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ABSTRACT

The term gentrification can have many different meanings. One person may think it stands for cleaning up a derelict part of a city while another may expand the term to cover everything from rehabilitated structures to improved infrastructure and a heightened sense of community. The Crossroads lies south of Interstate 70 which runs through downtown Kansas City, Missouri and south to twenty first street. The eastern extent of the area is Highway 71 and the western boundary is Interstate 35. Since the 1980s, the Crossroads District has been undergoing a marked transformation. Art galleries, lofts, and restaurants now occupy several of the once-vacant buildings in the Crossroads. But has this part of Kansas City been fully gentrified or was that even the original intent? In the course of this study I will examine the results of the Crossroads gentrification process through the use
of Census data, examining public policy, and by taking a look at the physical structure of the Crossroads today and how the presence of blight is affecting the area.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Today the process of gentrification is widely used throughout the United States to try and revitalize the urban cores of cities that are in decline. The deterioration of the urban core is typically the result of a large portion of its inhabitants migrating to the suburbs in order to reside in what they believe are less problematic areas. The results and relative success of gentrification are varied in each city depending on what specifically has been done to try and revitalize the areas. In Kansas City, Missouri, one area experiencing rapid change as a result of gentrification is the Crossroads Arts District. The following satellite image shows the full extent of the Crossroads District. There are no defined borders for the area but for the purpose of this study, the borders will be defined as Interstate 670 to the north, railroads tracks and East 22nd Street to the south, Interstate 35 to the west and Highway 71 to the east.
The Crossroads Art District in Kansas City, Missouri has emerged as an example of urban renewal, even though it is still difficult to gauge the success and sustainability of what has transpired. It is also unclear to what extent this process will continue in the future or if it is largely completed. Despite these uncertainties, the area is, for the most part, vibrant. Many new businesses operate here, young professionals and artists live and work in newly renovated lofts and condominiums, art studios, and other attractions seem to be plentiful enough to keep non-residents visiting the area. Urban renewal, in this area at least, is more than simply opening a few businesses and renovating old buildings. It is a revitalization of a community.
and a section of Kansas City’s urban core in a combination of ways, economic, social, and, to some degree, political.

The question as to whether this area has been gentrified is difficult to answer. Gentrification involves many aspects not typically considered by the general public that have to be planned and analyzed before the process can even begin. In the Crossroads, projects appear to be geared towards attracting a specific demographic to the area. The idea of attracting wealthy young professionals, families, and large scale businesses is not the ultimate goal of this renewal effort. The target demographic seems to be, at least from what I observed in this study, the same as those who initially began to gentrify the area: low-income artists. Even with the efforts to keep this specific demographic in the area to live, work, and shop, other populations have moved to the area and seem to have displaced some of the original gentrifiers. This succession creates not only displaced residents, but also rising property values. The area has become almost inaccessible to the very portion of the population for which it was intended, artists.

This seems to be an inevitable trend in the process of gentrification as stated by the Hackworth/Smith model of gentrification. Presented in 2001, this model shows the process of gentrification and how it has changed since Ruth Glass coined the term in 1964 to describe the class replacement occurring in London’s West End.¹ Hackworth/Smith lists three major “waves” of gentrification, with transition periods in between. The first wave includes “sporadic gentrification” and the buying of

---

property by the new gentrifiers. The second wave is a more defined set of
gentrification in that it becomes “anchored” in the area where it started. This stage
produces a higher flow of capital into the area which further exacerbates the
process. The third stage begins with the slowing of gentrification and, as the
model suggests, some claim de-gentrification. Although the process appears to be
halted it will eventually return to further gentrify or complete the process which
was left unfinished.2 A fourth wave of gentrification, investment, is proposed in
addition to the three presented in Hackworth/Smith by Lees, Slater and Wyly in
Gentrification.3 The investment wave helps to bring continued growth to an area
undergoing gentrification, building on past successes for future gains.

Only after an area has been gentrified do the effects become clear with
respect to the extent of the change. The results can almost never be predicted to be
a success or failure based solely on an initial plan. If one begins to look further into
the process of gentrification other questions start to arise besides the obvious ones
of what and how to gentrify an area. Who will inhabit these areas as the processes
begins, as it progresses, and after it supposedly finishes? In addition, will the original
gentrifiers want to stay there or be able to afford to remain in the area as the process
continues? Some areas can become geared towards one particular segment of the
population, such as bobos, the bourgeois bohemians, and do not or are not meant to
serve the population as a whole.

**Illustration 1.2: Crossroads/Downtown Satellite Maps Comparison** Satellite views of the streets in downtown Kansas City (top) and the Crossroads (bottom) show the difference in the layout. In downtown, almost all streets run from north to south or east to west. In the Crossroads, streets frequently curve and do not follow a traditional grid pattern. Source: Google Maps, http://maps.google.com/.
The purpose of this study is to answer questions such as those above with respect to the Crossroads District in Kansas City. The area is considered by many to be gentrified. As a researcher I question who this gentrification is really for and who is benefiting from it? Since the start of the gentrification process, this part of Kansas City has changed greatly and the effects of the process are still unclear. It is even unclear if the gentrification is complete with regard to its original purpose. Also, has government policy, specifically the Tax Increment Finance (TIF) plan affected the redevelopment effort in a positive or negative way? The long term affects may yet be years away and any final result still further in the future.

The Crossroads District, began as an industrial section of Kansas City. The industry in the area was not heavy industry, such as large scale manufacturing and raw material processing, but rather more light industry and wholesalers distributing goods after they arrived in the city. The evidence of this role is still there today in the buildings, train tracks, and general maze-like character of the area. It seems to have been built with industrial needs in mind, not ease of access and convenience for the general public. In contrast, the central business district of downtown Kansas City, mainly those areas north of Truman Road and up to the Missouri River, are set up on a grid system with very small variance from street to street. The contrast in the layout of the two areas can be seen in the satellite images on the previous page. The top image shows the layout in the Central Business District. Streets lay north to south, east to west with little diversion. The bottom image shows the street layout in

---

the Crossroads District. Here streets often do not cross at 90-degree angles and seem to not have been designed with ease of access in mind. The topography of the area also plays a factor in the street layout. By looking at the United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute quadrangle of Kansas City, it is easy to observe that the area inside the downtown loop and the Crossroads share similar topographic layout. Elevations change sharply in both areas but street layout is much different in each. In downtown, the streets rise and fall with the elevation and again, follow the strict grid pattern. In the Crossroads, some streets, like Southwest Boulevard, follow the changing contours. This style of layout creates less drastic changes in elevation, which would make it easier when trying to move massive loads of goods on rail lines within this industrial area.

The evidence of an industrial past is also clear in the buildings that remain in the area today. Several still have faded markings on their facades indicating to us what was produced or housed in that building. Many buildings still have loading docks and direct access to the rail lines criss-crossing the area. An example of the fading markings can be see in the picture appendix as Example A.

In addition to the layout of the streets, the industrial purpose of this area is evident in the fact that the Crossroads area still has active and some abandoned train tracks running though it at street level. Today the active train tracks are located on the southern edge of the district separating it from the Crown Center District, a popular Kansas City shopping and entertainment destination for locals and tourists.

---

alike. The Central Business District (CBD) does not allow for this type of layout and train lines are diverted around its periphery. Evidence of this industry remnant running though the district can be seen in the picture appendix as Example B. These industrial buildings show the diversity of activity that formerly took place in this part of the city. The easiest way to see this diversity is by considering the buildings listed on the National Historic Register and reading applications for these buildings to be placed on the National Register. The Hesse Carriage Company Building, located at 1700 Oak Street, was built in 1903 and served as a manufacturing station for wagons, custom auto bodies, trucks and beverage transportation vehicles.\(^6\) Conversely, the Globe Storage and Transfer Company Building, located at 1712 Main Street, served as a storage facility and receiving location for goods when they arrived or had to be transferred in Kansas City.\(^7\) Still another part of the Crossroads served as a distribution and service area for the film industry. The area known as “Film Row” was still under consideration for construction in 1921, but a general plan for the area had already been developed and published as public information.\(^8\) According to \textit{The Kansas City Star} article from that year, the area would include several office buildings for the management and storage of film which was to be distributed to and from the Kansas City area. The basements of these buildings even

---


\(^7\) City Planning and Development Department, \textit{Staff Review of National Register Nomination for Globe Storage and Transfer Company Building}, City of Kansas City, Missouri City Planning Department/Planning, Preservation, and Urban Design Landmarks Commission, 2007.

\(^8\) “A Film Square Develops Here”, \textit{The Kansas City Star}, September 9, 1921, N.pag.
included film vaults so films could be retrieved and moved quickly and easily. The buildings and vaults remain to this day in the Crossroads and now serve as a mix use space for artists and businesses. A picture of buildings in the Old Film Row district can be seen as Example C in the picture appendix.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Much of the current literature on the subject of gentrification covers the pros and cons of the issue. The literature may be divided into two broad categories. Some authors claim that gentrification is a process that brings great renewal and prosperity to an area.\(^1\) Others maintain that process destroys the local culture in whichever part of a city it is implemented and is unfair to the urban poor who had occupied the space before the gentrifiers.\(^2\) One of the most extreme points of view calls gentrification the “rape of our neighborhoods.”\(^3\) The vernacular on this subject matter even goes into discussions of intense efforts to resist gentrification and displacement with some saying the process brings only chaos and complexity to affected areas.\(^4\) In addition to this stark difference in opinion over the effectiveness of gentrification, much of the current literature seems to focus on larger cities in the


United States and in other developed countries across the globe. Very little literature can be found on gentrification in smaller urban areas such as Kansas City. The main focus of studies of domestic gentrification covers mostly major metropolitan areas. One example is Loretta Lees article “Super-gentrification: The Case of Brooklyn Heights, New York City.” The term super-gentrification, which designates a sub-section in the study of gentrification, is used by Lees to explain the renewal of the Brooklyn Heights neighborhood in New York.\(^5\) This renewal process is continuing even though the area had been considered gentrified previously. But, for all of the literature published on the subject, not much has changed since the 1960s when this type of redevelopment was first described as a phenomenon. The same arguments of the pros and cons, who is displaced, and even the establishments set up in these gentrified areas become repetitive. Although it is pertinent to read and review as much of the literature available as possible, for the purpose of this study a smaller set of literature has been selected to help explain the scope of gentrification and some of the past and current applications and results in various locations.

Gentrification, as it is known today, was first identified in the late 1950s and early 1960s when middle class residents “invaded” working class neighborhoods in the West End of London, England and pushed poorer residents out of their homes.\(^6\) A more affluent, younger, and educated population moved into the area. Similarly, a more American version of this process comes from several sources, which describe

---


\(^6\) Wharton, N,pag.
the practice of gentrification as the taming of the new American frontier. This type of comparison is meant to conjure images of the taming of the western frontier by the white man in what is now the United States. When seen in this light, the practice of gentrification seems like a poor choice for any urban area. It predicates the idea that the process is in essence a bad thing while ignoring the positive aspects. The original taming of the western frontier is a poor example to use as an analogy for gentrification. The brutality of that western frontier taming may not be repeated but some could equate the displacement of poor urban residents as harsh treatment, not unlike the treatment of native populations of the United States. In an almost eerie repeat of history, gentrification is now forcing the urban poor from their homes. The group taking their place in the urban core, or the new frontiersmen if you will, are young, educated professionals for the most part eager to live, work and play in an urban environment. This mass convergence into one area and the displacement of the urban working class and poor leads to several problems that are not fully addressed in Wharton’s article. It simply states that the new gentrifiers displace the urban poor and then makes no mention of the adverse affects this displacement will have on them. The issue of where these displaced people move to is noticeably absent. If people are displaced without thought as to where they will move and how this will be done, the city could face an increase in homelessness and civil unrest from the displaced population that could then lead to even larger problems throughout the city as a whole. In the reading of the current literature, this article

---

included, I found no formal processes have ever really been established to help deal with the issue of displacement. The current literature available seems to press this point and continually demonizes gentrification without a solid plan to combat the problem. One article even goes so far as to claim that not only are people displaced as a result of gentrification, but so too are the economic activities of an area once gentrification begins. This type of displacement is referred to as “the displacement of older economic functions.”

While the loss of a home to redevelopment is typically a major factor in displacement, loss of the economic activity that previously supported an area can be just a devastating. Even in this article, Lloyd does not put forth any solutions to the problem of displacement raised in the text. In cases where displacement occurs, gentrification is seen as more of a hinderance and injustice than a solution to decaying urban areas. The human cost, at least for most, simply seems not to outweigh the advantages that a successful gentrification process could afford a city.

Wharton’s article later explores the idea of who truly profits from the gentrification process. The first model in this section comes directly from Wharton’s article and noticeably does not include gentrifiers or general public in their list of those who profit from the process.

---

Figure 2.1: Gentrification Beneficiaries Model: The model above, adapted from Wharton’s article, does not include gentrifiers as a group that profits from gentrification.9

This omission is off-putting mainly because the residents of the city should be the primary beneficiaries of gentrification. The model does however do a good job of depicting the reality of gentrification and who are its beneficiaries. The article seems to suggest that aside from a gentrified area, with no indication to what degree gentrification occurred, the only other thing passed on to the public is the increase in taxes the city can now charge these new residents. The article goes on to state “from tax abatements to tax credits to grants and other public sector proposals, there were a variety of government initiatives that assist profiteers in countless ways. While many policy incentives spurred development in once blighted communities developers and investors grew financially and became politically dependent on such sources.10

Overall, this article does a very good job of pointing out the problem of the new colonialism of gentrification in the modern world. However, it does not seem to delve into the ramifications of the negative aspects that it brings up. Not going into these consequences in any form, the article seems to be a bit thin. The positive aspect of this work is that it conjures the idea that downtowns can again be viable

9 Wharton, p.5.
10 Wharton, p.5.
places for people to live, work and play, even if it is only for a select few of the cities residents.

There is a smaller group that sees the advantages of gentrification outweighing the disadvantages. The literature produced from this minority highlights the progress made in several cities both in the United States and abroad. Urban areas that had for years been ridden with crime, low property values, and abandoned and crumbling buildings have seen a resurgence over the past several decades. In the article “Who Gentrifies Low-Income Neighborhoods”, the authors find no evidence that city centers within the parameters of the study were improving prior to the implementation of gentrification. The carrying out of gentrification in cities, as reported in this study, did improve the conditions of the urban core, but at the expense again of the urban poor. The use of United States Census of Population and Housing data by McKinnish, Walsh, and White shows the demographics of who are the real gentrifiers of cities. Their analysis of census data shows that a significant number of gentrifiers are white, college-educated persons with higher incomes than the previous occupants. The following chart is presented in the article to show the results of the analysis of the 2000 Census data.

Table 2.1: Characteristics of in-migrants by gentrification status of tract, low-income neighborhood sample, 2000 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Migrants to gentrifying tracts</th>
<th>Migrants to non-gentrifying tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Family Income</td>
<td>$36,524</td>
<td>$25,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% No H.S. Degree</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% H.S. Degree</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% College Degree</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age &lt; 40</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 40-60</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Age 60+</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% With children</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Married</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Co-habitating</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Immigrant</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>38,308</td>
<td>316,355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This type of demographic profile is in a way good in that gentrification will thrive with residents who have disposable income. These young urban migrants have that income and will in theory spend money close to their new homes, if the services and products they desire are offered near by, thus encouraging developers to place diverse businesses in these areas.

Another article along the same lines asks if the downtowns in a future America will be rich? It proposes that cities develop and redevelop from the center

12 Adapted from McKinnish, Walsh, and White, 2010.
out over time. The authors in this case see the American city like a living organism that can pass through cycle-of-life stages, even rejuvenation. This view would suggest that any gentrification would be simply a natural part of the life cycle in a city. Bringing in a more affluent population over time is part of a natural growth and regeneration of a city, according to the authors. This article’s greatest value is the fact that it brings to mind the question of whether any gentrification project, no matter how successful now or previously, can be sustainable? Will the populations moving into the gentrified areas young, reasonably well-off professionals, stay after they begin to have families of their own or will they leave leading to poverty and disrepair in the urban core again? Although the main focus of this article is on the financial aspects of the gentrifiers, it does inadvertently become a paper about the sustainability of gentrification. But with the suggestion at the beginning of the article that the lifecycle of a city is cyclical, it can be reasonably assumed that at some point and to some degree the area will again fall into some disrepair and poverty. The degree to which this decline happens remains the unknown aspect and the article makes note of that as well. This theory of a cyclical life of a city is more in line with the theory I seek to prove through my research. Gentrification is not intrinsically good or evil. It is part of the natural life of a city. Whether or not the population sees it as a beneficial or detrimental is a valid public debate, but it seems there is little that can be done to stop the process on all levels. It is up to each city on a case by case basis to determine how the process should and will be implemented. No one city is the same and no one gentrification process is the same nor should it be. In Kansas

13 Brueckner and Rosenthal, p.3.
City, the Crossroads seems to be one of the current hot spots for gentrification. In many ways the change there has been going on for a few decades as it is a lengthy process. Only now can we begin to see the slightest glimpses of the true long-term affects of gentrification in the Crossroads and whether or not the current situation is sustainable financially.

Japonica Brown-Saracino’s *A Neighborhood That Never Changes* gives a fully articulated view of gentrification’s social theory and the ramifications it has on an area.¹⁴ Unlike other works on the subject of gentrification, this book seeks to focus solely on the social impacts of the process. The struggle of deciding whether gentrification is a productive or destructive force in an urban environment is largely ignored. Several key social themes are explored in detail, which further sheds light on the social components of this process and why they may be more important than other aspects of gentrification.

The first part of the book stresses the idea that social preservation is a major influence in the minds and actions of many gentrifiers. The author uses personal interviews of gentrifiers in several distinct neighborhoods in cities with varying degrees of urbanization to gather data on how gentrifiers see themselves and the results of gentrification. Early in the book this results in a chart that divides the gentrifiers into three main groups: social preservationists, social homesteaders, and pioneers. The chart reveals the motives for the origins of each type of gentrifier, their visions for their own future, their attitudes towards newcomers, and their attitudes

---

¹⁴ Brown-Saracino, pp.80-103.
towards “old timers” or previous residents.\textsuperscript{15} The idea of gentrifiers as “pioneers” is again raised in this book but with a different view on how they interact with their gentrified area. The pioneers that Saracino describes are much more territorial with regard to their space. They see it as something they built and have a right to inhabit. Their opinions of the previous residents are extremely critical to the point where these pioneers seem threatened by the previous residents of the area. Not all gentrifiers seem to think this way, however, as the other two groups, the social preservationists and social homesteaders, see the old timers as a part of the social fabric of the neighborhood.

The rest of this work reads much like a thesis overall. After a lengthy introduction full of the author’s personal stories and identification of gentrification terms, the methods of research and site descriptions are discussed in length. The justification of the sites selected is a bothersome point. In trying to prove the social differences of gentrifiers in different cities, the author has decided to study four locations; Dresden, Maine, Provincetown, Pennsylvania, and the Andersonville and Argyle neighborhoods of Chicago. The difference between a city in Maine and a neighborhood in Chicago is so vast the comparison of the two seems to make little sense on any level of analysis. Dresden, as described by the author, is in an early-to-mid stage of gentrification. Andersonville, in Chicago, however, is described as in an advanced stage. This is to be expected as the resources for gentrification, not to mention the population for it, are more widely available in Chicago than Dresden. It seems a lot like comparing apples and oranges and being surprised that the two are

\textsuperscript{15} Brown-Saracino, p.13.
different. Perhaps the authors should have compared the Chicago neighborhoods to ones in Boston or New York to see if there were differences in the social perspective of gentrification there. A difference there would seem to be much more telling of social demographics than comparing a small town to a neighborhood in a large city.

The third chapter of this book brings up the topic of social preservation. Gentrification seems to be portrayed as a destroyer of social bindings that exist in a neighborhood. But the real question is, can these social ties be preserved as gentrification takes hold? The author opens the chapter with the concept of origin-stories, which refer mainly to the how and why of a neighborhood. It explains why those who are there prior to gentrification have such strong ties to their neighborhood. The author uses a discussion with one study participant to explain the concept further. The study participant, who is describing Dresden, Maine, says that what drew him to the town in the first place was the fact that it was “the real thing.”

The city had an authentic feel to it of a real New England town and not a tourist trap as some others do. That authenticity is what made this person want to live there. The author wants to drive home the point that residents are attached to their homes and gentrifiers can be seen as destructive and intrusive force. These gentrifiers may not fully understand the social fabric of the area and begin to rework the area to suit their needs without thought as to how this will affect residents. Again, this lack of awareness can be tied back to the displacement problem that most gentrification literature identifies. In the Crossroads District, this situation exists and will be evident in the data later presented in this thesis. The preservation of the district is an

16 Brown-Saracino, p.81.
overwhelming issue, but, in the case of the Crossroads, the path to social preservation seems to be unclear. Displacement and the destruction of the social fabric are real problems in gentrification and need to be addressed.

One chapter I take particular issue with covers the finding of the “real people.” In this chapter the author seeks to set criteria for who qualifies as a true resident and almost makes it sound like they have exclusive claim to an area. The problem here is how does one identify who is a real person is and who is the intruder. It is subjective and seems to have no use in a scientific study of gentrification. There is no way to say one person is more entitled to an area over another based on the fact that they follow arbitrary criteria. Cities change, demographics change over time, they morph and merge and at times separate. If cities are not allowed to change over time they will stagnate and struggle to survive in their current form. A preservationist in the book discussing the Argyle neighborhood in Chicago argues that “Vietnamese merchants are at the heart of the community. It’s really Vietnamese.” Just because a neighborhood is currently Vietnamese does not mean it is destined to remain Vietnamese. It is likely the neighborhood was not always dominated by a single culture. Vietnamese residents certainly did not dominate the area when Chicago was first settled. Argyle has changed over time and should be allowed to continue to do so. That is why this chapter is bothersome. It makes it seem as though the “real people” have an exclusive birthright to their neighborhoods and that simply is not the case. They are currently the dominant presence in a neighborhood, yes, but the city needs to change to suit current and

---

future needs. This truth is not to say that mass displacement should be the rule or taken lightly. Rather it should be a gradual change with care taken to see that the needs of the current population are met as best as can be managed while allowing progress to move forward.

This work stands out in comparison to many works read for this study and in gentrification literature overall. It focuses solely on the social aspects of gentrification, a topic largely glossed over by most literature. At the heart of gentrification are people. Individuals are the agents of change at work in these cities and the social needs of those involved need to be taken into consideration when gentrifiers begin their work. At the same time current residents should not claim exclusive rights to an area and stand in the way of progress. This work drives home the point that there needs to be a balancing act done whenever gentrification occurs. Drastic measures could lead to undesirable results on both sides and then the hopes of bettering and or even preserving a neighborhood could be lost.

Lees, Slater, and Wyly in *Gentrification* present a comprehensive portrait of the gentrification process from terminology to applications in current urban areas and even a small discussion of the future prospects for gentrification. Of all the readings examined for this project, this volume is the most comprehensive work I could find on the subject of gentrification. It covers every subject, in broad terms, within the realm of gentrification from its inception and history to its future prospects. A good point is made towards the end of this book:

One criticism of existing approaches to gentrification is that they tend to see gentrification as a more or less homogenous process....Our
hypothesis is that different middle class groups would be attracted to
different areas and this would (be determined) by a range of factors, in
addition to what they might be able to afford in particular housing
markets.\textsuperscript{18}

This quotation falls directly in line with what this study is trying to prove. The
factors influencing the success or failure and extent and type of gentrification in any
given area are based to some extent, on the desired result. Gentrification does not
happen randomly and without any rhyme or reason. It is geared toward a specific
demographic and usually an ultimate master plan is in the minds of those who
gentrify an area. Gentrifiers know what they are hoping to achieve and that choice is
made clear in the type of gentrification that follows.

A chapter on the “mutation” of gentrification offers a unique look into the
changing nature of the process. In my literature research I found this section is the
most detailed statement on the subject and the only one I found which is solely
devoted to this change. The authors make a good point when they make note that,
“as the process of gentrification has mutated over time, so have the terms used to
explain and describe it. Most of the terms that have been coined are derivatives of
the term gentrification.”\textsuperscript{19} The authors then go into some detail about the separate
and varied forms of gentrification as they exist today. New subclasses such as rural
gentrification, new-build gentrification and super-gentrification are described as
being products of the process as it has mutated into what it is today. The main point

\textsuperscript{18} Lees, Slater, and Wyly, N. pag.
\textsuperscript{19} Lees, Slater, and Wyly, p.129.
of this section seems to be to drive home the point that, in a way, the term
gentrification by itself is outdated. When researchers, students and scholars now
discuss the subject, they must be more specific in their comments so as not to over-
generalize what may be occurring in a given area.

In accordance with cautionary note, Lees, Slater, and Wyly present all of the
aspects and several points of view on the process of gentrification. Their book
begins by explaining the history and origins of gentrification. The process, according
to the authors, first appeared in London in the late 1950s and early 1960s. As noted
previously the term “gentrification” was itself coined in 1964 by Ruth Glass, an urban
sociologist. The changes she witnessed in London are now referred to as “classical
gentrification” and are described in the following quotation:

One by one many of the working class quarters of London have been
invaded by the middle classes-upper and lower. Shabby, modest mews
and cottages- two rooms up and down-have been taken over, when
their leases have expired, and have become elegant, expensive
residences. Larger Victorian houses, downgraded in an earlier or recent
period-which were used as lodging houses or were otherwise in multiple
occupation-have been upgraded once again. Nowadays, many of these
houses are being subdivided into costly flats or houselets. The current
social status and value of such dwellings are frequently in inverse relation to
their [economic] status, and in any case enormously inflated by comparison
with previous levels in their neighborhood. Once this process of gentrification
starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working
class occupiers are displaced and the social character of the district is changed. (Glass 1964) 20

This quotation is accurate and comprehensive for its time. It does, however, present the process in a negative light. Glass made use of words like “invaded” and “displaced.” Although this is valid from the authors observations, other terminology should have been used so as to present an objective point of view in the study of this reportedly then-new phenomenon.

The final part of the book focuses on what future, if any, gentrification will have in urban centers. Many of the arguments for and against the process are repeated and thoughts on the demographic, financial, and cultural makeup of gentrified areas are presented. This is a fitting conclusion to the book as it seems to leave the question of what is gentrification’s future open to interpretation. There seems to be no definite way to predict to how large a scale this process will grow. It could continue on a relatively moderate scale, as it is now, with the same problems, or it could continue to evolve and refocus its purpose and outcomes. This work offers a broad understanding of what gentrification was, is, and could become. It seems, for the most part, to look objectively at the process and to weigh the pros and cons with no real a priori judgement nor with explicit agenda framing the text.

20 Lees, Slater, and Wyly, p.4.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The process of conducting research in the field of urban geography can be difficult and time consuming. Unlike many other fields of study, urban geography can sometimes require the participation of those living in the study area, city officials and business owners. In addition, I have found the need for sufficient background information, such as prior use of urban space, to be a vital part of the research. Background information gives the researcher an idea of what the study area was like previously and provides a basis for comparison to judge how gentrified the area has become. This information combined with observations from the field helps give insight into the degree that gentrification has taken place in the Crossroads. By studying past use patterns, past redevelopment efforts, and comparing that to current usage, one may gauge the progression and evolution of the area.

For the purpose of this study, several methods have been utilized to produce an accurate picture of the Crossroads District and the gentrification efforts up until 2010. United States Census of Population and Housing data, obtained from the City of Kansas City, Missouri, will be utilized to show changing demographic trends within the district. The Census data covers the years 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010. The
analysis of this data cannot be done all at once; it must be conducted in steps, each building on the results of the previous calculations. First, a description and breakdown of the raw data or numbers will show the changing demographic trends of the Crossroads District. This overview of simple numeric change in Census numbers will quickly and dramatically reveal the rapid degree to which demographics are changing in this part of Kansas City. Demographic factors singled out and studied include age, education, income, and ethnic diversity. Of the vast amounts of data compiled for this study, a few key factors will be statistically examined to show the shift in the make up of the district’s population over the past 30 years. By utilizing a basic statistical analysis of these factors, I will endeavor to establish a correlation between these population characteristics. The desired results of this statistical analysis are significant correlation coefficients. The closer to “1” or “-1”, the stronger the correlation between the two indicators. For example, a high positive correlation between education level and income, the closer to “1” the better, will help to prove the point that educated people with disposable income are moving to the area. For this study, several correlation coefficients will be calculated. The formula to find these correlation coefficients utilizes several factors to finally come to a correlation value for the two sets of data being compared.
\[
Y_{xy} = \frac{\text{Cov}(x,y)}{\sigma_x \times \sigma_y}
\]

**Figure 3.1: Correlation Coefficient Formula** The above formula was used in the analysis of the Census Data. This formula is used to produce a linear correlation between two sets of numerical data.\(^1\)

To find the correlation coefficient first part of the formula, \(\text{Cov}(x,y)\), utilizes the covariance between data sets \(x\) and \(y\). This is then divided by the product resulting from multiplying the standard deviation of \(x\), and the standard deviation of \(y\). For this study, I first calculated the statistics by hand. To check my work I then created data set pairs in the computer program “Numbers” and utilizing the correlation coefficient function in the program re-ran the numbers to find the correlation coefficient values for each data set pair using log normal data.

Prior to calculating these correlation coefficients, several factors had to be be determined. These were the mean of each data set (both \(x\) and \(y\)), the variance, the standard deviation and the covariance. Correlation coefficients for race (black and white), age (20-44), education (bachelor’s degree or greater), and income (over $20,000) will be calculated. The results of these calculations should show there is a relationship between these factors that indicate a young, white, and relatively financially stable population is now inhabiting the area. These factors were selected because out of all the Census data, these specific groups showed the most significant numerical gains from decade to decade.

---

After the statistical analysis of the data is completed, a study meant to show the spread of blight in the area will be utilized. Using the intersection of 18th and Walnut as a center point, I will conduct a street-by-street count of buildings with blight. To be as accurate as possible, two separate counts of blight need to be done. First, a count going through the area in a north to south direction is made, then a count going east to west is completed. This bidirectional method of counting is important because while most buildings in the Crossroads have facades facing the street as you travel north to south, several also are oriented to face the street when one travels east to west. As depicted in the map earlier, the Crossroads District is quite large. As it is an area still in transition and is still being gentrified, not every part of it is in heavy use at the present. As a result, I decided to focus the blight study on an area I defined as the core of the Crossroads. This is the area where art galleries, restaurants, and living space are the most concentrated. This is also the part of the Crossroads where one of the first incidents of gentrification occurred when the Leedy Voulkos Art Center, opened in 1985 at 2012 Baltimore Avenue.²

The area surveyed for blight is almost a perfect square with the exception of the souther boundary, which contours along the rail lines. The northern border of the core area was set as Truman Road/Interstate 670. This route acts as a clear dividing line and it forms a barrier to the rest of downtown to the north. The southern border of the core consists of railroad lines that run just north of Union Station. This border of the core area is not a straight line, further emphasizing the irregular nature of the

layout of the Crossroads. The curvilinear tracks disrupt the grid system that characterizes other parts of Kansas City. The eastern boundary is Holmes Road and the western boundary is Wyandotte Street. These streets serve as boundaries and properties beyond them are not included in the blight survey. The block running from Baltimore Avenue to Wyandotte Street is the last block going west and the block from Cherry Street to Holmes Road is the final block going east.

The type of blight addressed in this study is dilapidated buildings and poorly maintained street level parking lots. I formed this criteria after initial walks through the area, and I noticed several recurring features in buildings and parking lots. Many of the buildings in the area have broken and/or boarded up windows, crumbling facades, and, in some cases, severe structural damage. Parking areas, mainly expansive surface-level parking lots, have barriers that are crumbling, large amounts of plant overgrowth and pavement dotted with pot holes, cracks, and uneven grades. This type of street-level unsightliness is prevalent throughout the Crossroads District so these indicators served well as criteria for blight. Buildings that exhibited these indicators were counted as a single incidence of blight, unsightly parking areas were counted the same way. After the two separate directional counts had been conducted, overall blight incident totals for each city block within the core area were assigned. For example, the block between Cherry Street and Locust Street had two incidents of blight in the north to south count. Traveling east to west, I found an additional four incidents of blight. The block as a whole had a total of six incidents of blight. I was careful in the counting process not to include buildings or parking lots twice. Several buildings and parking lots wrap around corners or are connected to
each other and parking areas sometimes cover a city block from street to street. To minimize the risk of counting an incident of blight twice, I made several notes on printed field maps and marked buildings that could potentially be counted twice. This simple notation drastically reduced the risk of a double count during the study.

The analysis of data and mapping of blight is only one part of the exploration of gentrification in the Crossroads District. To fully understand what all this data means, one must look at the policy governing the Crossroads district. The first method I decided to employ was the personal interview. These were to be conducted with two public figures who had a broad knowledge of the gentrification occurring in the district. These interviews proved vital in gaining a further understanding of the social and political forces behind the gentrification of the Crossroads. Initially, the plan was to conduct some 10 interviews with key persons. This plan of necessity changed later due to an inability to reach many of the interviewees even after repeated attempts to contact them. Two interviews were conducted and these interviews did provide valuable insight into what exactly is behind the gentrification effort. The first interview was with Dr. Paul Hilpman, a Professor Emeritus of Geoscience at the University of Missouri Kansas City and a significant social figure in the Crossroads neighborhood. The second interview was Mr. Al Figuly, Executive Director of the Greater Kansas City Foreign Trade Zone. These interviews shed further light on the trends that were evident in the analysis of United States Census data. The personal experiences of those involved in the gentrification effort lend credibility to the data and further emphasize the importance of social aspects in any
gentrification effort. They also opened up new areas that were important to research to better understand what exactly is occurring there.

One of these areas was how tax incentives have influenced the gentrification process. Much of what gets developed and how it will be developed is heavily influenced by tax policy, specifically the Kansas City Tax Increment Finance (TIF) program. As I found out in my interviews, this tax incentive program has been used to spur development in the Crossroads, but it also comes with many restrictions and exceptions that require developers to adhere to certain guidelines and methods of repayment once projects are completed. The idea of using TIFs is nothing new nor is it exclusively used in Kansas City. In fact they are common and are widely used at the state and local level as a means to finance public investment into projects like infrastructure for specific geographic areas. It should be noted that as with gentrification, TIF programs have several pros and cons. Johnson and Man explore these in their book *Tax Increment Financing and Economic Development: Uses, Structures, and Impact*. One of the positive aspects discussed is the use of TIFs to correct market failure; a con is the complexity and cost of TIF programs. These aspects of TIFs are present in the Crossroads TIFs explored later in this study. To build on what I learned in the interviews, I found online copies of three approved TIF plans that are centered in the Crossroads; the West 17th Street TIF, the 19th and Central TIF, and the Performing Arts District TIF. These three proposals cover large

---


sections of the Crossroads District and each has specific guidelines with regard as
to what is supposed to be funded and how repayment is to be scheduled. Each TIF
must be read and considered individually but it is also prudent to keep in mind that
although these are individual projects, they are part of a larger process that is
underway in the district.

With the combination of the US Census data analysis, the mapping of blight in
the Crossroads, personal interviews, and a close examination of the nature of TIF
incentives, I intend to show that gentrification, even in a small section of a city,
involves several steps and is a complex process. The goal is to use these methods
to show that there is an ongoing shift in the Crossroads that is targeting a more
affluent, young, Caucasian, and educated demographic. At the same time, a high
number of blighted buildings and parking lots remain. This situation provides tangible
evidence that the gentrification of this district is not yet completed and the effort to
combat this blight, both physical and social, is ongoing.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

A primary method of detecting the process of gentrification is through a visual analysis of the area. In the case of the Crossroads District, I decided to use a visual survey counting the incidents of blight within the district. Blight, for the purpose of this study, was defined as any building with a derelict facade, crumbling structure, and general lack of upkeep. Also included were neglected parking lots, of which overgrown weeds were a strong indicator, within the district. Buildings that were abandoned and or empty but not run down were not counted as incidents of blight and parking lots with signs of use and upkeep were also not included. Because there is no clear defining border for the Crossroads District, a core area of study was established in which to conduct the blight count. This area, centered at 18th Street and Grand Boulevard, is where a majority of the art galleries, restaurants, housing units, and entertainment attractions are located. Specific boundaries were, to the west, Wyandotte Street, to the east Holmes Road. The northern boundary was Truman Road/670 and the southern boundary was set as the rail lines just south of 22nd Street. As explained in the methods section, after the count was completed, the data were then used to produce a map so that I could determine what areas
within the district had the highest incidents of blight per block. I also wanted to
discover if there was a general trend in the location of blight.

Initially, I had expected the blight to be more heavily distributed to the east of
the study area or areas to the east of Grand Boulevard. This theory was based again
on my initial observations when I first walked through the Crossroads trying to
decide how to study the area. During the initial walk-through I noticed that as I
walked east, many more buildings were abandoned, parking lots were less
maintained, and all types of street traffic noticeably declined. As expected, the
highest numbers of blight per block were present in this area. Oak Street from 19th
to 18th had five incidents of blight. The adjacent block, Cherry Street from 19th to
18th, had eight incidents and Cherry Street from 18th to 17th had six incidents.
Other blocks close to these commonly had two to four incidents per block though
they were more scattered in nature and not as heavily concentrated as those
specifically named previously. Areas to the west of Grand Boulevard had fewer
blocks with high numbers of blight. One exception was the block between Main
Street and Walnut from 20th to 19th streets. This block had five incidents of blight
and was noticeably different from the other blocks in the immediate area. Other
blocks to the west of Grand sporadically exhibited one to two incidents of blight per
block while several blocks had zero incidents.

Although the highest concentrations of blight were in the eastern portion,
there was also noticeable blight in the central and western portions of the study
area. The pattern did change noticeably in the central and western portions,
becoming highly scattered. One incident of blight per block was common in these
areas but the scattered nature did not lead to clusters of blight as in the eastern section. The patterns of blight in the Crossroads seems to have no real common factor. Other than that, the focus of the gentrification is mainly west of Grand Boulevard.

The results of this count were input into ArcMap, a computer program for Geographic Information Systems, to create a block by block choropleth map showing the areas with the highest concentrations of blight in stark contrast to other parts of the defined study area. The shapefile that was used as the basis for this map was retrieved from the United States Census Bureau website under the Tiger/Line shapefile page. The finished blight count map can be seen at the end of this thesis in the map appendix.

The statistical analysis of the Crossroads District was based on United States Census data complied by the City of Kansas City, Missouri for the following decennial censuses: 1980, 1990, 2000, and 2010. Looking at the raw data I concluded that my initial hypothesis with regards to population is true. Younger, single, and overwhelmingly, Caucasian people are moving into the area. They bring with them higher incomes that ideally help to support some businesses in the district and keep the neighborhood moving forward in other ways. One example of this clear trend revealed by the raw data is the population changes over the decades. In 1980 the Caucasian population was a mere 170 people. The number had risen slightly to 205 by 1990, declined to 203 in 2000, but by 2010 had exploded to 1,175. Age is also a major factor when looking at the raw Census data. The median age of the population fluctuates over the decades from 36.7 in 1980, 29.7 in 1990, 37.4 in
2000, and 33.0 in 2010. This set of numbers may not be as clear an indication of the population change as are the ages by racial or ethnic group. The age group with the most notable change is that of the 25-34 year-olds. In 1980 there were a mere 53 official residents of the Crossroads in this age group, 128 in 1990, 92 in 2000, and 736 in 2010. Just as with the Caucasian population number, this age group fluctuated somewhat but grew significantly by 2010. Age numbers act the same for the two other significant groups, 20-24 and 35-44, but are not as markedly changed as these of the 25-34 year-old age group. The data for education levels of residents appears to vary almost the same way as age and population data overall. From the raw data it is clear that there is a growing trend for residents to attain a college degree of at least a bachelor’s level. In 1980 there were only four people with a bachelor’s degree living within the Crossroads. In 1990 the number had risen to 14, in 2000 to 19, but by 2010, 570 residents had at least a bachelor’s degree.

One of the few sets of data that does not follow the general trend of other data is the income data. Household income data is sparse at best and is truly consistent only in the 2010 Census. Two decades, 1980 and 2000, have gaps in the numbers where some income brackets are left blank and all of 1990 income brackets were left blank. The reason for this, according to Development Specialist for the City of Kansas City, Missouri, Mr. Steve Lebofsky, was that there were not enough permanent residents in the Crossroads in 1990 to collect sufficient income data.¹ These kinds of gaps in data gather compared to the sufficient data gathered in

¹ Lebofsky, Steve. “Census Data for UMKC Thesis” Email response to data question from Michael Schuckman. 11 September 2011.
2010 further underlines the point that people are moving into the area making it a much more viable part of the city than in past decades. The following pages contain bar graphs that show the relationships between the data sets and also reveal the rapid increases and fluctuations over time.

**Figure 4.1: Income vs. Education**

Source: Author.
Figure 4.2: Race (White) vs. Income
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Figure 4.3: Race (Black) vs. Income

Source: Author.
**Figure 4.4: Race (White) vs. Age**

Race (White) vs. Age (20-44)

Source: Author.

**Figure 4.5: Race (Black) vs. Age**

Race (Black) vs. Age (20-44)

Source: Author.
Figure 4.6: Race (White) vs. Education

Source: Author.

Figure 4.7: Race (Black) vs. Education

Source: Author.
Although the raw data seems to prove the point that young, white, educated people are moving into the area, further analysis is required to see if there is truly a correlation between the various sets of data. Such statistical analysis will show if there is a stronger correlation between certain sets of data than others with reference to certain groups. To demonstrate the correlation between two variables I used the standard correlation coefficient formula in the computer program “Numbers.”

The same sets used in the production of the charts above was also employed in this process. The closer the results of this comparison were to the number one, the more closely related the two sets are in a positive way and the stronger the correlation. A strong correlation exist between data sets supporting my hypothesis that young, educated, Caucasian individuals with moderate incomes are the largest contingent moving to the Crossroads. The following results are from the several calculations completed. For several of the data sets, specific parameters were established to narrow the scope of the calculations. The goal was to help zero in on the specific data that were most relevant to this study. For the ages of the residents, only age groups from 20-44 were used for calculations due to the marked changes in this range. For income, only incomes greater than $20,000 were used. Race was divided into two categories because there were two groups with sizable increases throughout the data collection time period, Caucasians and African Americans. Education was evaluated by the number of residents with a bachelors degree or higher. This factor was the most difficult to limit simply because there are so many different levels of education residents could have attained. The limitation of a
A bachelors degree or higher was utilized because this category showed the most significant change over the course of the different Censuses reviewed for this project. The results of the calculations can be seen in the following tables.

### Table 4.1: Income vs. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual Annual Income &gt; $20,000</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Income)</th>
<th>Individuals with Bachelor’s or higher</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>1.3424</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0.7782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>0.3010</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>1.2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>1.3010</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>1.3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>753*</td>
<td>2.8768</td>
<td>572*</td>
<td>2.7574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient = 0.8158

* A constant of 2 has been added to the raw figures to avoid results of infinity or zero in the log transformations.  Source: Author.
### Table 4.2: Race (White) vs. Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race (White)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (White)</th>
<th>Income (&gt;$20,000)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>172*</td>
<td>2.2355</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>1.3424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>207*</td>
<td>2.3159</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>0.3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>205*</td>
<td>2.3117</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>1.3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1177*</td>
<td>3.0708</td>
<td>753*</td>
<td>2.8768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient = 0.8633

*A constant of 2 has been added to the raw figures to avoid results of infinity or zero in the log transformations. Source: Author.

### Table 4.3: Race (Black) vs. Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race (Black)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Black)</th>
<th>Income (&gt;$20,000)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Income)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>1.9030</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>1.3424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>161*</td>
<td>2.2068</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>0.3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>198*</td>
<td>2.2967</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>1.3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>233*</td>
<td>2.3674</td>
<td>753*</td>
<td>2.8767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient = 0.3814

*A constant of 2 has been added to the raw figures to avoid results of infinity or zero in the log transformations. Source: Author.
Table 4.4: Race (White) vs. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race (White)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (White)</th>
<th>Age (20-44)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>172*</td>
<td>2.2355</td>
<td>123*</td>
<td>2.0899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>207*</td>
<td>2.3160</td>
<td>241*</td>
<td>2.3820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>205*</td>
<td>2.3118</td>
<td>290*</td>
<td>2.4624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1177*</td>
<td>3.0708</td>
<td>1119*</td>
<td>3.0488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient= 0.9495

* A constant of 2 has been added to the raw figures to avoid results of infinity or zero in the log transformations. Source: Author.

Table 4.5: Race (Black) vs. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race (Black)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Black)</th>
<th>Age(20-44)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Age)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>1.9031</td>
<td>123*</td>
<td>2.0899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>161*</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>241*</td>
<td>2.3820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>198*</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>290*</td>
<td>2.4624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>233*</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>1119*</td>
<td>3.0488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient= 0.8481

* A constant of 2 has been added to the raw figures to avoid results of infinity or zero in the log transformations. Source: Author.
Table 4.6: Race (White) vs. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race (White)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (White)</th>
<th>Education (Bachelor’s or &gt;)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>172*</td>
<td>2.355</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0.7782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>207*</td>
<td>2.3160</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>1.2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>203*</td>
<td>2.3118</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>1.3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1177*</td>
<td>3.0708</td>
<td>572*</td>
<td>2.7574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient = 0.9829

* A constant of 2 has been added to the raw figures to avoid results of infinity or zero in the log transformations. Source: Author.

Table 4.7: Race (Black) vs. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Race (Black)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Black)</th>
<th>Education (Bachelor’s or &gt;)</th>
<th>Log Normal Value (Education)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>80*</td>
<td>1.9031</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0.7782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>161*</td>
<td>2.2068</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>0.3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>198*</td>
<td>2.2967</td>
<td>21*</td>
<td>1.3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>233*</td>
<td>2.3674</td>
<td>572*</td>
<td>2.8768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation Coefficient = 0.7694

* A constant of 2 has been added to the raw figures to avoid results of infinity or zero in the log transformations. Source: Author.
The reason for the normalization of the raw data was that they were very skewed by the large numbers from the 2010 Census. To solve the skewed problem and to normalize the data set pairs I added a value of two to each raw data number. Then, using a base of 10 in a logarithm calculator, I calculated the log normal value for each number. The resulting logs of each number were then used to calculate Pearson correlation coefficients. The resulting correlation coefficients supported the general trends indicated by the raw data.

The data clearly shows a strong trend towards younger, Caucasian, college-educated individuals with significant income. In each comparison, data relating to Caucasians showed much more significant trends toward a growing white population in the Crossroads due to the more significant correlations. African Americans also show signs of following the same trend, but this data suggests the relationship is not as strong for this group but also not insignificant. This should not suggest that there is no positive trend for the African American population as it is significantly stronger than any for other minorities combined. These trends identified by analyzing the data seem to contradict my findings in the blight map created for this project. With such significant increases in population, income levels, and education, it could be assumed that blight in such an area would be much more scarce. It may be that although there is significant growth of population and gentrification occurring in this part of the city there remain various blocks where rehabilitation of the physical

---

infrastructure have yet to occur or are, at best, unfinished. The increasing young populations and accompanying income, educations levels have affected parts of the area, mostly in western sections, but have not yet affected the Crossroads area as a whole.

It should be briefly noted that while there seems to be a huge population increase in the Crossroads, specifically in the last 10 years, the Census data covers only those who actually live in the area. Many people who are involved with the area do not live there but still bring something to the area. The Census data, however, is not divided into categories of who does what so it is difficult to decipher how many residents are artists, and how many belong to the young, educated, Caucasian population who continue to move to the area. Many people involved in the Crossroads do not live there and some who live there may not actually work there. When interpreting results from the statistical analysis, these results should only be used to identify general trends in the area, not predict exact numbers of total growth or the total significance of changes occurring.

One indication of the ongoing gentrification process is the Tax Increment Finance (TIF) program managed by the Economic Development Corporation (EDC) of Kansas City. This program, although not always embraced by all, seems to be having a drastic impact on the Crossroads gentrification process. According to the EDC’s own policies posted for public viewing its website, each TIF program is carefully planned, monitored, and executed. The purpose, according to the EDC, is to serve as a “financing and redevelopment tool that allows future real property taxes and other taxes generated by new development to pay for costs of construction of
This statement is not to say that all proposed projects are or will be sponsored by this program in the future. Only select initiatives are managed and financed in this way. There are five major requirements the project must meet in order to qualify for a TIF plan. First, “projects using TIF must have plans approved by both the TIF Commission and the Kansas City, Missouri City Council,” second, “TIF can only be used for redevelopment projects that would not be reasonably expected to occur without the assistance of TIF,” third, “the redevelopment area must be determined by the city or county to be either a blighted area, conservation area, or economic development area as defined by the TIF Act,” fourth, “the redevelopment plan must conform with the general development plans of the City of Kansas City, Missouri,” and finally, “a cost benefit analysis must be completed and show that the economic benefits flowing to the City and other taxing districts as a result of the TIF plan are greater than the costs.”

In the Crossroads District, which has its own section of TIF plans on the EDC website, there are three TIFs which have directly contributed to the gentrification of the area: the 19th and Central TIF approved in 1999, the Performing Arts District TIF approved in 2003, and the West 17th Street TIF approved in 2008. It should be noted that each of these TIFs, although having a tangible impact on the overall gentrification effort, is on the western side of the Crossroads. This may be a contributing factor to the relatively significant blight seen on the blight map in the eastern portions of the

---

area. A possible reason for this trend may have to do with the fact that the first art
gallery in the area, the Leedy Voulkos Art Center established in 1985, was opened in
a building on Baltimore Avenue, in the western portion of the Crossroads.\(^5\) Perhaps
future TIFs will be centered further east and help to better deal with the existing
blight problem but for now, the western half of the Crossroads is the main
beneficiary.

The plan for the oldest of these three TIFs, the 19th and Central TIF, calls for the “rehabilitation of a large number of buildings in the redevelopment area. The Plan will foster an urban live-work environment by developing office, studio, retail, and residential units. The Plan will strengthen the district of creative arts-related businesses in the area.”\(^6\) Two things stand out in this plan from 1999. The fact that both studio space and creative arts-related businesses are mentioned helps to reinforce the original concept of the area as a space for artists to work and thrive.

The officials of the EDC and the City of Kansas City clearly had artists in mind when writing this plan. This TIF also coincides with the timeline of the Census data because almost all the data, across the spectrum, begin to shift significantly in the 2000 Census, only a short time after the 19th and Central TIF was approved. In an interview conducted on October 28, 2010 with Dr. Paul Hilpman, a Professor Emeritus at the University of Missouri-Kansas City and an advocate for the Crossroads, he, too, stressed the importance of the artists within the Crossroads as

---

\(^5\) Leedy Voulkos Art Center, 2012.

redevelopment progressed. When asked what he thought of the gentrification of the Crossroads, Hilpman responded that even though the artists had begun the process, rising property values are forcing artists out of the area today.\(^7\) From Hilpman’s statements on the importance of the artists to the district, it seems that this gentrification effort is anything but typical. Artists did start the process, according to Hilpman, because of low rent and ample space in what was mostly abandoned buildings and storage warehouses.\(^8\) The focus now, in Hilpman’s opinion, has to be on the preservation of the “sense of community” established by these pioneering artists.\(^9\) Without any effort to keep the artist in this location to keep rent at a reasonable rate, and to preserve this community, the Crossroads might well become just another case of gentrification run rampant with the ever looming problem of displacement. In the article “A City Without Slums: Urban Renewal, Public Housing, and Downtown Revitalization in Kansas City, Missouri”, Kevin Gotham explores the problem of displacement through past revitalization efforts. The author stresses that in these past revitalization efforts the displacement of the urban poor has not been dealt with in Kansas City.\(^10\) TIFs like the 19th and Central TIF have the same problem as they do not deal with the problem of displacement after the

\(^7\) Hilpman, Paul, Interview to discuss the Crossroads Art District Gentrification, October 10, 2010.

\(^8\) Hilpman Interview, 2010.

\(^9\) Hilpman Interview 2010.

redevelopment has taken place. A picture of the 19th and Central redevelopment as it appears today, can be found in the picture appendix as Example D.

The Performing Arts District TIF, a plan that is massively more expensive to implement than the other two TIF plans in the Crossroads, was very much intended to draw the attention of Kansas City residents to the Crossroads. This plan consists of many stages and various projects, as it seems most TIFs do. The overall plan called for “the expansion and redevelopment of the existing H.Roe Bartle Hall Convention Center, the design and construction of the Performing Arts Center, the design and construction of public improvements, and the design and construction of a premiere office complex suitable for a national corporate headquarters.” This plan was lofty from the outset and has indeed drawn attention to the Crossroads, especially with the grand opening of the Kauffman Center for the Performing Arts in September of 2011. The plan put forth by the EDC and the City of Kansas City, projected an estimated cost of $432.35 million for the project. This huge cost brought to mind the question of, do TIFs pay for the entirety of a project such as this? I received my answer during an interview on February 25, 2011 with Mr. Al Figuly, who serves as the president and CEO of the Greater Kansas City Foreign Trade Zone, Executive Director Planned Industrial Expansion Authority, and Executive Director of the Industrial Expansion Authority. The short answer is that TIFs do not generally pay for the entirety of a project. Mr. Figuly explained that TIFs work as a “redirection

of tax to service debt.” Additionally, the plan itself only called for $7.35 million of the project to be covered by the TIF. Although this is not even close to total amount for the project, every bit does help to foster redevelopment. In the case of gentrification this is especially true because a project that never gets past the planning stage does not help anyone. A bond is specified in the plan to pay for much of the rest of the cost of the project. This cooperation of different funding sources working together for the greater good is a step in the right direction. As Mr. Figuly stressed in my interview with him, the balance of the Crossroads is “delicate” and should not be disrupted. I took this to mean that each of the TIF plans put forth and approved must go through a rigorous review process so that the resulting project(s) will not drastically disrupt or alter the nature of the Crossroads. This careful consideration and sense of balance can be applied to the funding of a huge project such as the Performing Arts District. Without a balance, in this case consideration of the need for continued progress and the preservation of the current social climate of the area, and cooperation of various organizations and individuals, gentrification could possibly slow down, be stalled, or even stop completely. Pictures of the Performing Arts District improvements can be seen in the picture appendix as Example E.

The third and most recent TIF approved, the West 17th Street TIF, reinforces the idea that major redevelopment efforts in the Crossroads are centered on the western side of the district. This effort is the only one of the three TIFs discussed

---

12 Figuly, Al. Personal Interview to Discuss the Crossroads Art District Gentrification and TIF plans, February 25, 2011.


14 Figuly Interview, 2011.
here that makes a special point that it is being proposed to eliminate blight. The plan calls for “a comprehensive redevelopment program to eliminate the blighting conditions currently burdening the Redevelopment Area, including but not limited to the creation of six (6) redevelopment areas within the West 17th area.” The special emphasis placed on the elimination of blight is key here because the buildings in this part of the Crossroads are old and had over time become run down. As discussed earlier, this area was the location of the Film District for Kansas City in the early part of the 20th Century. Eventually this area, like much of the Crossroads, seems to have become lost and detached from its original purpose and, without proper care, buildings fell into decline. Again, the TIF plan makes note that due to the historic nature of the area, more than simple redevelopment is needed for this part of the district. The plan calls for “preservation, rehabilitation, or redevelopment” of several areas within the West 17th Street area. Neither the Performing Arts District TIF nor the 19th and Central TIF specifically mentioned preservation. The initial plan, approved in 2008, is very limited, however, on what exactly it will do. The plan lists several project areas, Projects A-F, each representing an address and separate project to be developed. After the project list the plan then singles out “Project C” as the only one actually being considered for immediate approval. Upon its completion, “Project C” or the redevelopment of the Vitagraph Building, will use money generated from this TIF to be reinvested in the surrounding area and other projects

in the plan. The plan also lists “Project F” also known as the Webster House, as a “passive TIF.” Local tax revenues from this property, which had already been redeveloped, would be used to help fund the overall West 17th TIF, but this property itself would receive no benefit from it.\textsuperscript{16} The rest of the projects proposed (A, B, D, and E) are listed to be brought forward for approval either individually or as a group as necessary due to their impact as small scale retail and/or commercial locations.\textsuperscript{17} The wording and set up of this TIF plan in particular, sheds light on the complexity of each plan and shows there is no set rubric for the development of a TIF or gentrification, for that matter. Each case must be considered individually so as to best suit the needs of the immediate area it is meant to serve pending approval, financing, and construction. A picture of one of the completed portions of the West 17th Street TIF can be found in the picture appendix as Example F.

\textsuperscript{16} West 17th Street Tax Increment Finance Plan, 2012.

\textsuperscript{17} West 17th Street Tax Increment Finance Plan, 2012.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

The process of gentrification is clearly underway in the Crossroads District. The evidence for this claim is in the data presented in this study. The Census data collected over the past several decades shows steady and increasingly significant growth, particularly in the younger, white, well-educated population. This level of population growth, however, brings to the forefront the questions of whether this area can sustain the growth, is such growth welcome, especially by the art community, and how will it be managed in the future? To get an accurate picture of continuing growth, researchers will most likely have to wait until after the next U.S. Census for 2020 is completed to gauge if the trend is continuing.

With the amount of growth recorded, it is almost a contradiction that so much blight continues to exist in the district. As seen on the blight map, high concentrations of this problem still exist and in some cases are extremely severe as seen in the picture appendix, Example G. From the general lack of upkeep in this eastern portion of the Crossroads it would appear that the gentrification is highly localized even within this small portion of the city. On the day I took the pictures for Example G, there were no people walking on the sidewalks (what sidewalks there were), and there were very few cars being driven in this area along Oak Street. The
buildings in the pictures were completely abandoned and it is not clear why one of them had scaffolding on it. It is possible the scaffolding was left there when a rehabilitation effort for the building began, but because it had rust covering most of it I can only assume this effort was abandoned some time ago. I do not see how any gentrification effort can be successful if street scenes like this still exist. Personally I did not feel safe being in this area mostly because of its general appearance. Buildings looked as if they could collapse at any moment, and the lack of any noticeable population made the feeling more ominous. The appearance gave me the impression that I was in a ghetto. Lance Freeman in his book There Goes the ‘Hood: Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up, makes an important and unique observation. He notes that “indigenous residents do not necessarily react to gentrification according to some of the preconceived notions generally attributed to residents of these neighborhoods.”

This mind set should be considered by those behind efforts to redevelop the Crossroads. Just blocks away to the west of the crumbling buildings and infrastructure seen in Example G are art galleries and restaurants I frequently go to and never once have I felt unsafe at these locations. This type of inequality in redevelopment could lead to disdain for gentrification, specifically for those on the east side of the Crossroads who seem to have been mostly left out of the recent growth. More attention must be paid to the gentrification effort for the district as a whole, rather than just simply focusing on the western side.

To encourage this type of movement and redevelopment to the east, it seems logical to propose a TIF for the eastern section. As seen in the explanation of the three Crossroads’ TIFs previously considered, these plans can be complicated and must pass a rigorous review to even be considered for approval. There must also be a solid plan in place for what the buildings will be used for and the cost for each project. The reason for the lack of TIFs on the east side of the Crossroads may be that there is simply no plan as of yet for what to do with the buildings or land there. It is possible that there may be an over saturation of the art market if more galleries, shops, and restaurants open, which would in turn hurt the businesses open already. Considerations for what is best for all must be made if the area is to remain vibrant. If this is done correctly there seems to be no real reason why the east side of the Crossroads cannot be developed as successfully as the western half has been.

It should be noted as well that the TIF program, although generally successful, did create some problems within the Crossroads. The developments begun by the TIF proposals seem to have been a contributing factor in the rising property values and rents for those living and working in the district. Artists and those supporting the art community do not have the same income base as those who moved to the area after gentrification began. To counter the rising rents and property values, the Planned Industrial Expansion Authority of Kansas City created the Crossroads Arts PIEA. This program, begun in 2006, allows qualifying participants to receive a tax abatement of 100 per cent on tax increases for 10
years.² There is a PILOT (Payment in lieu of taxes) tax to participating properties.³

To qualify for this special tax abatement program, tenants had to meet certain criteria that associated them with the arts community such as offering gallery space, studio space, or being a part of the arts community directly.⁴ Today this program seems to have helped preserve the arts community in the district as it continues to thrive. This program also seems to have significantly slowed the often seen but rarely dealt with problem of displacement as a result of continued gentrification as evident by the numerous artists living and or working in the Crossroads still.

Art is more and more becoming a vehicle for rehabilitation of neighborhoods. In this area, the Crossroads can build on what is already established. Stuart Cameron and Jon Coaffee in their article, “Art, Gentrification and Regeneration-From Artists as Pioneer to Public Arts” propose that a third “key model of gentrification” can be utilized, that of public policy.⁵ It could be the case that the Crossroads is approaching this threshold of public policy becoming the main drive behind continued gentrification efforts. Public policy has already had a huge effect on the area as evidence by the implementation of the TIF plans discussed previously. In this case, however, the authors see the trend becoming less that revenue follows artists and artist are the main drivers of economic and gentrifying activity, but rather publicly commissioned art takes over and public policy drives the redevelopment.

² Figuly, Al. Second Personal Interview to discuss the Crossroads Arts PIEA, April 19, 2012.
³ Figuly Interview, April 19, 2012.
⁴ Figuly Interview, April 19,2012.
They call this “positive” gentrification.\textsuperscript{6} It is hard to say whether the Crossroads would benefit from a fully public-policy-driven gentrification effort. The seemingly organic nature of the redevelopment that has taken place already gives the area a unique feeling apart from many other neighborhoods in Kansas City. It is hard to deny however the positive results from public policy already in place as evidence by the vast amounts of space opened up for businesses and artists to use as a result of TIF programs.

The Crossroads seems to be a series of contradictions when it comes to gentrification. It is clear that since 1980, demographic trends have been revitalizing the district, slowly at first, then with greater speed in the past 10 years. What was first begun by artists is now being driven by a young, white, educated, and financially well off population and less by the pioneering artists. The push now, even though the area continues to grow and experience success, seems to be to reclaim space for artists to live and work. It has been well documented that in recent years property values continue to rise making it difficult for artists to survive in the Crossroads. \textit{The Kansas City Star} made note of this problem in 2006 saying that property values west of Main St. had begun to rise resulting in a migration of artists to the eastern portions of the Crossroads.\textsuperscript{7} Another article, from 2007, cites the discrepancy between what the community wants and what developers want. In this case the community sees a vacant lot between Ft. Scott Ave. and Wyandotte at W. 21 St. as the perfect place for an arts park; developers see it as a perfect location for

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{6} Cameron and Coaffee, p.40.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
condominiums. Disputes over what to do with vacant areas like the one mentioned in this article have proven to benefit no one because even as of 2012, the lot remains vacant. Fractured and sporadic gentrification, like that seen in the Crossroads, has been observed elsewhere. Again, the instigators of such gentrification were artists; in this case artists had begun to settle in the Bronx of New York. A quote by artist Linda Cunningham, who lives and works in the Bronx, sheds light on her reasoning behind settling in the Bronx; “I was driven out by escalating rents everywhere.”

One area comparable to the Crossroads, although at a much larger scale, is that of SoHo in New York City. In his book *The Unanticipated City* James Hudson explores the impact artists had on SoHo and how the community developed. The attitude of the artists is summed up very concisely by the following quote:

SoHo was not simply a place with cheap, large spaces that could be converted into artists’ studios at minimal expense. SoHo was a blue-collar manufacturing area; an industrial section of the city....This was a place where hard work was done and respected. Artistic production requires intensive labor and there was a recognition by the blue-collar workers that artists did work hard.

---


10 Matthews, p.1.

11 Hudson, James R. *The Unanticipated City; Loft Conversions in Lower Manhattan*, Amherst, MA. The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987, p.49.
The idea that the Crossroads should be artists only, however, does create less of a community atmosphere and more of a visitors-only-policy feeling. Mass numbers of visitors stream into the Crossroads every month for the openings of gallery shows on the first Friday of the month, but very rarely is the area exceedingly busy outside of these specific nights. Most days, it seems to be automobile traffic passing through and the sidewalks are largely devoid of any significant number of people. Personally, during most of the First Friday events that I attend, I feel as though I am a tourist treading on the turf of the artists. Although I am welcome to spend my money on the art and visit, lingering does not seem to be encouraged. More and more, the push to bring back low-cost areas for artists to work and live reinforces this feeling. Advocates for the Crossroads must be careful as the redevelopment continues so that trends do not shift too heavily to an artists only agenda. Similarly, developers should have respect for the artists living and working in the area and be cautious when planning and implementing projects so as not to drive artists away from the area. Cooperation between all parties involved is called for in this case.

With regard to policy, again, there seems to be an ongoing focus on investing effort and money only in the western side of the area while leaving the eastern side to, at times, literally fall apart. An inclusive approach is needed that benefits the area as a whole and creates a sense of community across the board. Infrastructure should not be repaired and safe in one area and then three blocks away, the sidewalk is so decayed it is almost non-existent.
Although there are harsh criticisms to be made of the gentrification of the Crossroads it does have several bright spots where success is evident. Simply by looking at Census data, it is clear there is a significant and growing interest in the area over the past several decades. People are living in the area, working, and visiting businesses. Buildings that would have otherwise most likely been left vacant and decaying have been restored and are now viable businesses, studios, and performance spaces. The area has also done a good job of marketing itself to the rest of the city as the arts destination for Kansas City. It is now popular for its galleries and special events and still retains a very rustic charm, making it even more unique and unlike other gentrified locations that seem very robotic and tightly controlled. This is not the case for the Crossroads as the gentrification seems to come about not all at once, but more on a case by case basis. Projects develop as needed and are continuing to grow and change, albeit at a slow pace, to suit the needs of artists and the city overall.
Let us remember the wasps
That hibernated in the walls
Of the house next door. Its walls
Bulged with twenty pounds of wasps

And nest, twenty pounds of black
Knots and buzzing fists. We slept
Unaware that the wasps slept
So near us. We slept in black

Comfort, wrapped in our cocoons,
While death’s familiars swarmed
Unto themselves, but could have swarmed
Unto us. Do not trust cocoons.

That’s the lesson of this poem.
Or this: Luck is beautiful.
So let us praise our beautiful
White neighbor. Let us write poems

For she who found that wasp nest
While remodeling the wreck.

But let us remember that wreck
Was, for five decades, the nest

For a black man and his father.

Both men were sick and neglected,
So they knew how to neglect.

But kind death stopped for the father
And cruelly left behind the son,
Whose siblings quickly sold the house
Because it was only a house.

For months, that drunk and displaced son

Appeared on our street like a ghost.

Distraught, he sat in his car and wept
Because nobody else had wept

Enough for his father, whose ghost

Took the form of ten thousand wasps.

That’s the lesson of this poem:

Grief is as dangerous and unpredictable

As a twenty-pound nest of wasps.

Or this: Houses are not haunted

By the dead. So let us pray

For the living. Let us pray

For the wasps and sons who haunt us.  

---

Example A: This building, located at 19th Terrace and Wyandotte, shows the fading sign along the top of the building. Fading markings like this dot numerous buildings in the Crossroads and reveal more clues as to what this area's original purpose was. Source: Author.
Example B: This stretch of abandoned railroad track runs through the Crossroads just west of the intersection at 20th St. and Grand Ave. Tracks like this one no longer in use are a reminder that the area was once mainly industrial and served as a shipping depot designed to move goods, not to accommodate people. Source: Author.
Example C: These buildings reside in what is known as the Old Film Row District within the Crossroads. Today, these buildings serve various purposes including studio space and multipurpose space as is the case with the Coal Bin, a small venue operated by Dr. Paul Hilpman and his wife, Carol, to help promote the Crossroads. Source: Author.
Example D: Streetscapes like this one along Wyandotte St. between 18th and 17th St. are good examples of the effort being made through the use of TIFs to improve the aesthetic of the Crossroads. Improvements in lighting, street paving, and sidewalk construction are just a few of the noticeable upgrades. Source: Author.
Example E: The centerpiece of the Performing Arts District TIF is the Kauffman Center for the Performing Arts (a), which is located just south of 16th St. along Broadway. This venue opened in the Fall of 2011 and has drawn significant attention to the Crossroads as an arts destination. Another addition in the vicinity of the Kauffman Center is a green community garden. This raised bed garden (b), located to the south of the Kauffman center along Broadway, promotes green technology and adds modern urban style to the area in a functional way. Source: Author.
Example F: This street scene, along Wyandotte St., reveals numerous infrastructure improvements that helped to beautify the area. Although the improved streetscape is one of the first things visitors may notice, numerous buildings are now occupied including the building at the corner of 17th and Wyandotte, which is occupied by the Kansas City Symphony. Source: Author.
Example G: This streetscape (a), looking south along Locust St. between 18th and 19th, shows the drastic difference in appearance between areas to the west as compared to areas like this in the east of the Crossroads. The building pictured (b) shows that improvements were possibly begun but abandoned and the scaffolding left to deteriorate around the building. The sign outside this building (c) further underlines the unsafe nature of the structure. Source: Author.
All pictures in this appendix were taken by the author in 2011 and early 2012 - in the Crossroads Arts District of Kansas City, Missouri.
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