgraded sidewalks simultaneously with discouraging through traffic (see Transportation Recommendations). Atwood, Oakland, and Semple are to be recognized pedestrian crossings.

Low-rise new housing of exemplary quality, for graduate, married or older students, for faculty, or for senior citizens and the handicapped, is recommended. A possible site is the parking lot between Oakland and Bouquet on Bates.

Portals to neighborhood streets (see Urban Design Details) should be located at Atwood and Oakland on Bates, on Bates at Bouquet and Zulema, and at each neighborhood street on the Boulevard of the Allies.

The Boulevard of the Allies should be heavily landscaped to insulate against noise. Crossings with pedestrian stoplights are to be at Parkview and Dawson, which is especially important for school children. Sidewalks should be upgraded for access to Schenley Park and the new swimming pool.

The Semple Street commercial area should be upgraded with low-interest improvement loans to businessmen, a graphics and awnings program, a landscaping-lighting program, and other public improvements to make it an attractive neighborhood commercial center.
64 Recommendations

Neighborhood Urban Design Guidelines

Infill Guidelines: Section

Neighborhood Street

Infill Guidelines: Elevation
4 South Oakland: Holmes-St. Regis School Area

Holmes School is the center of the community, and is the community's largest building. It is presently underused as a school, due to declining enrollments and lack of maintenance. To increase enrollment and stabilize the community, Holmes School should be upgraded physically and academically.

Saint Regis School, already a community center, should be strengthened both physically and in programs and community services.

Frazier Street Field and Park should be improved, especially signing, programming, and upgrading the field house.

Pedestrian links of Dawson and Parkview across the Boulevard of the Allies should be established with pedestrian stoplights. A pedestrian link between Holmes and St. Regis along Swinburne and Parkview should be part of the general landscaping program. A pedestrian link with a bridge over Bates between Cato Street and Craft Avenue extension is recommended to enable children and adults to cross between the two South Oakland neighborhoods. In addition, a carefully designed at-grade pedestrian crossing of Bates Street at the Boulevard of the Allies, up the hill to the Isaly site, should be designed and implemented.

Neighborhood commercial revitalization for the Dawson/Frazier area is recommended.

Portals to neighborhood streets should be at Parkview, Dawson, and Ward on the Boulevard of the Allies. The portal at Juliet Street is to be a small neighborhood park.
5 South Oakland: Lawn Street Area
Niagara Street Park should be upgraded as an active area for all age groups in the neighborhood.

Ophelia Street should be closed at Forbes Avenue through traffic from taking a short-cut to the F of the Allies.

Street repairs should be undertaken on streets which have been repaired until there is no curb left, condition.

The pedestrian link at Craft Place across the Bo of the Allies should have a pedestrian light. A pedestrian link at Halket and Zulema should utilize existing light. A pedestrian link and bridge across Street should be built to link Craft Avenue exte Cato Street.

6 Robinson-Dunseith-Chesterfield Area
Pedestrian links to Frick School and to the Oak1 business district along Fifth Avenue, Terrace St Allequippa, and Darragh should be designed as a comprehensive network with clear traffic and str crossings and pedestrian crossing lights.

Neighborhood commercial no longer exists in t neighborhood. New small-scale commercial, such groceries and cleaners, should be encouraged to locate here.

Portals to neighborhood streets (see Urban Design) are at Robinson/Fifth, Robinson/Allequippa, and Chesterfield. A landscaped intersection at Rob Terrace and a landscaped pedestrian link at Rob Dunseith on Allequippa should be created. These are especially important for this neighborhood, location next to major institutional uses.

Landscaping, tree planting, increased street li other public improvements to streets and sidewa
7 Terrace Village

Public housing should be rehabilitated by the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh to individualize the units and make the environment more livable. Good planning with the neighborhood should precede any construction or action.

Wadsworth Hall is recommended to be enlarged as a community center with an active and passive recreation component to serve both Terrace Village and the Robinson/Dunseith/Chesterfield neighborhoods.

The Mathilda H. Theiss Health Center and the Concerned Mother's Program should be strengthened and supported according to the planned needs of the community.

Pedestrian links to Frick School, Milliones, and Schenley High and the Oakland business district should be developed and landscaped. The intersections at Trees Hall should be carefully studied and redesigned for pedestrian safety.

8 Schenley Farms

Landscaping, tree planting, sidewalk repair, and so forth, are recommended.

Portals on Bigelow at Litton, Tennyson, and Parkman are recommended.
9 Bellefield-Neville Area

Senior citizens' center should be provided in the including recreation and social services.

New residential development should be encouraged on appropriate sites, including senior citizen housing, which should be in scale with the existing pattern. For example, Dithridge between Bayard and Centre could be stabilized as a low-rise residential street, while Craig near Bayard could accommodate higher density development. Buildings on Craig might include ground floor commercial to serve the neighborhood and to enhance street level security. This is a very complex neighborhood which will not lend itself to simple solutions.

Landscaping and other public improvements such as streetlighting should continue.
Commercial Revitalization Areas

Recommendations for Oakland's Commercial Revitalization Areas

Oakland's six commercial areas vary from small groups of neighborhood stores, to specialty restaurants and boutiques, to a concentrated retail and office shopping district.

In spite of the differences in scale and operations, essentially all of these districts, including the Forbes/Fifth corridor, have their origins as neighborhood shopping areas serving a residential service area.

Historically the shops were family-run owner-occupied operations, with the owning family living above the shops and with surrounding tree-lined residential streets leading to the shopping areas. The usual architecture was three or four-floor narrow frontage Italianate. In all six commercial areas the scale of this traditional type of operation remains, and thus becomes the basis for the following general recommendations for revitalization.

The Forbes/Fifth corner is perhaps Oakland's serious problem, but also Oakland's best opportunity.
perhaps our most fundamental recommendation is to restore pedestrian scale

Pedestrian scale is the key to all commercial district functioning. To achieve unity and a sense that the pedestrian is the most important element, the following urbanscape recommendations are made:

- Broad sidewalks should be created with trees, benches, and decorative streetlighting.
- Bus shelters at transit stops, designed to conform the overall landscape policy, should be built.
- Awnings over shop windows should be provided for shade and shelter from rain.
- Graphics controls and insistence on uniform height dimension for all shopfront signs should be established.
- Street cleaning programs and litter bins, particularly in the fast food areas, should be initiated.

Facade restoration for those historical commercial buildings that remain is crucial since these are recommended as the basis for the scale and materials of new construction. Low-interest loans to building owners/operators for restoration plus technical assistance in complying with comprehensive urban design guidelines for cornice materials, and panels for graphics are recommended.

New construction is recommended to replace blight conditions in empty sites, on the assumption that this will be in conformance with the scale, materials, heights, and proportions of the basic historical prototypes. (Craig Street provides a good example of this.)
Forbes-Fifth Business District
In addition to these general recommendations, a more detailed strategy has been worked out for the critical Forbes-Fifth business district:

**Multi-use** of buildings and land, including residential, commercial, and institutional, should be encouraged to reinforce the vitality and strength of this important area in Oakland.

**Multi-level links** should be created wherever possible to connect upper-story uses from building to building across streets to provide a second level of pedestrian circulation.

**New commercial development**, especially neighborhood-oriented, small retail, and service stores should be encouraged. Retail stores to service the professions and administrative employees of the institutions needed. Two possible sites for new commercial are the Iroquois Building and adjacent to the A&P (Gi at Forbes and Coltrane). New institutional buildings on Fifth Avenue should include ground floor commercial links across the street.

**Coordination of policies** developed for the Forbes-Fifth corridor should be carried out with existing or new created business organizations, such as the Chamber of Commerce or a Merchants' Association.
Forbes-Fifth Commercial Improvements

and we can enhance pedestrian character with trees, special lighting and awnings.
Institutional Revitalization

Recommendations for Oakland's Institutional Revitalization Areas

Oakland's major institutions serve medical, academic, and civic functions. They include the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie-Mellon University, Carlow College, Carnegie Institute and Library, and Conservatory.

Each of these institutions has its own single-usage area and buildings, its own internal budgets and programs. The general recommendation of this study is that institutional capital programs should occur in the land areas which are currently institutional Areas of Opportunity which are designated in the chapter following this section.

Institutional planning is complex, involving both short-range and long-range proposals which depend on fluctuating budgets, patients, students, and public and private interests. On the following pages are listed institutional, or projects which have been brought to ODI for review, and which are urged for implementation.

Pedestrian Spine
A continuous pedestrian spine uphill, (South East to North West) through the University of Pittsburgh should be articulated, from the new General Studies Building to the practice field area, above the stadium. Significant pieces of this spine already exist: for example, the pedestrian bridge across Forbes and provision for an escalator for this purpose within the Learning Research and Development Center. The section of the spine which passes through the Professional Quadrangle is a key link both for the University and the neighborhood. The connections across Schenley Plaza to the Carnegie Library, the Cathedral of Learning, and Schenley Park are all parts of the pedestrian network and should be designed in conjunction with the new traffic and parking scheme for Schenley Plaza (see Transportation Recommendations).
Student housing: Additional new student housing will be necessary to provide for students who will be relocated from the residential neighborhoods. To the extent possible, most of this housing should be built on campus and should not impact residential neighborhoods. It is recognized, however, that it may be necessary and desirable to construct additional housing for students in other areas of campus. Such housing in residential areas, either constructed or rehabilitated, should be limited to graduate, married or older students.

All proposals for such housing should be submitted for consideration and response prior to the development of detailed designs. The units themselves, whether off campus, should be designed for possible conversion to apartments in case the student housing market might change in the future, and should be designed in coordination with ODI and the City and be in conformance with adjacent heights, materials, and vernaculars.

A possible site for University-sponsored multi-story housing, restricted to graduate, married, older or faculty students and faculty, is in the Bellefield residential area on a University-owned site between Dithridge and Bell. The present zoning is R-5. A planning and design process by the University involving the adjacent Bellefield community, ODI, and the City’s planning agencies is recommended.

Another possible site for the new construction of student housing, particularly undergraduate, is the area above Pitt Stadium, which is also at the northwest end of the pedestrian spine described above. Undergraduate student housing could be built in a village form with commons over a 10-15 year period. The purpose of this housing is to relieve the student housing pressure on Middle Oaklawn and relocate fraternities, particularly those on Bayard Street, to reinforce new commercial facilities to serve Robinson/Oaklawn/Chesterton and Terrace Village; and to put the University in a more competitive position in the national student market.
Recommendations
The University is also encouraged to explore further possibility of student housing, graduate and undercol in the Forbes-Fifth corridor on upper levels above commercial facilities.

**Student Union**
Schenley Hall (the old Schenley Hotel) should be re for a student union, including restoration of the façades. Additional student services are expected relieve pressure on the Forbes Avenue business dis

**UHCP Renewal**
The University Health Center of Pittsburgh is conti changing. UHCP is currently revising its long-range plan, which will set forth the total renewal plan, solutions for parking and transportation. Known el the renewal plan include the following (at an estim of $160 million):

- New Eye and Ear Hospital.
- Additions to Children's Hospital, Magee Women's Hos Western Psychiatric Institute of Pittsburgh.
- Expansion of the Ambulatory Care Program.
- Expansion of Presbyterian-University Hospital into space to be vacated.
- Major parking facilities.
Areas of Opportunity

The preceding section dealt with guidelines for the revitalization of Oakland's "Fixed Areas". This section will outline Development Guidelines for the "Areas of Opportunity", those areas between and on the edges of the Fixed Areas. Within the Areas of Opportunity, the uses of the adjacent Fixed Areas can be brought together in comprehensive and multi-usage designs in such a way that the new development is an amenity for and a reinforcement of the adjacent zones.

**General guidelines common to all Areas of Opportunity**

Whether development occurs in the short or long range in the Areas of Opportunity depends on community needs and concerns, market forces, political decisions, land assembly, and other similar factors.

Regardless of when or where new development occurs, there are certain guidelines which always apply:

- The scale of development should be sensitive to adjacent uses.
- Sufficient parking should be provided.
- Traffic and access should be designed for both functional efficiency and minimum impact on surrounding streets.
- The needs of pedestrians should be provided for within and around the development.
- Open space and landscaping should be included.
- Review of development plans should be a joint planning effort, involving the residential, commercial, and institutional communities, as well as City agencies.

In Oakland's "areas of opportunity" new buildings are encouraged.

... providing they are sensitively and in the guide
In addition to the general guidelines, each Area Opportunity has specific assets and liabilities which should be taken into account, especially regarding its development affects adjacent land uses. On the next few pages are listed development guidelines for each Area of Opportunity. The guidelines are intended to guide both short and long-range programs, including planning and feasibility studies, land assembly, market analysis, and other preliminary development work which may take place in the immediate future.

The plan at the right shows the development guide in graphic form for all fourteen Areas of Opportunity. The following pages show where and how new developments may occur.
Development Guidelines for Areas of Opportunity

1-14 Areas of Opportunity
- Commercial
- Institutional
- Residential
- Open Green Space
- Pedestrian Spine
1 Western Portal

- Land should be assembled for high-density comp development for:
  - Apartments
  - Offices
  - Retail
  - Institutional
  - Transportation (including a node for down transit link)
  - Parking for development and/or peripheral

2 Forbes-Fifth-Craft-Halket Block

- St. Peter's Church and Meeting Hall should be
- Consolidation of County Health Department serv be considered.
- Possible additional uses include:
  - Retail commercial
  - Offices
  - Institutional
  - Residential.

3 Forbes-Fifth-Halket-McKee Block

- Pedestrian links from the Mane-Women's site to UHCP site should be developed.
- Possible uses include:
  - Hotel/conference center
  - Retail commercial
  - Offices
  - Institutional
  - Residential.
4 South Side of Forbes: Halket to Semple
- Iroquois Building should be preserved as a landmark building.
- Small-scale retail uses should be preserved.
- Comprehensive multi-use development (including small-scale retail) is possible behind the Iroquois Building and could be integrated with it.
  - Possible uses include:
    - Retail commercial
    - Offices
    - Residential.

5 South Side of Forbes: Meyran to Atwood
- The character of development should provide a buffer between Forbes retail uses and the residential neighborhood. It may involve extensions of Sennott Street from Atwood to McKee.
  - Possible uses include:
    - Retail commercial
    - Offices
    - Residential.

6 Forbes-Sennott-Bouquet-Oakland
"Two Block Area"
- Residential, commercial, and institutional development must be sensitively related.
  - Possible uses include:
    - Student co-op
    - University bookstore
    - Community facilities
    - Hotel/conference center
    - Park
    - Joint institutional/community multi-use cultural center.
7 Bouquet Street: Sennott to Bates
- A proper edge and buffer between residential and institutional uses should be created.
- A pedestrian link should be made between the re-neighborhood and Schenley Plaza, including the courtyards of the Professional Quadrangle. On the side of Bouquet, possible uses include:
  Townhouses
  Mid-rise apartments.
- On the eastern side of Bouquet ("Forbes Field"): possible uses include:
  Institutional expansion and parking
  Joint community/institutional facility.

8 Syria Mosque and Masonic Temple
- Syria Mosque and Masonic Temple should remain. Areas should be developed in such a way that the edge along Bigelow is respected.
- Possible uses include:
  Parking
  Residential
  Hotel/conference center.

9 Carnegie-Mellon Site: Fifth Avenue at
- Possible uses include:
  Research
  Office
  Parking
  Hotel/conference center.
10 Isaly’s Site on Boulevard of the Allies
- This is an important site because it is related to three residential neighborhoods.
- Possible uses include a mix of residential, office, retail commercial, recreation, park, and community facilities.
- Redevelopment of the site should be coordinated with solutions to the traffic problems of the Boulevard of the Allies.

11 Darragh-Terrace Triangular Parcel
- The site forms an important "edge" between residential and institutional uses.
- Possible uses include:
  - Parking
  - Retail commercial
  - Housing
  - Institutional
  - Park/open space.

12 Gulf Research Site on Boulevard of the Allies
- Possible uses include:
  - Continuation of current institutional use
  - Elderly housing
  - Low-rise family housing
  - Neighborhood commercial
  - Parking.
13 **Upper Panther Hollow**

- Possible uses include:
  - Parking
  - Institutional
  - Commercial
  - Boiler plant renovation/expansion.

14 **Forbes-Fifth between Kirkpatrick and Rot**

- Possible uses include:
  - Housing rehabilitation
  - New housing
  - Open space
  - Transit corridor.
Urban Design Sketch Designs
To illustrate the guidelines listed on the previous pages, we have chosen three Areas of Opportunity:
- Bouquet Street
- The Two-Block Area
- Forbes-Fifth-Halket-McKee

For more detailed urban design analysis and three dimensional studies which are shown on the following pages. These studies are not meant to be recommendations or endorsements of the developments shown, but are intended to illustrate the use of the development guidelines.

Two Block Area – Bouquet Street
The plan at right and the perspective on page 89 show a development alternative for two Areas of Opportunity, the Two-Block Area and Bouquet Street, which together comprise a very sensitive and fragile "edge" between the residential, commercial, and institutional areas.

The major uses in the scheme are:
- Bookstore and co-op
- Joint institutional/community multi-use cultural center
- New medium-rise apartments.

The urban design features are:
- Ground floor bookstore and co-op at Forbes and Bouquet in scale with the shopping street, including a covered arcade along Forbes and Bouquet.
- Second and third floors above the bookstore to be shared institutional/community space.
- A diagonal pedestrian spine through the Two-Block Area linking Forbes Avenue to the Professional Quadrangle.
- New medium-rise apartment buildings along the west side of Bouquet to eliminate blight and to strengthen the residential "edge".
- Development of a pedestrian path from Oakland Avenue to Bouquet to Schenley Plaza to link Middle Oakland with Schenley Park.
...and another multi-purpose opportunity that is also a "seam" is at Forbes & Halket

Forbes—Fifth—Halket—McKee
The plan above and perspective sketch on the page or show a multi-use development with the following major
Professional offices
Institutional offices
Residential
Retail
Integral parking.

The urban design features are:
- Forbes Street facade in scale with existing commercial buildings.
- A covered arcade for pedestrians along Forbes and McKee.
- Street trees, interior landscaping, widened sidewalk, special lighting.
- An interior public pedestrian spine with courtyards linking the Magee-Women's Hospital complex with the UHC facilities at Fifth and Darragh.
- Vehicular access off a new interior street running between Forbes and Fifth opposite Coltart Street.
- Two medium-rise towers rising from a pedestal of ground floor commercial and interior parking.
Area of Opportunity Sketch Designs

Two Block Area – Bouquet Street

Forbes – Fifth – Halket – McKee
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Transportation

The transportation problems of Oakland, such as parking shortages, congested streets, dangerous intersections, and an inadequate transit system, affect every segment of the community. Each group has sought solutions to its problems during the Planning Process, but in context with a comprehensive solution for all of Oakland. This section represents a summary of solutions arrived at over months of work within the ODI Planning Committee with technical assistance from the City of Pittsburgh and transportation consultants, Graham Bullen and David Wooster.

A separate document, The Oakland Transportation Study, prepared by Graham Bullen, is being published simultaneously with this report.

General guidelines
Enforcement of parking and traffic regulations throughout Oakland is crucial to the success of the plan.

When the City institutes a change in the traffic pattern, it will be as a "trial", which should undergo extensive testing in the field.

A mechanism (for instance, a representative committee) to coordinate planning and implementation of transportation improvements should be created.
Two-Year Traffic Plan

- Arterial Streets
- Local Streets
  - Synchronized Traffic Flow
Traffic Recommendations
The plan on the page opposite shows the traffic recommendations for implementation within the next two years. Note that there are two scales of streets: arterial and neighborhood, which work together to form a traffic system which accomplishes two main goals:

To protect the neighborhoods from commuter and through traffic.
To provide better traffic flow for commuters and through traffic around the neighborhoods.

The arterial streets and traffic signals should be designed to accommodate the large volumes of non-residential traffic. The neighborhood street system similarly should be modified to accommodate the needs of the residents. Below are listed the traffic recommendations for both arterial and neighborhood streets:

Synchronized traffic signals should be installed at:
Fifth/Forbes corridor plus cross streets (no turns on red where needed for pedestrian safety)
Centre Avenue (Bigelow to Millvale)
Bayard/Bigelow/O'Hara
Boulevard of the Allies.

A new circulation system should be developed for Forbes/Fifth corridor, Middle Oakland extending to Parkview/Dawson Streets, Bates Street, and Craft Avenue including provision for emergency vehicles.

Traffic in Schenley Plaza should be reoriented, retaining the same number of surface parking spaces.

All intersections on Darragh Street such as Terrace, Victoria, and Allequippa are to be re-examined and/or redesigned to accommodate the flow of traffic, parking facilities, and to protect the adjacent residential neighborhood.

Oehelia Street should be closed at Forbes Avenue to prevent a through-traffic short-cut to the Boulevard of the Allies.
Note that the new circulation system in Middle includes new stop signs on Bates and a complex internal circulation system designed to discourage through-traffic, especially trucks and commuters. A diagram of this system is shown on the opposite page. Details at left for Darragh Street and Schenley.

The ODI Planning Committee has also recommended improvements for long-range implementation:

There should be a detailed study of the Boulevards through Oakland for the purpose of permanent pedestrian movement across it, expediting through traffic and providing for local traffic. Special attention be paid in the study to the intersections with Halket as well as a comprehensive solution to the portal to Oakland which includes Forbes, Fifth, and ramp connections.

Sennott Street may be extended west of Atwood Street to McKee if needed to accommodate a new comprehensive development plan.

- New Stop Signs
  - Designed to encourage easy pedestrian movement
- Direction of Traffic Flow
  - Designed to discourage through-traffic.
- Local Traffic Only
  - Designed to discourage trucks and commuters.
- Synchronized Traffic Flow
  - Designed to encourage continuous vehicular movement
- Pedestrian Network
  - Designed to encourage easy pedestrian movement
Middle Oakland Traffic Details
Parking recommendations

The plan opposite shows the parking recommendations for immediate implementation:

Residential sticker parking program in all neighborhoods.

New parking facilities: (net new spaces)
- Darragh/Terrace (1100-1700 cars)
- Centre/Craig (50 cars)
- Fifth/Forbes/Bellefield/Neville (150-250 cars)

A management system for all on and off-street parking should be implemented which may include but not be limited to:
- Changing rate structures in lots, garages, and on-street parking.
- Changing 2-hour meters around the Cathedral of Learning to 4-hour.
- Removing parking from University Drive.
- Examining peak-hour on-street parking restrictions.

There may also be a long-range demand for parking. For instance, UHCP projects that by 1985 the net need for spaces (including the Darragh/Terrace garage listed above) will be 3,000 spaces. This figure, however, could be offset by an efficient overall management system or major transit improvements. The long-range projects for non-UHCP institutions and the commercial sector have not been developed at this time.

---

Residential Sticker Parking
Designed to protect residential streets.

New Parking Facility
Designed to provide parking at critical areas.

Exclusive Bus Lane
Designed to improve transit circulation.

Major Bus Stop
Designed for easy transit access at key points.

Pedestrian Connection
Facilitates pedestrian movement between buildings.
Transit and Parking Recommendations
Transit recommendations

The mainline or "through" bus system should be restructured to accommodate the special needs (night shift workers, students, patients, etc.) of Oakland and to account for a new bus lane on Fifth Avenue and the East Busway, now under construction.

A feeder bus system (including loop buses) must be coordinated with the mainline system and should serve neighborhoods, institutions, schools, and stores.

Major transit stops should be developed at key interchanges, be related to feeder bus service from the neighborhoods and institutions, and connect to the park and ride network.

Regular transit stops should be upgraded to be more attractive, comfortable, and usable to encourage use of the transit system.

A sophisticated transit link from downtown Pittsburgh to Oakland is a clear and immediate need and should be planned for eventual extension to the east.

The creation of an Oakland "jitney" type service to serve the neighborhoods and institutions should be explored.

The creation of a "free fare" transit zone supplement to loop buses within Oakland should be explored with the Authority.

Parking operators (public and private) should give priority to car pool and van pool vehicles.
Implementation
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This document is intended as a policy statement. Some of the recommendations are specific. Others are more general. Some are short-term, others are long-term. At the beginning of the Oakland Planning Process the members of ODI made a commitment to assist and monitor the implementation of the recommendations coming out of this study.

There is still a long way to go. The first step is the publication of this policy statement. Its purpose is to show how each recommendation relates in the whole; and, of course, the purpose of the whole is to upgrade the quality of life, work, and recreation in Oakland and the welfare of the Oakland citizens.

Once this policy statement has been accepted by the various interests, the next step is the development of detailed proposals by those public agencies, institutions, or individuals directly responsible for them. As these proposals are developed they will be reviewed in detail by the various interests through the ODI joint planning process for the purpose of developing an ODI recommendation.
The work of ODI and its citizens, in concert with the City's agencies, the institutions, and the private sector, now enters a new phase.

The focus of implementation will continue to be through the ODI and its Planning Committee in order to maintain control of the process and to insure continuity of policy. The complexities of getting things done will require than a volunteer steering committee. A full-time coordinator will be essential in addition to the professional consultants brought on for specific studies or projects.

The chart below shows the proposed organization for implementation. Note that the ODI Board will have overall responsibility and control, but the Planning Committee will continue to be more involved in the actual details of implementation. The roles of each are described on the opposite page:
Implementation

ODI Board

* Appoint committees.
* Review and approve committee functions.
* Advise on and consent to annual program and budget for implementation, as well as for special projects.
* Modify organization as needed.

ODI Planning Committee

* Coordinate general planning and programming.
* Set up a five-year program and budget, updated annually.
* Monitor implementation (including project review and monitoring code enforcement).
* Secure funding as needed.
* Guide staff and consultants.

ODI Planning Committee Staff

* Carry out day-to-day coordination of ODI Planning Committee functions, such as planning, programming, monitoring, and implementation. (Not to be involved in securing funds.)
* Perform secretarial functions for ODI.
* Provide initial staffing of any other ODI subsidiary organizations, such as a non-profit Community Development Corporation, which may be created.

Consultants

* Carry out specific tasks as needed, such as market studies, urban design plans, transportation plans, funding applications, architectural designs, development packaging, and publicity.
a recommended procedure for all projects, large and small...

Of course, most of the actual implementation will be not by ODI, but by its constituent members or outside interests working within the overall guidelines of the study. Planning and implementation of housing programs and neighborhood revitalization will involve mainly neighborhood organizations (separately funded) and institutional planning and renewal will be done in- and private development will involve a wide range of interests.

The key to the success of the implementation will be the continuing role of ODI in reviewing the plans of the constituencies in accordance with the guidelines of the study. It is essential that the constituents in each disclose and discuss their plans at an early stage and be willing to negotiate according to the guidelines for this study, or as amended later.
After the publication of the Oakland Plan the procedure for obtaining the community's endorsement of particular projects is as follows:

A project is conceived, a problem develops, or a situation arises which involves the public interest in Oakland.

A person, organization, or business, concerned with the project or situation contacts ODI.

The president of ODI is notified immediately. He or she in turn notifies the appropriate Committee (such as Planning or Transportation).

The concerned person or organization appears before the Committee and presents the project, problem, or situation.

The Committee reviews the issues and alternatives and makes a recommendation on the request. The recommendation will include a written report detailing the committee's findings.

If ODI Board action is necessary, pertinent information is sent to each Board member in sufficient time before the next Board meeting.

The person or organization is notified of the date of the next ODI Board meeting and is asked to attend.

The person or organization is notified of the ODI Board decision within five days after the ODI Board meeting.

Where there is a vote, an officer of ODI will report that vote to proper parties and authorities and will be present at appropriate hearings to indicate the positions represented by that vote. All findings related to that project, problem, or situation will be made available to any interested person or organization.

All member organizations of ODI will be free to pursue whatever course of action they wish regarding the project, problem, or situation.
Two-Year Plan

The ODI Planning Committee has carefully put to two-year implementation plan (much amended and through public meetings and negotiation) which the page opposite. The plan is realistic, fund unanimously endorsed by all constituents.

The table which follows the plan lists the two-and projects, the major implementing body, and cost. This two-year plan will be updated annually ODI Planning Committee.

An important aspect of the two-year plan will be enforcement of existing zoning laws as well as: review of zoning categories and classifications possible amendment where they are inconsistent to the implementation of the Oakland Plan.

This report is not intended to sit on a shelf or dust. The guidelines are important, of course, direct development as it occurs. However, with "action" plan for immediate implementation, and to do it, this report will be ineffective.

The Oakland Plan is intended to provide policies guidelines. The success of the plan depends not the implementation of particular projects but all way in which each project contributes to the realization of the plan's comprehensive goals.

The ODI Planning Committee should continue to play three important roles:

To review projects to ensure compatibility with interests of the plan as a whole.

To set up, in those situations where a project is at variance with the plan or with the in the adjacent community, joint planning processes resolve the differences.

To review continually the guidelines themselves of changing circumstances and to recommend to the for adoption such changes and amendments as beco
Two-Year Plan Proposals

- R1 Housing rehabilitation
- R2 New elderly housing
- R3 Landscaping
- R4 New market housing
- R5 Park improvement and new park construction
- C1 Facade and business improvements
- C2 Public improvements
- C3 New retail and office
- I1 400 units undergraduate housing
- I2 Remodeling of Schenley Hall for student union
- I3 First-phase renewal of UHOP

- T1 Synchronization of traffic signals
- T2 New circulation system for middle Oakland
- T3 Design for reorientation of Schenley Plaza
- T4 Design of Darragh Street safety improvements
- T5 Closing of Ophelia Street
- T6 Boulevard of the Allies study
- P1 Residential sticker parking program
- P2 New parking facilities:
  - Darragh-Terrace
  - Centre-Craig
  - Fifth-Forbes-Bellefield-Neville
## Two-Year Budget

### Program or Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Totals
## Funding and Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>HUD</th>
<th>UHCP</th>
<th>Pitt</th>
<th>Businesses Developers</th>
<th>Homeowners Landlords</th>
<th>Combinat Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | $5,520,000 | $4,000,000 | $36,000,000 | $18,000,000 | $11,500,000 | $1,600,000 | $404,000 |
Institutions and private developers for the most part have their own planners and sources of funds for implementing their parts of the two-year plan. The recommendations for the residential neighborhood depend almost wholly on governmental programs and projects. A key to the success of the resident component of the plan will be detailed neighborhood design. Below are listed the elements of a proposed Neighborhood Revitalization Work Program, including annual administrative costs:

**Neighborhood design program**

- Work with block clubs and neighborhood associations to develop fine-grain plans and implementation procedures.
- For both public and parochial schools, work with the School Board, and Diocese to increase enrollment and coordinate programs.
- Plan and design work for a multi-use center with St. Regis.
- Continue Oakland-Hill Better Bus Committee planning, including loop buses and identifying future facilities.
- Do East Busway planning for impact on neighborhoods.
- Coordinate neighborhood input into Boulevard of Allies and Bates improvements.
- For Semple Street, Frazier Street, and Robinson plan and oversee implementation of improvements development of new neighborhood shopping.
- Bring neighborhood input into large-scale commercial upgrading.
Housing program
New construction and rehabilitation for senior citizens and handicapped:

- Establish site selection process, identify sites with residents, develop site plans and preliminary drawings, and identify funding sources.
- Develop and coordinate support programs.

Rehabilitation for new families and owner occupants:

- Develop program for provision of architectural advice, counseling on rehabilitation and financing, and coordinating with City programs.
- Develop process for identifying houses for sale and attracting prospective buyers.
- Develop rehabilitation program if needed.

Administrative costs
Planning and Housing Personnel: (annual budget)

Coordinator $9,000
Planner 13,000
Community Outreach 15,000
Consultants:
   Architect/Planning (senior citizens) 17,000
   Architect (owner occupants) 5,000
   Real Estate 3,000

$62,000
References and Credits

Market studies
"Memorandum on Student Housing", W.G. Conway & Co. for the Urban Redevelopment Authority of Pittsburgh.
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Citizen participation process summaries
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Forum I Summary.

Task Force Workshop Summaries: Residential; Commer Institutional; Transportation; Public Safety.

Note:
All documents listed above may be obtained at the Department of Planning, City of Pittsburgh.
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