



140  
599  
THS



218545

LIBRARY  
Michigan State  
University

7196  
8H747

EXAMINING THE OPPORTUNITIES AND APPROACHES TO RECREATIONAL AND OPEN  
SPACE DEVELOPMENT WITHIN INNER CITIES OF METROPOLITAN REGIONS

Alvin T. Holman

Plan B Paper

Submitted to Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the degree of  
Master of Urban Planning

Professor Keith M. Honey, Chairman  
College of Social Science  
Department of Urban Planning  
School of Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture  
Fall 1972

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
~~SCHOOL OF URBAN PLANNING AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE~~  
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN

X

.....

.....

.....  
.....

## PREFACE

The subject matter of this Plan B paper generated an inquisitive interest to this author as a result of general "shop talk" with some of my fellow professional and student peers, and much of the awareness that has been given to me via the content of the courses taken and the courses that I am currently enrolled in within the Departments of Park and Recreation Resources and Resource Development. The courses that I have taken and will complete within those two departments are as follows:

- (3) RD 880 Special Problems
- (3) PRR 880 Special Problems
- (4) PRR 440 Park Administration
- (3) PRR 842 Park and Recreation Policy
- (3) PRR 880/5 Research Methods

16 credits

My main concern and area of interest in park and recreation resources as it relates to urban planning is that of examining the opportunities and approaches to recreational and open space development within inner cities of metropolitan regions.

The goal of serving human needs is accepted by most open space planners. Little has been done, however, to define what these needs are or how open space can best be designed to meet them. Open space is frequently determined by opportunistic purchases or the "mystic of the map". A design is selected because it looks good on a multicolored land-use map. Research has concentrated on such problems as how to measure and project the acreage requirements for broad types of open space---playfields, playgrounds, tot lots, etc. This work has been useful in obtaining general land requirements for standard recreation activities. But all too often it has produced stereotyped plans.

Conventional notions about recreation and open space disregard such essential questions as:

- \*\* What human values and preferences should open space serve?
- \*\* How can these values be applied to the design of particular types of open space?
- \*\* How can the specific values and needs of different groups within the population be identified and incorporated into the open space and recreational planning process?

Senator Harrison Williams of New Jersey aptly expressed this belief: "There is a certain psychic relief in open space that cannot be underestimated. It gives us visual relief from the tangled, jarring, and often monotonous sight of urban development and a sense of orientation and community identity. Very few can picture the location

of every street in town, but most of us can immediately place the location of an attractive park or open space in our mind's eye."<sup>1</sup>

The main thrust of identifying new forms of opportunities and directions of development of recreational opportunity and resources will be in the planning stage of operation more than any other stage of activity. This would include development, operations, and administration. In order for new trends and directions to be successful as they could possibly be, it is imperative that the catalyst for such would be in the planning stage of the activity process whereby disjointed incrementalism of application can be minimized.

Open space plans, under this approach, would be based on the needs and attitudes of various population groups in a given area. These groups would be the potential users of the open space and their needs would be recorded through systemic social research techniques. Present methods rely on generalized analysis of needs obtained by relating gross quantities of people to gross quantities of acreage. A "typical population" with "typical interests" is usually assumed. As a result, the diverse values of ethnic, economic, age, and other groups within the urban population are largely ignored.

Open space has many meanings in the planning of cities. It refers to grounds for sports and games, or to large areas in public or quasi-public ownership. It includes unbuilt on land, "natural"

areas, voids open to view, and places of outdoor assembly. To this ambiguous cluster of places is attached a similar cluster of purposes: Conservation, recreation, contact with nature, social or mental health.

Such areas are usually shown in green on a comprehensive or city plan, and the plan is judged on the size and the continuity of its green areas.

Open space in the sense that I am making reference to is an outdoor area in the highly developed and matured areas of a metropolitan region which is open to the freely chosen and spontaneous activity, movement, or visual exploration of a significant number of city people. It includes places which are not green on planners' maps, such as vacant lots and alleys.

Beyond the previously mentioned concepts of open space, there can and should be modifications in the accepted procedure for designing and planning for an open space or recreational system within inner cities or highly matured central cities. The usual method begins with a study of existing and projected future population, and perhaps with an analysis of the present patterns of recreation activity. By applying recognized quantitative standards of certain common types of recreation facilities per unit population, a present and future demand for these facilities is calculated. Meanwhile, a survey has been made of existing public open space and recreation facilities, and this is compared to give a present and future deficit. Independently, a survey is also made of the



region to identify the lands which are lightly developed and which have potential for use in one of the standard ways. These potential open spaces are compared to the future deficit; costs and access to using population are computed; and a "best fit" is found between location of demand and location of supply within cost limits. This then becomes the recommended plan, expressed as a staged program of land acquisition and open space development.

From this author's viewpoint, this is inadequate. Such an open space system (except as it takes cognizance of the distribution of population, general time-distances, and the pattern of existing open land) fails to deal with the total urban pattern of which the open spaces are a reciprocal part. It confines itself to some rather stereotyped categories of open space: Beaches, regional parks, playfields and playgrounds, urban parks. Through its use of standards, it makes gross assumptions about the open space behavior and desires of very large aggregates of the population, without real regard for class and individual differences. It plays down the possibilities of future change and innovation. It largely ignores the possibilities of large-scale design (except for generalized map patterns) and the vast number of potential site-planning devices and characteristics. The use and administration of these open spaces are dealt with superficially. The system concerns itself with only publicly owned open spaces of a particular type. It does not contain a clear statement of objectives, and how they connect with proposals.

It is easier to attack an old concept than to create a new one. I cannot suggest a new procedure which will overcome all of the faults.

However, some additional steps to the usual open space planning process will be examined in the following section. These steps do not constitute a complete open space planning process, nor do they include other open space uses, such as conservation. Within these restrictions, they are offered as useful in helping insure that open space and recreational facilities will be more responsive to meeting human needs of urban dwellers and the disadvantaged segments of urban areas:

- 1.) An operational statement of goals for the use of open space should be made. These goals will vary for different groups within the population, and they may change in emphasis while the plan is being implemented.

- 2.) A detailed study should be made of existing open space behavior and aspirations of the population, divided by economic, ethnic, and age groups. Members of these groups should join in these studies. Projections would be made of probable future changes in this behavior and of ways by which it may be modified in desirable directions. In dealing with a broader, more ill-defined, and shifting set of behavioral patterns than formal recreation, it will be more difficult to make quantitative estimates of land and facility requirements. Computations of front feet of beach and numbers of picnic tables can still be made, but how do you determine how many tree houses are needed? Since we are dealing with open behavior, presumably

partly free and idiosyncratic, we will always have to live in a penumbra of uncertainty. This must be dealt with by community participation, by feel, by experiment, by feedback, and by a wide degree of physical flexibility. Facilities for formal recreation, conducted according to fixed rules and requiring commitments of specially designed outdoor space (tennis courts, for example), would be programmed and located according to need.

3.) The entire existing system of open space, in the sense that I have used the term, must be surveyed, including its physical character, use, and control. The potentialities for future open space must be analyzed in the same broad way.

4.) Prototype facilities of a very wide range should be designed, fully exploiting technical and design possibilities and abandoning former stereotypes of "proper" or "good" parks. These prototypes should include proposals for use and administration as well as physical form.

5.) It should be kept in mind that spaces are used only if they are accessible. Also, remember that the view in motion is the most important way of seeing a city, and that many recreational activities are themselves types of movements.

A detailed planning-area analysis should be completed for communities or planning areas within the metropolitan region. It can best be done as part of comprehensive planning studies or in conjunction with urban renewal planning. The format for the planning

for community recreation could be as follows.

Planning Community Recreation

Step I      Goal Formulation

Establish community recreation philosophy  
Establish recreation goals  
Coordinate with overall goals of community

Step II     Data Collection

Socio-economical data  
Delineation of neighborhood  
Inventory of recreation facilities  
Administrative structure  
Adapted and adopted standards

Step III    Plan Formulation

Identification of recreation needs  
Use of standards  
Involvement of citizens and civic groups  
Demand use factors

Step IV     Implementation

Short range objectives  
Assignment of priorities

## Financial plan

Cities using a planning method in an attempt to find the best possible recreation program will improve the recreational opportunities for the urban dweller.

Another study that could exist which would both complement and supplement the forementioned approaches is one which defines the "demand" for outdoor recreation facilities in terms of the city's societal structure and its particular economic characteristics.

In economic terms, "demand" as applied to outdoor recreation means consumer requirements for use of visits to a recreation area. Providers of recreation areas therefore must gain knowledge of consumers' "wants and needs" for outdoor recreation facilities. There exists a correlation between demand and supply of the commodity. Demand is also a function of the satisfaction users derive from their present degree of participation.

From the perspective of the whole society and the whole economy, outdoor recreation is but one part of the total life. Hence, demand for outdoor recreation will be determined in large measure by societal processes external to recreation itself. The experience of economic studies with estimates and projections of demand for outdoor recreation is relatively short and incomplete; and particularly so within inner city core areas of metropolitan regions. A study could be designed to explore and examine factors external to recreation which are alledged

to underlie the rises in demand in outdoor recreation facilities. In the following, economic trends and social indicators are discussed which are argued to be causes for rising demand in outdoor recreation.

#### The Effects of Economic Factors

The combination of a growing population, shorter work hours and longer vacations have increased total leisure time and generated demand for leisure time activities. In addition there is a change in the age group distribution among the population. We have a younger population today and fore-casts are for a still larger percentage of young people in the next decade. These young people are using, increasingly, their leisure time for outdoor recreation activities. Considerable attention is given to the role of leisure in our economy today and to the future; and to recreation as one of the many uses of leisure. Available statistics on average time per capita participation in outdoor recreation activities suggest the enormous rise in the time spent over the past two generations on outdoor recreation activities.

Revealing data on participation trends in outdoor recreation activities are given in a study by Mary A. Holman, Associate Professor in Economics at the George Washington University.<sup>2</sup> This study is concerned with the estimate of how people divide their total time which is a clearly defined limited resource of 24 hours per day. The national time budget estimate includes time divisions for leisure trends during the 1900-1950 period and a forecast for the year 2000. The study



also analyzes the interrelationships between income increases, leisure time increases and rising demand in outdoor recreation activities. The findings reveal that more people, more of them in leisure age groups, and more leisure for all people, combine to suggest a very great increase in total leisure in the decades ahead. The examination of the statistics presented in the study indicates that time spent in outdoor recreation increased at a much higher rate than leisure time generally, and that income increased many fold times more than leisure. For the 1900-1950 period, leisure per capita rose by 27 percent, while real incomes per capita increased about 150 percent; for the period 1950-2000 period, Professor Holman anticipates a still sharper contrast. A rise in about 12 percent in per capita leisure is expected to be contrasted with an anticipated rise of at least 150 percent in real income per capita. The foregoing trends and forecasts show that the leisure-income balance is shifting toward much more income and to slightly more leisure, each on a per capita basis. The same trend is shown in the outdoor recreation activities-leisure time balance.<sup>3</sup> Estimates indicate that from 1900 to 1950 the total time spent on outdoor recreation activities increased only three-fold. The estimated amount of time to be spent by the total population in outdoor recreation activities over the next 40 years will be proportionately even greater relative to the increase in total leisure time over the same period.

The Effects of Social Indicators on Recreation Demands

While economists reason that the factors of more available time for leisure and increased income effect the continued rise in demand for outdoor recreation, sociologists, psychologists, social workers and outdoor recreation specialists emphasize the link between demand for recreation activities and social objectives. There is general concurrence that constructive leisure time activities contribute to the social good of all elements in the population. Different social groups and different age groups, however, have diversified recreation needs and varying capabilities in meeting these needs. Pressing social objectives are linked to needs of recreational opportunities for low income disadvantaged youth and those which have been victimized as a result of inherent cultural and racial biases. Behavioral scientists argue that constructive recreation activities are an important means for alleviating and preventing social ills. Some of their arguments are:

Prevention of Crime and Juvenile Delinquency; anti-social behavior is related to social deprivation resulting from low income, poor education, substandard housing, broken families, and inadequate neighborhood environment. In regards to recreation, inadequate and disjointed recreational facility development along with neglect of proper methodologies for facility and park system renewal has had an equitable role in contributing to unwholesome socio-psychological instability within our society also.

In other segments of society, naturally the forementioned will not be the case and alternative approaches would have to be explored. For instance, it would appear as if social deprivation did not exist as a medium <sup>ti</sup> high income, quality educational opportunity, a "decent home for every American", and a wholesome neighborhood environment, the problem would be solved. The forementioned characteristics are not utopian in thought or suggestion but exist in reality; yet then, the question is asked, "Why is shoplifting highest in the suburbs?" In relation to recreation, in this case, may not be so much that of inadequate recreational facility development as it would be appropriate recreation activity programming. It is postulated that improved recreational opportunities will help in alleviating problems of crime and juvenile delinquency by providing alternatives and socially acceptable uses of leisure time.

Educational and Cultural Enrichment: Recreational activities provide opportunity for furthering educational goals as a result of the recreation program itself (reading, acting health programs, etc.). They provide the so-called disadvantaged with skills such as arts and crafts, swimming, tennis instructions, etc.

Recreation and Socialization: It is pointed out the recreation programs provide the disadvantaged the participation in organized athletic activities; an activity most lack otherwise. Shared experiences is an aid in socializing disadvantaged or advantaged youth

for that matter. The experience that good performance in sports requires some degree of discipline, training, and practice. Excellence is reinforced by visible social rewards both from peer groups and adults.

The link of social objectives to recreation activities may be defined in economic terms as an "externality argument". The assertion is that recreation lessens juvenile delinquency and other undesirable consequences of life under depressed urban conditions, and that those not directly involved nevertheless gain a better community life as a result of the external effect. Thus, there is an indirect source of demand by the people of the community for recreation facilities.

## METHODOLOGY

### I. The Comprehensive System Approach

The procedure of system analysis is used to arrive at a comprehensive array of factors which may be effecting "demand" for outdoor recreation in highly urbanized and depressed areas. Two methods of techniques could be used in the analysis. These are: exploratory technique and interrogative technique. The methods of the two techniques are as follows:

#### A. Exploratory Technique

This technique consists of empirical methods that assess the effects of demographic factors of social indicators, and the effects

of the types and quality of available resources on the demand for outdoor recreation areas. While it is probably impossible to enumerate, much less to measure all of the factors that might be involved, it would appear that some, if not all of the following factors might well influence attendance at a particular outdoor recreation area.

## 1. Effects of Demographic Factors

### a.) Population Characteristics

Total population

race and sex

### Specific age groups

### Age groups by family relationships

Minor population

Elderly population

Pre-school children

## b.) Population distribution

Density structure-person/acre

2. Effects of Social Factors

a.) Family environment

Household size

Normal family life index %of children under 18 living with  
both parents

Marital unrest

Matriachy index

Fatherless children

b.) Housing

Total housing units

Single family dwellings-% of total

Average housing unit size

Home ownership and occupancy

Average value of housing

Monthly contract rent, units with 1.01 or more per room

Low rent index (% of rental housing units with a contract  
monthly rent of less than \$80)

c.) Social deficiency indicators

School dropout rates by school level

Delinquency referrals

Welfare aid (Aid to families with dependent children)



3. Effects of Economic Factors

- a.) Income by family and per capita
- b.) Educational attainment
- c.) Occupation

4. Effect of Resource Supply

- a.) Number and acreage of outdoor recreation resources by census tracts
- b.) Unit operation days/year in each unit
- c.) Supervisory man hours/10,000 population

B. The Interrogative Technique

This technique relies upon value judgement and perceptions of recreation professionals and facility users. Perception of the participant will reveal information on the innate attractiveness of the facility as judged by the average user and the extent to which demand has been stimulated by good facilities and management. Perception of the professional should be applied to test the capacity of the recreation facility to accommodate recreationists and the intensity of management of the recreation area.

II. The Planning Strategy

A study should adopt the following procedure:

- a.) the starting point is the investigation, by exploring exploratory techniques of the people, their economic and social characteristics

which are assumed to effect the demand for recreation facilities. Then the recreation resources and related institutional problems are investigated by applying both empirical and interrogative techniques. Major, but not exclusive attention should be focused throughout the study on publicly owned facilities.

b.) A model could be constructed whereby the interrelationship of the effects of multi-variate factors on outdoor recreation demand will be tested. The interrelationships of measurable variables will be established by method of linear regression equations. The model would test the validity of the interrelationships of the multi-variate factors and the degree of impact they have on demand for outdoor recreation.

The model would hopefully test the input of the aspiration and satisfaction value judgements by users and the perception of the recreation professionals and tell why any recreation facility gets the use it does.

### III. Regression Equations <sup>5</sup>

#### a.) General Recreational Demand Analysis

First "demand" will be analyzed as a recreational facility is used by an individual. The regression equation could look something like the following:

$$D_{ij}^t = \text{demand by individual (i) for facility (j) over time period (t)}$$

Measures of effectiveness on demand can be postulated as follows:

$$D_{ij} = D_{ij} (P_j, Q_j, L_i, A_i, Y_i, E_i, S_i, R_k)$$

where  $P_j$  = the price for use of facility j

$Q_j$  = the quality of facility j

$L_i$  = leisure time available to individual i

$A_i$  = age group of individual i

$Y_i$  = the income group of individual i

$E_i$  = the economic, educational and occupational characteristics of individual i

$R_k$  = the quality and quantity of alternate recreational sites

In establishing the **regressions**, one must assume effects of the multi-variate variables applied in the equations on demand and the interrelationships between the variables.

It appears to be probable that an individual's demand for a facility will be positively related to that facility's quality and to the individual's available leisure time. Demand of the individual to use the facility will be related also to the quantity and quality of available recreation sites.

The age group distribution and population density in an urban area will determine the intensity of demand for quantity of recreation facilities.

The study should also test the effect of economic and social measurable variables on the demand for recreation activities and facilities.

b.) Demand Analysis by Categories of Recreation Facilities

In this portion of the study, the interest would be in the demand of categories of recreation facilities which are required to serve the recreation needs of the citizen in (name of city) inner city core.

At the present time most municipalities administer three general categories of urban recreation centers:

- a.) Neighborhood recreation centers
- b.) District or community recreation centers
- c.) City-wide recreation activity facilities

Moreover, to serve all recreation needs of inner city residents, regional recreation areas located outside of the city of open lands should be added to the analysis. Hopefully at some point in time a model can be constructed to determine demand for the various categories of a complete urban recreation center system including the regional recreation centers.

The "markets" for neighborhood, district, and city-wide facilities are not independent; that is, the demand to use a neighborhood facility will depend upon the supply of the municipality will depend upon the number of neighborhood facilities in the city etc. Formulation of demand relationships should take place accordingly and calculation of

the net change in demand for recreation with the addition of a particular type of facility.

In order to highly effectuate such an effort by a municipality, external resources can be tapped and utilized also; and this does not negate the fact that such efforts could not serve as a catalyst for stimulating alterations in governmental roles and responsibilities either. Examples of external resources that can be tapped for the purposes of developing open space and recreational facilities are programs that are available through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Such resources from the Department of Housing and Urban Development are:

The Office of Community Development

The Neighborhood Facilities Program

The Urban Beautification and Improvement Program

The Open Space Land Program

The Interim Assistance Grant Program

The following will be a general capsulation of the above mentioned programs.

Office of Community Development<sup>6</sup>

The Office of Community Development was established in the the Department of Housing and Urban Development to promote the well-being of people in urban communities and new towns.

To enhance the environment in which people live, work, and play, the Office of Community Development:

\*\* Shapes social policy for HUD

\*\* Supports research and development in such areas as tenant-management relations, self-help and personal growth programs and training for the unemployed and underemployed

\*\* Works with HUD program administrators to further social goals

The Office of Community Development is responsible for environmental planning for all HUD programs. It administers no grants, but plans for people through its offices of relocation, social planning and services, Workable Program for Community Improvement, and urban design.

In relation to open space and recreation the Relocation staff, the Social Planning and Services staff, the Workable Program for Community Improvement, and the Urban Design staff are involved in the following:

\*\*Develops relocation policy for those affected by open space and recreation development or redevelopment

\*\*Development of a comprehensive planning and programming process for designing action programs to meet specific problems in the community and to mesh with the decision-making process

\*\*Involvement of citizens, including the poor and minority groups

\*\*Promoting the relationship of design to the social needs of people

\*\*Expanding research which explores the influence of the physical environment on human behavior, experience and development

\*\*Devising and introducing new modes of citizen participation in the physical design process



### The Neighborhood Facilities Program<sup>7</sup>

HUD's Neighborhood Facilities Program provides grants to help local public bodies finance development of neighborhood centers to serve low- and moderate- income communities. These centers can bring to neighborhood residents a wide range of services and activities, including health, educational, social, and recreational programs.

Grants may be used to help finance up to two-thirds the costs of a new building or to rehabilitate an existing structure. In areas which the U.S. Department of Commerce designates as Redevelopment Areas a grant may increase to three-fourths of the cost of the project.

The federal grant may be used for such expenses architectural services, land acquisition, demolishing unneeded buildings, and site improvements, as well as for construction of the neighborhood center. Grants may not be used to cover the costs of operating the center.

Grants are available only for multipurpose facilities which provide a variety of services, including health, welfare, educational, recreational, cultural, social, and similar community services for neighborhood residents.

### The Urban Beautification and Improvement Program<sup>8</sup>

Federal grants are available to local public bodies and agencies to finance up to 50% of the cost of beautification and improvement activities above the public bodies average level of activity for the two fiscal years preceding application.

The city, county, or State government must officially adopt a beautification and improvement program if a public body is to

participate in the Federal grant program. The local program should set forth general priority schedule for both public and private activities to be undertaken within the next three to five years and should make full use of both private and public resources. Federal grant aid is available only for the public activities involved.

Applications may cover many types of beautification and improvement projects. An application may include proposed activities in all four of the following categories:

GROUP I. Upgrading and rehabilitating parks, including basic utilities, paths, walks, roadways, landscaping and shelters.

GROUP II. Improvement of public places, including design, construction, and upgrading of malls, squares, plazas, waterfront areas, and similar sites. Items such as decorative pavement, lighting, planters, street furniture, and fountains are eligible.

GROUP III. Communitywide activities, including landscaping, special street furniture, signs, benches or other improvements to improve the appearance of streets, greenways, parkways, and other non-recreational public sites.

GROUP IV. Historic and other public building sites including special lighting, paving, landscaping or other work to beautify such sites.

Design costs directly related to these four groups are eligible for grant assistance.

Not eligible are administrative costs incurred by a public body;



costs of major construction or development, land acquisition, maintenance; cost of certain recreational equipment or facilities; and the cost of any activity for which Federal assistance is available under another program.

#### The Open Space Land Program<sup>9</sup>

Providing and preserving open space in our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas has been a responsibility shared by the Federal Government. Open space land--whether used for public parks and recreation, or to conserve natural resources, historic, and scenic areas--improves the quality of urban life. It is a necessary component of a viable urban environment.

Federal grants are available to public bodies to finance up to 50% of the cost of acquiring and developing land for public parks, and public recreation, scenic, historic, or conservation areas. In built-up urban areas where no suitable land is available, grants may cover up to 50% of the cost of acquiring, clearing, and developing land.

Eligible costs include acquisition of land and certain structures on the land, demolition of inappropriate structures, and real estate services. In general, all development activities in central cities and low-income neighborhoods can be assisted with full 50% grant aid. Development assistance for land already in public ownership is available through the HUD Urban Beautification and Improvement Program.

Assistance from HUD is not available for the purchase of already-developed specialized open space areas, such as golf courses, marinas, and others.

Development costs may include: basic sanitary, water, and lighting facilities; paths; walks; landscaping; equipment sheds and other small buildings; safety facilities such as retaining walls, fencing, signs, and curbing; basic recreational facilities and equipment having long-term use; and other minor improvements necessary for open space use.

#### Project Priorities

Priority is assigned to open space programs which meet the urgent needs of people, especially those of low-income neighborhoods and communities. The Department also gives special attention to projects that will shape metropolitan growth and to projects coordinated with other programs designed to improve the urban environment. This might include projects such as small park developments in Model Cities or parks in overcrowded inner-city neighborhoods on short time schedules, often related to special summer programs to ease urban tensions.

#### Interim Assistance grant Program

The primary purpose of the Interim Assistance Grant Program is to help localities alleviate harmful conditions in slum and blighted areas. These must be areas marked for urban renewal in the near future, but in which some immediate public action is needed.

HUD provides grants to municipalities to carry out

assistance program in one or more areas, on the following basis:

\*\*Not more than two-thirds of the cost of planning and carrying out the program for municipalities with a population of over 50,000, according to the most recent decennial census.

\*\*Not more than three-fourths of the cost of planning and carrying the program for municipalities with a population of 50,000 or less, according to the latest decennial census.

An example of how such a concentrated effort in the area of urban recreational planning and development can have in serving as a catalyst for stimulating alterations in government roles and responsibilities would be that of placing the role of alleviating inequality of recreation opportunity upon State Government.

An area of concern that has definite possibilities for efforts in this direction is that of a strategy, legislative, and methodological development of a state supported effort in park and recreation resources within central cities. From time to time, and increasingly so in the past several years, there have been discussions on the role of state government to provide, develop, and maintain recreational facilities to a statewide cross-section of the constituency. This has been done year in and year out, methods to improve the facilitation of recreational areas to the statewide constituency has been endeavored. However, although the utilization of facilities has been intense and the demand for such is even more so, the realization that a cross-section of the state-wide has not been achieved. As a result,



the concern for inequitable opportunity for utilization and consumption of the psychological, cultural, educational, and social benefits of existing systems have not been reaped by the majority population of states whose taxes support the largest portion of a state department's appropriation for state parks and other recreational areas.

There have been research efforts and studies which indicate that the overwhelming percentage of patrons, who are the small number of select few users of state parks and other recreational areas are from the urban metropolitan areas of the state. However, this large percentage of patronage use is a very small percentage of the total number of urban dwellers. Hence, the vast majority of these individuals, or social groups, are not able to absorb any benefit whatsoever from statewide programs or opportunities.

The reason for this phenomena is not one which is without an answer. The generalized hurdles to benefit are the lack of transportation, lack of economic opportunity to support such participation, proximity relationships between state recreational areas and major urban areas, are just a few.

With such an inequitable governmental administrative practice that has been traditionally practiced, perpetuation of such a one-sided approach is bound to be evident. It would therefore seem only natural that such departments of jurisdiction within state governments would research the possibility of equalizing the "state of things and the state of things to come".

In order for a state agency to prepare for possible courses of action in responding to the immense attention that innovation in the administration of its function would require, it would only seem to be a logical approach to programmatically pursue a three-fold process in meeting up to the demands of innovation and equitable accountability.

One level would have a macro analysis orientation which would examine, evaluate, monitor, and develop strategies for policy development that would be conducive to drawing support for any state-wide innovation---a national affairs collaboration type of activity. The second level of activity which would be involved in in state and local cooperation and methodologies for implementation of developing state recreation facilities within central cities. The third level would be the micro level whereby project oriented methodologies, research, strategies, and specific development issues would be devised and operated.

A package of sequential studies would have to be dove-tailed together on all three levels to come up with any form of conclusions to substantiate a state policy toward development of state recreational facilities within urban areas.

I. Tentative Studies for Macro Level Activity

- a.) Assessment on a nation-wide scale, of state policies regarding acquisition of land, the development, administration and maintenance of state parks within central cities and/or metropolitan areas (by state).

- b.) A legislative review and analysis of what is, what could be,

or what is being done on the Federal level to stimulate such activity as mentioned in Ia.

## II. State-wide Level Activity

- a.) An assessment of what policy developments, if any, are taking place on the state level to stimulate such activity as mentioned above, by state (i.e. the Department of Natural Resources for the State of Michigan and corresponding departments and agencies of all other states).
- b.) Analyze relationships of autonomous authorities whos focus is in park development, management and administration (i.e. the Clinton-Huron Metropolitan Park Authority), to the functions and the responsibility of the state.
- c.) Develop strategies whereby in the funding portion of proposals or legislative enactments, the inflationary costs for urban property can be adequately met in light of the fact that urban property values and speculative assessments raise costs to premium levels.

## III. Tentative Studies for Micro Level Activity

- a.) Dvelop methodologies for surveying potential sites and resouces within matured urban areas.
- b.) Examine land use compatability and relationships of potential sites to assess the types of treatments that might be applied to resolving land use conflicts, transportation problems, etc..

- c.) Expand the range of leisure and recreation encompassment to include all forms of leisure and recreational activity of urban populations and urban sub-groups and minorities.

#### IV. Significance of study areas

##### A.) Macro level activity

- 1.) The rationale for study on this level is to crystalize the picture of what developments have taken place with regards to such an emphasis; what trends are developing on the national/Federal level of policy determination; what are some of the trends and conceivable directions that can be taken in the future.

##### B.) State-wide level activity

- 1.) The rationale for study on this level is to crystalize the picture of what developments have taken place with regards to such an emphasis on the state level of policy determination; what are some of the trends and conceivable directions that can be taken in the future.

##### C.) Micro level activity

- 1.) To devise and develop viable methodologies for assessing needs in urban areas for urban populations in relations to the resources of both the state administration and urban resource capabilities.
- 2.) To devise and develop viable methodologies for integrating and juxtaposing new physical systems with and onto highly



matured urban physical systems and land use compatibilities and conflicts.

- 3.) Establish and enlarge the inventory of forms of recreation within urban areas for urban populations whereby such activities can be invaluable "planning factors" in a recreational system's development.

### CONCLUSION

The comprehensive planning process encompasses many facets of the urban planning profession. And likewise, the techniques and methodologies employed in the various aspects of a plan development are just as diverse and complex. The focus of this paper has been specifically on that of examining the opportunities and approaches to recreational and open space development within inner cities of metropolitan regions, as it relates to the entire comprehensive planning process. In arriving at a truly comprehensive approach to this aspect of planning as it relates to the inequities, complexities, and considerations for new and divergent methodologies, strategies, and commitments, no total solution has been sought; however, the main thesis of this entire effort is that of acknowledging the disparities that exist with this complex problem and to attempt to operationalize unconventional, but rational and professionally acceptable thought processes along the lines of attempting to alleviate such disparities from an institutionalized perspective.

The reason that this particular approach was selected for such an investigation was that it would appear that such changes will only come to fruition when the social institutions take it upon themselves to facilitate for such changes. The methodologies that will be applied will have to be both professionally acceptable and socially beneficial to all institutions involved.

I would, in a very positive way, suspect that any of the methodologies or concerns raised in this paper would at minimum, be at least as legitimate as any of the conventional approaches that are operating to date in the area of concern of this paper. And with this as a criteria of validity, it can be assumed that further development and experimentation into such realities should be encouraged by both the institutions involved and the related professions...that is to say, if the institutions and the related professions are truly legitimate, valid, and ethical enough to pursue another challenge from an aspect of socio-physical planning which traditionally has been the door-map to other rated and higher priority concerns as housing, public expenditure, transportation, manpower and welfare, and the whole mixed bag of socio-physical concerns of urban America.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Holman, Alvin T., Prospectus for a System Analysis to Determine the Demand for Outdoor Recreation Facilities, unpublished paper, July, 1972

Holman, Mary A., "A National Time-Budget for the Year 2000", Sociology and Research, Vol. 46, No. 1, 1961

Housing Legislation of 1961. Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 1st Session

Department of Housing and Urban Development pamphlet--Office of Community Development

Department of Housing and Urban Development pamphlet--Neighborhood Facilities Program

Department of Housing and Urban Development pamphlet--Urban Beautification and Improvement Program

Department of Housing and Urban Development pamphlet--Open Space Land Program

Department of Housing and Urban Development pamphlet--Interim Assistance Grant Program



MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02645 9796