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Everyone is interested in saving money - particularly his own money, and public officials are - or should be - interested in saving the taxpayer's money. The school-park combination has appeal, it is true, as a method of saving money. The development of combined facilities for schools and parks to provide local recreation results in more efficient and more economical service and, consequently, saves money. However, the saving of money is a minor by-product of the school-park combination; such combinations have many features of much greater importance. Most discussions of them - and this is no exception - deal more with how to spend money on school-park combinations than with how to save money through use of them.

Principles

Over the years various experts in parks and recreation, schools and urban development have devised certain standards that are now fairly well accepted for the location and development of parks and schools in an urban area.

Minimum Standards

Insofar as park area is concerned the general standard or objective has been to provide one acre of park for each 100 persons within the urban area. Of the one acre of park per 100 persons a simplified version of the standard would call for about half of this to be in the form of large parks of interest to the entire community, and the remainder to consist of smaller neighborhood parks serving the recreation needs of the tributary residential neighborhood. The large parks are customarily located to take full advantage of topographic and scenic features. While the neighborhood park should also have features of topographic or scenic interest the factor of service to the neighborhood is of
greater importance. It is a generally accepted principle that there should be a neighborhood park within about a half mile of every home in the urban area.

Insofar as the elementary, junior and senior high schools are concerned, let us assume a customary public school system operating on the 6-3-3 plan. The elementary school serves an area within about one-half mile; it should have a minimum site area of five acres with one additional acre for each 100 students. The junior high school should serve an area of one mile to a mile-and-a-half with a minimum area of 10 acres with one acre for each 100 students, while the senior high school may serve an entire municipality or a major section thereof with a minimum area of 20 acres plus one acre for each 100 students.

Both the parks and schools provide recreation areas. The elementary schools provide play areas for children of that age group. Theoretically, a completely adequate system of elementary schools would largely serve the recreational needs of this group of children. The high schools provide facilities for active play: baseball, football, tennis, sometimes swimming, and if adequately developed in accordance with the standards, pretty well take care of the needs of this age group for recreation facilities. Recreation facilities in the parks supplement the needs of the elementary and high school age groups, provide for pre-school and adult age-group requirements and for family recreation.

Obviously, in any community there is going to be an overlapping of the use of the facilities by the various age groups. Many benefits and economies are effected where the schools make use of park facilities and where non-school age groups make use of school building facilities.

Over the years in numerous communities there has been many examples of the combined use of parks and schools in an infinite variety of situations.

The Neighborhood Theory

The most important example of school-park combinations is found where the neighborhood park and elementary school are placed together. These both have the same general radius of service. By combining an elementary school and a neighborhood park on one land area portions of the school building may serve community needs and indoor recreation requirements; portions of the park area may serve part of the school's recreation program. The combined park and school then truly serves as a neighborhood center.
The neighborhood theory of residential organization and design is quite a misunderstood one. The sociologists have caused some confusion as many of them have considered the word "neighborhood" to have a deep sociologic significance. The neighborhood theory actually is concerned only with physical layout of the neighborhood itself. It has been in use for many years in development of residential areas abroad, particularly in England. The first detailed analysis in this country is probably that of Clarence Arthur Perry in his book *Housing for the Machine Age*, published in 1938. Basically, the objectives of this theory are: (1) to bring some type of pattern, some type of sensible arrangement into a community's residential areas, (2) to make it possible for children to walk from home to school without crossing a major street, (3) to provide peace, quiet and amenity in the residential areas and (4) to guard the residential area against the intrusion of heavy traffic and adverse land uses.

In its simplest form the neighborhood is about one square mile in area; it is bounded by major streets, railroads or topographic barriers; its center is a combined neighborhood park and elementary school; shopping areas and churches are found at the corners of the neighborhood, close to or near the intersection of the major streets; minor streets are arranged to be curvilinear and discontinuous so that through traffic is not able to penetrate the neighborhood but is pretty much forced to use the surrounding major streets. While existing conditions preclude arranging many neighborhoods that perfectly fit in with this theory it is possible in most cities to develop many neighborhoods that closely conform.

Where a neighborhood has been developed in this manner, living conditions, property values and general amenities are far superior to the areas where the theory is not followed. While the neighborhood theory may not be perfect it is the best principle that we have for the design of residential areas; it is significant that in 20 years no alternate theory has been advanced.

The combined elementary school and neighborhood park is the very essence of the neighborhood theory and it is most difficult to develop a satisfactory neighborhood without having a combined school and neighborhood park as the neighborhood center.

Certain variations on the theory should be mentioned. Sometimes a neighborhood center can be developed with a combination of a neighborhood park and junior high school. The neighborhood theory can also be extended and a series of several neighborhoods interrelated, insofar as high school service is concerned. A group of three to five neighborhoods are served by a high school, with the high school building serving as a community center and with high school playfield facilities supplemented by a playfield area in a park adjacent to the high school.
Size of Area Needed

A major difficulty with the park-school combinations comes from our assumption that local park-school combinations serve only educational and recreational needs. This is as bad a fallacy, and perhaps a more dangerous fallacy, as the belief of some park people some 30 years ago that recreation did not belong in the parks. The pendulum has again swung too far in the other direction. A major purpose of any park must still be scenic; it must serve to break up the mass of the urban developed area; provide trees, grass and perhaps even flowers, and be a pleasant area for people to walk in, sit in and look at. It must be more than a mere arbitrary combination of play areas for supervised recreation.

Unfortunately, most published standards for neighborhood parks are based upon provision for recreation alone. The National Recreation Association, for example, recommends a total neighborhood park area of only three and one-half acres to serve a neighborhood of 5000 persons. The total recommended area for schools, playgrounds and park for such a neighborhood was only 11.7 acres in a report of the Committee on the Hygiene of Housing of the American Public Health Association.

Almost every new publication on this subject recommends a smaller neighborhood park area. A recent master plan of a large California city recommended neighborhood parks of only five acres in area. It is significant that these minimum standards - objectives that are never attained - are constantly being cut down and reduced.

In his book on the neighborhood, Perry recommended that 10 percent of the total neighborhood area be devoted to parks, schools and open spaces. A one square mile neighborhood with a density of three families per gross acre would have a population of about 6000 persons. Perry suggested in 1937 that such a neighborhood have 64 acres of open space. This is contrasted to recommendations of the National Recreation Association and the American Public Health Association for 11 or 12 acres. There is no question but that Perry comes much closer to being right than his successors. Nor would his successors object to the greater area and the neighborhood amenities that would result from its use.

The size of the neighborhood park or school area, of course, should be related to population. An arbitrary percentage of land area is not a satisfactory standard. In our office in preparing city plans we have been using a standard calling for a neighborhood park area of one acre for each 200 persons or about one acre for each 70 families. In a neighborhood having an area of one square
mile and a population of some 6000 there would be about 600 elementary school children, and the neighborhood park-elementary school combination should consist of 30 acres of park and an elementary school area of 11 acres or a total area of 41 acres. Developed at a density of two families per gross acre there would be 4000 people, 400 school children and a neighborhood park-elementary school area of 29 acres.

With a school-park area of 30 to 40 acres a real neighborhood facility can be developed. Ample area for landscape and scenic effects may be provided; the recreation facilities need not be ugly or crowded.

Through proper subdivision design it is possible to provide park and school areas of this area without sacrificing the number of lots or the other so-called economic land uses. In redesigning a large subdivision that had been submitted to a planning commission without providing any park or school area it was found that, with a carefully studied new subdivision design, it was possible to provide a 25-acre park and school area, a greater number of lots and a shorter street mileage. There is no question but that living conditions in our cities would be vastly improved without economic damage whatsoever if we could provide combined park-school areas in accordance with these standards.

Examples

Unfortunately, we are not doing this. No American city has provided adequate close-at-hand school and park areas. When we look at a very small city such as DeKalb, Illinois, we find that 50 percent of its residential area has not been adequately served by local parks. The situation becomes even worse when we look at a larger city such as Waco, Texas, where 83 percent of the residential area is without adequate close-at-hand park and recreation facilities.

In a city such as Waco it is possible to develop a park and school plan to overcome some of these inadequacies and to obtain the support of the electorate in purchasing and improving them despite the great difficulty and expense of providing new park areas within the developed residential neighborhoods.

Most of our cities are expanding very rapidly and while the old residence areas present a difficult problem there are opportunities on the outskirts to develop new residential neighborhoods with adequate local park and school areas. Through coordinated arrangement of land use, major thoroughfares and park and school
areas, neighborhoods may be created that will meet most, if not all, of the specifications previously outlined for neighborhood areas. This may be accomplished through adopting and carrying out a comprehensive city plan.

In a suburban municipality such as Blue Ash, Ohio, where this has been done, it is possible to secure proper neighborhood development through very detailed subdivision control. In a few unusual municipalities such as Crossett, Arkansas, and in certain Texas cities such as Corpus Christi, and Amarillo, ownership of large land areas by a single individual or corporation may make it possible to secure an extraordinarily fine neighborhood arrangement. In other cities such as Bloomington, Illinois, we pretty much have to do the best we can with what we have and even the plan itself may not come too close to meeting the desirable objectives. In most of our cities, however, to overcome the problem of inadequate local park and school areas in presently developed residential neighborhoods we will have to content ourselves with extremely small areas except in a few unusual instances where, through urban renewal or the changes in use of an institutional property, we are able to obtain a neighborhood park-elementary school combination of adequate area.

Practices

It is illuminating to look a little more closely at what has been accomplished in connection with coordinated park-school facilities. In Dallas, Texas over the past 10 years the city's population has increased from 350,000 to some 600,000. During the period from 1945 to 1957 Dallas made additions to 14 existing parks and added 53 new park areas, with a total of 2,650 acres being added to the park system. Even though the growth in Dallas has been extraordinarily rapid the city today has a higher ratio of park area to population than it had in 1945. Of the 2,650 acres added to the park system, 657 were purchased at a cost of $1,156,000.

Park-school combinations are not too frequent in the Dallas picture, however. Of the 53 new parks only one-third, or 17, are adjacent to public schools. It is interesting also to note the size of the park properties acquired in Dallas during this period. Of the 53 new parks, 8 contained less than five acres, 26 contained five to 15 acres, seven contained 15 to 25 acres, four - 25 to 50 acres and eight more than 50 acres. More of the park areas provided are in accordance with the minimum standards of the National Recreation Association than are in accordance with the "one acre to 200 persons" standard or with the "10 percent of land area" standard.
The 250,000 persons added to the Dallas population is the equivalent of 50 neighborhoods of 5000 persons each, yet only 12 parks contained more than 25 acres.

Corpus Christi also has a small park-school plan and has been expanding its park and school systems. However, it has not been as fortunate as Dallas in the amount of money available for purchase of park property. Since 1945, Corpus Christi has added 31 new park areas, 10 of which have been adjacent to schools - about the same proportion as Dallas. Of the 419 acres added, somewhat more than half - 241 acres - of park has been purchased while 178 acres has been dedicated through subdivision control. During this period the population of Corpus Christi has increased from 82,000 to 165,000. Increase in park areas has amounted to just about one acre for each 200 persons.

The experiences of Dallas and Corpus Christi indicate that it is difficult for a very rapidly growing municipality to keep pace with its needs for park area. There is an obvious tendency for provision of relatively small neighborhood parks and an apparent difficulty in provision of fully coordinated park-school developments.

Method of Organization

Probably the most complete analysis of park-school programs is that prepared by Mr. George Butler, Director of the Research Department of the National Recreation Service and published in "Recreation" magazine for three issues in 1953. This series of articles cited numerous examples of cities that, by one means or another, had found successful methods of cooperative action on the part of the park and school authorities in developing combined school-park facilities. The objective of the wide varieties of cooperative agreements is well expressed in the statement included in the agreement between the Board of Education and the Board of Park Commissioners in Minneapolis in 1948:

"That the combined facilities are a single community asset, the operation of which should be so conducted as to provide maximum community benefits which can be derived through joint use. The facilities are to be operated jointly or separately, in whole or in part, in accordance with details as agreed upon by the executive staffs or their representatives, keeping in mind that the foremost function of such operation would be the expenditure of available funds in such a way as to provide the greatest service to the community."

Many of the methods of cooperative action call for joint committees. One of them, in Muskegon, Michigan, utilized a joint landscape architect and some of them, such as Grand Rapids, Michigan
and Glenview, Illinois, provide that the park agency develop and maintain all of the areas outside of school buildings, with the school district in turn making indoor facilities available for the recreation program. In general, experience with all these cooperative agreements has been excellent. The usual difficulties encountered in any human affairs are found. However, significant savings have been made such as the one cited in Seattle where the Park Department utilizes nine field houses of the school system for a payment of $15,000 per year whereas comparable facilities provided by the Park Department would cost $150,000 per year.

The following two examples of combined municipal and school developments are from the experience of Lincoln, Nebraska. They are fairly typical, however, and similar case histories could be found in almost all of our larger cities.

The first example is a rather unusual one. Closely adjoining the central business district of Lincoln is the Lincoln Senior High School. Originally located on a small site the school district enlarged the facility by purchase of property across Randolph Street south of the original school. Randolph, however, was a major street. To the east of the school is located Antelope Creek along which the city owned certain park property. The city's master plan proposed a new major diagonal thoroughfare leading from the business district to the southeast along Antelope Creek. The high school building badly needed a new field house; the only logical location for which was immediately adjacent to the present building occupying the path of the major street. Here was a problem that obviously required coordinated action. The school board could not add to the high school without the city's cooperation and the city could not build the major thoroughfare without the school board's cooperation. The city planning commission developed a preliminary plan combining certain of the park and school areas, rerouting the major street so that the high school could have a consolidated campus and providing for the major thoroughfare in such a way as to do the least damage to the school facilities. Negotiations required several months but culminated in a written agreement and the entire plan has now been carried out.

A second example is in one of the residential sections of Lincoln where the city planning commission developed a neighborhood park through expansion of a very small existing park. When a preliminary subdivision plat was submitted for a part of the proposed park area, the city planning commission notified the park board only to find that it was not possible to interest the park
board in purchasing the property in advance of the time the subdivision would take place. Shortly thereafter the school board proposed that the very small park area in that same general location be purchased and used for an elementary school site. At this point it was possible for the planning agency to bring both the park and school boards into agreement on the need for a park-school development in this neighborhood. Again a satisfactory written agreement was made and a combined park-school facility is now being developed in this location.

In Lincoln there is no specific organization or mechanism that insures complete coordination of park and school development. The school district is completely independent and completely separate from the municipality and is not required to coordinate its efforts with the municipal efforts. In other cities, however, the situation is further complicated by having an independent park district that is completely separate from the school district and from the municipality.

Problems

From the above very brief discussion of the principles of park-school combinations, and the above examples of practices currently being followed, it is possible to identify the major problems that confront us in provision of adequate park-school facilities. Actually, there are two major problems: (1) a land problem, and (2) an organizational problem.

1. Land Problem

In the average American city somewhere between one-half and three-fourths of the existing residential area will not be adequately supplied with local park-school areas. There is a real problem in acquiring adequate land area for these facilities in new as well as built-up residential areas.

Part of the land problem has been caused by inadequate objectives. Here the city planning and park executive leadership is at fault. Progressively, over the years, we have allowed our standards and objectives to be severely reduced. We are now left in the place where most of our recognized standards call for the creation of park and school areas that are so completely used, so completely devoted to active recreation that they become an objectionable feature rather than an attractive asset to the neighborhoods they serve. The park-school areas are so small that they do not break up the monotony of the built-up city area;
they do not provide areas for relaxation or for refreshment of the human spirit; and it is little wonder that we are not able to interest the citizenry or obtain enthusiastic public support for the building of such miserable little facilities.

There is a second problem very much akin to the problem of objectives. In recent weeks considerable attention has been occasioned by Mr. LaGasse's article in which he denounces the city planner as being a park system's worst enemy. Many city planners would counter by saying that in their cities the park executives were the park system's worst enemy. I would not want to count the number of cities in which the park personnel has told the planning agency that they don't want any more park area because they can't take care of what they have. Such a statement was made to me only two weeks ago in a city that has not made a major park acquisition since 1918 (and is using maintenance practices of almost the same vintage). Without a 180 degree change in this attitude we will not be able to make any progress in providing adequate park-school areas.

A part of the park acquisition problem, of course, is a financial problem. However, the only reason that so much money goes into highway improvements is that highway officials have been able to demonstrate and dramatize their needs. Some cities such as Houston, Dallas, and Kansas City, have found ways and means of financing park expansion. Inadequate funds are a problem but this problem can be overcome; it is not a good excuse.

2. Organization Problem

There is no question but that the division of effort between park boards, school boards, and city departments is a major impediment in the provision of a sufficient number of park-school areas. Consistent cooperation is essential and that is difficult to accomplish with changing personnel, rivalries, feuds, and petty jealousies that seem so characteristic of local affairs of this type. The city's planning agency should exert the needed leadership to secure this cooperation and bring about the dynamic support required. It should be a major objective of the Planning Department to bring school and park officials together, to make coordinated long-range plans agreeable to both agencies for the park-school areas, and then to secure the coordinated development of residential neighborhoods that will focus upon the park-school areas.

Hit-or-miss cooperation is not adequate. A formal and permanent committee set-up by joint official action of park and school agencies is essential. The committee should have representation from the
planning department to insure that facilities are coordinated with the city plan and other municipal activities. All park and school expansion and development should be channeled through this committee.

Finally, problems of operation and maintenance cannot be separated from problems of long-range planning and capital improvement. Persons experienced in operation and maintenance should be a part of the long range planning and development process. While the first advantage of the park-school combination is the efficient use of limited recreational area, economical operation and maintenance may be a second but almost as important an advantage. Here the best thing to do is to have the park system maintain all of the school grounds under contract with the school district. This eliminates duplication and saves money. Where it has been done the complete benefit of the park-school concept has been received by the taxpayer.

Solutions to the Problems

In spite of the remarkable achievements of a few cities, the general impression of the status of local park development in the nation is a negative and a pessimistic one. Very few cities have ambitious programs of acquisition and improvement of their park systems backed up by adequate financing. While certain cities are acquiring local park areas in connection with school grounds, many of the areas being acquired are quite small.

Many cities have benefited from combinations of park and school facilities, from joint use of school buildings, and from school use of park areas. On the whole, however, the surface has hardly been scratched in regard to the taxpayer receiving full benefits of this concept. For example, only a handful of communities have carried this concept on to the stage where there is unified operation and maintenance of all open areas whether they are parks or school grounds.

We are in a period of extraordinary urban expansion both in population and in land area occupied. Not only is the population of most every community increasing but each family is occupying a much greater area for residential purposes and much greater areas are being utilized for business, industrial and institutional uses. Public schools with the almost universal use of one-story structures sprawl over huge land areas. Good park sites and good school sites are being swallowed up by urban growth almost every day.
One of the greatest benefits that can be derived from long-range planning comes through the acquisition of park and school sites in advance of need. Yet only a very few of our cities are fully utilizing this extremely simple and sensible concept. Lack of funds for advance acquisition of these sites continues to frustrate this process.

This problem of park-school development is merely a part of a greater difficulty confronting our urban areas. In virtually every community we have divided the urban area among several political agencies: cities, townships, counties, school districts, park districts, sewer districts and so on, and then have state and federal agencies independently building improvements in the cities. None of these agencies have to pay much if any attention to any type of over-all plan for the development of the community as a whole. We should not be surprised, consequently, to find our urban areas turning into a mixed up and botched up mess under such circumstances.

Of all of the urban problems, the problem of inadequate open space is one of the most serious not only because the open space is needed but because the open space, properly located and improved could do so much to bring order into the entire urban area. The greenbelt at Ottawa, the neighborhood parks of Minneapolis, the boulevards of Kansas City, the park-school combinations being developed in many cities, all have a pronounced effect upon the very form of the urban area itself.

There are two general approaches to the solution to these problems.

1. We can make better use of the tools that we have. Very few of our communities are taking full advantage of the opportunities provided by existing legislation. For example, we have known for years that some cities can finance the acquisition and improvement of neighborhood parks by benefit assessment. This has been successfully done in Kansas City and Minneapolis. There is no reason why this device could not be used for the acquisition and improvement of park-school areas of adequate size in many other places. The device could be used in both developed and undeveloped neighborhoods. Where the power is not available only a simple legislative amendment is required.

Nor have we taken full advantage of powers for the control of land subdivision. In Corpus Christi, for example, a major part of new park area is dedicated in connection with development of
new subdivisions. Corpus Christi requires a five percent dedication with the provision that in smaller subdivisions, a cash payment can be substituted for the dedication. Bloomington, Illinois has a subdivision control ordinance in which a 7-1/2 percent dedication is required. Parks are dedicated only as proposed on the official master plan; if the subdivision does not include a proposed park an equivalent 7-1/2 percent cash payment is made. The cash payments go into a special fund that is used to buy park and school areas. The Bloomington ordinance, no doubt, will be attacked in the courts. However, the Illinois planning law provides that subdivision regulations may include "reasonable requirements for..... parks, playgrounds, school grounds and other public grounds", and the city feels that it is on firm ground in requiring the 7-1/2 percent dedication or cash payment. In the City of Blue Ash, Ohio, a suburb of Cincinnati, such a requirement was translated into a cash payment of $100.00 per lot in new subdivisions.

The requirement for park dedications in new subdivisions such as those cited above in Texas, Illinois and Ohio are quite reasonable ones. Local park and school areas are used by tributary population. There is no question now about requiring pavement of streets and installation of water and sewers in new subdivisions. Parks and schools are equally necessary. In most instances, the cost of adequate park-school areas amount to only about a one-half of one percent tax on a new house. This would appear to be a very fair financing method and would appear to be so reasonable that there would be little ultimate question of it being approved by the courts. Opposition to such practices on the part of organized minorities is to be expected and must be overcome. Significantly, where these are put into effect there is frequently little support for them from school and park officials.

In most of our cities, we can do much more about coordination of activities between the municipal, park, school and planning agencies. Particularly is this true insofar as the need for each being conversant with the problems and needs of the other is concerned. Here again, we need to dramatize our needs in a manner similar to that done by the highway officials. The highway people have gotten across the concept of planning and building highways now for traffic estimated for 1975. It is equally valid to plan and build parks now for the needs of 1975.

2. Obtain new tools. Many persons concerned with problems of urban growth are beginning to conclude that, even with full use of all present legal and financial tools we have cannot bring fully satisfactory living conditions into our urban areas.
One conclusion that is almost inescapable is that it is most difficult, if not impossible, to bring about a satisfactory urban area without the ability to place large land areas in public ownership. This public ownership need not be complete, and in some instances, such as in provision of greenbelt areas, might well consist of purchase of development rights and in other instances such as runway approaches to airports might consist of the purchase of air rights. However, in order to provide for the necessary drainage areas, flood control areas, recreation areas and park-school sites, we need much larger areas in public ownership than we have now, and we need the ability to acquire lands for these purposes and hold them 20 or 30, or perhaps even 50 years in advance of need or use.

Our cities are growing rapidly; our national economy is expanding; and the value of urban land and buildings is increasing at an almost astronomical rate. Private individuals are making fortunes out of these increments in the value of urban land. The community, of course, obtains some benefit from its power to tax these increased values. However, it would seem that the benefits to the land owner and to the community from these increments in land and building values are most disproportionate.

The Federal Government has not overlooked this matter; it levies a capital gain tax on increases in the value of urban land and buildings.

Let us look at the extent of some of these increases in value. In the year 1946 the assessed value of land and improvements in the five-county area that makes up the San Francisco Metropolitan District was $1,442,000,000 and, remember, this is assessed value and is probably less than the true value. By 1955 this had reached $2,800,000,000. It had almost doubled in 10 years. In the City of St. Louis, which was stationary in population, the assessed value increased from $1,012,000,000 to $1,214,000,000 in the 10-year period 1947 to 1957.

A municipality, or a metropolitan district, should be able to impose a tax on capital gains in real estate; or the Federal Government - if really interested in law autonomy - should return this tax to the local community. Such a tax would be relatively simple to levy and collect. This money should be used solely for the purchase of land for parks, public schools, highway rights-of-way, airports, and other public uses. The lands could be purchased well in advance of need, in accordance with a comprehensive plan and then turned over to the "using agency" for development and maintenance when needed.
It is difficult to estimate how much a capital gain tax on land and buildings might amount to. However, some very rough estimates indicate that in a stable city such as St. Louis the turnover in property is about seven percent each year and that in a more rapidly growing area it might be twice that much - or 13 to 14 percent each year. In a more stable community such as the City of St. Louis a 25 percent tax might amount to as much as $2.50 per person per year. A 25 percent capital gain real estate tax might amount to as much as $7.00 to $10.00 per person per year in a rapidly growing area such as the San Francisco Bay Area.

We know that we should undertake our urban planning on a metropolitan basis. We also know that to plan alone is not enough - to carry out a plan is the more important part of the job. We know the importance of public ownership of land properly located and of adequate area, and of the beneficial effect this has on the proper growth and development of a metropolitan area. We should establish metropolitan land agencies and empower them not only to do the planning, but also to acquire all of the public land within the metropolitan area, land for the highways, for the schools and for the parks, as well as for public buildings, approach zones to runways, greenbelts, and public institutions. This agency should be financed by a capital gain tax on real estate transfers.

By its power to buy land and furnish right-of-way such a planning agency could not be ignored by a highway department, a school board, or any other public agency. The planning agency would, of course, have to work closely with the agencies that would improve and maintain the land. However, cooperation with the planning agency would cease to be a one-way street. Constituted in this manner the metropolitan planning agency could insure the complete coordination of schools and parks, the provision of adequate park and school areas purchased in advance, the location of highways coordinated with parks and schools, and the development of urban areas with a more rational form. As the community grows it increases in value; it is only proper and reasonable that part of this increase in value be used to bring about a more desirable community.
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