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ABSTRACT

The primary goal of this research is to link two currently disconnected literature; the history of urban redevelopment and the one of urban parks and open spaces in the United States (US). Through this exercise, this study attempts to reveal examples of urban parks and open spaces that have yielded economic effects, and emphasize their possibility as a measure of urban redevelopment. Five phases are presented, starting with two Pre-World War II urbanization periods, and three subsequent periods of Post-World War II urban redevelopment (1940s~1960s, late 1960s~1970s, 1980s~present). While urban parks in the 19th century urbanization period held a preeminent place in urban design, policy and economy, ensuing depression and World War II diminished their role as a channel to ease unemployment. In the first phase of urban redevelopment, the economic motive to build open space was to boost the appeal of specific locales in order to draw people and businesses back to a neglected city. In the second phase, public effort to create and maintain urban parks and open spaces declined due to the budget austerity, instead, community open spaces flourished through the voluntary actions and helped neighborhoods regain desirability. In the third phase, the aspirations and functions of such projects resemble their forerunners of the first phase, but their targets extended to global businesses and elites.
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국문초록

이 논문은 현재 단절되어 있는 도시 재생과 도시공원의 역사를 연계하여, 그 안에서 도시 공원이 경제적 기여를 했던 사례를 찾아내고, 더불어 도시공원이 가진 도시 재생 매체로서의 가능성을 역설함을 목적으로 한다. 19세기부터 오늘날에 이르기까지의 시기를 총 5개로 구분하였으며, 그중 2단계는 도시화, 2단계는 도시 재생 시기를 아우른다(1940s~1960s, late 1960s~1970s, 1980s~present). 도시화 단계에서의 도시 공원은 도시 계획에 있어 정지, 경제적 지배력을 가진 요소였으나,
1. Introduction

Post-World War II urban redevelopment in the United States (US, hereafter) has comprised two main strategies to cope with economic decline: one is investment in property development as a future fiscal resource; and the other is the development of public amenities to create an economic ripple effect in the local surroundings (Clark et al., 2002; Smith, 1984; Smith and DeFilippis, 1999). Commercial, residential and retail developments are the most common of the first kind (Frieden and Sagalyn, 1989), while the second type, also called "spatial activity generators," consists of cultural, sports, business venues, and tourism facilities (Chapin, 2004). This activity generator is a magnet, drawing visitors to the area, which benefits existing businesses, and further boosts the desirability of the area to new businesses and residents. Subsequent tax revenues from new sales and income go to the city governments' coffers (Teaford, 2000).

The question then arises as to how urban park and open space has contributed in the redevelopment mission? While parks are not income-generating properties of the first type, their capacity to produce ripple effects is equivalent to the projects in the second category. Throughout all the phases of urban redevelopment, many types of urban parks and open spaces have been created independently or as ancillaries to such redevelopment projects, maintaining their economic attractiveness by benefitting their neighboring vicinity to varying degrees.

Especially, contemporary urban parks and open spaces play an extended role. Contrary to the traditional idea that people follow industries in search of jobs, in the post-industrial era, industries began to view people as a primary concern around which to organize themselves (Clark et al., 2002; Florida, 2002; Strom, 2002). Consequently, creating good working and living conditions became an important priority on urban agendas (Brash, 2012; Currid, 2007). Unique urban open spaces are valuable assets to cities because they provide a sense of "authenticity" (Florida, 2002; Fainstein, 2007) and the high "quality of life" (Musterd and Murie, 2010) that is favored by a wide range of professionals and residents.

Despite their importance, the economic benefit of urban parks and open spaces has not been sufficiently discussed in the context of urban redevelopment. Quantitative research typically focuses narrowly on property value increment — i.e., a monetized measure of the willingness to pay, based on the proximity to open space (Crompton, 2005; Bolitzer and Netusil, 2000 among many), while qualitative studies generally don't extend their focus beyond a conventional discussion of the public welfare benefit associated with urban park and open space use. Consequently, the economic agenda that underlie open space developments are understated in the literature, thereby the notion to understand them as fiscal burden prevails. In public practice, open space procurement has been a challenging task in chronic budget shortage, without strong recognition of its economic viability.

The primary goal of this research is to link two currently disconnected literature: the history of urban redevelopment and the one of urban parks and open spaces, in order to reveal examples of urban parks and open spaces that have participated in urban redevelopment and emphasize their possibility as a measure of urban redevelopment. This exercise will shed light on the economic function of urban park and open space, further encourage their use as an apparatus in urban economic development.

In the following text, I outline a general trend of urban redevelopment in US as a backbone, then describe a chronology of US urban park and open space development as a parallel. Selective types of urban parks and open spaces are further examined for their close engagement with the urban redevelopment. While many other types of urban green spaces
have coexisted throughout the history. I choose one type per each phase of urban development that deserves a significant attention. The selection criteria is first, the dominant presence in the urban landscape, second, the greater economic contribution, and finally the direct reflection of the urban economic policies of their corresponding eras. A couple of cases are introduced in order to elaborate the argument, in certain time periods. The cases are reported as economic successes. However, even as the economic ambition of these projects was in the forefront, they were also loaded with other goals such as human health and social harmony. Also, even though other cases could have been selected for its equivalently robust economic performance, this study takes the ones that their economic motivation and impact is clearly documented.

Between the two categories of urban redevelopment tactic—income or activity generation—economic function of parks and open spaces is of the latter, spatial activity generator. Therefore, in this study I define the economic influence as a ripple effect to increase a desirability and visibility of the neighborhood, to attract visitors and residents and consequently to trigger physical redevelopments in the neighborhood.

Urban economic development efforts traces back to 1940s (Miles et al., 2000) and have persisted into the present. Over the course, different strategies have been deployed under political philosophies of the eras, and realized into distinctive urban landscapes. While there is not a single periodization that has earned universal consensus in the field of urban development study, this text take a three-phase approach due to its general acceptance — 1940s~1960s, late 1960s~1970s, 1980s—present. In addition, my study includes the mid-19th century in order to introduce the role of urban parks in urbanization process for comparison.

Literature review is the main methodology of this research. Therefore, the economic success of each case is by no means subject to analysis in this study, rather, already recognized by a considerable number of scholars, which will be cited later in this text.

II. Background

1. 19th Century Park Movement

The late 19th century saw an unprecedented proliferation of urban parks (Garvin, 2002; Schuyler, 1988). As urbanization and industrialization proceeded, and immigration from European countries continued to increase, urban problems surfaced in many different forms. Some of the most pressing issues were unsanitary and unpleasant working and living conditions, which were believed to cause mental and physical illness in city residents. The urban park was devised as an antidote, a “pleasure ground” to provide a respite from everyday urban life. It offered a peaceful, picturesque, and natural setting to encourage relaxation, light exercise for refreshment, and opportunities for social interaction (Cranz, 1982; Cranz and Boland, 2004).

In addition to its benefit to public welfare, this type of urban park was also recognized for the economic benefits it offered. Frederick Law Olmsted acknowledged the potential economic spillover that parks could generate (Fein, 1979) by increasing adjacent property values, mainly due to their attractiveness and recreational use. Central Park is a well-known example that was financed under this assumption (Crompton, 2005). In a city like New York, where rapid urbanization increased land values, the opportunity cost associated with the park’s development was substantial, even in the 19th century. The estimated land acquisition cost was high, and the proposed design—a reproduction of nostalgic rural environment—required extravagant labor expenditure; sparking opposition from city and state legislators (Schuyler, 1988).

The lesson of Birkenhead Park in Liverpool, England helped to turn the situation around. In order to secure development resources, city officials planned residential lots along the edge of the park site, in the hope to sell these at a higher value, based on the appreciation expected from the park’s presence (Crompton, 2004). Olmsted envisioned the same for Central Park. He believed that it would stimulate residential development in its vicinity that might generate increased property tax revenue for the city, and which would justify the upfront cost. Despite widespread skepticism, the park indeed realized a doubling of nearby residential property values per annum, and quadrupled the land price, in total (Foglesong, 1986).

Given the highly limited recreational opportunities in cities, urban parks became the greatest amenity that could most efficiently spur urban development (Schuyler, 1988). Central Park further facilitated the city’s physical growth towards the north, Following its lead, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Chicago developed urban parks and enjoyed consequent land value appreciation—an average of 300 to 500 percent in park
vicinities (Foglesong, 1985). Meanwhile, land speculation heated up and park location became a political issue (Crompton, 2004; Foglesong, 1985).

Based on the increasing popularity of parks, cities extended this opportunity to maneuver growth and limit of urbanization. At the turn of the 20th century, the acceleration of urban expansion was indisputable, and cities began to approach planning schemes at the regional scale (called "metropolitanism", Scott, 1995). In this new framework, the park system was introduced as an apparatus for laying out city boundaries. The premise was that parks and parkways would attract sufficient population density in their vicinities, creating new city boundaries, even where far from current ones (Garvin, 2002). Boston's Emerald Necklace and the park systems of Minneapolis, Kansas, and Buffalo are some examples of this strategy (Olmsted, 1870). Figure 1 exhibits Buffalo Park System of 1880, planned by Olmsted.

2. Great Depression and World War II

The Great Depression and the period ensuing World War II (WWII) saw a greater level of economic motivation centered on urban parks and open spaces than ever before. However, the underlying purpose shifted from idealistic and reformative to practical and utilitarian (Cranz, 1982). Arguably, the primary objective of park projects, during this period, was to create jobs to ease unemployment and the burden on the direct monetary relief fund for households (Fusfeld, 1956). Franklin D. Roosevelt’s administration (1933~1945) used public projects as a source of employment while the private sector slowed. Under the New Deal program, the Works Progress Administration formed the Civilian Conservation Corps program to execute park projects, resulting in 1,666 parks, totaling 75,152 acres, including 800 state parks, 3,085 playgrounds, 3,026 athletic fields, and 2,303 stadiums and spectator structures (Teaford, 1990).

Although a large portion of the New Deal budget was allocated to recreational amenities—the second and third largest spending of federal and non-federal construction budget respectively—other types of construction projects were also implemented, such as housing, roads and streets, educational institutions, and flood control engineering (Cranz, 1982; Cutler, 1985; Fusfeld, 1956). Therefore, it is difficult to regard urban parks and open spaces as a distinct economic development mission from other types of construction projects. This is evident in that their location was determined by land availability not local need (Cutler, 1985), as well as by their standardized, equipment-filled design (Cranz, 1982).

![Figure 1. Buffalo, New York park system plan, 1880. Source: Wordpress.com](image)

![Figure 2. Urban parks and open spaces in urbanization period and their subsequent urban redevelopment phases. Source: Drawn by author](image)
III. Economic Aspirations of Urban Parks and Open Spaces in Urban Redevelopment Context

In this study, urban redevelopment history from the postwar period to the present is phased into three (1940s-1960s, late 1960s-1970s, 1980s-present), using the most commonly accepted milestones in the literature. Levine (1989) divides the period from 1945 to 1989 into three phases (~1970s, 1970s-1980s, 1980s~ - -) to explain dynamics between public and private forces in urban redevelopment industry. Leigh and Blakely (2013) take similar concept with Levine (1989) having major three periods (~1960s, 1960s-1980s, 1980s~ - -) with two overlapping periods in between the second and third phases. Althuler and Luberof’s (2003) phasing is slightly different, in that they subdivide pre 1970s period into three (~1950, 1950-late 1960s, mid 1960s-1970s - -) and view the post 1970s as the latest period, by their unique focus on politics regarding mega-scale public projects (so-called “mega-projects”).

While minor discrepancies do exist, the first phases conceptually refer to the first two decades of postwar period, driven by the urban renewal policy. In this period, urban redevelopment projects have been carried out by partnerships between local governments and downtown elite groups, empowered by federal grants and pre-development regulatory frameworks. The second phases commonly have its core in 1970s-1980s, around the termination of the urban renewal policy in 1974. In this period, the former government-driven, wholesale clearance approach instigated civic activism, while federal budget for urban redevelopment was greatly reduced. Policies reflected this circumstance, being restructured under modest-scale, participation-inducing strategies.

The third phases, commonly indicating the period after 1980s to the present, are distinguished by continuing budget deficit, privatization, neoliberalism, and global economy. Private sector assumes larger responsibility and authority in the task of redevelopment of urban environment, while private profit-seeking weighs in during the course. Figure 2 illustrates the phasing and the characteristics of each phase.

Compared to 19th century forms, urban parks and open spaces in substantially matured urban areas could not be developed in such systematic ways, rather, they were introduced where open space was available or it was necessary to provide them alongside other urban redevelopment aims.

1. Phase I (1940s-1960s)

The first phase coincides roughly with the urban renewal era, from the late 1940s to the 1960s. During and after WWII, the continuing flight of the urban population to the suburbs eroded the municipal tax base, leading to the neglect of already decaying urban infrastructure (Frieden et al., 1969). Starting in the early 1940s, to counter the problem and compete with suburban counterparts, city officials and downtown elite groups began formulating postwar redevelopment plans.

Title I of 1949 Housing Act and the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 were the two most fundamental regulatory frameworks that instituted urban renewal. While the policies were purposed to address housing demand by expediting the sprawl of suburban residential developments and renewing the urban settlements at the beginning, cities utilized these to regain locational advantages of good accessibilities, sufficient developable sites and public facilities to appeal to new industries and businesses (Levine, 1989: Althuler and Luberoff 2003). Through the program, cities pursued large-scale projects from office buildings or complexes, residential developments, to entertainment/ cultural facilities and institutional venues, with generous federal budget and regulatory expediency (Frieden et al., 1997; Levine, 1987; Caro, 1974).

From this point on, parks and open space no longer held a preeminent place in urban design and policy. Instead, an aggressively economic rationale supplanted the earlier progressive ideology. Although cities indeed aimed to equal their suburban counterparts by increasing parks and recreational opportunities in the urban areas, priority was frequently given to more essential or lucrative uses of land than recreation (Cranz, 1982; Garvin, 2002). Consequently, parks and open spaces in this period were created in much modest forms such as facility-oriented playground, following the convention of the depression era. As part of an urban renewal effort, increasing numbers of modest playgrounds cropped up on affordable parcels in large cities such as Chicago, San Francisco and New York (Schuyler, 1988).

Also, open spaces annexed to public facilities were common in this era, The ideal “to be in closer contact with nature” (Levy, 2011) created this modern style open spaces, epitomized by Le Corbusier’s “tower in a park” (Cranz, 1982; Zipp, 2010;
Alexander, 1979), Public housing such as Stuyvesant Town and East Harlem housing development are notable examples of this type (Zipp, 2010). Highways were also flanked with open spaces. Among many, East River Park along Franklin Delano Roosevelt Drive of East River, an expansion of Riverside Park along Henry Hudson Parkway have been established, being evolved from their earlier design (Bone, 2004; Cutler, 1985).

The urban open spaces of this sort, however, were controversially deemed as a spin-off of wholesale clearance (Cranz, 1982). Obliterating the urban decay and realizing modern order was one of the manifestos of the urban renewal (Zipp, 2010). And in design language, this idea was realized as a destruction of existing urban fabric to secure a large tract of land for a new modern-style development (Beauregard, 1989). In reality, the cleared sites did not necessarily turn to attractive, park-like built environment, rather remained as empty lands that disconnected their towers from the surroundings. Moreover, many of such projects were halted after site clearance as they could not lure private developers, consequently failed to yield profit to cities (Frieden et al., 1997; Teaford, 1990; Teaford, 2000).

Some exceptional urban renewal projects are highly reviewed for their own economic soundness and substantial ripple effect, and two of them introduced here used urban parks as an enticement to invite private developers, Private developers often recognized the value of open space to the success of their ventures (Gordon, 1997). Therefore, ironically parks and open spaces were sometimes created in the process of strict pursuit of profit. The two examples are Point State Park in Pittsburgh and Independence Mall in Philadelphia, and their role in the Gateway Center and East Downtown Philadelphia will be described in detail.

1) Point State Park, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Point State Park is located in the Golden Triangle¹ in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The Allegheny Conference, a group of downtown business elites, worked in close collaboration with the city government to create the park, a 36-acre section of the 1900 downtown redevelopment plan, completed in 1974. It was able to come into being to induce private development of Gateway Center, a 23-acre commercial and residential private development, Figure 3 is a picture of Point State Park in 1964.

Formerly owned by the city and the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, the site was occupied by warehouses and railroad yards, and congested with traffic from the Manchester and Point Bridges, leaving insufficient room for traffic interchange (Balliet, 2001). Robert Moses - a former park commissioner and director of the Triborough Bridge Authority of New York - came to Pittsburgh as a traffic consultants, originally conceived the idea of developing a park under these complicated conditions. Rather than merely solving traffic flow problems, he envisioned a design inspired by its 18th century heritage of Fort Pitt, and proposed creating a national historic park on the site (Beauregard, 1989).

This seemingly impractical solution to the sites' pressing problems initially faced intense opposition from local authorities. However, eventually, they offered their consent to the proposal and state money for site clearance, on the condition that the park would be tied to nearby mixed-use development. In 1940, the local and federal government clearly articulated that the goals of the park plan should be: "the creation of a park commemorating the site's history, improved traffic circulation through the construction of new roads and bridges, and designation of a portion of the site for new office buildings, intended to stimulate private interest in the Golden Triangle" (Cleary, 1993).

In 1946, an elaborated site design, combined with improved traffic management, succeeded in attracting a primary investor, The Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York, in the development of the Gateway Center (Muller, 2006). However, it is also obvious that the proximity to Point Park

Figure 3. Point State Park, Pittsburgh in 1964.
Source: Charles M. Stotz.
was one of the attractive factors for the private developer. In the agreement with the city government, while there were conventional clauses the private developer requested unusual provision. It was to maintain an unobstructed view from their prospective buildings to Point Park (Crowley, 2005). The ripple effect of this project is also noteworthy; It triggered redevelopment of the downtown Pittsburgh, as a result, somewhat influenced the one fourth of the construction in the central business district (Garvin, 2002: Teaford, 2000).

2) Independent Mall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Another example is Philadelphia’s Independence Mall, a three-block section of Independence National Historic Park (INHP). It consists of 12.54 acres of open space, home to the National Constitution Center and the Liberty Bell Center, and closely abutting Independence Hall and Old City Hall. In 1948, the bill to create the national park was signed by President Truman, and the construction was completed in 1969 (Greiff, 1987). It shares with Point State Park a centuries-old historic significance. Unlike the Pittsburgh case, however, local business / political coalitions and social reformers had long expressed concerns over its historic integrity, which was threatened by surrounding neighborhood blight (Metraux, 1999: Greiff, 1987). Figure 4 shows Independence Mall surrounded with office development as planned.

During its manufacturing heyday, industrial laborers who migrated to Philadelphia for economic reasons populated downtown Philadelphia. Their employment was mostly hard labor, low wage, and temporary: cheap accommodations, taverns, and adult entertainment venues characterized their environment (Metraux, 1999). At the turn of postindustrial era, urban manufacturing declined and lowered the economic position of workers. After WWII, having lost its economic viability, the area turned into morally and physically blighted district, with high crime rates, alcoholism, and panhandling. This so-called Skid Row expanded into the downtown, encroaching on the Independence Mall site from the north (Central Philadelphia Development Corporation (CPDC, 2006: Metraux, 1999).

In the era of urban renewal, city officials and downtown elites made the revitalization of the central business district a priority. The potential attraction of sites like Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell to tourists and residents was a key part of the effort (Claflen, 2000). From 1948, under the leadership of Edmond Bacon, the director of the City Planning Commission of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority, the City Planning Commission, and the State of Pennsylvania and Greater Philadelphia Movement (a coalition of businesses) jointly implemented a pilot project of the business district renewal plan, called Center City Development Plan. In the course, Independence Mall project was expected to boost commercial development on the east side of downtown Philadelphia. With other comprehensive renewal projects such as Washington Square East Urban Renewal and Society Hill redevelopment, Independence Mall fulfilled its original expectations by spawning new office developments in the downtown (Beauregard, 1989).

In general, despite the destructive manner in their implementation socially and ecologically, it is claimed that urban renewal projects did not satisfy the fiscal expectation either. Great share of the federal grant was poured into displacing and gentrifying urban slums, but middle class residents and lucrative businesses did not come back to cities (Gans, 1965: Teaford, 2000; Teaford, 1990). Also they did only a little role in instigating further developments in their vicinities (Teaford, 2000).

A few examples, including above two projects - Gateway Center and the east side of downtown Philadelphia, have been acclaimed as positive examples at least for their economic impact. They successfully accommodated their own tenants, and trickled down the development momentum to the rest of the downtown. Lafayette Park of Detroit, Society Hill of Philadelphia, Lincoln Center of New York are some more examples in the same sense. Although a comprehensive analysis on their success factors has not been conducted altogether, respect to the existing conditions (in Society Hill), good design (in Lincoln Center, Lafayette Park), ample landscape

Figure 4. Independence Mall, Philadelphia in 2011.
Source: National Park Service
(Lafayette Park) and strong private demand are speculated as partial reasons (Beauregard, 1989; Garvin 2002; Teaford, 2000; Waldheim, 2004).

It is difficult to tease out a magnitude of contribution that is explained by the park-like settings or nearby parks from the factor of “good design”. However, aforementioned projects clearly revealed that parks and open spaces were a critical part of a good design, and they were created partly for the economic reason even in the era when undeterred economic rationale dominated the urban political.

2. Phase 2 (late 1960s~1970s)

The second phase spans from the late 1960s to 1970s, when grass-root neighborhood development shaped the urban landscape. The changes in economic development schemes in this period can be attributed to two factors. First, social and environmental repercussions of the urban renewal policies began to be recognized, second, a tightening federal budget led to a moratorium on housing and community development assistance9 (Hackworth and Smith, 2000; Wyly and Hammel, 2004).

These factors together shifted the urban development agenda from federally oriented large-scale renewal approach to modest and grass-root revitalization strategy based on limited financial and regulatory resources. Urban renewal program was officially ceased and new concessionary policies were initiated, headed by Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, where Community Development Block Grant Program was one of the most impactful programs under the act (Altshuler et al., 2003). The new initiatives from the 1970s, unlike the former, did not dictate the means and methods to achieve the promised goals: rather, left those on discretions and abilities of the grant applicants. Community Development Corporation (CDC)10 typified a strand of task forces of this phase. CDC is a community-base group, voluntarily formed by neighborhood activists to take responsibility of neighborhood redevelopment on a house-by-house, block-by-block scale (Altshuler et al., 2003; Rossi, 1999; O’Connor, 2009).

Meanwhile, federal budget deficit adversely affected urban park and open space. In this period, the maintenance of the existing park became increasingly unaffordable, let alone the new development (Cranz, 1982; Garvin, 2002). In response to the circumstance, the concept of park has been extended.

The term “open space” began to be used to call urban parks, making the orthodox definition of park more flexible. The new open space approach departed from the former ones that required sizable lands and costly design for the purposes of social and sanitary reform or of the attraction for private investment, rather allowing a diversity of scales, designs, and programs to be realized in unconventional urban locations such as streets, and empty or irregular lots. This also differed from the facility-oriented playground from the previous era. With a so-called “anything goes” attitude (Cranz, 1982), those space were supposed to be empty and unprogrammed, so that it could accommodate more diverse activities. Minipark, playlot, vest-pocket park are some of the examples, and at the new modest scale, this type of open space did not yield the same economic effects as the examples of phase 1 (Cranz, 1982; Garvin, 2002).

Another unconventional type of open space emerged in this phase — the community open space. While the aforementioned small parks were born to a vague purpose, community open spaces was originated from a strong reform ideology and economic concerns, and played an active role in urban re-development mission.

1) Community Open Space (Garden)

The history of the community garden traces back to the 1890s, when its economic advantages were more apparent. At times of national or local crises, community gardens provided a resource to cope with problems at the local level—whether as farmland for food production during the war and depression, or as educational institutions in the Progressive Era. The National Victory Garden program in New York is one of examples. During the WWII, New York City released city-owned vacant land and called for voluntary participation in food production, resulting in the yield of 40 percent of the fresh vegetables consumed in the entire country (Fox et al., 1985). Because community gardens generate substantial amounts of tangible values with a sense of satisfaction from the labor, they have persisted on the urban scene, waxing and waning in popularity depending on the economic cycles (Francis et al., 1984; Hou et al., 2009).

It was both public and private sector that triggered the revival of the community open space, in many cases in the form of gardens, in the 1970s. As described above, the loss of federal grant money and a deteriorating tax base made it
difficult for municipalities to provide recreational infrastructure, which was not considered an urgent priority on urban agendas. This change disproportionately harmed poor communities where recreational opportunities were already very limited (Fox et al., 1985; Gelobter, 1994). Consequently, the responsibility of providing recreation facilities was delegated to communities. The social activism of 1970s aligned with the current urban policies, engendering community participation in public decision-making and CDC evolved their own mechanisms to improve the living environments (O'Connor, 2009; Keating et al., 1996; Ladd, 1994).

At the same time, there was a surplus of abandoned or disposable land in the cities: potential sites for the community open spaces. While cities experienced the flight of population to the suburbs, disinvestment in urban property and infrastructure left the neighborhoods with an excess of foreclosed housing and vacant lots, encumbered by unpaid taxes and maintenance problems (Schukoske, 1999; Schmelzkopf, 1995). The abandoned lots quickly became a nuisance for the community, as they attracted illegal dumping, arson, homeless people, and criminal activity. While they threatened the social and physical health of the community and devalued nearby properties, cities did not have resources to address these problems in a proper level (Francis et al., 1984; Schukoske, 1999).

In the early stages, community gardens were mostly initiated by voluntary but illegal actions of community organizations in order to maintain safe and clean neighborhoods. By squatting vacant lots for agricultural and recreational activities, they demonstrated the legitimacy of their control over the unclaimed land. Their persistent appeals brought authorization from local and/or state legislations for the interim use of the land. Federal support followed with further provision of land through the Urban Land Program of The Trust for Public Land, and grants from the U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The American Community Garden Association (ACGA), a national organization, was established in 1979 to facilitate the establishment of community gardens. According to a 1996 ACGA survey, 6,020 community gardens were recorded in 24 cities in US, with the largest number of those located in New York City. State and local governments lent their support by identifying vacant land for garden use, establishing safety guidelines for food production, and securing collaborative agreements with other government agencies.

Some states also permitted merchandising the produce (Fox et al., 1985).

Although some localities practiced systematic production, in the beginning, contemporary community gardens were not motivated primarily by economic factors but rather by the zeal of self-help, social reform, and activism. The community gardens and open spaces were planned for interim uses, located on sites with short-term, renewable leases—from six months to five years—and typically included a clause of at-will termination on short notice. This provisional condition was intended to allow the quick conversion of the land to other more permanent and profitable uses in the future (Schukoske, 1999; Fox et al., 1985).

Despite such a tenuous hold, a substantial number of community gardens have remained more than two decades, making their presence virtually permanent and realizing positive externality in the neighborhoods. The proximate effects of community gardens are well documented in places like the Lower East Side, the South Bronx, and Hell’s Kitchen in New York (Voicu and Beem, 2008). With the help of enhanced physical environment and sense of safety and health conditions, population of the neighborhoods started to grow so did real estate developers’ attention (Garvin, 2002; Fox et al., 1985). The trajectory follows the well-known “sweat equity labor” of SoHo (South of Houston) (Schmelzkopf, 2002), where artists took over buildings as working and living spaces in the former manufacturing district, thereby transforming it into a desirable area. This transformation eventually invited high demand of property developers (Kostelanetz, 2008; Zukin, 1982).

Community gardens were the first lots picked off for sale when the real estate market improved. Housing demand swelled in neighborhoods with concentrations of community gardens, for example, the Lower East Side of New York, which grew more than others. Ironically, this cycle ultimately led to the closure of more community gardens (Garvin, 2002). Under the privatization and neoliberal, free-market ideology of the 1990s, city governments began to dispose of public land to private developers, putting them back on the property tax rolls. In New York, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani’s administration put 114 community gardens up for auction in 1999, for the development of low- to middle-income housing. Questions arise as to why the gardens were chosen for private development while there were 11,000 other vacant lots simply
abandoned in the city. The answer is the intense housing demand created in those specific areas, partly by the improvement made by the presence of the community open spaces (Smith and Kurtz, 2004).

Although the scale, design, budget and the underlying motivation are drastically different from the examples of the previous phase, it is commonly observed that well-conceived open spaces acted as an anchor attraction amid the declined area. Compared to the other types of small-scale parks in this era, community open spaces were more influential in raising desirability of the neighborhood. It might be due to the sense of ownership the community members had on their community garden, which made them pay more attention in maintaining the spaces. However, more importantly, the modest level of impact from the small parks was more visible and effective in the area where the declining was apparent, and improvement could be easily made. That is probably the reason that community gardens had a larger presence in the urban redevelopment industry. Figure 5 shows El Sol Brillante Garden in New York, one of the most successfully maintained and arguably impactful community gardens.

3. Phase 3 (1980s~)

The third phase is from the late 1980s to the present, the rise of neoliberalism and economic globalization ushered in an era of diminished federal leadership on domestic issues (Fitzgerald and Leigh, 2002). International associations required global headquarters that create a spatial consolidation of producer services such as administrative, legal and financial consultancies, and information and computer technologies. Geographically central cities with accumulated human resources emerged as best situated to host these functions (Fainstein, 2001; Sassen, 1990).

While cities reclaimed their preeminence over suburbs, they began to compete among each other for business and workers (Brash, 2006, 2011). Cities observed large quantity of property developments. In coping with federal fiscal austerity, localities found a breakthrough, so-called “inducement strategies”, in which regulatory expedients were deployed to encourage private sectors to participate in resolving social problems, while unfettering their profit-seeking (Frieden et al., 1997). Under the banner of neoliberal ideology, deregulation and privatization facilitated the public and private partnerships being more deeply intertwined, and their projects became more extravagant and entrepreneurial (Friend et al., 1991; Garner, 2008).

Beyond the fiscal subsidies used as enticement, cities needed to devise new attractions to win so-called customers to their area. Many cities found the answer in good amenities and public services (Brash, 2011; Storper and Scott: 2009). These investments were also justified on the basis that they provided new recreational offerings to business and leisure travelers (Hyra, 2008; Sassen, 1990).

On top of recruiting and expanding post-industrial businesses, what added to this effort is the emphasis on people, so to speak to create a good human-centered climate. Recognizing that jobs would locate where people want to live reversed the traditional idea that people follow jobs (Florida, 2002; Strom, 2002). The presence of a highly educated and skilled workforce became a major factor in a firm’s decision about where to locate, thus creating a desirable environment for them was recognized as a new priority of the urban agenda (Currid, 2007; Florida, 2002; Hannigan, 2003; Strom, 2002).

In New York City, for example, Michael Bloomberg’s Five Borough Economic Development Strategy of 2002 explicitly focuses on providing high quality public services to build human resources and appeal to business owners (Porter et al., 2008). Real estate development plays an important role in this plan, designed to offer a “luxury city” (Brash, 2011, 2006) with “unequaled amenities” (Brash, p.122, 2011) including high-end entertainment and recreational industries (Brash, 2011; Retano, 2010). Since the start of Bloomberg’s tenure in 2002, the city has procured 750 acres of new parks and open spaces (WNYC News Blog, 2013), PlaNYC 2030, a long-term com-
prehensive plan for New York, released in 2007, extends this aspiration. One of its main strategies is to “create destination-level spaces for all types of recreation”. By “destination-level spaces,” and interchangeably, “flagship parks,” the city enlists its green infrastructure to attract visitors from elsewhere to become residents of the city (City of New York, 2007).

The two cases below have been selected to demonstrate the way public open space within or closely located to government-driven development projects are used as a marketing tool to attract private investment. Battery Park City in New York is one of the early examples of this approach. Although its genesis is in the spirit of urban renewal of the 1960s, the character of the project changed over several decades, before its eventual completion in the 1990s. The second example is the MTA (Metropolitan Transportation Authority) Rail Yard (Rail Yards) also located in New York, Rail Yards is one of the latest development projects that New York City has undertaken in an effort to compete for global city status. The project is called as the “microcosm and capstone” of Mayor Bloomberg’s administration planning agenda, whereby he incorporated differing tactics for the success, and open space strategy was one of the critical elements.

1) Battery Park City, New York

Battery Park City is a 92-acre mixed-use development project built on reclaimed land along the western shoreline of lower Manhattan, on the Hudson River. It includes 9.3 million square feet of commercial and retail spaces and 7.2 million square feet of residential spaces including educational and cultural facilities. Of the 92 acres, 36 acres are dedicated to open space. The Battery Park City Authority (BPCA), a New York State agency, runs the project jointly with the city government. The BPCA’s plan was to divide the land for sale to private developers, while it assumed provision of public services and infrastructure (Fainstein, 2001; BPCA, n.d.).

Cargo piers and ferry terminals previously occupied the site, until they were made obsolete by the advent of containerized shipping and trucking in the 1960s. The abandoned facilities began deteriorating, and the decline of maritime industries exacerbated the poor physical and economic condition of the site. However, this also opened up a new opportunity for commercial development on the waterfront. In 1968, Governor Nelson Rockefeller and Mayor John Lindsay saw a real estate development opportunity in the ruins and embarked on an experiment to turn their vision into an “unprecedented new city” (BPCA, n.d., Gordon, 1997).

Because of the magnitude of the project, fast-changing political and economic circumstances, the development process was delayed and a decade passed without any construction on the site. Called the “white beach,” the project signaled bureaucratic inefficiency, discouraging the interest of private developers (Fainstein, 2001; Ponte, 1982). After several fruitless proposals, Cooper Eckstut Associates’ Master Plan of 1979 was accepted as the project guideline, which remains to the present. Unlike its predecessors, the plan was not in the orthodox modernism style—the so-called Corbusian style, which would have required a large budget and high technology. That approach would have been out of sync with city budgets after the financial crisis of 1975. The chosen plan was practical, realistic, and respected the historic urban design.
language of New York (BPCA, n.d.). Figure 6 shows the Battery City Park layout of 1979.

Parks and open spaces had a prominent place in the plan. Around 30 percent of the site is dedicated to open space including an esplanade, parks and plazas, which is reflected in more than 60 percent of the budget that the BCPA allocated to the provision of infrastructure (Alexander, 1979). The emphasis on open space was motivated by the same goals as the projects mentioned above: to reshape the image of the project, stimulate developer investment, and capture potential tenant interest in the area.

Ground breaking finally happened in 1982 with two pilot projects. One, Gateway Plaza, is a government-subsidized housing project, and the other is a 1.2 mile-long esplanade in front of Gateway Plaza, meant to entice residents as well as prospective developers. This strategy continued throughout the project. Even in the face of constant threat of budget shortfalls, resources for open space were not reduced, reflecting the importance placed on maintaining high land values to appeal to investors with higher standard (Fainstein, 2001; Gordon, 1997). The BCPA expanded the tactic by launching a public space program and setting up the Public Art Advisory Committee to consult on the open space design of the South Cove and World Finance portions of the project. Eventually, the BCPA sold all the lots to private developers, and the project turned out to be a great success, becoming one of the most popular residential and work districts in the city. Figure 7 shows the construction site of the Gateway Plaza in 1981 and the present design of the Esplanade.

2) MTA Rail Yard, New York

Rail Yards is the heart of a larger project called Hudson Yards, affecting 60 blocks—300 acres in total, which includes the No. 7 subway extension, Hudson Park and Boulevard, and the rezoning of the area bordered by West 30th Street to the south, 7th and 8th Avenues to the east, West 43rd Street to the north, and 12th Avenue to the west (City of New York, Department of City Planning (DCP), n.d.).

The Rail Yards is a 26-acre mixed-use development project, located in the Far West Side neighborhood of Midtown Manhattan, between West 30th and West 33rd Streets, south to north, and 10th and 12th Avenues, east to west. It covers six blocks, and includes 8.2 million square feet of commercial and retail space, five million square feet of residential space and 32 million square feet of educational and cultural space, housed in 14 buildings, generously situated on 14 acres of public open space (Hudson Yards, 2013). Figure 8 displays the site location and the master plan finalized in 2012.

The Hudson Yard Development Corporation (HYDC), the Hudson Yard Infrastructure Corporation (HYIC), and local development corporations govern and coordinate the public financing process. Related Companies and Oxford Properties are the private developers in charge of site development and operations, under a 99-year ground lease with MTA. With the ground breaking in 2012, construction is underway. The occupation of buildings is anticipated for 2014, and the No. 7 subway will open in 2014 (Hudson Yards, 2013).

The Far West Side area of Midtown, so-called “Hell’s Kitchen”, was a neighborhood that had been reputed to be a derelict residential district with high crime and violence rates.
since the 19th century (Brash, 2011). The 1960s saw the proliferation of transportation infrastructure, such as the West Side Highway, the Pennsylvania Station storage rail yard, and automotive and mechanic services.

The area has continually attracted redevelopment proposals from various groups. In the 1990s, stimulated by new policies of deregulation and a bullish stock market, the city’s financial sector recovered its strength, and office space demand soared around SoHo and Chelsea. Under such favorable economic conditions, both the Giuliani and Bloomberg administrations attempted to link the Far West Side to the Midtown Business District, a prime Manhattan office district since the 1920s (Brash, 2011; Brash, 2012; City of New York, 2011).

The site was originally intended to be a “convention and sports corridor” for the 2012 Summer Olympics, had the city’s bid succeeded. The idea of a new stadium remained in the plan despite the failed proposal, which aroused a heated controversy. Its proponents viewed the stadium as an anchor for a multi-use facility, aimed at transforming the yard into a “24-hour neighborhood,” which would distinguish it from other business districts in the city. The planning strategy for the neighborhood is grounded in the concept of “place-making” (Brash, 2011), seen as the way to make it the next great destination in New York City, following the path of Lincoln Center, Park Avenue, and Central Park (Brash, 2011).

After long debate, the plan was finalized without the stadium (Brash, 2011; Brash, 2012; DCP, n.d.). In its place, the role of catalyst was assigned to the open space design. The private developers identified three main components meant to ensure the success of the project: a vibrant neighborhood, public investment in transportation and open space, and an innovative master plan (Hudson Yards, 2013). As Bloomberg’s administration emphasized, the interest to link the Far West Side to Midtown took a form of intensive open space creation on the west side, 67 acres of the High Line and four acres of Hudson Yards Park and Boulevard were made possible with $190 million and $30 million of public money respectively.

Over the course of this administration, 550 acres of Hudson River Park, a development initiated by the previous administration, is gradually being completed (Brash, 2011). With 14 acres of open space, the Rail Yards clearly establishes the use of open space and urban parks as a selling point. Its recent completion does not yet allow ex-post evaluation; however, the economic intention of the open space strategy is evident.

These two projects are so-called planned community development, whereby a large-scale living-working complex was established on the land that has not been used as a human settlement. Therefore, the risk of the projects was magnificent.
and efficient enticement of developers and tenants was the most important than any other cases. Given this backdrop, these examples proved that open space strategy could be used for economic reason even in the difficult but successful projects run by one of the most profit-driven and successful property developers in the city of the era.

IV. Conclusion

In this study, I attempted to examine the economic aspirations embedded in providing open space as part of larger urban redevelopment. I described the general forms, political backdrop, and economic motives of five different phases of urban park and open space development, starting with two urbanization periods, and continuing through three subsequent urban redevelopment periods.

To conclude, I will summarize the findings. In the 19th century when urbanization was a matter of concern, there was more land available for open spaces. This flexibility, together with the prevailing picturesque and naturalistic design concept, and higher scarcity value as an urban amenity, urban open space could exploit the public resources. In result, open spaces of the era were large and extravagant by today’s standards. Their economic influence was commensurate with the appearance, in that it attracted businesses and residents large enough to shape a new urban form. During the great depression, urban parks and open spaces, along with other types of physical projects, were initiated for the purpose of easing unemployment. Compared to the earlier ones that were purposed to be an attraction points, the open spaces in this era did not have economic and physical impacts on its surroundings.

In the urban redevelopment phases, some types of urban parks and open spaces revealed their economic influences. In the first phase, the economic motive to build open space was to boost the appeal of specific locales in order to draw people and businesses back to a neglected center city. In the second phase, public effort to create and maintain urban parks and open spaces diminished due to the budget austerity, instead, community open spaces flourished through the voluntary actions of neighborhood level groups. However, eventually their presence had similar effects, though of a smaller magnitude. In the third phase, the aspiration and functions of such projects resemble their forerunners of the first phase, but their targets extended to global businesses and elites. In short, whether as a stand alone or an annexed form, there was open space and urban park that played an active role in urban redevelopment.

As shown in the most of the case, although community garden has a direct use-value as a cultivable land as well, most of the effects from urban open spaces in other phases was to attract people and new businesses, bringing new economic vitality to a declined area.

In the contemporary urban planning, as human-centered climate gains attention, and tourism industries become a larger economic resources, the recognition on urban parks and open spaces are growing. City governments can proactively use open space development as a strategy for urban revitalization. Aforementioned projects, as well as Chicago’s Millennium Park, New York’s High Line are evidences to support the argument. Such high-impact parks may be aimed to emulate other types of amenities on this count, such as museum, represented by the Bilbao effect.

Under this particular goal, however, open spaces and urban parks tend to be luxury products that cater to the taste of people and businesses with means (Brash, 2006). This may be problematic in terms of equality of distribution. While public amenities for newcomers are addressed by spending disproportionately greater public resources, open space that serves existing populations and businesses suffer from lack of investment. As an extreme example, public budget deficit in the 1970s turned the urban parks into unwelcomed facilities even they used to be great urban destinations, such as Bryant Park and Central Park in New York. On the other hand, the use of budget has been a sensitive issue for citizens, as excessive spending of it may return as a tax burden to them. Given this, the idea of unfair distribution of public benefit arouses citizens’ criticism and opposition.

Furthermore, as these amenities successfully restructure the economy of the neighborhood, processes of gentrification displace existing inhabitants that are not considered economically beneficial to the city (Brash, 2011). Gentrification always has been in the history of human settlement, whether it was urban or rural. As described, large portion of urban renewal projects were built on a cleared land that had been condemned as blight from a public point of view, however, in many cases it was a neighborhood that people had their lives for a long time, Independence Mall is one of the examples. It succeeded at the cost of destroying the existing urban fabric.
After a fruitless effort to moderately rehabilitate the surrounding neighborhoods, the city leaders turned to wholesale slum clearance to facilitate development of Independence Mall and to maximize its influence to other parts of downtown (Metraux, 1999). In what became standard procedure, INHP used federal grants and the power of eminent domain to raze the buildings. Consequently, five blocks of residential and commercial buildings gave way to developments serving populations of higher socioeconomic status, and the remaining manufacturing facilities were moved to other parts of the city (CPDC, 2006).

Although in a much less severe way, gentrification is commonly observed in contemporary examples. In the back of many higher-end open spaces or other types of amenities, there are existing inhabitants who could not welcome their positive ripple effect. A great amenity may raise property values in the neighborhood and benefit the owners, others who rent the spaces in the property could not afford the increased rent and need to move out. This change usually seems less obvious than the direct displacement and it is not legally required to compensate those tenants. However, anecdotal evidences mount up as the economic performance of a project becomes more effective.

In order to address the issue of fair distribution of the public resources, innovative financing mechanisms could be one of the solutions. For example, through developer incentives, tax increment financing and business improvement districts, many of New York’s prominent open spaces including the High Line, Brooklyn Bridge Park, Riverside South, and Hunter’s Point have been developed without relying on General Fund Appropriations. Also, substantial number of higher-end open spaces has come into being through private donation (Crompton, 2005: Harnik, 2010).

While distribution issue can be resolved in relatively apparent ways, gentrification is much more complex one. Although the notion of gentrification is biasedly negative in literature, certain level of gentrification is indeed a goal to achieve in economic developments. Throughout the history, finding a fair level of balance between the new and old has been left to the discretion of a public authority in charge of the project. This practice made it difficult to make a holistic system for the compensation, while practicality and effectiveness of its application to diverse projects is still questioned even it was made well. Therefore, it should be still a project-level in handling this issue but urban practitioners’ consideration need to be extended.

In Korean context, its urbanization and urban redevelopment processes drastically differ from the ones of US in its physical style and implementation procedure. Among many, one of the most distinctive differences is the time scale, in that from the World War II, Korea experienced urbanization and urban redevelopment simultaneously, while suburbanization has not been a major cause of the urban decline. Meanwhile, the college level education of landscape architecture began in 1970s, when industrialization and economic development was a national priority. It was from the late 1990s, the point when local government embraced more authority than before, that quantitative growth of open spaces and parks have been more visible (Seoul Dept. of Park and Recreation, 2009).

In Korea, a couple of concerns might make it potentially difficult to use open spaces as an urban redevelopment measures. First, the economic benefit of the parks and open spaces has been less recognized, because relatively short generations have passed since open spaces and parks have been in the urban scene, thus successful precedents has not been sufficiently accumulated. Second, open space development is largely considered as public matter, and financing mechanism is less flexible. In order to yield a higher impact, as described above, significant investment should be made. However if the public coffers was the only available resources, an expenditure on extravagant parks is neither fiscally feasible, nor socially justifiable.

Cheonggyecheon Stream, an urban stream restoration project, is arguably successful example in terms of its economic influence (Kang and Cervero, 2009, among many). However, it also pertained the aforementioned issues - unfair distribution of public resources and gentrification. Although it is one of the rare examples that yielded substantial ripple effect, it has not been much duplicated or modeled after, presumably due to the significant fiscal and social cost. While the cost of construction and maintenance is enormous, it was funded solely from city’s coffers, i.e., the tax money. Although the new development around the stream was an expected source of budget that offset the cost in the future, however the upfront cost was still hard to afford, and triggered citizens’ opposition. The opposition of the existing merchants to the displacement was even worse. Therefore, inventing suitable regulation and development mechanism is a prerequisite to promote open spaces in urban redevelopment mission in...
Korea.

Compared to the rigidity in the open space procurement from public side, private developers seem more advanced in utilizing open space strategy for their profit. The landscape design for apartment complexes gained increasing attention, and substantial innovation has been made in its concept and design.

In the future, comparative study with Korean condition would make this research more enriched, and applicable tactics could be learned for the Korean landscape architecture field.
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