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Foreword:  
Parading on Empty Streets: The Lost Landscape of the Cradle of Jazz

On Liberty, Perdido, Franklin and Poydras there were honky-tonks at every corner and in each one of them musical instruments of every kind were played. At the corner of the street where I lived was the famous Funky Butt Hall, where I first heard Buddy Bolden play. He was blowing up a storm. That neighborhood certainly had a lot to offer. (Louis Armstrong 1951, p. 22 and 23)

But the site of this parade- the cold, empty streets of the Central Business District- betrayed [the mayor's] claim to street level authenticity. Those streets flanked by glass and steel skyscrapers- which are the mayor's corridors of power and, arguably, his real constituency- yielded up no followers who would join into the parade. (Regis 1999, p. 496)

On a hot evening in August of 2001, a group of participants in the Louis Armstrong Centennial Conference gathered to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Armstrong’s birth with a tour of the jazz master’s old neighborhood in the central business district of New Orleans. Many in the crowd of more than forty people had undoubtedly read about this neighborhood in Armstrong’s autobiography *Satchmo*. In Armstrong’s eloquent, almost lyrical prose style, tales of the grinding poverty and violence of the neighborhood are counter-posed with street scenes of ecstatic musical transcendence. Armstrong describes a world of street parades, honky-tonks, and church choirs filling the streets with music. A diverse set of characters from prostitutes to church people to judges to jazz musicians populate Armstrong’s portrait of his neighborhood. Armstrong’s recollections provide an important description of what turned out to be the first landscape of jazz.¹
On this afternoon, the neighborhood that helped send Armstrong off into the world with the rich musical heritage of jazz was deserted. A sea of empty parking lots surrounded the last few nineteenth-century buildings. Only a few blocks away, the Superdome and business towers vaulted into the sky, protected from the low-income neighborhoods to the north by the elevated wall of Interstate-10. The only sign that jazz had sprung from this area was a mural of a clarinet painted on the side of the high-rise Holiday Inn, the self-proclaimed “jazziest hotel in New Orleans.”

During the 20th century, the Perdido Street neighborhood was transformed from an area “that had a lot to offer” for Louis Armstrong to a corridor of power and parking lots that “yielded up no followers who would join the parade” (Regis 1999, p. 496) for the 1998 inaugural of then-Mayor Marc Morial. The question of how the vibrant, flawed neighborhood of Armstrong’s childhood became a forgotten parking district of a modern central business district is the subject of this work.

Two basic angles are taken to address this question. First, addressing this question requires both a cultural and morphological understanding of change in this neighborhood. This work seeks to address landscape change as the interface of cultural and morphological change. To accomplish this, this work examines the changes in the built environment that transformed the landscape of jazz, with its densely packed, diverse mix of dwellings, honky-tonks, stores, and governmental uses, into a lost landscape of surface parking, abandoned buildings, and specialized high-rise uses. Through the use of detailed records of land use change found in planning and insurance documents, augmented by a time-series of aerial and ground photographs, both the chronology of change as well as the specific physical changes of the area are
documented. This physical portrait is expanded to include the voice of early jazz found in the descriptions of the area by both jazz scholars and the musicians themselves.

Second, this descriptive approach is broadened through an analysis of the political economy of landscape change in the New Orleans central business district. The transformation of Armstrong’s neighborhood into a part of the central business district was affected by a series of urban planning documents created by the political and business elites of the city. Each of these plans sought to make major changes to the essential morphological structure of the city to enhance the power and prestige of the downtown core. The methods used for achieving their goal of creating a solid central business district mirrored the nationwide currents of modernist planning thought. While New Orleans lacked legislative authority to enact “urban renewal” practices until 1968, the modernist philosophy of these practices was at work in the city well before this date. Major street widening and Interstate building projects cleared out low-income residents in linear swaths while the core of Armstrong’s old neighborhood was cleared for a new Civic Center complex. The result of these major changes was de jure urban renewal².

**Structure of Dissertation**

This dissertation is broken up into three main parts. First, a literature review section provides an overview of the important concepts and methodologies employed in this work. Chapter one explores the meaning and use of public space in the contemporary city. A near universal complaint about the quality of contemporary public space is the problem of lost space or units of poorly designed and used spaces. Chapter one explores how urban design scholars and historians have explained the growth of these areas. Chapter two concludes the literature review section. This chapter articulates the
methodology to be used in tracking land use change in this work. The techniques of the urban morphologic approach are explored and articulated in this chapter.

In the second section, the intersection of morphological and cultural change in New Orleans is explored. Chapter three presents the results of an urban design analysis of the contemporary central business district of New Orleans. This analysis utilizes lost space indicators to track the extent of poor urban design in the CBD. To provide a strong footing for in depth discussions of morphological change in New Orleans, chapter four looks at the historic morphology of New Orleans from its founding through 1900 with a special emphasis on the cultural roots of the city. Chapter five presents a morphological and social portrait of the early twentieth century Perdido Street area that Louis Armstrong called home. This area formed the backbone of the landscape of the cradle of jazz, the place from which jazz was incubated. Chapter six looks at how this amazing place was gradually altered from the 1920s to 1937 through an examination of Sanborn and photographic evidence. Chapter seven utilizes government and photographic evidence to articulate the important morphological changes that occurred in the city during its high modernist transformation from 1947 to 1974. While complete Sanborn records do not exist for this period, the detailed planning record provides ample evidence of the dramatic changes that altered the area socially and morphologically.

The dissertation concludes with two chapters that explore the issue of appropriate landscape management. Chapter eight explores the concepts of modernism as articulated by Marshall Berman. Berman's intricate discussion of the tension between the modern imperatives of change and the desire to preserve is applied to landscape
changes that have been identified in Louis Armstrong’s old neighborhood. In this chapter Armstrong, who lived in the neighborhood, and Robert Moses, whose plans helped alter it, conceptually meet on Perdido Street. Their meeting tells us a great deal about the importance of historic landscapes and the people who make these places home. The final chapter provides an examination of the current efforts in New Orleans to revitalize the jazz district around the Perdido Street area. This concluding chapter explores the possibilities of utilizing design review as a mechanism to positively manage the unique landscape of the Perdido Street area.

In addition, a technical appendix is presented to help define the specific techniques that were utilized in the construction of the historic morphological model of New Orleans. The techniques utilized in this dissertation proved to provide an excellent framework for exploring historic city change at the micro-level. It is hoped that a detailed articulation of these techniques will help others to begin their own explorations of the intricate changing city.

1 The phrase “the first landscape of jazz” is meant to specify the general location of the beginning of the jazz, i.e. the neighborhoods of New Orleans. The use of this phrase is not to enter the debate over the exact origin of jazz. I leave this to jazz scholars. Rather, the goal is to delve into a broader discussion of the cultural, economic, and land use components that comprised the landscape of jazz.

2 Traditional analysis of landscape change in New Orleans has focused on the important resilience of New Orleans neighborhoods because of the lack of urban renewal power to affect widespread change (Lauria, Whelan, and Young 1994). While this type of analysis is certainly accurate for a city-wide analysis of landscape change in New Orleans, it could be seen as minimizing the destructive importance of other large-scale government redevelopment projects that were carried out in New Orleans. The linear insertion of Interstate highways, other street widening programs, and insertion of large government building complexes into the heart of downtown New Orleans helped to create a downtown landscape that matches that of cities that suffered the full force of the destructive power of urban renewal. While New Orleans did not have de rigueur urban renewal until 1968, the power of the modernist philosophy was made manifest in the de jure urban renewal of other large-scale local, state, and federal projects.

3 The Sanborn Company created fire insurance records for cities around the country. These records provide incredibly detailed portraits of land use for multiple time points. They are, thus, excellent resources for tracking micro-scale changes in the landscape over time. Vernez-Moudon (1986) provides an excellent description of the technical applications of using Sanborn records for urban research in her book *Built for Change.*
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Abstract

While Jane Jacobs’ frontal assault on “modern planning” is now over forty years old, communities around the United States are still struggling to deal with the legacy of modernist interventions that dramatically altered the historic urban form and culture of their downtowns. In the worst cases, whole zones were transformed into nearly unusable space. Reintegrating these lost spaces into the urban fabric is one of the most significant challenges of urban planners and designers today.

Despite the ubiquity of lost spaces in American cities, comparatively little research has been done on the specific historic urban forms that were altered. This dissertation seeks to explore the processes of landscape change through a case study of Louis Armstrong’s downtown neighborhood in New Orleans. It employs an urban morphological framework to uncover the specific landscape changes that occurred in the neighborhood over time. This micro-level view is broadened through an examination of the political economic forces that helped to transform the once vibrant neighborhood into the lost space of today.

This study concludes that while it is tempting to identify the twentieth century modern interventions as the cause of lost space in New Orleans, such a reading unnecessarily isolates the modern development era from the historical continuum of land use that helped define the city. When the scope of inquiry into the causes of lost space is widened to include the historic formation of landscape remnants, long-standing patterns of lost space development begin to appear that stretch back to the founding of the city. Modern development, seen in this light, exacerbated existing negative landscape features more than created them.
Chapter 1: An Overview of Lost Space

This chapter presents an overview of the literature relating to the urban design concept known as lost space. The chapter surveys relevant literature from urban design scholars as well as urban historians to present a comprehensive portrait of this significant negative landscape typology.

Introduction to the Problem: The Decline of Public Space

In recent years, the perceived decline in the quality of public space in contemporary North America has received a great deal of scholarly attention (Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee 1998, Ellin 1996, Sorkin 1992, Cooper-Marcus and Francis 1990, Whyte 1988). An important trend that has been examined in this recent literature is the move from the traditional downtown public space of streetscapes to the quasi-public spaces characteristic of malls and many other commercial developments. While the newer spaces are characterized by consumption and privatization, the traditional streetscapes have, in many cases, been left forlorn and lost.

One of the most forceful critics of the bifurcated landscape of private opulence and public squalor is Mike Davis. His books City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles (1990) and Ecology of Fear (1998) paint an evocative portrait of a Los Angeles controlled and constrained by a defensive urbanism of downtown towers surrounded by moats of deserted and marginalized public space.

A full extrapolation of these trends is found in the fictionalized Los Angeles of Neil Stephenson’s (1991) Snowcrash. In this account, the gated neighborhoods and mega-
towers of today have been morphed into a fully balkanized landscape of completely independent fortified mini-fiefdoms. These burbclaves exist as independent entities with private armies and mined borders.

While the dystopian future of Stephenson’s extrapolation and Davis’s excavation represents the extreme edge of analysis of the “landscape crisis” (Davis 1990), urban scholars have broadly condemned the problem of the loss of quality public spaces since the late 1950’s¹. One of the central characteristics of these descriptions is the palpable sense of loss expressed by the authors as treasured places are transformed into landscapes of urban devastation. While this sense of loss can be seen as misplaced nostalgia, the ubiquity of this emotional response to the lost landscapes of the past and the physical reality of the devastated landscapes of the present demand a more thorough understanding of the causal processes that help to create and perpetuate these lost spaces.

This chapter explores two areas of literature that help to explain the changing landscape of the downtown public sphere. The chapter begins with a review of the pertinent urban design literature. This is followed by an examination of the changing meaning and use of one of the central components of the public space system, the street.

Utilizing Urban Design To Define The Concept of Lost Space

The academic literature relating to urban design has provided some of the most thorough examinations of both the causal mechanisms and substantive dimensions of the lost space problem. The urban design literature is particularly valuable in understanding lost space creation because it is generally focused on the impact that
small-scale alterations of the urban form have on the larger landscape. When this level of fine-grained analysis of form is utilized as part of a historic examination of landscape change across time, the creation of detailed portraits of change can be produced. These detailed portraits are crucial for understanding how, when, and why lost landscapes developed. In this section, the works of Jane Jacobs (1961), Kevin Lynch (1960), William Whyte (1988), Roger Trancik (1986) and Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris and Gail Sansbury (1995) will be examined to uncover some of the key characteristics of lost space formation.

**Jane Jacobs and Border Vacuums**

Jane Jacobs’ frontal attack on modern urban planning in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) provides a good starting place for explorations into the creation of lost space. In this classic work, Jacobs explores how high-modernist city planning schemes have failed to create viable, livable communities. In this wide-ranging discussion, numerous examples of negative landscapes are examined in fine detail. Jacobs’ keen eye explores these places, not from the towering heights of the city skyscrapers, but from the point of view of the pedestrian struggling to make use of the landscape. This scale of analysis, in Scott’s (1998) words, the “microsociology of public order (p. 136), allows Jacobs to identify the minute details of a landscape that can make it enjoyable, functional, boring, or dystopian.

While she discusses the formative processes of many negative landscape typologies throughout the work, her most developed examination of these processes revolves around her discussion of border vacuums. In Jacobs’ reading, border vacuums are areas of “massive single uses” that “form borders” (p. 257) that disrupt the crossing of
an area by a pedestrian. For the pedestrian, “nothing dramatic” usually presents itself to mark the entry into these zones. “Rather, vitality just appears absent and the condition is apt to be taken for granted” (p. 261).

In Jacobs’ discussion of this phenomenon, two types of land use are identified that help to create these “dead place(s)” (p. 263). The first land use problem is the large parcel development, such as civic center complexes and skyscrapers that either break or significantly weaken the pedestrian connections to the surrounding city. Jacobs argues that the large perimeter of these areas acts to deaden both the pedestrian activity on that particular parcel as well as acting to siphon off the vitality from the surrounding blocks. Jacobs argues that this happens because “oversimplifying the use of the city at one place, on a large scale,…tend(s) to simplify the use which people give to the adjoining territory too, and this simplification of use- meaning fewer users, with fewer different purposes and destinations at hand- feeds upon itself” p. 259.

The second land use problem identified is the large-scale transportation project that acts to break pedestrian connections to an area. Because of the extended breakage in the city fabric, a zone of disuse and dampened activity often linearly extends down the length of these projects.

The classic example of this extended land use is railroad tracks. City districts of the late 19th century were divided by the intrusion of the tracks and the belching smoke and steam of the engines that propelled the trains. The “wrong side of the tracks” became not just a statement about a physical border, but a statement about social division as well.
During the late 1950s and early 1960s when Jacobs was penning her attack, another linear intrusion was entering the heart of American cities, the interstate highway. Planners of this era argued that the massive road networks were necessary to help save downtowns by providing access back to the area for the burgeoning suburban population. This physical “reform” of the city failed on many levels, but, most importantly for our present discussion, the roads created both the same physical and social divisions that had plagued the city during the railroad’s heyday.

The cumulative impact of both inward-looking large parcel development and the large-scale incursion of interstate highways into the core of cities resulted in a profusion of border vacuums that surrounded many downtowns. According to Jacobs, these dysfunctional landscapes resulted from planners’ desire to create purely “functional” city zones. The problem was that the planners failed to understand “how cities themselves work” (p. 269). Cities are not just abstract machines composed of zones of single-uses. People’s lives are messier and more interesting than the rationalists wanted to admit. Jacobs argues that care needs to be taken to create physical places that help allow people to take advantage of the freedoms that the city can provide. She argues that, “The schemes, with the best intentions behind them, can inject no end of border vacuums and discontinuities of use, and in places where these may do the greatest and most gratuitous harm” (p. 269).

Kevin Lynch and Lost Areas

Kevin Lynch’s *The Image of the City* (1960) provides another example of how planned landscapes resulted in “lost areas” (p. ??). Lynch utilizes the concept of *imageability* to explore how people perceive and actually use their environments. He
argues that people navigate through their environments using a process of way-finding based on a clear “environmental image, the generalized mental picture of the exterior physical world that is held by the individual” (p. 4). When this image is drastically altered through dramatic landscape change, the way-finding process is interrupted and a sense of being lost develops. For Lynch, this loss carries significant problems for city residents. He states that, “The very word ‘lost’ in our language means much more than simple geographical uncertainty; it carries overtones of utter disaster” (p. 4).

Lynch’s imageability work defines the types of landscape features that help to create these lost areas. In his analysis of Boston, he creates “a graphic compilation of what seem to be the major difficulties in the city image: confusions, floating points, weak boundaries, isolations, breaks in continuity, ambiguities, branchings, lack of character or differentiation” (p. 25). When the negative properties of this mapping of pedestrian experience of place accumulate in one edge, Lynch argues that areas of the city “seemed to be mentally erased” (p. 64).

Wiliam Whyte: Pedestrian Tastes and Cosmopolitan Places

William Whyte’s (1988) work provides a strong foundation for understanding how lost spaces impact people in their daily lives. Whyte traces the impact of urban form through “direct observation” (p. 4) of pedestrian usage patterns. Through the use of extensive personal observation and videotape documentation, Whyte discovered that pedestrians exhibit distinct movement patterns when confronted with the urban landscape. Certain features of the landscape acted as attractors drawing in pedestrians, while others seemed to actively discourage pedestrian use. By centering the understanding of the
social life of cities at the scale of pedestrian perceptions to the street environment, Whyte is able to uncover the specific landscape features that attract or discourage use.

In Whyte’s view, the street is the “river of life of the city, the place where we come together, the pathway to the center. It is the primary primary place” (p. 7). For pedestrians to want to use the street as a social space as well as a transportation corridor, a specific set of landscape features needs to be present. These include stairs or ledges for sitting and watching people, food vendors for encouraging social interaction, short city blocks to encourage multiple street uses and pedestrian linkages, and many other small “courtesies” that create places for people².

While Whyte effectively creates a portrait of a functional pedestrian landscape, he also identifies the dysfunctional landscape features that act to repel pedestrians. He says that, “It is difficult to design an urban space so maladroitly that people will not use it, but there are many such spaces” (p. 1). Several of these features are particularly valuable for understanding lost space creation.

One of the features that Whyte sees as helping to create “poor” urban spaces is the proverbial blank wall. The blank wall is a large, windowless, doorless area that acts as an impediment to pedestrian social life. Just as an interstate roadway corridor acts as a large-scale linear wall to pedestrians, the blank wall acts as a micro-scale vacuum within the confines of downtown. The problem is not really so much a single blank wall, but a series of these dead zones that acts to suck the life out of an entire area.

Whyte argues that large governmental land uses and the modernist megastructure are particularly culpable for creating this negative urban design feature. He states that, “The ultimate expressions of the flight from the street are the megastructures: huge,
multipurpose complexes combining offices, stores, hotels, and garages, and enclosed in a great carapace of concrete and glass—such as Detroit’s Renaissance Center or Atlanta’s Omni International. Their distinguishing characteristic is self-containment” (p. 206). Instead of acting to encourage pedestrian activity in the crucial downtown core, these land uses act as lost space generators. To add insult to injury, the edges of these large complexes are often overrun with surface parking lots. The lost space of parking “lies in what is not there. People. Activity. Function” (p. 314). When these negative landscape features accumulate in a particular area, the social life of pedestrians grinds to a halt.

**Finding Lost Space: The Work of Roger Trancik**

Another avenue for exploring lost space development is provided by Trancik (1986). Trancik argues that lost space has developed in the contemporary city along a series of linear areas that he calls “seams” in the fabric of the city (Table 1). He argues that these seams resulted from careless development initiatives of

**Table 1: Trancik 1986**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Seams in Downtown Fabric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured landscape at the base of high rise towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unused sunken plazas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The edges of freeways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned waterfronts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned blight clearance sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual areas between districts and loosely composed commercial strips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorated parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal public housing projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface parking lots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the modernist era that failed to understand the importance of “tying” the fabric of the city together.

Trancik utilizes three basic urban design theories for uncovering these seams in the urban fabric: figure-ground theory, linkage theory, and place theory. Each theory seeks to articulate the spatial relationships that define places in a slightly different manner. Figure-ground theory seeks to define the quality of spaces by defining the interaction between the solid masses of buildings and the open space voids that surround them. When the relationship between solids, represented by the building footprint, and voids, representing open space, is poorly defined, the resulting streetscape is often dominated by lost space. Trancik explains this relationship further when he argues that, “If the relationship of solids to voids is poorly balanced, fragments become disjointed, falling outside the framework; the result is lost space” (p. 106)\(^3\). Linkage theory, on the other hand, is concerned with the lines or links between spaces (streets, linear open spaces, etc.). When these linkages are broken by street closures or other impediments, the circulation system is compromised resulting, again, in lost space\(^4\). Finally, place theory ties the social and cultural needs of people directly to the specific spatial setting of places. The cultural aspirations and needs of the populace are, thus, tied to the specific physical setting of the city. When the physical setting of the city and the aspirations and needs of the citizens are mismatched, lost space is likely to result\(^5\). Trancik contends that a research approach that includes all three of these theoretical components is ideal for uncovering poor (or even positive) urban spaces.

While Trancik’s work provides a good conceptual overview of both the lost space phenomenon and urban design theory, he stops one step short of providing an
overarching framework for the systematic study of lost space. While the three theoretical components of a strong lost space study are identified, a specific strategy for incorporating these elements together is not forthcoming.

**Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury: *Lost Streets of Bunker Hill***

Probably the most comprehensive approach to examining lost space creation can be found in Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury’s (1995) article *Lost Streets of Bunker Hill*. The authors provide an excellent example of how a landscape study can be utilized to link the specific characteristics of urban form change to the political economic forces that lead to lost space development. The authors explore the changes to the streets and public spaces of the Bunker Hill area of downtown Los Angeles, an area that had the potential to become a West Coast Greenwich Village. These “street biographies” (p. 394) explore how a once vibrant section of Los Angeles was transformed into the heart of a sterile, corporate landscape of the late 20th century. They argue that this type of work “resembles archeological work; instead of digging through layers of dirt, we sorted through layers of maps, redevelopment plans, photographs, a documentary film, and literary material on Bunker Hill” (p. 394).

Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury highlight the significant link between the cultural use of an area and its perceived urban form characteristics. They argue that to understand the politics of landscape change an examination of the culture/urban form interface must be included. They point out that, “How we define ‘bad’ or ‘blighted’ becomes an important political question in chronicling the life of a street, a neighborhood, or a community. Issues of class, race, ethnicity, and sexuality may easily obscure the view of the built environment’s condition and form” (p. 402).
In this reading of the landscape, the political question of why a neighborhood is defined as a ‘slum’ becomes a central question. In the Bunker Hill area of Los Angeles, Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury show how governmental and private sector interests were able to “obscure the view of the built environment” by utilizing the significant urban renewal powers of expropriation to classify and clear ‘slum’ areas. In this social reading, the authors trace the succession of the area from a fashionable neighborhood of the late 19th century to a mixed gay enclave and boarding room district of the 1940’s. This social change was utilized as a proxy for declining urban form. In a ten year span, from 1941 to 1951, the area went from being described in a Los Angeles Master Plan as “an asset” to the downtown area to being condemned “as blighted” and “designated for redevelopment” by the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (p. 396). While the urban form of the area stayed nearly the same, the perceptions about the area’s character changed dramatically. Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury’s work shows the political underpinnings of urban form descriptions. In this reading, the polarized contemporary landscape of haves and have-nots stands in stark contrast to the socially mixed landscape of the past.

While Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury’s work highlights the political economic forces at work in the urban form change process, they also seek to “recover” design precedents from the lost Bunker Hill neighborhood. Three characteristics of the former landscape are identified that helped to make it a socially vital and memorable place. The street environments of the past were complex, diverse, and contextual (p. 405).

Complex landscapes are characterized by varied street environments where pedestrians are met with a wide choice of differing movement paths and landscape
features. Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury describe these characteristics in the Bunker Hill area by stating that, “The high walls and narrow streets and, in some cases, the tree canopies, created a sense of enclosure. The multiplicity of windows, doorways, porches, and balconies gave the street environment its human scale, but also created a continuation and a response to the public realm of the street” (p. 403). The modernist spaces that replaced these street environments lacked both the visual stimulation and varied movement options that the complex landscape of the past provided.

Another characteristic of the recovered landscape was that it was integrated and diverse. In the lost Bunker Hill, residences were mixed with small businesses and shops. In addition, the street public spaces were used for both social and transportation purposes. Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury argue that, “Years before planners would reinvent the ‘mixed-use’ concept, the overlay of activities in the streets of Bunker Hill contributed to their vibrancy and liveliness” p. 403.

Finally, the landscape of Bunker Hill was contextual. The authors draw from Kevin Lynch’s imageability work here by showing how the area provided a distinct identity for residents. This identity was bound up in the urban form and social networks that framed the landscape. They sum this up by stating that, “Kevin Lynch has written about landscapes that provide a sense of orientation in time, environmental forms and sequences that help their users understand how the present moment is linked to the near or distant past. The Bunker Hill streets represented such landscapes” p. 405.

Urban Design Literature Conclusions

The urban design literature surveyed here helps to provide a foundation for understanding the specific urban design characteristics of lost space areas. Each of the
iterations of lost space examined in this chapter provides a slightly different angle for seeing the dimensions of the problem. Jacobs and Lynch provide background on some of the basic problems of lost landscapes. Whyte’s extensive fieldwork extends this by showing how people respond to these settings. Trancik provides more structured approaches for uncovering the historic dimensions as well as specific methodological avenues for examining the problem. While each of the approaches helps to articulate differing dimensions of the lost space phenomenon, they each only provide focused snap-shots of lost space. By incorporating an explicit avenue for exploring the political economic forces that affect urban design over time, Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury’s approach comes closest to providing a comprehensive approach to understanding lost space creation.

One of the central characteristics identified by all the authors in this section is the problem that pedestrians experience in moving through the modernist city. The pedestrian experience of downtown public space can also be examined as part of a larger historic survey of the changes in the American conception of public space. The following section explores several important works on the changing perceptions and use of the public space of the street.

**The Street as Public Space and The Street as ‘Traffic Sewer’: Changing Perceptions**

The street is a central physical component of the public space system of a city. It serves both the transportation needs of automotive commuters and the social and mobility needs of pedestrians. The altered public street environment that has resulted from the competition for this space between pedestrians and automotive commuters forms the basis of this section. Reviews of the works of McShane (1994), Baldwin
(1999), and Davis (1990) are utilized here to help show the specific forces that have altered the public space of streets.

One of the most significant factors in the transformation of urban public spaces has been the introduction and widespread acceptance of the automobile as a mode of transportation. In the 19th century, the street was the predominant public space of the city. By the end of the 20th century, many argue that its central role is that of a transportation conduit. The three books examined in this section explore the impact of the use of this technology and the physical alterations to the city that were made to facilitate its widespread use. Significantly, these three works explore the social and philosophical changes that helped facilitate the use of this new technology. In these works, the universal use of the car is seen more as a social transformation than as a technological revolution.

**McShane’s *Down the Asphalt Path***

McShane’s book *Down the Asphalt Path: The Automobile and the American City* (1994) traces the social and technological changes that led to the acceptance of the car as a significant factor in the American urban landscape. McShane explores the intersection of the advances in automotive and paving technology and the social changes that altered the perceived uses of streets. His central thesis is that automobiles were accepted not just because of technological improvements in engine and paving technology, “but because American urban culture had changed” (p. x). This cultural change altered the views that city residents had of streets. McShane argues that, “City residents perceived their streets in a different way, thinking of them more as trafficways than open public spaces” (p. x).
In a rich, chronological evaluation, McShane uncovers several important periods where radically differing views on the appropriate role of streets were held. First, McShane highlights a period of remarkable regulatory oversight in which the pre-cursor of the car, the “steamer,” was effectively prevented from using public streets. This important but rarely recognized period around 1880 clearly shows social actors working to prevent the new technology from overtaking the public spaces of the city.

Another mechanism for minimizing the use of streets for auto traffic was the intentional use of poor paving materials. In this era, streets were upgraded one block at a time through payments made by those who directly abutted the street. The abutters in residential areas generally sought to exclude “through traffic” from utilizing their street by maintaining poor pavement surfaces. McShane shows the significance of this phenomenon by stating that, "As late as 1890 half the mileage of streets in major cities remained unpaved. Abutters in residential areas almost invariably ordered the cheapest and least durable forms of paving they could find, typically gravel or cobblestones" (p. 64). McShane argues that “this form of private planning reinforced the social uses of streets” (p. 63 and 64) by maintaining these multi-purpose recreational and socializing spaces. The dual efforts of neglecting roads and strictly regulating personal vehicles maintained the street as the predominant public space of the 1880’s.

Significant changes, however, occurred in the 1890’s and 1900’s to facilitate the use of streets for automobiles. For McShane, this era of change holds the key for understanding how and why the public space of streets was altered. McShane states that, “For the student of urban transportation, the key questions about automobiles are
not technological, but social. What changed in the decade between 1890 and 1900 to make powered vehicles, once the anathema, acceptable?” (p. 100).

McShane answers this question by uncovering significant social and philosophical shifts in the perceived uses of streets that altered both their appearances and uses. He argues that the newly minted class of suburbanites was at the heart of these changing views. The reform-minded suburbanites began to effectively overturn municipal bans on autos and reverse the abutter control of street surfaces. McShane argues that these changes resulted from increased power of the middle class suburbanite reformers and their changed outlook on the role of streets. He states that, “The now dominant suburbanites lived in detached homes, each on its own lot. They did not perceive the traditional functions of streets as socialization and recreational gathering places. Instead, they saw them almost entirely as thoroughfares whose primary value was transport” (p. 29). McShane also argues that these changes, with the addition of advances in automotive technology represented by the internal combustion engine, led to an explosion in the number of personal automobiles and a consequent decrease in the quality of public space for city residents. In this way, the cultural transformation of values and the morphology change that this shift made possible transformed how space was perceived and used.

While McShane effectively shows the importance of the social ideas behind the era of regulatory oversight, his conclusions on the impact of suburbanite reformers are not as strong. In the second half of the book, McShane fails to hone in on the specific social ideas of reformers, instead concentrating on the broader popular culture perceptions of the automobile found in movies and newspaper articles. While an analysis of these
popular culture views is important, they only tangentially build his central case on the importance of middle-class suburbanites’ power. The analysis fails to uncover the specific mechanisms that were utilized by reformers to transform the cultural landscape of streets.

**Baldwin’s Domesticating the Street**

Baldwin in *Domesticating the Street: The Reform of Public Space in Hartford, 1850-1930* (1999) steps in to provide a more in-depth analysis of the politicized, contested realm of urban space. In Baldwin's case study of Hartford, CN, the middle class reformers are seen as politicized agents with a mixture of motivations. Baldwin argues that, “Campaigns to reform the use of public space were seldom examples of pure altruism. Competing interest groups struggled for power over this highly visible and symbolic terrain, and their struggle had an important effect on the resulting system of public space” (p. 8).

Baldwin argues that the ideas represented in these interest group campaigns are crucial to understanding the changes in physical fabric of urban public space. He states that, “In tracing these reform campaigns, I argue that ideas have a powerful role in shaping cities, a comparable to- perhaps even exceeding- the effects of technology” (p. 7). Baldwin’s interest group approach, though similar to McShane’s approach in emphasizing the impact of social and cultural factors, provides a more focused lens for analyzing the specific impact of reformers actions by tracing a chronological succession of reforms. This approach uncovers several important reform efforts that directly impacted the allowed uses of streets.
Baldwin begins his analysis by examining the efforts of the noted theologian Horace Bushnell to improve the physical fabric of Hartford through his pioneering use of urban parks in the mid-1800s. Bushnell believed that the city was becoming intolerably divided due to increased immigration and industrial development. He believed that the feminine values of the home needed to be physically manifested to provide a virtuous space compared to the rough, gritty world of the emerging industrial city. Baldwin says that, “Rather than grappling directly with the miseries of the industrializing city, (Bushnell’s) solutions would involve creating countervailing strongholds of virtue and beauty- first and foremost, the park” (p. 22). Baldwin argues that while the parks would provide an alternative space to the street environment, they were not designed to “create a replacement for the social life of streets” (p. 32). At this phase of the reform agenda, the street spaces of the city were still considered an important, though maligned, space.

Baldwin argues that the next generation of reformers “believed that it was not enough to influence people indirectly through the park; the crusade for gentility had to be extended into the downtown street and slums” (p. 39). This new generation began to push for significant changes in the morphologic fabric of the city based on the perceived need to remove street influences from the most impressionable members of society, children.

For reformers the sight of children playing in the crowded dirty streets was unacceptable and, further, the sight of them working in those same streets selling newspapers was unconscionable. These reformers took Bushnell’s idea of the segregated space of parks directly into the heart of the city in the physical form of more
parks and in the regulatory form of increased control of the use of urban space. Baldwin
says that, "Desires for social control and for proper child development merged in a
sophisticated campaign to reform the use of urban space" (p. 148). This movement
effectively politicized the geography of recreation, extending Bushnell’s park movement
into a specifically political direction. The result of these efforts was an increase in
downtown park space and municipal bans on the use of children in the street trades
such as newspaper selling.

Baldwin argues that the following period of reform in the 1920’s and 1930’s took
Bushnell’s ideas of purifying the city to their logical conclusions. Instead of seeing the
street as a necessary evil as Bushnell had, they began to argue for the full separation of
the street from the social lives of people. Having already forced children from the street,
reformers now set their sights on pedestrians. Baldwin argues that, "Downtown, the
intense regulation of street use further contributed to the differentiation of public space.
The regulations ensured that pedestrianism, like children’s play and street peddling,
would be forced from major streets to alternative spaces- in this case, sidewalks" (p.
229).

Where Bushnell had called for the segregated parkland to provide a unifying space,
the reformers of this era now saw the segregation of space as a way to exclude.
Baldwin argues that, “Progressive reformers and city officials shared Bushnell’s faith in
the power of the environment but they had different goals. They wanted order, not social
unity, and many of them were eager to split up urban space in order to achieve that
order” (p. 247).
Baldwin carefully articulates the evolution of these reform ideas through analyses of the series of specific actions taken to alter public space use in downtown Hartford. The cumulative impact of these actions on the public space of the city was profound. Baldwin argues that, “The wholesale segregation of public space resulted from numerous piecemeal reform efforts and was strengthened by the unexpected explosion of automobile travel” (p. 265). By situating the technological advances of automobile travel within the broader context of Progressive reforms, Baldwin is able to provide a strong framework for understanding how the public space of the street was drastically changed. When Baldwin’s analysis is combined with specific street use changes articulated by McShane, a strong case begins to emerge as to the causes of the major changes in public space of downtowns through the 1930s. The examination of Davis’ work provides one more crucial step to understanding these changes as they accelerate through the rest of the 20th century.

Davis’ City of Quartz

While Baldwin and McShane focus on reformers interventions into the public space of the city, Davis focuses more broadly on the impact of the overall framework of the political economy on public space restructuring. In City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles (1990), Davis explores some of the major changes that have transformed Los Angeles from the 1930’s through the early 1990’s with reference to a wide variety of important social and economic transformations. The forces that Davis examines include “Faustian economic restructuring, social porosity, elite anti-semitism, central place competitions, internationalization of class formations, extreme political fragmentation, and disenfranchisement of the inner-city” (p. 104).
This litany of significant social and economic issues is situated amidst a political power structure more interested in the advancement of elite interests than in the well being of the majority of its citizens. Davis argues that this historical view helps show how the promise of the American Mediterraneaen of the California coast was transformed into the vast sprawl of the Valley. He eloquently states that, “The best place to view Los Angeles of the next millennium is from the ruins of its alternative future” (p. 3).

At the heart of Davis’ view of these ruins is the repeated and intentional destruction of public space by organized capitalist interests. He states that, “This obsession with physical security systems and, collaterally, with architectural policing of social boundaries, has become a zeitgeist of urban restructuring, a master narrative in the emerging built environment of the 1990’s” (p. 223). Davis argues that this built environment resulted from “an unprecedented tendency to merge urban design, architecture and the police apparatus into a single, comprehensive security effort” (p. 224). Davis concludes that, “The universal and ineluctable consequence of this crusade is the destruction of accessible public space” (p. 226).

Where Baldwin looks at the reformers transformation of the street and McShane views a generalized “social” change in the perception of streets, Davis situates the change in the racial and class conflict of cities. Instead of the social cleansing of Baldwin’s Hartford, the segregation of spatial uses has been extended to the exclusion of whole classes of people in Davis’ Los Angeles. Davis argues that “this new class war” has found dramatic focus “at the level of the built environment” (p. 228). At its most extreme, Davis argues that the urban redevelopment strategy of this class war “has converted once vital pedestrian streets into traffic sewers and transformed public parks
into temporary receptacles for the homeless and the wretched” (p. 228). Davis pulls no punches when he finally concludes that, “Indeed, when Downtown’s new ‘Gold Coast’ is viewed en bloc from the standpoint of its interactions with other social areas and landscapes in the central city, the ‘fortress effect’ emerges, not as an inadvertent failure of design, but as deliberate socio-spatial strategy” (p. 229). For Davis, the destruction of downtown public space is not the inadvertent result of wrong-headed transportation and urban design strategies, but instead a deliberate strategy of exclusion.

**Urban Design Interventions and Morphological Consequences**

Davis’ political economic analysis of land use change in Los Angeles draws heavily on a selection of political and business records that helps to create a portrait of greed and exclusion. Whether Davis’ reading of public space change is seen as overheated hyperbole or a critical indictment of historic and contemporary urban policy hinges on how this “evidence” of public space change is perceived. While this analysis provides a strong backdrop on the motives of the urban actors of spatial change, the built environment is not systematically analyzed.

Another way to “read” the changes that have taken place to the public space system of cities is to analyze the built form of cities over time through the use of urban morphologic techniques. The evidence here lies in both the sweeping changes of urban renewal programs along with the minutiae of individual building and street changes. One of the primary aims of this dissertation research is to show how the systematic study of urban form can complement the broader political economic readings of public space change, making both stronger. In this way the specificity of scale of the urban design approach can be linked to a broader historic portrait of city change.
The following table lists the wide variety of authors that have coined terms to describe this phenomenon.

**Renderings of Lost Landscapes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Lynch</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Lost Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Jacobs</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Border Vacuums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Berman</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Modern Wastelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Whyte</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Empty Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane Lanken</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Dead Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakle and Wilson</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Derelict Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Trancik</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Lost Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Zukin</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Wastelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Sucher</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Awkward Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hillier</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Disurbanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajay Garde</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Marginal Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Baldwin</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wastelands of Modern American Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annick Germain and Damaris Rose</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Dead Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Ford</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Anonymous Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Davis</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Urban Deserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Kallus</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Negative Urban Space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Sucher also (1995) does an excellent job uncovering numerous examples of these small courtesies in his book *City Comforts*. Sucher walks through the city looking for the micro-scale courtesies, like well-placed street seating and clear effective wayfinding signage that can make walking an act of exploration, enjoyment, and transportation.

3 Trancik’s critique is similar to Jacobs’ and Whyte’s critique of large parcel, single-use zones discussed earlier. Trancik, however, provides an explicit methodological avenue for identifying these areas.

4 Again, Jacobs’ description of the problem of large-scale transportation projects mirrors this approach. The explicit methodological approach of Trancik makes it easier to identify these areas.

5 Place theory, as used by Trancik, is similar to Lynch’s imageability work. When people lose the ability to effectively conceptualize their environments, lost areas (Lynch) or lost spaces (Trancik) develop.

6 This approach begins to bridge the gap between Davis’ (1990) broad political economy approach to landscape study and the minute, small-scale work of much of the rest of the lost space research.

7 The issue of the interconnection of class, race, and the definition of urban form is central to understanding the historical use of the word “slum.” For urban renewal projects of the mid-20th century, poverty and poor urban form were often synonymous. Sugrue (1996) does an excellent job exploring how housing policy of the 1940s and 50s racially encoded city space based on false definitions of poor urban form.
Chapter 2: Urban Morphology Methodology

This chapter surveys the relevant literature of urban morphology studies. The urban morphology methodology is then laid out for application in this dissertation research program.

Understanding the Changing Landscape: Urban Morphology as a Methodology

One of the central goals of urban landscape study is the creation of organized portraits of place during particular eras. Place connotes a specific, spatialized location where social, economic, political, environmental, and land use conditions create definable spaces (Zukin 1991). Urban landscape study seeks to understand and explain the changes in these places over time. Studies of place can vary in terms of scope from examinations of regions down to studies of particular urban blocks or even lots. The goal of this research is to examine the fine-grained details of change at the level of urban blocks and lots. To accomplish this task, the specialized techniques of urban morphologic study are utilized.

Urban morphological study seeks to understand changes in the built environment over time by analyzing detailed historical records of land use in order to produce comprehensive portraits of place by “mapping the various stages that together create an urban landscape” (Lilley 2000, p.6). At the heart of this type of work is the assumption that the placement of buildings in lots and along streets is one of the central, defining components of how places function and feel. Unlike architectural histories that may
focus on the characteristics of a single building, morphologic studies focus on the interaction of a series of buildings in creating identifiable spaces over time.

Morphologic studies have been utilized in Europe for over a hundred years, but have been only fairly recently employed by North American researchers. While several schools of morphological research have been popularized in continental Europe, the primary school of morphological research in the English-speaking world has been that of M.R.G. Conzen. The study of Conzen, one of the “seminal investigators” of urban morphologic study (Vernez-Moudon 2000, p. 3), provides for an excellent starting point for understanding the specialized techniques and concepts of morphologic study.

**Conzen’s Morphological Template**

The work of German-born M.R.G. Conzen on the English city of Alnwick in 1960 helped to create a strong methodological foundation for work in townscape change that has been widely utilized for urban morphologic study. Conzen’s work traces the dynamic interaction of land use, building forms, and the town plan as they change over time. While this break down of the components of the urban landscape may sound simplistic, tracing these changing patterns can help to uncover both important historic economic and social processes that altered the landscape as well as identify important areas in need of landscape conservation.

Lilley (2000) presents one of the best distillations of Conzen’s morphological techniques. According to Lilley, the guiding principle of “Conzen’s approach is that the form of streets and plots revealed on a large-scale plan of a given settlement provide in themselves clues about their origin and development” (Lilley 2000, p. 7). In practice, this principle helps define the three essential ‘plan elements’ crucial to Conzen’s research
agenda: streets, plots or lots, and buildings (Lilley 2000, p. 8). The changing patterns of these three elements for Conzen helped explain the historical development of the city.

The interaction of these building blocks of the townscape can be seen in Conzen’s work on central business districts (Conzen 1981). Conzen argues that centralizing economic pressures in this area tend to lead towards land parcel combination where individual parcels of land are combined to provide the land needed for larger structures. He argues that this type of pattern change comes in two main types: augmentative and adaptive change. In augmentative change situations, the street pattern is changed to contain new building structures. In adaptive change situations, however, redevelopment occurs within the framework of the existing street pattern, either in a gradual, piecemeal manner or in a swift, radical alteration of the pattern. By mapping these changing patterns, the impacts of townscape alterations can be specifically identified.

Conzen argues that the impact of these development pressures and the accompanying alteration of the townscape have significant effects on the type of place that is created. He argues that, “This affects the building fabric of CBD’s in towns widely and is a powerful agent in the obliteration of historical townsapes just where the character is most marked and calls for the most skillful management” (Conzen 1981, p.57). Conzen calls for townscape management practices that recognize the importance of these patterns. He argues that without concerted efforts to maintain our “cultural landscapes” we risk losing the significant “educative and regenerative influence” (Conzen 1981, p.58) that our historic landscapes facilitate.

Conzen’s qualitative conclusions and methodological innovations provide a strong conceptual foundation for townscape studies, but his works gloss over some of the
specific steps and data sources that are necessary to effectively carry out this type of study. Lilley (2000) makes this point when he argues that “despite the growing acceptance of Conzen’s approach since the 1960’s, an explicit statement on the methodology of plan analysis has been absent” (p. 9).

Lilley’s Methodological Structure

To rectify this important oversight in the Conzen school, Lilley (2000) steps in to provide “a methodological outline” (p. 11) of the steps necessary for effective town plan analysis. Lilley identifies a four-stage process for conducting this type of research. First, a base plan map of the area is prepared from detailed historical maps and plans. This base town plan map need only identify the streets and lot patterns of the area that form “the town’s morphological ‘skeleton’” (p. 11). Second, the plan units of the area are identified. Plan units are areas that show similar morphological characteristics within the network of buildings, streets, and lots of land. Similar size, shape, date of construction, and orientation are often used to help in this determination. These areas are then numbered and named. This stage is especially important for lost space research because it helps to reveal the “plan seams” (Lilley 2000, p. 13), linear areas separating different development era typologies, along which lost space is most likely to form.2

The third stage involves linking historical information to the town plan map. Lilley points to the use of archeological documentation as well as town land use data as important sources for this data. At the end of this stage, Lilley argues that “the morphological history of each plan unit has been carefully mapped” (Lilley 2000, p. 13) to show the form of the townscape in relation to buildings, streets, and lots and to show the specific morphological changes that took place within each plan unit. The final stage
pieces together the individual plan unit histories to create a map of the changing form of
the landscape. Lilley sums up this stage by stating that,

This means interpreting, or reading, the plan units as a physical expression of the
formation of the urban landscape, and at the same time it involves noting the internal
transformative changes within each plan units, taking care to recognize that townscape
changes not only through outward cumulative expansion (accretion) but also through
phases of impositionary growth (rebuilding). p.13

This step-by-step morphological methodology helps to provide a systematic and
thorough framework for “conceptualizing, measuring, and interpreting” (Lilley 2000, p.
15) landscape change. While this methodology greatly improves our ability to
conceptualize and analyze landscape change, the processes of the study are not strictly
objective. A great deal of subjective “decision-making” is necessary to classify the
different units. Lilley points out that the processes for determining both the elements of
the base town plan and components of the plan units may be difficult “for positivistic
empiricists to handle” (p. 16). He argues that while the methodology may appear to be
subjective, the morphological methodology forces the practitioner to perform a series of
rigorous evaluation steps that helps produce a strong analysis of townscape change.

Lilley argues,

The process of selecting plot boundaries and defining plan units is therefore no exact
science, and neither should it be. Indeed, the selection of morphological features and
the definition of plan units is a process that cannot easily be simply summarized in a few
words or neatly conveyed as a series of mechanical procedures, but rather it is one
picked up through the practice of drawing... With each redrawing the same
morphological features and plan units were picked out, and repeated activity of drawing
the plan enables one continually to question why it is that a particular street or plot has
the form that it has (p. 16).

**North American Context: Vernez-Moudon’s San Francisco**

While the Conzen school of urban morphology provides a strong methodological
framework for understanding townscape change, it has largely been used to study the
evolution of medieval towns. While this focus does not directly affect the methodology, it does limit the application of many of the substantive conclusion that are drawn from these studies, especially to newer, North American cities. In order to provide more applicable morphological context for the present study, the work of Anne Vernez-Moudon on the San Francisco neighborhood of Alamo Heights will be analyzed.

Vernez-Moudon’s work (1986), while not strictly a Conzen morphological study, uncovers numerous important details that are important for studying the evolution of contemporary American cities. Her work straddles the line between architectural history, urban design theory, and urban history to create a “walk through time” (Vernez-Moudon 1986, p.5) that helps to reveal structural patterns of change at the building and lot level as well as the processes that affected these changes. She utilizes the detailed Sanborn Fire Insurance maps to create a time-series of land use change in the Alamo Square area from 1899 to 1976. Her work collected a wide variety of data on the structure of the neighborhood such as the number of buildings per block, the number of lots per block, building coverage at the ground, as well as other data on habitation and business trends in the area.

Vernez-Moudon’s central conclusion concerns the importance of “resilient” building types to accommodate the changing needs and desires of generations of city residents. Over the course of the time period studied by Vernez-Moudon (1899-1976), significant changes altered the residential and economic needs of city residents. She argues that successful city environments are those that can accommodate these changing needs and desires without requiring major changes to their fabric. These “resilient” forms, then, have “the ability to assume a variety of functions as well as meanings, to be owned and
inhabited in a variety of ways without major disruption to the principles of the structure of that space. Resilience balances continuity and change in space” (Vernez-Moudon 1986, p. 157).

Vernez-Moudon’s study concludes that one of the central features of resilient spaces is the underlying lot size. She argues that the lot should be seen as “the basic cell of the neighborhood fabric that “establishes the pattern of the grain of the city and determines its scale” (p. 144). In this conception, smaller lot size helps to produce diverse, resilient environments. Vernez-Moudon concludes: “By ensuring that property remains in many hands, small lots bring important results: many people make many different decisions, thereby ensuring variety in the resulting environment” (p. 188).

**Urban Morphological Study in a North American Context**

Taken together, the works of Conzen and Vernez-Moudon present a functional and theoretical template for understanding city form changes. Conzen articulates a typology of urban fabric change centered on land parcels and street networks that provides guidance for identifying the major structural changes, augmentative change, from the adaptive changes to the urban fabric. With the inclusion of Lilley’s methodological template, the Conzen school of morphology can facilitate the systematic analysis of landscape change, specifically lost space development, through the analysis of ‘plan unit seams.’ Vernez-Moudon provides a link between the broad changing morphological patterns and the specific techniques for measuring those changes at the lot and building level in an American context.
**Purposes for the Research Methodology**

This dissertation research is aimed at providing both methodological and substantive contributions to the understanding of lost space development. From a methodological perspective, this research seeks to examine how morphological studies can be used to enhance the study of public space change. The research examines land use change, specifically the type of public space change represented by lost space development in the New Orleans downtown using the methods of urban morphology.

While the bulk of the primary research is focused on implementing urban morphologic research techniques, the conclusions of this morphologic phase of the research are broadened with a review of the political economic and cultural changes in New Orleans over the same period. Opening the “methodological door” to the cultural and political economic background was crucial considering the significance of the study area to the growth of jazz. The conclusions of these two “readings” of land use change provide a platform for more comprehensive analysis of urban form change.

From a substantive perspective, this research seeks to understand the specific processes of change that generate lost space environments. Because of the paucity of serious research on New Orleans prior to the mid-1970s (Lewis 1976), a comprehensive portrait of land use change in New Orleans is particularly valuable. The following methodological template sets out how these goals are to be achieved.

**Methodology for Research**

This research examines lost space development in the area of the New Orleans central business district using a methodological template of urban morphology.
pioneered by Conzen. The four-step synthesis of Conzen’s methods articulated by Lilley (2000) is utilized to help structure the study. Once again, these steps are as follows:

1. Prepare a Base Town Plan for the Study Area
2. Define Plan Units within the Base Town Plan
3. Integrate Historical Land Use Developments Into Morphological History of Area
4. Create Cumulative Map of the Changes in Urban Form in the Study Area

While this four-step process forms the backbone for the study, the research attempts to capture some of the unique aspects of the North American urban context in two ways. First, the data sources and North American context of Vernez-Moudon’s (1986) work can be utilized to help focus the proposed study. Her methods for collecting and using Sanborn Fire Insurance maps are mirrored in the present study. In addition, her collection and measurement of the important quantitative urban form dimensions of the number, type, and area coverage of buildings within blocks are likewise utilized in the present study.

The second way that the basic morphological template is expanded is by utilizing Trancik’s (1986) lost space concepts. This is done in two ways. First, Trancik’s lost space research provides an interesting conceptual opening that can be used to link contemporary urban design practices with the more arcane subject of urban morphological study. One of the perceived short-comings of morphology research is its lack of application to the contemporary needs of urban designers (Thomas 1998). Because morphology studies have traditionally been used to study medieval cities, their perceived application to contemporary urban design problems has been seen by many students as minimal. This perceived lack of concrete ‘usefulness’ of the morphological approach has limited its wide-spread acceptance as an important tool for urban designers.
One way to overcome these perceived shortcomings is to provide concrete techniques that can help practicing urban designers. Because the 'seams' concept of Trancik and the 'plan seams' concept of Conzen are so closely identified, they can be linked together to provide a stronger methodological avenue for understanding this type of land use change, broadening the usefulness of urban morphology method in the process. In this study, this important linkage between the morphology literature and the lost space literature is ‘fleshed out’ to map lost space corridors. By providing a concrete technique that can be used by urban designers to confront contemporary design problems, it is hoped that urban morphology techniques can be brought into wider acceptance.

A second avenue for linking urban morphology studies and urban design works is also drawn from Trancik’s work. Trancik identifies three central components of “good” lost space studies. Once again, these are figure-ground, linkage, and place studies. He argues that while the use of each component helps to provide a framework for understanding lost space creation, a deeper understanding can be achieved by utilizing all three simultaneously. The problem is that he does not provide an effective technique for linking these three components.

This study aims to provide a functional example of how these three components can be used together. The figure-ground and linkage components are subsumed in the morphology study outlined above. The place study components are included by collecting photographic evidence and the cultural/social documentation of census records and literary accounts of neighborhood change. Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury (1995) utilized similar techniques in their study of the lost streets of the Bunker Hill area.
of Los Angeles. This “archeological urbanism” lays out a broad net to capture both the physical components characteristic of lost space creation as well as the changes that help to make this work a story not just about buildings and streets but also about people and places.

1 Conzen argues that landscape conservation is a more appropriate moniker than historic preservation because it connotes the importance of the interaction of buildings, streets, and land parcels that forms the historic sense of place that, he argues, should be the real goal of preservation.

2 In fact, Conzen even coined the term ‘urban fallow’ for land that was temporarily unused. This concept along with the ‘plan seam’ analysis can be used to help identify lost spaces in contemporary cities. It is hoped that linking the morphological approach and contemporary lost space research will provide an important methodological avenue for quantifying where and how lost space developed.
Chapter 3: Lost Space and Perdido Street 2000

This chapter presents the results of an urban design study of the contemporary New Orleans Central Business District. Significant negative landscape features are identified and analyzed by utilizing the combined urban design/morphology framework laid out in the previous chapters.

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of an urban design analysis of the contemporary New Orleans central business district (CBD) focused on locating and mapping areas of poor urban design that weaken pedestrian connections. Fourteen indicators of lost space, drawn from the urban design literature review in Chapter one, are utilized to map the location and patterns of lost space. This map is then examined in light of the urban morphological concepts discussed in Chapter two.

Examination of the compiled map of these indicators with an urban morphologic foundation can help to reveal patterns of poor design. Mapping these indicators can then be utilized as a concrete, accessible tool for practicing planners as part of a larger analysis of existing urban design conditions. Areas that are dominated by lost space could then be evaluated for possible inclusion in a design review district formulated specifically to help reintegrate this area into the existing urban fabric.

Landscape Remnants: The Year 2000 Townscape

In the 1986 work Finding Lost Space: Theories of Urban Design, Roger Trancik argues that the core areas of many contemporary cities are composed of swaths of poorly utilized space. These areas, such as spaces surrounding interstate highways,
abandoned industrial sites, corridors of surface parking, and the windswept spaces surrounding high-rise towers, create vacuums of inactivity where pedestrian activities are discouraged. While a small, isolated “lost space” may not be a significant problem in and of itself, the cumulative impact of large numbers of lost space areas can create zones of disuse.

While it is difficult to know the exact “tipping point” between an isolated problem and a full-blown “landscape crisis” (Davis 1999, p. 65) certain indicators of lost space can be tracked and mapped. Table 1 provides a compiled list of common lost space features identified from the urban design literature reviewed in chapter one of this dissertation. Mapping these indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Seams in Downtown Fabric</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured landscape at the base of high rise towers</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unused sunken plazas</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edges of freeways</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned waterfronts</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned blight clearance sites</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual areas between districts and loosely composed commercial strips</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorated parks</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal public housing projects</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface parking lots</td>
<td>Trancik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large parcel developments</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edges of large transportation projects (wide roads)</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large blank walls</td>
<td>Whyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large governmental structures</td>
<td>Whyte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megastructures</td>
<td>Whyte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
either as individual breaks in the urban fabric (points) or as linear seams (lines or polygons) provides a useful way of tracking the extent and concentration of lost space in an area\(^1\).

To identify the lost space indicators, aerial photography and base data layers were acquired from the City of New Orleans Planning Department and the Regional Planning Commission. These data were then ground-truthed through an urban design survey of the area. A GIS database was then created in ArcView to map the location and extent of the indicators. The following section presents the results of this analysis.

**New Orleans in Context: Lost Space and the Crescent City**

The central business district of New Orleans, unfortunately, provides an excellent location from which to view the evolution of lost space. The central business district of New Orleans was “created” within the core of the established neighborhood of the Faubourg Ste. Marie\(^2\). The process of converting the historic neighborhood into a modern CBD has left numerous scars on the urban fabric. This process shows the failure of urban planning to effectively balance the economic interests of a growing business district with the historic and cultural resources of the area. This management failure is particularly troubling because much of the New Orleans economy is based on tourism to the historic city, the resource that was conspicuously sacrificed in the creation of the CBD. The remnants of this historic past now sit amidst the surface parking and large parcel megastructure development. Pedestrians move through the cavernous edges of high-rises on the side of wide thoroughfares connected to the Interstate system.
One of the most significant negative landscape features found in the New Orleans CBD is the wide extent of surface parking. An analysis of land use in the central business district shows that 10.05% of total land area is turned over to surface parking. When the amount of surface parking is calculated for the South Rampart Street Corridor, the percentage goes up even higher. 17.47% of land in this zone is covered with surface parking. Figure 1 shows the extent of surface parking in the CBD (represented in light red). Much of the parking is concentrated in a “seam” that follows the South Rampart Street Corridor (the near vertical red line on the left hand side of the image), transecting Louis Armstrong’s old neighborhood. A close-up image of the area shows the negative pedestrian environment that has resulted from this concentration of surface parking (Figure 2). The name of the parking company, Jazz City Parking, is a cruel play on the authentic history of the area.

Today, the area lies between the governmental/institutional uses to the north and the more concentrated area of high-rises towards the river and along Poydras Street. The concentration of institutional uses to the northern end of the image of Figure 3, represented in pink, includes the New Orleans City Hall, Louisiana Supreme Court, New Orleans Library, the Louisiana State Office Complex, Charity Hospital, the Superdome, and the United States Post Office Complex.

The institutional and high-rise land uses are significant because they generally utilize large land parcels that tend to have a negative impact on the diversity of uses in an area. Figure 4 shows that in New Orleans the concentration of institutional uses overlaps with the area of the highest concentration of large parcels (shown in yellow in the image). The entire northern extent of the image, as well as the area along the
Mississippi River, is covered with large parcels (nearly all of which are institutional uses). As Vernez-Moudon pointed out in Chapter 2, areas of large land parcels are characterized by single-uses that negatively impact the diversity of landscape uses. When single uses and large parcels dominate an area (as they do in the northern extent of the image), the vitality of the cultural landscape is often threatened.

This assertion appears to be born out by an analysis of the number and type of businesses along the Rampart Street corridor. While this issue is dealt with in greater depth in Chapter 6, a cursory examination of the Polks Directory of business records along the Rampart Street corridor show a dramatic decline in the number and type of establishments that continued to exist after the creation of the large Civic Center complex. Chart 1 shows that after a brief rebound in the number of businesses after the Great Depression and World War II in 1947, the number of business began a steady decline. The decline was particularly steep between 1958, shortly after the Civic Center opened, and 1968. While the forces at work in this area are complex, the creation of the large single-use district to the north and gradual
insertion of large, insular high-rise complexes in close proximity to area appear to have robbed the area of much of its clientele.

The area is further divided by the wide expanses of Loyola Avenue and Poydras Street (Figure 5). These wide thoroughfares act to hamper pedestrian mobility by creating large areas given over to the automobile. The automobile landscape is made all the more stark as the scene shifts to the north towards the enclosed megastructure development of the Superdome/Hyatt Regency/New Orleans Center complex and the elevated Interstate Highway above Claiborne Avenue (Figure 6 and 7).

It is little wonder then that this area is identified as “lost space.” Large parcel sizes to the north and south concentrate use while the predominance of surface parking along the “seam” of Loyola Avenue creates a landscape that, while not overtly hostile to pedestrians, certainly is not inviting. The wide streets linking into the Interstate system cede control of much of the area over to the automobile. Figure 8 provides a graphic portrait of the extent of lost space in the Perdido/Rampart Street area.

Unfortunately, the lost space problem in the CBD of New Orleans extends beyond the bounds of the immediate study area. Figure 9 presents a complied map of the lost space indicators in the New Orleans CBD. The areas marked in red denote the identified linear lost space indicators. The resulting graphic highlights the incredible number of seams that exist in the current urban fabric. While it is possible to traverse the upper CBD areas by foot, the journey is in no way pleasing. The area basically contains “bubbles” of insular development surrounded by broad roadways and surface parking. The area is a spread out zone of 9 to 5 activity nodes surrounded by lost space.
Landscape Management or Landscape Capitulation?

Lost space along Loyola Avenue is the result of a series of urban design breakages that have developed due to poor landscape management. One of the important tools that can be utilized to help manage landscape change is the use of historic districts. This technique has, especially in the French Quarter, been used effectively to maintain the historic morphology. While numerous weaknesses exist with the current use of historic districts in New Orleans, they at least provide a modicum of protection. The Perdido/Rampart Street area, however, is covered by neither the local historic district landmarks commission zones nor the national register of historic districts zones. Figure 10 shows the national register historic districts. Figure 11 shows the local districts.

The only current mechanism to attempt to manage the remaining historic properties in non-historic districts is the use of the historic landmark tag. Three properties along Rampart Street that were important to the creation of jazz have been nominated (Figure 12). While this technique can make it more difficult to demolish these properties, the failure to include the historic fabric of the Perdido area in a historic district has significantly decreased the viability of adaptive reuse strategies.

While the contemporary Rampart Street corridor probably does not have enough historic structures to be included as a historic district, the preponderance of lost space indicates that significant attention should be paid to this space. A design review overlay district could be an effective tool to help reintegrate the area into the urban fabric. The concluding chapter of this dissertation explores the use of design review in greater depth.
Conclusion

This urban design analysis has highlighted the significant weaknesses in the present urban fabric of the Central Business District of New Orleans. By utilizing a GIS system to map areas of lost space, a comprehensive portrait of the seams in the urban fabric has been created. This approach utilizes readily available technology to track current landscape conditions using well-established urban design analysis principles. This snap-shot of current conditions does not, however, describe what has been lost or tell the detailed history of how the lost space was transformed. The following series of chapters seeks to provide a more detailed portrait of the landscape transformation process.

1 The compiled indicators list is intended as a general guide to possible lost spaces. It is not meant as a definitive list of all poor urban design conditions. In practice, the types of indicators will vary from location to location. It is offered here as a basic template for this type of work.
2 The Faubourg Ste. Marie, the first suburb of New Orleans, was originally platted in 1788 after a fire in the French Quarter (Wilson 1972). The following chapters discuss in detail the basic patterns of historic morphology and the successive mechanisms that altered it.
3 The New Orleans CBD has fared better than some other U.S. cities. By way of comparison, forty percent of the land area in the warehouse district in Cleveland is covered by surface parking (Livingston 2004). This area on the edge of downtown Cleveland, unfortunately, resembles many lost space areas around the country.
Chapter 4: The Island City (New Orleans 1788-1900)

This chapter explores two crucial components of the New Orleans nineteenth century landscape: its evolving morphological base structure and the growing multicultural ethnic fabric of its culture. These founding patterns set a remarkably resilient template for the growth of the jazz landscape in the early twentieth century.

Introduction to the Morphological Analysis of New Orleans

The lost spaces of the contemporary New Orleans central business district outlined in the preceding chapter appear at first glance to be the sole products of twentieth century modern development. While it is tempting to identify these twentieth century interventions as the cause of lost space in New Orleans, such a reading unnecessarily isolates the modern development era from the historical continuum of land use that helped define the city. When the scope of inquiry into the causes of lost space is widened to include these “inherited geographies” (Lewis 1976, p. 31), long-standing patterns of lost space development begin to appear that stretch back to the founding of the city. Modern development, seen in this light, exacerbated existing negative landscape features more than created them.

Instead of arguing that modern development led to the introduction of lost space into the urban pattern of New Orleans, it is more appropriate to look at modern interventions as failed “cures” to a preexisting lost space problem. In Chapter 1, Baldwin’s (1999) analysis of urban space reform efforts in Hartford, Connecticut was highlighted. His analysis showed how “numerous piecemeal reform efforts” (p. 265) resulted in the modern segregation of urban space. These reforms, coupled with the growth of the use
of the automobile and its attendant space needs, helped transform the multi-use public spaces of the nineteenth century street into the single-use, “wastelands of modern American cities” (p. 262) of the latter twentieth century.

While the negative consequences of modern interventions, in many instances, were the result of well meaning, though, misguided reform efforts, the worst excesses of modern development in the 1950s and 60s appear to spring from a different, more authoritarian strain of the modern project (Scott 1998). Berman’s discussion of Robert Moses (1982) highlights the de-coupling of the modern project from its reform heritage that occurred in the mid-twentieth century. When the social and material sides of modernism were split apart, the brutality of efficiency represented by the single-use conception of the city drastically altered city form. This era was marked by, what Conzen (1981) in chapter two called, augmentative change where the entire street grid is altered to expand the size of the lots of land for the large modernist structures. Rather than the piecemeal reforms that had characterized most previous interventions, adaptive change in Conzen’s language, the mid-century modern project sought to wipe away the existing morphology to start from scratch. The following morphology chapters highlight how these processes affected what is now the New Orleans central business district.

Introduction: The Island City

This chapter explores two crucial components of the New Orleans nineteenth century landscape: its evolving morphological base structure and the growing multicultural ethnic fabric of its culture. Morphological analysis of the historic patterns of development in New Orleans reveals the existence of “seams” in the urban fabric that
date back to the city’s founding. One of the most persistent seams is located in the area between the developed riverside areas and the backswamp territory in the interior. Throughout the 19th century (and into the 20th and 21st), this "seam" has consistently been located along the Rampart Street corridor.

The multicultural ethnic fabric of New Orleans that developed during the nineteenth century was marked by, as Hirsch and Logsdon (1992) argue, “a racial order unique to the United States” (p. 101). In New Orleans, large numbers of free people of color, many of whom were French speakers, had been integrated into the culture and economy of the city. In the early to mid-nineteenth century free people of color represented a large portion of the city’s population. According to Hirsch and Logsdon (1992, p. 192), free people of color made up 29 percent of the city’s population in 1810 and still comprised 18 percent of the city’s population as late as the early 1840s. In addition, racial mixtures among the many ethnic groups of the city had been “common and widely accepted” (Hall 1992, p. 63). While many complex interactions and forces helped to create this unique climate, the continued importance of the assimilationist ethos planted by the colonial French helped to allow a greater freedom of association and interaction between different groups than in probably any other U.S. city. The evolution of this ethos will be traced in this chapter through an examination of Hirsch and Logsdon’s edited collection Creole New Orleans (1992).

As we will see in chapter five, the Rampart Street corridor will become the setting for the most important cultural product that New Orleans, and possibly the United States, has ever produced: jazz. The late nineteenth and early twentieth century cultural fabric of this area and the city in general was still marked by the traces of the French colonial
racial dynamic that helped to foster a wider freedom of association between different peoples. This wider latitude played a significant role in creating the multi-cultural neighborhood that helped to produce jazz. The morphological base structure of New Orleans is examined first.

**Morphologic Study of New Orleans**

While a definitive, overarching study focusing exclusively on the evolution of New Orleans' morphological structure has yet to be written, several excellent portraits of the growth of the city can be used to provide guidance. The multi-volume New Orleans Architecture series by the Friends of the Cabildo (Pelican Publishing) is particularly valuable for its detailed analysis of early property transactions that affected city growth. Volumes 1 (1971), 2 (1972), 4 (1974), and 6 (1980) covering respectively the Lower Garden District, the Faubourg St. Mary, the Creole Faubourgs and Treme and Bayou Road have been mined extensively for this section. These accounts are used to focus on the growth of the new suburb of the Faubourg Ste. Marie adjacent to the French Quarter. The development of this area during the nineteenth century shows the emergence of a distinct business section of the city developing adjacent to a mixed-use residential and industrial section focused around the riverfront and along the *internal waterfront* of the newly constructed New Basin Canal. The morphological development during this era sets the pattern for the development struggles that are covered in greater detail in the latter chapters of this dissertation.

**Setting the Template: The Colonial Morphology of New Orleans**

At the dawn of the nineteenth century, New Orleans was under the colonial rule of the Spanish. The French had lost control of the area to the Spanish in 1763, though
they would briefly regain the rights to the territory before the Americans purchased the territory in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. The French had found it difficult to make the Louisiana colony into a workable economic engine. Despite New Orleans’ dominant position at the end of the Mississippi River, the colony as a whole struggled to produce the wealth that the French desired.

The Spanish also had trouble creating a strong colony in Louisiana. The urban engine of the colony, New Orleans, could not effectively be linked to the surrounding countryside because of the vast swamps that surrounded it. Instead of acting as an engine for regional growth, New Orleans was more like an island state of the Gulf of Mexico. It was well connected to the outside world and its cultures, but ill connected to the southern region. New Orleans floated culturally just out of reach of the inland territory of North America. It was “a cultural island” (Lewis 1976, p. 30).

Despite problems managing the colonial enterprise, New Orleans itself was outgrowing its original urban template of the French Quarter. The French Quarter, the morphological original plan unit of New Orleans, had been formally laid out in 1722 by Le Blond de la Tour (Wilson 1972, p. 3) as a grid, with 7 horizontal streets paralleling the Mississippi River and 13 vertical streets moving away from the river towards the inland swamps.

The surrounding areas had been divided up by the French into long, narrow plantations. The French system was based on providing crucial water-access to multiple owners and was used extensively throughout colonial French North America. Germain and Rose (2000), in their excellent work on the growth of Montreal, note that:
“Under the French regime, agricultural land was divided into long, narrow lots, roughly 2
arpents wide by 20 arpents deep and perpendicular to the waterways” (p. 37).

In New Orleans, the system was slightly different because of a large land tract owned
by the Jesuits. During the early to mid-1700’s, the Jesuits had acquired a considerable
amount of property along the upriver section of New Orleans. They had acquired thirty-
two arpents of riverfront property stretching from the French Quarter to what is now
Felicity Street Uptown. In 1763, after the French and Indian War when the Spanish took
control of Louisiana, the Jesuits were expelled from Louisiana. Their property was put
up for auction and divided into six parcels (Wilson, 1971, p. 6). The tracts allowed for
river access of five arpents, except for the tract closest to the original city which was
seven riverfront arpents long. The seven arpent tract was sold to Charles de Pradel
who then immediately bought the adjacent five arpent tract no. 2. These two combined
tracts created a single developable area next to the French Quarter of twelve riverfront
arpents. While the New Orleans system was carried out slightly differently than its
Canadian counterparts, the impact of the land subdivision arrangement was the same
with a resulting landscape of thin, long properties that extended back from the water.

Two significant aspects of this original French development are worth noting here.
First, the grid pattern of the French Quarter with a public square at its center became
the established template for urban development. This grid system was protected by
earthen walls and wooden gangplanks that divided the city from the swamps and
wilderness that surrounded it. While these ramshackle fortifications, or a “higgledy-
piggeldy wooden palisade” (Lewis 1976, p. 32), never became a well-established wall
like the one that still stands in the preeminent French North American colonial city of
Ville Quebec, they acted to constrain and focus development within the grid. The name Rampart Street even today echoes the history of fortification and division that were the original purposes of this space.

A second significant aspect of the original French land development scheme is linked to the use of the long, thin subdivision of plantations surrounding the original city. The original layout of these properties has had a persistent effect on the morphological fabric of the city to this day. As the city began to grow, the plantations one at a time were essentially plugged into an extended urban grid.

Each plantation, from a morphological perspective, acted as a plan unit representing a different development era. As each plan unit was added as needed, the street system was extended to incorporate these new areas. Streets paralleling the river like St. Charles Avenue and Magazine Street were simply extended when new development occurred. In addition, boulevards were created along the dividing lines of the old plantation land. The great boulevards of Louisiana and Napoleon Avenues owe their existence to this form of development (Lewis 1976).

The first modern plan for New Orleans created by the national consulting firm of Harland Bartholomew and Associates notes the continued importance of the original land layout into the twentieth century. Bartholomew (1926) notes that: “The property lines of a community have a pronounced effect upon its character. In New Orleans, old plantation lines have a determining factor in the arrangement of the street pattern. They have given the city a circulation plan that is unique in many respects. Streets running back from the river tend to come to a focus” (Harland Bartholomew and Associates, 1926 p. 19).
The “focus” that Bartholomew is referring to occurs because of the relationship between the curve of the river and the original long, thin plantation lines. This subdivision of land resulted in a crescent shaped configuration of property boundaries that, when they were eventually connected into the street grid, resulted in a network of streets that resembles a wagon wheel. The curve is represented by the river and is connected to the hub in what would eventually become Mid City. The Crescent City, in this sense, is an apt nickname for the city as it helps to define the morphological fabric of the city.

**Creating the “Double-Yoked Egg”: The Growth of Faubourg Ste. Marie**

The interplay of the original morphologic template of the area with development pressures can be seen in the first expansion of the city into the upriver area that had originally been the Jesuit plantation. The morphological and cultural development of the new area can be read as a form of competition between the inhabitants of the original plan unit of the French Quarter and those of the new growing area of the Faubourg Ste. Marie. In many ways, the growth of the new subdivision mirrored the developments that had taken place in the original French Quarter. Lewis (1976) argues that important elements of the two areas “were sharply duplicated. New Orleans, with its two self-sustaining centers, was rather like a double-yoked egg” (p. 40). This process of morphological mirroring provides important insights into both the physical and cultural landscape that developed during the nineteenth century in New Orleans. The next section explores the physical changes that occurred to the landscape providing context for the cultural discussion to follow.
Plan Unit Expansion in Action: The Faubourg Ste. Marie

In 1788, the threat of fire and increasing development pressures led to the growth of a new subdivision of the city. The area chosen for the new development was located just upriver from the French Quarter and was originally known as the Faubourg Gravier after the owner of the plantation on whose land the new area was built. The name of the area was eventually changed to Faubourg Ste. Marie to honor the deceased wife of Gravier. This became the second basic plan unit of New Orleans.

Much of the template for this second plan unit, as Lewis suggests, was based on the original morphologic fabric laid out in the French Quarter. One of the earliest elements of the process of mirroring can be seen in the development of the street morphology of the Faubourg Ste. Marie. The new area was originally divided by Trudeau in 1788 into 3 horizontal streets paralleling the river and 4 vertical streets stretching towards the back swamp area in the interior of the city. In addition, the newly subdivided area also had an oblique street named Gravier after the plantation owner. Gravier Street divided the newly subdivided area from an open area between the Faubourg Ste. Marie and the French Quarter known as the Commons that was occupied by a ramshackle fort. Development in the new Faubourg Ste. Marie was focused around a ceremonial square just like the original French development.

As the area grew, the plan was enlarged to encompass several new horizontal streets that had by 1798 increased the number of streets paralleling the river to seven. Significantly, the edge of the planned land in the new Faubourg Ste. Marie paralleled the original edge of the planned area of the French Quarter that was established by
Rampart Street. Rue de Cirque, the Faubourg St. Marie equivalent of Rampart Street, divided the developed high ground of the riverside area from the interior swamps.

The two original plan units of the city, however, were not originally connected through a well-defined street system. Between the two areas sat the triangular plot of land, the Commons. The Spanish had laid this land aside for military purposes. After the Americans took possession of the Louisiana Territory in 1803 from the short-lived second French possession, the Commons area sat mostly dormant for several years as the old Fort Burgundy was ransacked for firewood.

In the intervening years, the city began to expand both upriver and downriver. In 1806, Barthelemew Lafon was charged with drawing up plans for an extension of the Faubourg Ste. Marie further upriver into the Delord-Sarpy planatation. In the same year, Lafon also drew up plans for the Faubourg Marigny just downriver form the French Quarter. The rapidly growing city now had added two new plan units to its morphological structure.

The Commons area, however, still remained undeveloped. In 1810, the city surveyor, Jacques Tanesse, was charged with linking the area into the city grid system. His plan for this triangular shaped area extended the street grid with six cross-streets that linked the Faubourg Ste. Marie street system into the streets of the French Quarter. This triangular shaped plan unit is still visible in the street grid of the city. Once again, the plan for the Commons area extended back only as far as Rampart Street. Thus, the edge of these plan units was fixed on Rampart Street (Figure 1).

By 1817, the Rampart Street edge had been breached along nearly the full extent of the Commons and French Quarter plan units. According to Tanesse’s a Plan of the City
and Suburbs of New Orleans from an actual survey (1817), the Commons area had been extended back from the river another 5 horizontal streets. This new area began to encompass the land around the Carondolet or Old Basin Canal that had been dug in 1794 to provide water access to nearby Lake Pontchartrain (Toledano and Christovich 1980, p. 60). In the Faubourg Ste. Marie section, the streets had been extended back 3 horizontal streets linking to the streets of the Commons area. The horizontal street plan, however, stopped at Poydras Street because of a canal that had been dug along the upper portions of the street. The result of this “blockage” in the street grid system was a definitive “L-shaped” plan unit seam running along the undeveloped area of Rampart Street to Poydras and then up that street.

While in 1817 this plan unit seam simply separated undeveloped swamp land from the edge of urban growth, the succeeding development schemes during the nineteenth century served to reinforce this edge. The most important addition to the nineteenth century landscape of this area was the creation another canal, the New Basin Canal. Its creation and the subsequent industrial and railroad development that took place on its banks helped to entrench the original landscape division, creating a remarkably persistent seam in the landscape.

**Internal Waterfronts: The New Basin and Old Basin Canals**

While the Mississippi River provided the front door to the city and a definitive edge to development in the growing city, two canals, the Old Basin and New Basin, were designed to help funnel development and industry into the backdoor of New Orleans. The Old Basin Canal, dug in 1894, and the New Basin Canal, dug in the 1830s, were
designed to take advantage of an easier and faster water route into the city, Lake Pontchartrain.

The trip from the Gulf of Mexico up the Mississippi River was often a treacherous and slow journey because of shifting sand bars and narrow passages. Lake Pontchartrain, a tidal lake connected to the Gulf, provided another avenue for ships to reach New Orleans. The edge of the lake at New Orleans was separated by only a couple of miles from the Mississippi River. The two canals took advantage of this short distance and provided access to an easy transshipment point where goods could be transferred to other ships for movement up the river.

These two canals were significant elements of the New Orleans 19th century landscape. The banks of these canals are best conceptualized as internal waterfronts with all the attendant industry and intrigue associated with port areas. While the Old Basin Canal focused on the backside of the French Quarter, the growth of the New Basin Canal created an important morphological and cultural component for South Rampart Street in the Faubourg Ste. Marie, the backdoor into the city.

**The New Basin Canal: Irish, Industry, and Americans**

Lewis (1976), in probably the best work on the significance of morphological changes in New Orleans, makes three important arguments about the impact of the New Basin Canal on the growing city. First, Lewis argues that the New Basin Canal was dug because of the shift of economic dynamism from the Creoles and their French Quarter to the new American dominated Faubourg Ste. Marie. He says:

Even navigational canals were duplicated, although more for economic than for ethnic reasons. As the American city grew upstream, the Carondolet Canal behind the French Quarter was farther and farther away from the focus of commercial activity, which continued to move Uptown. In 1832, therefore, construction began on a 'New Basin
Canal’ which by 1838 had connected Lake Pontchartrain directly with the back of the American city. It was an exact counterpart of the Carondolet Canal of the Creoles (p. 40).

While Lewis is certainly correct in asserting a geographic shift in the economic core of the city from the French Quarter to the Faubourg Ste. Marie, his contention that “ethnic reasons” played a small part in the decision to dig an entirely new canal to link to the lake probably should be refined further. Geographically, the terminus of the Old Basin Canal turned out to be only about ten blocks away from the eventual turning basin of the New Basin Canal. If there had not been such great animosity between the French-dominated zone and the English-speaking area, it would have been significantly easier to extend the canal towards the new business section. Instead of extending the canal, the Americans dug through the sweltering, backswamp for miles to achieve their goal. While further research could help to clarify this situation, it appears that the tremendous distrust and animosity between these two groups helped to justify such a large-scale operation in contrast to the relatively minor, communal endeavor of extending the canal.

Despite this difference of opinion on the reasons for building an entirely new canal, Lewis makes two more great points on the significance of the canal to New Orleans’ geography. Lewis argues that the new canal helped establish “another major route into the city from behind- a route which ultimately became the main umbilical cord from the central and western United States. Alongside it were built several railroad lines, the most important of which eventually became the main line of the Illinois central to Chicago” (p. 40). These railroad lines helped focus industrial development of the city along the canal banks. While New Orleans never became a major industrial center, the
linear corridor of the New Basin Canal was, with the Old Basin Canal, the focus of industry in the city during the late nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries (Barthlomew 1926, p. 37)

The final major impact of the New Basin Canal on New Orleans, according to Lewis, was the impact on the city’s population geography. Because of the scope and expense of building the canal, a large work force was needed to carry out the operation. Lewis argues that the Irish were brought in to fill this need. He says, “To do the job, Irishmen were hired in great numbers, just as they were hired in the North and West to build railroads. New Orleans became the only Southern city with any substantial number of new European immigrants” (p. 40). The Irish paid a terrible price for their work on this project as they died in large numbers due to tropical diseases. Despite the tragedy and large death count, significant numbers of Irish and other Europeans continued to come to New Orleans. While this influx began to significantly alter the cultural geography of New Orleans, the incoming immigrants encountered the remnants of the French colonial cultural framework known as the assimilationist ethos. The remnants of this system helped to produce a cultural framework in New Orleans that was unique to other growing United States cities of the nineteenth century.

Cultural Fabric of the Expanding City: Immigration, Americanization, and the Assimilationist Ethos

One of the keys to uncovering the origins of New Orleans’ unique cultural fabric is an understanding of the colonial French system of assimilation that had been planted in Louisiana. The French assimilationist ethos focused on integrating the native cultures with the incoming French colonists. This thesis is explored in Johnson’s excellent chapter in Creole New Orleans (1992). Johnson argues that the French colonial system
that was utilized in Canada was transported to the Louisiana colony. In the same way that the French morphological concepts of city building became embedded in the fabric of New Orleans, so too did the French cultural assimilationist ethos. Johnson argues that, “Most of colonial Louisiana’s history is better understood against its Canadian background. The formative Louisiana colonial experience represented an extension of the French experience in Canada” (p. 19).

The French system was marked by an attempt to integrate native populations with the incoming French through intermarriage and other channels. This process, while significantly more open than the English system of segregation and conflict, was not without its share of brutality. Johnson argues that, “When Indians resisted French plans, French authorities were as ready and willing to destroy them as the English” (p. 25). Though still often brutal in its implementation, this French colonial practice encouraged a wider latitude of interaction between differing peoples and considerably more “accommodation” (Johnson 1992, p. 26) when common ground could be established.

While the implementation of this French ethos was a complicated and contested affair, the lingering impact of this practice offers an important window into how the nineteenth century New Orleans cultural fabric developed. Johnson (1992) makes this point when he argues that, “If, however, one views early Louisiana, and particularly New Orleans, in French colonial terms, as a fragment of the eighteenth-century French ethos, many aspects of its early and later social and ethnic history fall into place” (p. 12).

Several important nineteenth century cultural developments in New Orleans can be seen as an extension of this assimilationist ethos. The unique process of
Americanization of New Orleans provides an avenue into this analysis. With the Louisiana Purchase, New Orleans began to be inundated with the English-speaking Americans. The process of turning an established French-speaking city into an English-speaking city linked to the rest of America, the process of Americanization, helps to show the enduring importance of the assimilationist ethos to nineteenth century New Orleans.

In New Orleans at the turn of the nineteenth century, racial categorization was a significantly more fluid affair than it was in the former English colonies. The Anglo system, in general, focused on a dualistic racial categorization scheme that recognized whites and blacks. The French system, however, was a three-tiered system of whites, blacks, and free people of color. While this categorization was under significant threat during the nineteenth century from a broad array of cultural forces that are covered extremely well in Creole New Orleans, the broader elements of tolerance embodied by this three-tiered racial system resulted in a city culture in New Orleans that was drastically different from probably any other place in the new United States. The persistence of the assimilative tradition throughout the nineteenth century into the beginning of the twentieth century created a cultural landscape that was unique to the U.S. experience.

While the cultural uniqueness of New Orleans is often noted as an important element in the eventual growth of jazz in the city, the cultural uniqueness that helped foster the growth of jazz does not, however, come from the traditional view of Creole versus Anglo residential pattern often cited in the literature as a source of the cultural vigor of New Orleans. The traditional view of the New Orleans ethnic fabric has focused almost
exclusively on the rivalry between the influx of English speaking Americans locating in the American sector uptown versus the entrenched French speaking Creole residents of downtown (Johnson 2000). While this reading of New Orleans cultural history is generally valid for the period immediately after the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, its validity for understanding the mid-to late-nineteenth and twentieth centuries, particularly in relation to the formation of jazz, is far more tenuous.

Research into immigration patterns of New Orleans during the nineteenth century has helped to create a much more nuanced portrait of the New Orleans ethnic makeup. New Orleans, like many other urban centers in America, was infused with a tremendous number of European immigrants. Before the Civil War, New Orleans was second only to New York as a port of entry for immigrants (Hirsch and Logsdon 1992, p. 96). In New Orleans, the predominant immigrant nationalities before the Civil War were the German and Irish along with a still steady stream of French immigrants. After the Civil War, significant numbers of Italians along with Spaniards, Latin Americans, Greeks, Dalmatians, Chinese and Filipinos also began to make their way into the city (Hirsch and Logsdon 1992, p. 96). This steady stream of immigration of non-French immigrants altered the traditional French versus English view of New Orleans cultural landscape. Tregle (1992) sums this up when he argues that, “So dramatically did this invasion reshape the demographic patterns of the city that the old descriptive designations of ‘American’ and ‘creole’ sections of town became meaningless except as familiar labels of geographic location” (p. 164).

While the influx of immigrant groups into the urban center is certainly not unique to the New Orleans experience, the existing cultural fabric that took in these new
immigrants was different from the wider American experience. This factor is crucial to understanding how the New Orleans cultural fabric helped produce a wider freedom of association that has been characterized with the beginnings of jazz.

Despite the huge influx of new immigrants, New Orleans' cultural fabric in the late 19th century still showed the effect of the assimilative tradition planted by its French and Spanish colonial experience. New Orleans' colonial heritage as part of the French and Spanish colonial administrative systems had planted an assimilative racial ethos into the culture that allowed for a broader, though still restrictive, categorization of race. Instead of the clear racial lines of white and black drawn in most of the rest of the United States, the New Orleans colonial experience had fostered, in Hirsch and Logsdon’ (1992) terms, “the curious coexistence of a three-tiered Caribbean racial structure alongside the two-tiered American counterpart in an ethnically divided city” (p. 189).

Hirsch and Logsdon’s description highlights both the continued importance of the colonial heritage and the contested nature of the process of Americanization that was altering this heritage. In New Orleans in the late nineteenth century, both the American and the French traditions competed, creating “an ethnically divided” but, paradoxically, more tolerant city.

Conclusion

Despite the dramatic physical growth and cultural upheaval that had shaken New Orleans throughout the nineteenth century, persistent morphological and cultural characteristics remained embedded in the fabric of the city and its residents. The assimilationist ethos, while challenged, still allowed a far greater interaction of different peoples than was widely accessible in the rest of the country. The settlement plan of the
city was focused along the higher ground of the river. The land in the interior was still mostly swamp. And, importantly for the present study, the area around Rampart and Perdido Streets was still a definitive edge between the Front of Town and the Back of Town. Before these patterns were shattered by the full force of Jim Crow, improved drainage, and the widening suburban sphere with its attendant super highways, a new sound began to emerge that would soon sweep through the world: jazz.

---

1 Scott’s (1998) work provides a broad look at how large-scale projects designed to engineer society failed. He argues that four elements were necessary to produce a large-scale tragedy. He says, “In sum, the legibility of a society provides the capacity for large-scale social engineering, high-modernist ideology provides the desire, the authoritarian state provides the determination to act on that desire, and an incapacitated civil society provides the leveled social terrain on which to build” (p. 5). His chapter on Robert Moses provides a compelling document of how these four elements lined up in the United States in the 1950s to help pummel many central cities.

2 The New Orleans Architecture series does an excellent job in describing the specifics of this process. The intervention of several excellent town surveyors, most notably Barthelemy Lafon, helped to create continuity in this process.

3 The historic information for this section was taken from Wilson’s essay in the edited work of Cristovich, Toledano, Swanson, and Holden (1972). This text provides the best detailed historic account of land use development for the Faubourg Ste. Marie section of the city.

4 Johnson (1992) argues that it was during the Spanish regime that the free people of color in New Orleans “matured into a community” (p. 52). He argues that the increasing numbers of free people of color in New Orleans resulted from an influx of free people of color from Saint Domingue and the easier process of acquiring freedom, manumission, under the Spanish regime.
Chapter 5 Landscape of the Cradle of Jazz: Transcribing Louis’ Vision onto the Landscape

This chapter builds a portrait of one of the central early landscapes of jazz in New Orleans. The South Rampart Street neighborhood of Louis Armstrong is examined through an analysis of Sanborn records and the written descriptions of the area by both jazz musicians and jazz scholars.

Introduction

This chapter explores two aspects of the evolving early twentieth century landscape of jazz in the Perdido Street area. First, Louis Armstrong’s portrait of the area is examined. Louis, the most famous resident of the area, was an avid writer and immortalized the area in his autobiography Satchmo: My Life in New Orleans (1954). Louis’ description of the area provides a unique window into both the land uses and the cultural interplay between the various ethnic groups that inhabited the area. The second half of the chapter examines the morphological fabric of the area. This section provides an in-depth portrait of the streets, architecture, and public spaces of the area.

A Landscape of Jazz

Laurence Bergreen in his biography of Louis Armstrong refers to the importance of the changing nature of the “landscape of jazz” (Bergreen 1997, p. 442) to Armstrong’s musical growth. Bergreen is referring here to the musical landscape, a cauldron of changing popular tastes and artistic ambitions. The landscape of jazz can, however, be taken literally. Bergreen’s work throughout points to the significant social spaces, real places, that helped to shape Armstrong’s career and the jazz movement in general.
While Armstrong moved out of New Orleans for good in the summer of 1922, the formative landscape of jazz and Armstrong’s own childhood landscape were inextricably intertwined. This section explores the landscape of the cradle of jazz through the eyes of Louis Armstrong. Bergreen’s biography and Louis’ own autobiography provide a rich source of information on the social and cultural aspects of the Perdido/Rampart Street neighborhood. This information, augmented by other significant accounts of the culture and morphology of the area, is presented to help create a portrait of the landscape of jazz during its formative period.

**Defining a Jazz Landscape: Louis’ Landscape of Jazz**

In the first three decades of the 20th century, South Rampart Street was the main stem of Black Society in New Orleans. If ever there was such a thing, it was a jazz neighborhood.

(Al Rose 1988, p. 13)

In the early 1900s, a young Louis Armstrong moved from his grandmother’s home in the Jane Alley area around South Broad Street to his mother's tiny confines on Perdido Street. While Louis was only physically traveling a mile or so on the streetcar, he was moving into an exciting and perilous new cultural landscape. Louis was moving straight into the heart of what was becoming one of the first jazz landscapes.

As Louis arrived in his new neighborhood, a new sound was beginning to develop. The first stirrings of jazz were beginning to take shape. While it is difficult (and contentious) to pinpoint the exact moment when jazz began to flower, the period between 1895 and 1917 provides several good benchmarks for the development of the new sound. Bruce Raeburn (1995), the Curator of the Hogan Jazz Archive at Tulane University, makes this point when he argues that “until new evidence is forthcoming
an evolutionary scenario extending from the formation of the Bolden Band in 1895 to the first recordings in 1917 by the Original Dixieland Jazz Band provides convenient benchmarks for consideration of the relevant issue pertaining to jazz origins in New Orleans, even if it leaves many questions unanswered” (p. 69).

The evolutionary development of jazz with its wide cultural underpinnings, while geographically occurring in a myriad of distinct locations, was centering in this period on New Orleans, and specifically in the area surrounding Louis Armstrong’s new neighborhood. In his new neighborhood, Louis was surrounded by a wide assortment of characters: from the rough “sporting” crowd of the legalized prostitution area known as Storyville to the Jewish and Italian merchants along Rampart Street to the musicians who worked the saloons and parades that criss-crossed the area. The world Louis had moved into was chaotic and dangerous, as well as exciting and supportive. This incredibly mixed, contradictory universe was the place where, as Louis says in a description of his childhood, he and jazz grew up². In describing his childhood home, Louis helps to provide a broad-reaching account of the cultural components of a jazz landscape³. Three components of Louis’ description are particularly important for defining the jazz landscape. These are: the diversity of land uses he describes in his neighborhood, the significance of the street as a setting for many of his encounters, and the wide variety of different ethnicities that populate his stories.

**From Banana Boats to Bakeries to Brothels: Land Use in Louis’ Landscape**

First, Louis describes an incredible diversity of differing land uses concentrated in close proximity to one another. Figure 1 shows the geographic distribution of some of the important places in Armstrong’s neighborhood overlaid on a contemporary aerial
photo of the area. What is significant about the places that Armstrong and Bergreen mention is both their diversity in terms of types of land uses and their concentration in a relatively small area. Within three blocks of Armstrong’s home no less than 10 saloons and dance halls are mentioned. This is in addition to several Social Aid and Pleasure Clubs in the area that provided an early form of insurance as well as work for musicians in their sponsored parades that circulated through the area. In addition, restaurants, bakeries, music shops, and public markets dot Armstrong’s neighborhood. This multitude of social and commercial uses existed side by side with the governmental uses of the court complex on Saratoga Street and the industrial uses of a coal company and the commercial docks of the New Basin Canal. This incredible mix of uses was all concentrated within the radius of 5 blocks of Armstrong’s home.

Within five blocks of Louis’ home, he could be on the banks of the New Basin Canal watching the banana boats dock with their cargo from Central America, walk through the fresh produce (and scavenge from the discarded produce) of the Poydras Street Market, explore the street parades of the Social Aid and Pleasure Clubs of his neighborhood, sit outside the saloons to hear the early stirrings of jazz, walk into churches to hear the choirs sing towards heaven, and watch the prostitutes trade their bodies for dollars in the red light district of Storyville. An examination of the New Orleans Underwriters Inspection Bureau Records from 1897 (New Orleans Public Library Website 2003) shows the great number and type of the businesses that coexisted with residential uses in the first four blocks of South Rampart. One hundred and eighty-nine separate uses are listed for this four block area alone⁴.
Public Space and Jazz: The New Orleans Street

The second major component of Louis’ description of his neighborhood is the importance of the public space of the street to neighborhood life in general and to the growth of jazz in particular. Bruce Raeburn (2004) argues that music was and is an integral part of the New Orleans neighborhood experience. Raeburn lays out the significance of music to daily lives of a significant subset of the New Orleans population and, significantly, he situates it in the public space of the street. Raeburn says, “Meanwhile, in New Orleans, community connections such as ‘jazz funerals’ in which brass bands performed at funerals held by benevolent associations continued to underline the role of jazz as part of everyday life. Jazz may have been a luxury (entertainment) in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, but in New Orleans it was a necessity—a part of the fabric of life in the neighborhoods” (Raeburn 2004).

A report on jazz-related structures in New Orleans submitted to the National Park Service by Jerde and Treffinger (1990) echoes this point. Jerde and Treffinger argue that, “An energetic street and saloon culture typical of the world’s major port cities grew up here as the product of an ethnically diverse urban underclass, expressing itself through a rich vernacular musical tradition” (p. 1).

Jazz grew in the streets and saloons of this New Orleans neighborhood landscape. A brief look at the street life of the corner of Perdido and South Rampart Streets, one of the noted public places in Armstrong’s neighborhood, helps to show the importance of these street spaces.

Jonathan Tabak (1995) argues that if forced to “pinpoint one location as the true birthplace of jazz”, the Eagle Saloon, which was and still is at the corner of Perdido and
South Rampart, would be “a good candidate” (p. 62). While many other saloons scattered throughout the area can arguably lay claim to that title\textsuperscript{5}, the importance of the Eagle Saloon is amplified by its location as a staging ground for the many street parades that circulated throughout the neighborhood. Tabak (1995) quotes Louis Armstrong as stating that, “I remember the time when it had the good old street parades, you know, and brass bands, and everyone of ‘em was great. They’d all congregate in front of the Eagle Saloon at Rampart and Perdido” (p. 62).

One reason for congregating at this spot was the preponderance of fraternal and other organizations that made this area home. Don Marquis in In Search of Buddy Bolden (1978) argues that the music that filled the public spaces was fostered by a web of these organizations. He says, “The brass bands that so filled Buddy’s musical background were part of an interesting interweaving of undertaking establishments, churches, and benevolent societies and social clubs” (p. 32). These organizations’ sponsored parades provide work for a large number of bands. Tabak (1995) estimates that at the turn of the century about 100 bands were being employed in the city.

In addition to the parades that wove their way through the streets of New Orleans’ neighborhoods, the streets were an active setting for peddlers and hawkers of all types. Louis himself was employed by the Karnoffsky family to help out on a junk wagon that traversed the city’s neighborhoods. Marquis (1978) describes some of the others who made their livings from commerce on the city’s streets. He says, “The fruit and vegetable hawkers loaded their carts with produce from the canals and markets- such as Treme, Poydras, Kellers, and the old French Market- and then journeyed up and down city streets, each chanting his distinctly identifiable call” (p. 37).
In addition to Armstrong’s experiences on the Karnoffskys’ wagon, a significant part of Louis’ early musical career occurred in the streets. Numerous encounters and experiences happened for Louis in these public spaces. These ranged from the street parades that passed through his neighborhood, the corner musical performances by bands out to entice customers, and Armstrong’s own start singing with a group on the streets for tips.

These experiences led to Armstrong's eventual “discovery” by Band Leader Fate Marabel who offered Armstrong a place in his group that plied the river on a traveling riverboat. Bergreen (1997) describes this moment in Armstrong's life. He says:

“It was a Sunday, and he was riding through New Orleans along with the rest of the Ory band on the back of a truck, advertising their Monday night concert at Economy Hall. ‘We were playing a red-hot tune when another truck came along the street with another hot band,’ he said. ‘We came together at that same corner of Rampart and Perdido streets where I had been arrested five years before and sent to the Waifs Home. Of course that meant war between the two bands and we went to it, playing our strongest. I remember I almost blew my brains through my trumpet. A man by the name of Fate Marable was watching Louis that day” (p. 143 and 144).

Marable’s offer to join the band opened the door for Louis to begin his journey from a New Orleans phenomenon to an international icon. The journey began from the streets of New Orleans.

**Black and White and the Shades in Between: Ethnic Diversity and the Jazz Landscape**

The last major component of the landscape of jazz articulated by Armstrong is the fairly wide diversity of different ethnicities sharing and contesting the use of a concentrated space. Louis mentions a wide array of different groups who sometimes fought and sometimes worked together in his dense childhood neighborhood. Louis’ recollections of the cultural fabric of his neighborhood provide an amazing window into
how the first landscape of jazz functioned. Hirsch and Logsdon (1992) point to the significance of Louis' account when they say that, "Louis Armstrong’s autobiography, *Satchmo: My life in New Orleans* (New York, 1954), may be the most accurate treatment of the complicated- sometimes friendly, sometimes hostile- relationship between immigrants and black New Orleanians" (p.191).

Louis’ description of his neighborhood paints a portrait of both cultural conflict and cultural understanding between different ethnic groups. This description opens up an important avenue into one of the under appreciated aspects in the growth of jazz: the importance of the multicultural fabric of the city to the music's growth. Kathleen Rippey (1995) argues that one of the important factors in the growth of jazz in New Orleans was the interplay of the many different cultures then inhabiting, what she calls, “the original multi-cultural city” (p. 70). While this dissertation does not seek to articulate the specific cultural roles played by different ethnicities in the growth of jazz, it does seek to relate some of the broader historical scholarship on race in New Orleans to Louis’ articulation of the cultural fabric of his neighborhood. The unique articulation of race in New Orleans may be one of the avenues that helped to foster the openness needed to produce the multicultural art form of jazz.

Despite its geographic position in the south, the New Orleans of 1908 was a city that still floated beyond the direct pull of its regional and, in some ways, national contemporaries. Several factors helped to create a multi-cultural fabric that while similar in pattern to other American cities still maintained a basic cultural uniqueness that helped provide a significant openness and freedom that helped jazz develop here.
As was discussed in chapter four, this cultural uniqueness does not, however, come from the traditional view of the Creole versus Anglo residential pattern often cited in the literature as a stimulus to the growth of jazz. Once again, the traditional view of the New Orleans ethnic fabric has focused almost exclusively on the rivalry between the influx of English speaking Americans locating in the American sector uptown versus the French-speaking Creoles of downtown. In his excellent work on the origins of New Orleans jazz, Johnson (2000) seeks to correct an error in jazz scholarship that has attributed the growth of jazz to the forced cultural connection of black Creoles or, in Johnson’s terminology, Franco-black, and Anglo-blacks. In the commonly held reading of jazz history, the passage of Jim Crow laws in the 1890s forced these two groups together creating a common cultural basis for the new music.

Johnson’s careful examination of the historical record shows that the New Orleans of the early twentieth century had not yet become fully inflicted with the pernicious racial coda of Jim Crow. Johnson argues that it was not until World War I that the dual racial categorization was fully implemented in New Orleans. The result of the full implementation of Jim Crow was not the growth of jazz in New Orleans, but instead the growth of an exile community of jazzmen that left the city for the north searching for freedom. Johnson argues that,

Indeed, when Jim Crow finally took hold of New Orleans and drew a rigid segregation line through the population, the city’s long tradition of easy interaction of peoples was seriously altered. And New Orleans jazz, far from prospering in the newly segregated society, almost died. Full segregation took hold in New Orleans not in the 1890s, but only around the time of World War I (p. 249).
From this perspective, jazz grew, not from the restrictive cultural confines of Jim Crow, but instead from the cultural fabric characterized by “the assimilative tradition of easy interaction of peoples” (Johnson 2000, p.245).

**Louis’ New Orleans: An Island Just Off American Shores**

The world described by Louis Armstrong shows this wider freedom of association that helped foster the growth of jazz as well as the contentious nature of the racial transformation process. Louis’ relationship with the Jewish immigrant family, the Karnoffskys, shows the benevolent side of the relationship. The Karnoffsky family lived at 427 South Rampart Street just around the corner from Louis’ Perdido Street home. The Karnoffskys worked in a variety of occupations from junk collectors to tailors to pawn shop owners. In their role as junk peddlers, they employed Louis to help on their wagon as it moved through the city’s neighborhoods. Louis finished his days work and was often asked to stay for dinner. Because of Louis’ chaotic family situation, the structure and food must have been welcome to young Louis.

The Karnoffskys also took an interest in Louis’ musical development by giving him a tin horn to blow on the junk wagon as it moved along. While the tin horn itself wasn’t much, the encouragement that Louis received from the Karnoffskys was immeasurable. Bergreen (1997) quotes Louis as saying “As a young boy coming up, the people whom I worked for were very much concerned about my future in music. They could see I had music in my soul. They really wanted me to be something in life. And music was it. Appreciating my every effort” (p. 56).

The impact of the Karnoffsky family on Louis is covered well by Bergreen (1997). Bergreen’s account shows how “the prototypical jazz artist”, Louis Armstrong, “was
gaining his first musical experience with a white family, and adapting it to his black idiom” (p. 57). The door that was swinging open here was significant not just for Louis, but the developmental trajectory of jazz overall. Jazz was not a closed movement, but instead was open to multiple influences. Bergreen’s conclusions show the deep impact that this early interracial interaction had on Armstrong. Bergreen argues that:

And because the earliest encouragement he received in music happened to come from this white family, Louis always remained open to whites and willing to express himself to them through his music. He was convinced that his music, jazz, had no cultural or ethnic limits; it was neither white nor black nor Creole, but was an admixture of all these elements, and more. Indeed, one of the most interesting aspects of jazz was the way it leapt like a flame from one culture to another (p. 57).

The Jewish merchants were but one of the many ethnic groups inhabiting the neighborhood. Louis describes the Italian grocery store and saloon owners who were vital to the functioning musicians of the area. Louis says that, “I always kept in good graces of the grocery man. It is important to be able to use his phone and to have him take messages for you, even more important is the good credit he can let you have. All my gigs used to come in by phone, and old Tony, Mr. Gaspar, Mantranga, or Segretta never failed to let me know” (1954, p. 168 and 177).

In addition to the Italian merchants, a sizable Chinese community was also ensconced in the area. In In Search of Buddy Bolden, Marquis (1978) pinpoints the location of the Chinese community. He says that, “The Chinese community was located along Tulane Avenue, and most of the Chinese groceries, restaurants, and laundries were in the 1000 to 1400 blocks” (p. 49). An 1897 survey by the Underwriters Inspection Bureau of New Orleans showed numerous Chinese businesses located throughout the city and particularly around the Chinatown section⁹.
Of course, the area was also filled with large numbers of African-American organizations and residents. Jelly Roll Morton is quoted in Alan Lomax’s *Mr. Jelly Roll* (2001 edition) as stating that New Orleans “has always been very organization-minded” (p. xii). The organizations that Jelly Roll had in mind were the myriad of Social Aid and Pleasure Clubs along with the various lodges and unions that permeated turn of the century New Orleans. These organizations provided regular work to musicians in the numerous parades and funeral marches sponsored by the groups.

Louis does a good job of explaining the importance of these organizations to the community and to musicians when he says that, “To watch those clubs parade was an irresistible and unique experience. All the members wore full dress uniforms and with those beautiful silk ribbons streaming from their shoulders they were a magnificent sight” (1954, p. 225).

Assimilation and Racial Violence in Turn of the Century New Orleans

Despite the great mixing of ethnicities that occurred in Louis’ neighborhood, the relationship between different groups was in no way free of strife. In 1900, a well-documented incident between the police and a black laborer named Robert Charles sparked a serious racial incident that culminated at 1208 Saratoga Street, only blocks away from the Perdido/Rampart Street area. While the details of the incident that sparked the conflict are difficult to piece together precisely, it appears that Charles was approached by several white officers while sitting on a stoop waiting for a friend. Charles stood up, the police reacted with force hitting Charles with clubs and shot at Charles as he attempted to escape. Charles then returned fire hitting one of the police officers while being shot himself. Charles then holed up in a nearby house and, over the
course of several days shot, twenty-seven whites, killing four police officers and three
other bystanders, before he was killed (Hair 1976, p. 171). A mob rampage of white
residents seeking retribution then followed. William Ivy Hair (1976), in his detailed work
on the affair, describes the situation: “While the siege on Saratoga Street was coming to
an end, a roving mob of about a hundred white men saw a black laborer, about thirty
years old, passing through the French Market…the mob surrounded him and shot him
to death” (p. 176). One other innocent black man was shot to death that night. In
addition, the Lafon School for black youth on Seventh Street near South Rampart was
burned to the ground.

Charles’ doomed fight against the police resulted in a song that enjoyed at least
some popularity among poor blacks in the city. Hair (1976) recounts a conversation
between Jelly Roll Morton and Alan Lomax where Morton says that he once knew the
Charles song “but I found it was best for me to forget it and that I did in order to go
along with the world on the peaceful side” (p. 179).

The Charles affair was, however, not an isolated incident, but, rather, the culmination
of a series of conflicts revolving around race that had begun in the 1890s. Arnesen
(1994) in Waterfront Workers of New Orleans: Race, Class, and Politics, 1863-1923,
does an excellent job tracing the precursors to the wave of violence of the Charles affair
by exploring the interplay of race and class in the realm of labor and workplace
relations. In a series of empirically researched, highly detailed chapters, Arnesen
chronologically explores the ebb and flow of a multi-ethnic labor coalition on the
waterfront.
Despite antagonistic labor relations among whites and blacks during the early postbellum era, white and black workers in the 1880s began to articulate common cause in improving working conditions on the waterfront. A series of strikes and the subsequent resolutions brought white and black workers to the conclusion that “a formal alliance” would be the only way “to achieve their common goals” (p. 75). This alliance was helped along by the machine political system that governed New Orleans during this era called the Ring. Because the Ring’s power base was composed of immigrants and the working class, it maintained a supportive attitude toward labor issues or, at worst, “neutrality” (p. 77) in labor disputes.

The situation began to change for the worse in the 1890’s. A severe economic recession increased economic pressure on dockworkers. In addition, the Ring began to lose power and was ousted in 1896 by reformers who were not beholden to the labor movement. These pressures and the upsurge in white racial identity created a dangerous situation on the docks. The result, unfortunately, was violence.

Arnesen traces numerous incidents of white violence upon blacks during this era. This detailed examination helps to provide excellent contextual ground for understanding William Ivy Hair’s work, Carnival of Fury, on the Robert Charles riot at the turn of the twentieth century. Arnesen’s meticulous tracing of the labor riots and violence helps to provide the setting for the powder keg that would explode in the Charles riot.

Arnesen’s strength in this work is the incredibly detailed portrait that he uncovers of labor relations between white and black workers in New Orleans. He uncovers a complex network of race and class relationships that helps to flesh out the inner
workings of what racism meant during this period. As Arnesen says, “Racism was never static or uniform” (p. x). The breaking and forming of interracial alliances during this period helped to continually redefine race and status creating hope one moment and shattering it again moments latter.

Despite the violence and strife, something positive and astounding was happening in Louis’ neighborhood. Different groups of people were being thrust together in an atmosphere that was wild, in both its positive and negative connotations. The myriad of influences was coming together to help create a new music that spoke to these freedoms and influences.

**Jazz, Race, and Integration: Starting from New Orleans**

The wider latitude of racial relations helped to open avenues for different cultures to come together in an arena that existed, at least partly, beyond the strict racial categories that dominated the south at this time. New Orleans’ multicultural population and, at the time, more open relations between these groups appears to be at least one of the significant factors in the growth of jazz in the city.

While New Orleans’ early openness helped to create the foundations of jazz, this cultural uniqueness has often been overlooked in broader discussions on the growth of jazz and racial relations. A case in point can be seen in Appel’s otherwise excellent, *Jazz Modernism: From Ellington and Armstrong to Matise and Joyce* (2002). In this work, Appel points to the importance of jazz as a mechanism for integration in mid-twentieth century America. Appel paints a portrait of what he calls a jazznocracy, an authentic multiculturalism, where different groups came together playing off each other’s cultural strengths to create music. He points to the process of cultural interchange
where the music of Louis Armstrong influenced the white musician Bix Biederbecke with Biederbecke’s music then going on to influence others. Appel argues that the cross-pollinating influence of jazz on music and on the wider experience of race in America has been largely ignored. He says, “Armstrong’s All-Stars were in fact always integrated, in all its editions (1947-71), thereby complimenting the Civil Rights Movement. Ambassador indeed! The social history and importance of jazz integration has never been properly appreciated” (p. 179).

Appel’s centering of the importance of racial integration on Louis Armstrong in this quote is more telling than he intends. Appel goes on to point out that “Armstrong’s All Stars was the first black band to feature a white musician, Jack Teagarden;…” (p. 179). With the background of Louis’ formative experiences in New Orleans in mind, Louis’s role as an agent in the process of racial integration makes perfect sense.

Appel argues that the lack of proper biographical information has been one of the causes of the failure to properly attribute jazz as an agent of racial integration. He says that, “The interracial components of jazz groups and their audiences are of great social significance, and not likely to be analyzed well, since potential jazz historians and biographers are deprived of what serious scholars take for granted- a paper trail of letters, diaries, and so forth” (p. 60). Louis Armstrong has, however, left us with just such information. When his musings on the racial components of his neighborhood are seen with a historical understanding of the unique components of race in New Orleans, a portrait of the depth of the interracial components of jazz, and the importance of New Orleans as a setting for this process, begins to develop.
Appel, however, centers this transformative process in the jazz clubs of the north in the early- to mid-twentieth century. He argues that, “The intimate, crowded jazz clubs along Fifty-Second Street offered nightly examples of interracial harmony, on and off the bandstand” (p. 64). While in no way discounting the importance of these encounters in the north, the experience of the early period of jazz in New Orleans suggests that the roots of this jazznocracy stretch back to the formative growth of jazz and the assimilative racial structure that helped to open those freedoms in the streets and honky-tonks of turn of the century New Orleans. This avenue for multiculturalism appears to have sprung from the “intellectual hinge” (Hirsch and Logsdon, 1992, p. 189) of New Orleans and its peculiar public cultural milieu.

While this analysis is far from a definitive reading of the process of cultural transference, it does point to a significant, and understudied, role for New Orleans jazzmen. The New Orleans “diaspora” (Bergreen 1997, p. 111) can be seen in this light as important agents that helped transfer this particular form of freedom to the rest of the country. With this wider view of New Orleans’ racial history in mind, Appel’s own comments about Louis Armstrong seem to suggest as much.

The portrait of New Orleans articulated by Louis Armstrong provides a significant window into the formative period of jazz and the cultural fabric of one of the neighborhoods from which it sprung. Louis’ descriptions effectively capture the inner-workings of a complex place of strife and wonder. While this section in no way attempts to create a definitive portrait of the early cultural landscape of jazz, it has sought to provide a bridge between jazz scholarship and the wider literature on New Orleans urban history and racial transformation. The significance of the unique cultural and
racial climate of New Orleans during the formation of jazz seems to call for a much more definitive study that incorporates a deep understanding of the music and its practitioners with a broader understanding of the historical formation of race and the public landscape in New Orleans. The “intellectual hinge” of New Orleans history that Hirsch and Logsdon point to needs to be opened further to explore these significant issues.

**Morphological Components of the Landscape of the Cradle of Jazz**

The second part of this chapter presents the results of a morphological study of the area. This section fleshes out the place described by Louis Armstrong by articulating the building and street networks that connected the landscape of jazz together.

**Morphological Portrait of 1908 New Orleans**

The backdrop of differing land uses, cultures, and people described by Louis Armstrong existed within the framework of a dense network of mostly single- and two-story buildings connected by a grid street system. The small blocks and dense street system helped frame and contain building size by forcing land uses into a relatively small area. This small area, however, contained a large number and type of structures. An analysis of Sanborn Insurance Maps highlights the density of this area. Within the confines of a nine-block area, a total of 774 structures were identified\(^{10}\). Figure 2 shows a photograph from the early 1920s of the study area. The dense block structure can be easily seen from this photo. Figure 3 shows another view of the area. It shows a close-up view of a typical block in the area from the early 1930s (Neuman Photographic Collection University of New Orleans, ca 1930). The structures facing the streets were
mostly two- to three-stories in height, while significant numbers of single-story structures existed in the interiors of the blocks.

In addition to the dense network of buildings, the area was transected by a grid network of streets. The basic morphological pattern in the center of the city was still based on patterns set up decades or even a century before by these street networks. This basic street pattern, laid out in 1788 by Trudeau, formed the heart of the Faubourg Ste. Marie. The Perdido/Rampart Street area lay just at the edge of this original street network and several street network additions. To help understand the impact of the convergence of these street networks, plan unit analysis is utilized.

**Plan Unit Analysis: the Interlocking System of Neighborhoods**

The convergence of street networks in the Perdido/Rampart Street area left areas of morphological “weakness” where the different grids came together. A more detailed look at the morphology of New Orleans using Conzen’s plan unit analysis helps to explain the location and extent of these morphological “weaknesses”. In chapter two, the basic components of plan unit analysis are set out. Once again, plan units are areas that show similar morphological characteristics within the network of buildings, streets, and lots of land. Similar size, shape, date of construction, and orientation are important keys to determining the extent of a plan unit. Establishing plan unit boundaries is especially important for lost space research because this process helps reveal the “plan seams” (Lilley 2000, p. 13), linear areas separating different development era typologies, along which lost space is most likely to form. The plan unit analysis, then, helps to determine where and how lost space developed.
The basic plan units of the heart of New Orleans along the riverfront in 1908 were the French Quarter, the emerging central business district (the old Faubourg Ste. Marie), the Faubourg Marigny, and what we now call the Lower Garden District (parts of the old Jesuit plantation). As we move away from the river, the essential characteristics of these areas begin to give way at some point. Pierce Lewis (1976) argues that the demarcating line for the land use change runs along the 40 arpent line, approximately a mile and a half.

While Lewis’ analysis provides good general guidance for the morphological template of the city, a more detailed analysis of the study area shows that plan unit changes can be identified much closer to the river along the old edge of the original city along Rampart Street. In the study area, several important “seams” in the plan units stand out. First, the Commons area between the French Quarter and the Faubourg Ste. Marie was not yet totally integrated into the central business district. The Commons ran linearly out from the Mississippi River to a dividing line that ran along Rampart Street. This old dividing line of the city memorialized “old Fort Burgundy” (Wilson 1972, p. 11), a defensive fort that was decommissioned when the French took control back from the Spanish in the early 1800s.

This dividing line was accentuated by a series of breakages in the landscape that centered along this old dividing line. First, the Old Basin Canal, that ended one street up from Rampart on Basin Street at the edge of the French Quarter, and the New Basin Canal, that ended on Rampart Street at the edge of the Faubourg Ste. Marie, were the major landscape features on this side of town. The canals acted to separate neighborhoods and formed a dividing line between areas. Second, the canals attracted
industry and railroads to their shores which further accentuated the breakage. According to the 1926 Preliminary Report on Major Streets, two elongated sites along the canals were the primary locations for industry in the N.O. area (p. 37). This preponderance of industry and water traffic made them prime locations for railroad connections as well. The Illinois Central ran along the New Basin Canal while the Southern Railway ran along the Old Basin Canal. In addition, rail lines also paralleled the Mississippi River. Finally, both areas were sites of old cemeteries that further accentuated the breakages in the urban fabric. The Girod Cemetery was within a couple of blocks of the New Basin Canal while the St. Louis Number One Cemetery was at the turning basin of the Old Basin Canal and St. Louis Number Two was located close by on Claiborne Avenue. The preponderance of these “separating” landscape features created discontinuities and breakages in the basic fabric of the city on the backside of the French Quarter and the Faubourg Ste. Marie. The lack of an integrated urban fabric in these areas, or weaknesses in the urban form, made these places prime targets for latter modernization efforts.

Morphological analysis of the study area around Perdido and Rampart Street highlights the impact of these urban form weaknesses. In 1908, a basic plan unit can be identified in the Perdido/Rampart Street area (Figure 4). The basic characteristics of the study area that separates it as a plan unit are the significance of residential uses mixed with low-intensity commercial uses, small lot sizes, and low-scale (one- to three-story buildings). Each boundary of the plan unit represents a significant change in land use. Tulane Avenue forms the eastern boundary of the plan unit. This wide street separates the old Commons area with its generally larger buildings from the lower scale
buildings of the Perdido area. Howard Ave. forms the northern boundary separating Charity Hospital and the industrial uses from the more mixed residential and commercial uses within the plan unit. Poydras St. forms the western boundary. It separates the industrial and railroad land uses from the heart of the plan unit.

It is possible to make a case for a linear extension of this side of the plan unit running along Saratoga Street from Poydras to the New Basin Canal and down to Baronne Street. While this Saratoga Street corridor forms an edge to the industrial uses to the north and the commercial uses towards the river, the lack of residential housing density seems to differentiate this side from the core of the plan unit. It was, therefore, excluded from the plan unit.

Finally, Baronne Street forms the southern boundary. Once again, the exact definition of this plan unit boundary is slightly “fuzzy”. In general, Baronne separates the smaller lot uses with mixed residential and commercial uses from the emerging larger lot uses in the heart of the business district towards the river. While this description is generally accurate along the length of the Baronne Street boundary, a few of the adjacent blocks have similar small-scale commercial and residential uses that could place them within the study plan unit. While they were excluded from the plan unit, it must be pointed out that this plan unit boundary is fairly porous and not as clearly defined as the other edges.

**Morphological Measurement**

The plan unit analysis has sketched out the basic interlocking land use units of the area. The morphological analysis is taken one step further through the measurement of several important descriptive morphological characteristics of the area. Two basic types
of measures help describe the area. First, measurements about the extent of building coverage on a block were taken to help show the extent of space used in this area. Measurements of the building area, building perimeter, and the acreage of buildings were taken for nine blocks in the study area. These measurements are put into context by comparing the extent of building coverage to the block area as a whole (Table 1). The “% of Block Covered” measure helps to show the built density of the area.

Table 1: 1908 Block Area Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID 1908</th>
<th>Area_Feet Buildings</th>
<th>Perimeter_Feet Buildings</th>
<th>Acres Buildings</th>
<th>Block Area Acres</th>
<th>% of Block Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>26457.53</td>
<td>1222.769</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>47458.42</td>
<td>8184.176</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>73.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>73578.15</td>
<td>9759.849</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>43610.25</td>
<td>8461.607</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>73494.43</td>
<td>12613.42</td>
<td>1.686</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>68384.73</td>
<td>12404.38</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>2.781</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>63454.67</td>
<td>7744.894</td>
<td>1.457</td>
<td>1.961</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>40104.66</td>
<td>3931.282</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>1.886</td>
<td>49.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>70820.88</td>
<td>13801.08</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>58.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>507363.7</td>
<td>78123.46</td>
<td>11.645</td>
<td>17.791</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To understand these data, it is useful to take a closer look at some of the specific blocks. A good point of orientation in Figure 5 is the long, connected structure on the western side of the graphic. This was the Poydras Street Market located on the Poydras Street neutral ground (labeled block 260 in the tabular chart). The block that directly abuts the Poydras Street Market in the graphic is labeled in the chart as block 270. Seventy-four percent of this block (270) was covered by structures in 1908. The only block that had under fifty percent coverage was block 303 (located on the eastern edge of the graphic third from the top) that contained the court and police functions for the
These high coverage percentages resulted from large numbers of structures both framing the blocks along the streets and being spread within the blocks themselves.

Another important measure of the morphological character of the area is the number of buildings per block. The number of buildings on a block tells us a great deal about the diversity of uses of a space. As the number of buildings in an area increases, usually there are a greater number of individuals making decisions about how to use those buildings (Vernez-Moudon 1986). This helps to create a very diverse landscape. The study area in 1908 was filled with a great number of different structures. Table 2 shows the number of structures identified for nine study area blocks.

**Table 2: Number of Structures per Block 1908**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th># of Structures 1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What becomes clear from this analysis is the large number and diversity of structures that existed on most blocks in the study area. The structures facing the streets were mostly two- to three-stories in height, while significant numbers of single-story structures existed in the interiors of the blocks. To continue the example of block 270, the block contained 99 different structures. The low figure is for block 260, the Poydras Street Market which directly abuts block 270. Here only three structures are identified. This low number is misleading, however, because the market was in the center of Poydras Street. The Market helped to create a unique public space, a type of “mini-block” in the
center of the street. The high figure for 1908 was block 304 located behind the New Orleans Court facility (block 303). This block (block 304) contained 156 structures, many of which are located in the interior of the block.

Conclusions
The landscape of the cradle of jazz was marked by an incredible diversity of both land uses and peoples all focused within a dense urban fabric. This small geographic area acted as a location for neighborhood businesses, as a commercial hub for port and railroad trade, as an edge to prostitution district of Storyville, and as a home to a neighborhood population. The area was filled with contradictions: generosity and violence existed simultaneously in the helping hands that neighbors offered to each other and in the brutal fights that spilled from the many saloons. This contradictory landscape was the formative place where jazz developed.

Unfortunately, the modern attempts to reform this area would only further accentuate the breakages in the urban fabric, creating the lost spaces characteristic of the area today. The violence and poverty that dominated the area were shifted into the hypersegregated neighborhoods that surround the northern extent of the CBD. The landscape of the cradle of jazz was sacrificed for a modern vision of New Orleans; one in which the rich culture of the downtown neighborhoods was effectively swept away. The following chapters show the particular mechanisms of this process.

1 The phrase “cradle of jazz” has been used frequently to describe New Orleans’ relationship to jazz. See Marquis (1978) and Berry, Foose, and Jones (1986).
2 Armstrong himself uses this reference in discussing his early life.
3 While many other neighborhoods of New Orleans can legitimately claim to have been landscapes of jazz, the Perdido area has probably the most accessible inventory of accounts.
4 Marquis (1978) argues that types of businesses that made this area home began to change around the turn of the century. He argues that: “Shortly before 1900 the neighborhood atmosphere around Rampart and Perdido began to change. The regular grocery stores became combination grocery-bars; saloons opened at every other corner. In 1897 or 1898, when (Buddy) Bolden began playing the area, just about
every corner of Rampart, Franklin, Tulane, Howard, Liberty, Poydras, Lafayette, Gravier, and Perdido streets has either a grocery store, a saloon, or a combination of the two" (p. 49). Despite these changes, the area still maintained a wide assortment of commercial establishments and a fair amount of residential dwellings as the 1897 data shows.

5 The Funky-Butt Hall only a few blocks away on Perdido Street certainly can lay title to this claim. It was demolished to make way for the Civic Center complex in the 1950s. An excellent source describing many of the local clubs is the New Grove Dictionary of Jazz (2002) edited by Barry Kernfeld. In addition to descriptions of the various clubs in the area, this work provides a good overview of how jazz developed locally, nationally, and internationally.

6 Clearly, African-Americans played a pivotal role in the growth and sustenance of jazz. In no way is this questioned. My analysis mirrors Appel (2002) here. Appel argues that, “The designation ‘multicultural’ by no means diminishes the African-American core of jazz, nor the historical fact that the principal players on every instrument have been black, with the exception of Benny Goodman on clarinet (some would say Artie Shaw) and Jack Teagarden on trombone (the pre-1950 period)” (p. 41 and 42).

7 Alfred Appel (2002) frequently uses the “ragpicker” analogy to help define the capacity of many modern artists (Picasso comes to mind) to pick through material and create something far greater than the sum of their parts. Louis not only was the proverbial ragpicker, he actually was employed early in his life in that profession. In Chapter 8, we return to Louis’ ability to turn these scraps into something far greater.

8 While the Karnofsky family was important to Louis, his biological family was also important. Louis speaks lovingly of both his grandmother and mother. While evidence points to the fact that Louis’ mother was at least employed part-time as a prostitute, Louis never referred to her as such.


10 The term “structure” is used here instead of the common term “building” because of the large number of relatively small identifiable structures in Sanborn maps. The interiors of the blocks had many small structures that appeared to be sheds and small bungalows. From the Sanborn maps, it is, however, impossible to determine the exact usage of all structures identified on the maps.

11 The study blocks can be seen in Figure 5. The top two rows of blocks on the northern end of the graphic were not included in the measurements table to provide consistency with the data collected in 1937. Sanborn records in New Orleans were updated at irregular intervals and often new updates were simply pasted on top of older records. The data on the northern end of the study section for the 1937 time point appeared to have been updated in the late 1940s. The bocks were included in the graphic for 1908 to help present a unified visual portrait, but the area figures were excluded from the tabular chart to provide consistency with the measurement data examined in Chapter 6.

12 The block-numbering schema used here matches the Sanborn numbering system.
Chapter 6: A Landscape in Decline (South Rampart Street 1922-1937)

This chapter examines the declining landscape of jazz from both a morphological and political economic perspective. An analysis of Sanborn records and New Orleans city planning Department maps of the area underscore the gradual “thinning” of the dense fabric of the neighborhood. The planning department records also show a willful pattern of early urban renewal-style city clearance efforts aimed at the South Rampart Street area. While most of these early plans were delayed because of the Depression and World War II, these plans laid the seeds of the large-scale clearance schemes that would dismantle the neighborhood in the 1950s and 1960s.

Introduction

In the summer of 1922, Louis Armstrong left New Orleans for the bright lights and steady nightclub work of Chicago. While Armstrong would soon help to transform the early jazz of New Orleans into the sensation of the jazz age, his legendary neighborhood was transformed by changing economic and cultural forces that combined with modernist city planning interventions to drastically alter his neighborhood.

This chapter explores the changing fabric of Louis’ neighborhood from the early 1920s to 1938. It is divided into two parts. The first part explores early city planning efforts in the city, specifically the Harland Bartholomew plan of 1927. The second part of the chapter utilizes Sanborn records, land use data, and photographic evidence to create a morphological portrait of the area.

Through a series of gradual, piecemeal changes, adaptive change in Conzens’ language, the social and economic diversity of the area that Louis knew was gradually
thinned out through the 1920s and 1930s. The large-scale changes, augmentative change in morphological terms, occurred after WWII and are covered in Chapter 7.

City Planning and the Landscape of Jazz

A consistent theme in the New Orleans planning literature throughout the 20th century has been the importance of revitalizing the downtown core of the city. For the political and business elite, the emergence of a solid central business district was the goal *par excellence*. The methods for achieving this goal mirrored the nationwide currents of modernist planning thought and were specifically laid out locally in a series of planning documents. While the period from 1970 to the present has been explored by a series of authors (Hirsch 1983, Smith and Keller 1983, Brooks and Young 1993, Lauria, Whelan, and Young 1994, Brooks and Gladstone 2001), the impact of early city planning efforts to reshape the downtown from 1927 to 1973 has received comparatively little attention (Arthur D. Little, Inc. 1967). This early period laid the seeds for the growth coalition’s spatial transformation of the old Faubourg Ste. Marie into the modern central business district. This section explores the first major planning document to emerge from New Orleans, Harland Bartholomew’s 1927 *Major Streets Report*.

The “Modern” Street Comes to New Orleans: 1923-1946

While the world began to come under the sway of jazz music in the 1910s and 20s, the city that had given birth to this art form was turning its back on both the music and the people who made it. The neighborhoods and streets from which jazz had sprung were perceived as dangerous, immoral places that needed to be reformed. The red light district of New Orleans, Storyville, which had helped provide work for musicians had been shut down by the department of the Navy in 1917. The original idea of a “cordon
“sanitaire” (Bergreen 1997, p. 44) encouraged by New Orleans City Councilman Story had only encouraged the growth of the prostitution area. More serious reform was necessary to control the vice.

While the prostitution in the extended area surrounding Storyville did not end overnight, its closing is traditionally seen as the end of significant era in New Orleans history. Louis Armstrong in a “rare flash of bitterness” is quoted as saying, “After Storyville closed down, the people of that section spread out all over the city, so we turned out nice and reformed” ((Bergreen 1997, p.110). The modern reform movement that ended Storyville was, however, just picking up steam.

In the same year, the New Orleans Times-Picayune attempted to disavow the city’s association with the burgeoning music phenomenon. They state that,

We do not recognize the honor of parenthood [of jazz], but with a story in circulation it behooves us to accept the atrocity in polite society, and where it has crept in we should make it a point of civic honor to suppress it. Its musical value is nil, and its possibilities of harm are great.

Times-Picayune June 17, 1917

Many New Orleans jazz musicians, the New Orleans “jazz diaspora” (Bergreen 1997, p. 111), had left the city for Chicago and other northern cities to look for work. In the summer of 1922, Louis Armstrong had joined them. While Armstrong left New Orleans helping to bring the modern art form of jazz to the world, the neighborhood that he left behind was about to be visited by a the purifying agenda of modern city planning¹.

In 1923, the New Orleans City Planning and Zoning Commission was established. The first major planning document to come out of New Orleans was the 1927 Major Streets Report produced by Harland Bartholomew and Associates². This document aimed to provide the basis for a comprehensive city plan for New Orleans. The report
surveyed the conditions of the community and offered modernization recommendations focusing specifically on the road networks of New Orleans.

At the heart of Bartholomew’s recommendations was the perceived need to drastically alter the existing transportation system of New Orleans to accommodate increased automobile traffic. Bartholomew utilized a biological systems-based “scientific” approach to street planning that focused on the need for creating street connections to link the system together. Through an extensive survey of existing morphological conditions, Bartholomew identified the basic components of the street system and the “dead ends and jogs” that existed in the system.

Bartholomew’s report accurately traces the existing fabric of the city back to its French colonial roots. In the French system, plantation lines were drawn to provide access to the Mississippi River. Because the river curves in New Orleans these plantation lines run back to a point in the middle of the city. When streets were created out of this plantation system they tended to follow the edges of plantation lines. This produced a radial network of streets that moved from the Mississippi River towards a point in Mid-City. This network was bisected by several major streets that moved parallel to the river creating, what Bartholomew called, “a circulation plan that is unique in many respects” (Harland Bartholomew and Associates 1926, p. 19).

While Bartholomew accurately identified this unique set of circumstances, his plan focused on dismantling the uniqueness, forcing New Orleans into “more concentric growth” (Harland Bartholomew and Associates 1926, p. 31). Bartholomew centered the street plan on linking the disparate units of New Orleans’ historical fabric together through street widening and street extensions. Bartholomew identified 50 miles of
streets in the city of New Orleans that needed to be widened to accommodate the new automobile city. Because New Orleans was densely developed in the small area of higher ground around the Mississippi River, this plan meant the removal of a great number of buildings and people to make way for the widened streets. The dispassionate rationale of Bartholomew’s plan described the property lines that stood in the way of the plan as “invisible” and “arbitrary” (Harland Bartholomew and Associates 1926, p. 20). Bartholomew’s scientific analysis concludes, “It will be an aim of this study to overcome the resistance of arbitrary lines wherever they promise to handicap proper growth of the community” (p. 20). Bartholomew cites the recently passed Louisiana building line law (1926) that could be used to expropriate buildings standing in the way of street widening projects as a major tool to be used in pursuing these aims.

The street widening proposals of Bartholomew’s plan began the process of dismantling the fabric of Louis Armstrong’s neighborhood. This area on the edge of the downtown core was not perceived of as an important area in Bartholomew’s plan. Bartholomew’s description of the area is telling. He says, “Just beyond this area of intense property uses, however, is a twilight zone wherein certain operations may still be performed to improve the efficiency of existing traffic channels” (p. 62). This “twilight zone” was a hindrance, a blockage in the artery of traffic that needed to flow into downtown. Bartholomew proposed widening and extending a series of roads that ran through the area.

One of the proposed widening projects was to take place on Saratoga Street, the street just lakeside of Rampart Street. Saratoga Street directly bisected Louis’ neighborhood. Bartholomew argues that, “This proposed improvement would provide a
by-pass around the rear of the present area of congested, one-way streets and encourage the natural expansion of the central business district, and no property which is recommended for condemnation has yet attained a high value for business property” (1927, p. 66). He goes on to say that, “Saratoga Street now stands on the fringe of the high value section and may be modernized without serious difficulties” (1927, p. 66)\(^3\). The people who lived and worked here are completely dismissed. They pose no “serious difficulties” because their property has not “attained a high value for business property.” Even at this early stage of the planning process, the interests of a narrow class of business leaders are placed above the interests of the citizens as a whole and certainly above the interests of the largely poor residents on the fringe of downtown.

In addition to the ambitious street widening projects, Bartholomew suggested creating vehicular linkages to connect the many “dead ends and jogs” (Figure 1) that hampered the street system. Bartholomew’s analysis found 800 streets that ended abruptly, mostly at the edge of the many canals and railroads that bisected the area. One of the proposed solutions to this problem was the filling of the New Basin Canal “as a measure of progressive civic development” (p. 66). The area covered by the New Basin Canal could then be put into more productive use as a highway to help encourage the concentric growth of New Orleans. Bartholomew says, “The present development of the central business district warrants the moving of industries served by the New Basin Canal; vacation of the right-of-way for canal purposes; draining and grading of the present channel and improvement of a highway designed to accommodate eight lines of vehicles when fully developed, as far as Jefferson Davis Parkway, and six lines from
that point to Lake Pontchartrain” (p. 71). The plan for the highway era had
dispassionately, scientifically arrived in New Orleans.

As in other parts of the country, the combination of the Great Depression and World
War II significantly slowed modernization efforts in New Orleans. Much of the
Bartholomew plan lay dormant during this period. While much of the major street
widening and extension work was delayed during this period, work was begun on the
filling of the New Basin Canal.

While the canal landscape had become economically obsolete for its original purpose
of maritime trade, modern reformers of the day could see no alternative uses for the
space other than as raw land for a highway. Instead of working to tie the community
back together through a series of small-scale revitalization initiatives, they sought to
wipe the space away completely. The canal that had been a fixture of the New Orleans
landscape for a hundred years began to disappear. The following section explores this
major morphological change in greater depth.

**Morphological Change: Filling the New Basin Canal**

As drainage projects opened new residential space in many of the formerly low-lying
areas of New Orleans, the geographic constraints that had bound New Orleans to the
dense strip of higher ground along the Mississippi River began to be loosened. The
economic fabric of the city was also changing with the completion of the Inner Harbour
Navigation Canal, popularly called the Industrial Canal, on the eastern side of the city.
This infrastructure project marked the end of the economic usefulness of the New Basin
Canal, a significant landscape feature of the upper downtown area.
The canal, which had provided an avenue for cargo transshipment from Lake Pontchartrain to the Mississippi River, had been gradually supplanted for maritime purposes by the newly opened Industrial Canal (1923). While the New Basin Canal maintained a growing shipping trade through the end of the 1920s, the economic challenge of the new waterway combined with the impact of the Great Depression began to significantly erode canal business by the early 1930s. According to records kept by the New Basin Canal and Shell Road Commission (Table 1), total arrivals and departures in the canal had decreased from a high of 13,005 during the years 1902 through 1904 to 6,318 between 1936 and 1938 (Biennial Report of the Board of Control and Superintendent of the New Basin Canal and Shell Road, 1900-1938). Just ten years before, during the period 1924 to 1926, the canal had managed a near record of 12,719 arrivals and departures. By July of 1937, however, the process of filling in the canal had been approved by order from the State of Louisiana.

Table 1: Biennial Report of the Board of Control and Superintendent of the New Basin Canal and Shell Road, 1900-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Arrivals</th>
<th>Departures</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900-1902</td>
<td>6622</td>
<td>6326</td>
<td>12948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-1904</td>
<td>6605</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>13005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904-1906</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906-1908</td>
<td>6125</td>
<td>5998</td>
<td>12123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908-1910</td>
<td>5766</td>
<td>5796</td>
<td>11562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1912</td>
<td>5487</td>
<td>5472</td>
<td>10959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-1914</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-1916</td>
<td>4765</td>
<td>4789</td>
<td>9554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1918</td>
<td>4731</td>
<td>4795</td>
<td>9526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-1920</td>
<td>4438</td>
<td>4444</td>
<td>8882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1922</td>
<td>4978</td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>9987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1924</td>
<td>5939</td>
<td>5916</td>
<td>11855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-1926</td>
<td>6419</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>12719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1928</td>
<td>5670</td>
<td>5717</td>
<td>11387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-1930</td>
<td>4494</td>
<td>4502</td>
<td>8996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1932</td>
<td>3943</td>
<td>3972</td>
<td>7915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Campanella and Campanella (2000) point out that, “The Inner Harbour Navigation Canal (1923), connecting the river with the lake and later with the gulf, was and is the ultimate answer to the old Bayou Road portage, the Carondolet Canal, and the New Basin Canal” (p. 22).

The Buildings and Streets of a Landscape in Decline

The impact of this economic change on the landscape, along with the increasing use of the automobile and its attendant needs, can be seen in the slow, piecemeal changes that occurred in the area from 1920 to 1937. These changes decreased the built density of the area and gradually increased the extent of surface parking.

Figure 2 shows a contemporary aerial image of the CBD with the 1937 building footprints overlaid on top. The study area appears to be gradually thinning, with a marked decrease in building coverage both within the interior of blocks throughout the study area and an overall decrease in coverage within the upper area of the study area specifically.

While it is difficult to discern these specific changes from a comparison of the figure-ground drawings from 1937 and 1908, a comparison of the numeric data helps bring these changes into relief. Tables 2, 3, and 4 present the changing face of the built environment in numeric form. While minimal changes in the percentage of block covered by buildings are noted in several blocks (268, 297, and 299), other blocks showed more considerable change. Block 260, the Poydras Street Market, was completely eliminated in 1932 in accordance with the 1927 City Planning and Zoning
Commission report on improving traffic flow (Campanella and Campanella 2000, p.278 and 279). The market block had been “a block within a block,” located entirely within either side of Poydras Street. The elimination of the market shows the beginnings of street modernization efforts aimed at improving traffic flow.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID 1937</th>
<th>Area_Feet Buildings</th>
<th>Perimeter_Feet Buildings</th>
<th>Acres Buildings</th>
<th>Block Area Acres</th>
<th>% of Block Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>44658.52</td>
<td>3898.543</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>72.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>53350.53</td>
<td>5195.932</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>59.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>48579.71</td>
<td>4869.336</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>62246.87</td>
<td>6603.149</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>2.281</td>
<td>62.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>70638.47</td>
<td>7282.808</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>59.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>63562.19</td>
<td>4594.24</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>75.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>26783.05</td>
<td>1409.196</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>32.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>52052.97</td>
<td>6013.678</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>2.673</td>
<td>44.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>421872.3</td>
<td>39866.88</td>
<td>9.685</td>
<td>16.457</td>
<td>58.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>% Change in % Block Covered 1908-1937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>-0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>-21.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>-2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>-32.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>-22.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>-9.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th># of Structures 1937</th>
<th>% Change 1908-1937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-74.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-71.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-71.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-66.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-67.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-71.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocks 269 (in the lower middle portion of the study area) and blocks 303 and 304 (at the top right of the study area) also showed significant negative change. Block 269 decreased its building coverage area by about 21%. The changes here appear to have occurred both in the number of interior block buildings and in the coverage of buildings on the western, lake-end of the block. Block 303, the criminal court area, suffered a negative 32.86% change. Many of the police functions and buildings on the western side of the complex appear to have been eliminated. Probably the most significant change occurred in Block 304, on the western adjacent side. It had its building coverage decreased by nearly 23%. This block, which had the highest number of buildings in 1908, appears hollowed out as many of the structures within the interior of the block were removed.

These building coverage changes are amplified when the changes in the number of structures are examined (Table 4). Huge decreases in the variety and number of structures are indicated throughout the study area. Many of the smaller structures in the interior of blocks have been eliminated. While these changes resulted in relatively minor overall changes in building coverage, their elimination appears to have significantly decreased the diversity of structure types and social uses of the area.
Old Urbanism: A Slum or Mixed-Use New Urbanism?

While the area was gradually being altered morphologically, the residential and business base of the area was still holding together fairly well. Two data sources help provide evidence of the continued vitality of the area as a residential and commercial zone. First, a 1929 land use map created for the City Planning Commission shows some of the fine-grained land use characteristics of the area. Figure 3, an enhanced version of this original map\(^6\), shows that residential activity in the study area was centered in the blocks just to the north of South Rampart Street. Commercial activity was focused on the riverside of the study area closer to the growing CBD zone. Industrial uses were focused on the northern portion of the study area and, strangely, on the block of South Rampart closest to Poydras. The industrial designation of this block could have been derived by the area's proximity to the railroad use that still dominated just to the west of the study area. Figure 4 shows an aerial view of the northern extent of the study area. The New Basin Canal, railroads, and industrial activity can be seen. Residential uses are visible on the bottom, riverside portion of the photo.

The land use map can be made more comprehensible with an analysis of another important data source from this era. The Polks Directory of Businesses began to provide a block-by-block compilation of business and residences in 1938. These data provide a more nuanced portrait of land use in the area. Table 5 provides a complete list of the identified uses along South Rampart Street from Canal to Poydras Street. The abbreviations in the table come from the original list and are left in the table as they were written. The table shows a wide diversity of business and, from an overview of last names, a diversity of ethnic groups as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938 Polks Directory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1938 Polks Directory Business Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl Shirt Shops Inc</td>
<td>110 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiners Loan Office</td>
<td>112 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailets Second Hand Clothes</td>
<td>115 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peccaro Jos barber</td>
<td>117 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Haberdashery Store</td>
<td>118 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solito Vito shoe repair</td>
<td>119 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elite Restaurant and Bar</td>
<td>120 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Key Shop</td>
<td>121 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverts Shoe Store</td>
<td>122 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Dental Company</td>
<td>122.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moler Barber College</td>
<td>123 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Loan Office pawnbroker</td>
<td>124-30 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion Picture Machine Operators Union Local 293</td>
<td>129 South Rampart 2nd Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cady Fredrick C. jr.</td>
<td>129 South Rampart 3rd Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Store clothes</td>
<td>130 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caro Jos fruits</td>
<td>130a South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cady Frerick C confr</td>
<td>131 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Room bar</td>
<td>132 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy Bee Shoe Repair</td>
<td>133 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Jewelry Store</td>
<td>134 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State Department of Public Welfare</td>
<td>135 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity Distribution Division (dist office)</td>
<td>135 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Brand Shoe Store</td>
<td>136 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrets Men's Wear</td>
<td>138-40 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>139 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcann Thom brand shoes</td>
<td>142 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas Copenhagen Institute massage</td>
<td>144 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontchartrain Tent No 15</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliveri Tent no 138</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory Tent no 200</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maccabees The ins</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulnier Pamela mrs</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO Tent no 3</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie tent no 6</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane tent no 19</td>
<td>145 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>147 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calamari Anthony fruits</td>
<td>148 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Hat Co Inc</td>
<td>150 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Shoe Store</td>
<td>152 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>153 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman's Shoes</td>
<td>156 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentes Herman H mens furngs</td>
<td>158 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Roy brand shoes</td>
<td>162 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover brand Shoe Store</td>
<td>164 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star Jewlery and Loan Co</td>
<td>168-70 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Florestine Mrs photography</td>
<td>170 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrich Brand Tailoring Co</td>
<td>172 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernestein Louis womens furngs</td>
<td>174 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hite Henry A liqors</td>
<td>176 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertel's Loan Office</td>
<td>200 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fertel Sam</td>
<td>200 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Music House</td>
<td>203 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty Shirt Shop</td>
<td>204 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem Tailors</td>
<td>206 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigsby and Grigsby tailors</td>
<td>207 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickerman Morris</td>
<td>208 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benarby Printing Press</td>
<td>209 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichtenstein P Inc shoes</td>
<td>210 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astoria Cab Co</td>
<td>211 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>211.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupperman Frank Dept Store</td>
<td>212-214 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanfrau Garage Inc</td>
<td>215 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Star Meat Market</td>
<td>216 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Star Grocery</td>
<td>220 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>222 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weil Leopold shoes</td>
<td>222.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchiz Harry Square Deal Tailors</td>
<td>224 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty Grand Beer Parlor</td>
<td>225-27 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Longshore Workers I LA Local Union No 1419</td>
<td>227.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Union No 854 ILA</td>
<td>227.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier Aaron physician</td>
<td>227.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Benjamin F physician</td>
<td>227.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes Thomas D physician</td>
<td>227.5 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monteleone Jos A fish market</td>
<td>228 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Thos produce</td>
<td>228 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Meat Market Inc</td>
<td>228 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>230 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaise Parking Lot</td>
<td>231 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kunnes Morris shoes</td>
<td>232 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Loan Office</td>
<td>234 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astoria Restaurant</td>
<td>235 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astoria Barber Shop</td>
<td>237 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiMaggio Jos grocery</td>
<td>238 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Meat Market</td>
<td>240 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estevez Gilbert meats dir</td>
<td>240 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein Louis womens furngs</td>
<td>300 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrault Arthur J photography</td>
<td>302 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pelican Restaurant 303-313 South Rampart
Schneider M and Son tailor 304 South Rampart
Gerber Dave Loan Office 306 South Rampart
Castrinos Bakery 308 South Rampart
Castrinos Dimitri meat market 308 South Rampart
DiVicenti Frank liquors 310 South Rampart
Dix Barber Shop 313 South Rampart
Klemes Chas mens clothing 314-16 South Rampart
Omaha Inn liquors 317 South Rampart
Abbott Percy J liquors 318 South Rampart
Rogers Horner shoe shine 318 South Rampart
Butler Jewlery Co 319 South Rampart
Bidding Marie 319 South Rampart
Robinson David K cigars 320 South Rampart
Daggs Luis Mrs restaurant 321 South Rampart
Vacant 322 South Rampart
Ace Theatre 323 South Rampart
Offner Harry hardware 326-28 South Rampart
Globe Garage 327 South Rampart
Bagelman Cecil mens furnishings 330 South Rampart
Standard Tailors 332-34 South Rampart
Heyman Carl S 332-34 South Rampart
Esteves Gilbert liquors restaurant 336 South Rampart
Stabile John shoe repair 341 South Rampart
Roxy Clothing Co 342 South Rampart
Harold Batiste 343 South Rampart
Eagle Tailor Shop 343 South Rampart
Fink's Loan Office 344 South Rampart
Johnson George barber 345 South Rampart
Shuster Benjamin shoe repair 347 South Rampart
Harris Lynn 347 South Rampart
Hartman Nathan men's furnishings 348-50 South Rampart
Vacant 352 South Rampart
Glucksmann Tuoro Second Hand Clothing 353 South Rampart
Simmons Helen 353 South Rampart
Shocket Jospeh hat cleaner 354 South Rampart
New Temple Barber Shop 355 South Rampart
Abner Samuel 356 South Rampart
Nash Tailors 356 South Rampart
Double Dip Ice Cream Company 357 South Rampart
Papa Samuel confir 358 South Rampart
Dianne Cleaners 359 South Rampart
Gautreaux George Dr optometrist 360 South Rampart
Oriental Laundry 361 South Rampart
Braquet Peter E meat market 400 South Rampart
Dixie Beer Parlor 401 South Rampart
Smason Samuel jeweler 402 South Rampart
Main Liquor Store 404 South Rampart
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staehle John J</td>
<td>406-8 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staehle's Bakery</td>
<td>406-8 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Southern Novelty and Music Co</td>
<td>409 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Louis M radio repr</td>
<td>409 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purvin Rose Mrs mens furngs</td>
<td>410 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>411 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Mary Mrs</td>
<td>413 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brant Gus shoe repair</td>
<td>414 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Sylvester restaurant and barber shop</td>
<td>415 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovira C F grocer</td>
<td>416 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangiracina Peter J meat dir</td>
<td>418 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>419 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulitz Max mens furngs</td>
<td>420 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>422 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>423 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komiariski Harry M</td>
<td>424 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>425 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>427 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>428 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantee Barber Supply Co</td>
<td>431 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginsburg Abr mens furngs</td>
<td>432 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Frank T</td>
<td>433 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>434 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracker Jack Drug Store</td>
<td>435 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailet Maurice Second Hand Clothing</td>
<td>437 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolworth F W and Co</td>
<td>438 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Barber Shop</td>
<td>439 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson Felix D</td>
<td>439 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Thos shoe shiner</td>
<td>439 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Bargain House Second Hand Clothing Store</td>
<td>441 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomez Jack</td>
<td>441 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverstein's Dept Store</td>
<td>442-46 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>445 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacoby Joseph F</td>
<td>447 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgets Store shoes</td>
<td>447 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailet's Loan Office</td>
<td>449 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailet David</td>
<td>449 South Rampart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several other important land uses can be identified from this table. First, numerous neighborhood-oriented land uses still existed in the area. Numerous grocery stores, butchers, and even bakeries (the famous Staehle’s Bakery mentioned by Louis
Armstrong) still dotted the area. Small-scale businesses were, however, beginning to dominate the area. Clothing stores, including many second-hand stores, are heavily represented in this area. In addition, some specialty stores appear in the list. Most notable is Morris Music at South Rampart owned by Morris Karnofsky. In addition, several union offices existed to provide services for dockworkers.

A notable absence, however, is the lack of a strong, identifiable Chinese presence. The 1897 Underwriters Survey showed a large Chinese presence in the 200 block of South Rampart on the Tulane Avenue end. The only direct reference to Chinese businesses in the area in 1938 was the Oriental Laundry in the 300 block of South Rampart.

Music was still an integral part of the neighborhood foundation of this area. The Astoria in the 300 block often had jazz offerings. Kernfeld, editor of The New Grove Dictionary of Jazz (2002), says that the Astoria “flourished during the 1920s and 1930s and often engaged jazz musicians to accompany dancing” (p. 98). Musicians who played there included Kid Rena and Jones and Collins Astoria Hot Eight.

Conclusions

Taken together the data on land uses and morphological orientation suggest that the South Rampart Street area still had a viable residential infrastructure of neighborhood businesses and residences. While the area was not as dense as it had been in 1908, the South Rampart Street area still had definable block faces that acted to provide a coherent pedestrian environment.

From a morphological perspective, the late 1920s and 1930s period in the South Rampart Street area was marked by slow, piecemeal land use changes, adaptive
changes in morphological terminology. Despite a gradual thinning of the built landscape, the area still maintained a fairly large residential population and a fair number of neighborhood-oriented commercial enterprises. Louis Armstrong and the large “jazz diaspora” (Bergreen 1997) of New Orleans had left, but music still was a significant feature of the nightlife and neighborhood fabric of the area.

The gradual process of land use change that had characterized this area, however, was about to be dramatically accelerated. The template of land use change created by Bartholomew, while delayed by the Great Depression and the impending World War II, would soon help to irrevocably alter the fabric of this area. It is difficult to know whether this area could have slowly been transformed into a more stable, prosperous neighborhood. The changes wrought by the augmentative alteration of the 1940s and 1950s wiped away the area before this future could be realized.

---

1 The implications of the split between the spirit of modern art and the technological manifestations of its material side are examined by Berman (1982).
2 Harland Bartholomew and Associates was formed in 1919 in St. Louis. Bartholomew’s influence in early city planning efforts was immense. Between its 1919 founding and 1932, fifty comprehensive plans were completed by the company (Lovelace 1993, p.12).
3 The Preliminary Report by Bartholomew (1926) argues Dryades Street should be widened. When the final report came out in 1927, Dryades Street had been replaced by Saratoga as the proposed location for street widening.
4 Campanella and Campanella (2000) argue that the City Planning Commission proposed the elimination of street markets and the widening of Dryades, Saratoga, Poydras, and other streets in 1927.
5 This conclusion should be seen as a numeric approximation. The Sanborn data sources used in 1908 and 1937 differed slightly in their orientation. The 1908 data were stitched together from multiple, fine-grained block-level analyses. The 1937 Sanborn data set, on the other hand, was acquired from an overview map of building footprints not available for 1908. Unfortunately, block level data from 1937 has been “updated” by pasting newer changes on top of the old map. It is difficult to determine the exact timing of these updates. While the exact numeric change figures should be viewed with some caution, they effectively capture the overall portrait of change that was taking place in the study area. Aerial photos of the area show the thinning out of interior block space that is captured in the Sanborn records.
6 This map was photographed at the New Orleans City Planning office. It is still being used by city planners to provide historic context to their contemporary studies. The original map is printed on cloth and the colors on the map are beginning to wear away. The photo of the map was placed in ArcView and manually enhanced to provide a more coherent picture of the land uses in 1929.
Chapter 7 Erasing the Past: The Political Economy of the Lost Landscape of Jazz 1947 to 1974

Comprehensive Sanborn records are not available for detailed morphologic study of the crucial mid-twentieth century interventions in the New Orleans CBD. The detailed plans that are available, however, provide a strong record of the specific morphological changes and ideological justifications of the major changes that swept the South Rampart Street corridor. The major post-war plans that affected the area are examined in this chapter.

Introduction

The seeds of the modern street that had been planted by Bartholomew in his 1927 Major Streets Report lay dormant through most of the Great Depression and World War II. It took Robert Moses, on one of his many consulting jobs, to bring these seeds to life in the late 1940s. Moses’ 1946 plan along with three other major planning efforts from the 1940s to the 1960s, the Civic Center Plan of 1946, City Planning and the Chamber of Commerce’s Prospectus for Revitalizing New Orleans in 1957 and the Chamber’s 1965 Guidelines for Growth, formed the basis for action to modernize the city. The changes proposed and eventually etched into the New Orleans landscape dramatically altered the traditional fabric of the city. The changes wrought by these plans, augmentative changes in morphological terminology, ripped apart the traditional grid of the city to accommodate large-scale transportation and building projects to accommodate the growth machine’s vision of the central business district. Tracking the logic of the plans in this way becomes a way to track both the driving concepts and physical impact of the growth machine¹.
The previous chapters have utilized Sanborn records as a basis for determining the fine-grained details of landscape change. Unfortunately, between 1937 and 1985 complete Sanborn records for the study area are not available. To study this era of change, government documents on road and building projects along with aerial photos of the area were examined. While this type of data is not as fine-grained in nature as the Sanborn maps, it does provide evidence of the sweeping landscape changes that transformed the study area.

Robert Moses and Perdido Street: the Arterial Plan for New Orleans

Moses, in conjunction with Andrews and Clark Engineers, authored the Arterial Plan for New Orleans in 1946. This document took the essence of Bartholomew’s plan and added the larger component of a two-loop highway to the biological system. The two-loop system envisioned a riverfront expressway weaving along the edge of the French Quarter linking to a north/south expressway along the route of the New Basin Canal. This system would additionally link to a bridge over the Mississippi River and a series of widened streets providing greater access to New Orleans’ downtown.

The scope of Moses’ proposal dwarfed anything the New Orleans planning community has seen before or since. Just the first stage of the two-stage proposal was monumental. The consultants sum up the proposal by stating:

The first-stage construction program consisting of the Pontchartrain Expressway, the traffic plaza at the proposed Union Passenger Terminal with connection to the Municipal Auditorium, the Waterfront Expressway, the Elysian Fields limited access boulevard, the widening of Claiborne Avenue and Rampart Street and, finally, the Mississippi River Bridge to be built when financing can be arranged, will provide a network which will cope with the immediate arterial problem in New Orleans (p. 25).2

While the plan was more of a conceptual vision of New Orleans’ future rather than a true comprehensive analysis (the plan was only thirty or so pages long), dealing with
only the “immediate arterial problem” had a tremendous impact on the urban fabric of New Orleans. Arthur D. Little, Inc. (1967), in *A Review of Transportation Planning in New Orleans*, argued that the Moses plan was “probably the most important single document in the history of New Orleans transportation planning” (p. II-3).

While the massive scope of the proposal set the planning agenda for the next twenty-five years, Moses argued that his plan was only a small, focused vision necessary for maintaining the future vitality of the city. Moses believed that this type of system would help to maintain a strong center, avoiding the problem of “decentralization- the last thing an old, established city wants unless it contemplates suicide” (Robert Moses, 1946 p. 10). His plan, he believed, avoided the problem of large-scale and unnecessary decentralization that plagued so many plans. Moses says, “The trouble with most plans is that they are too grandiose” (p. 11). In a time of big ideas, Moses saw himself, or at least portrayed himself, as a purveyor of sensible, rationale modern alternatives.

The specifics of Moses’ proposal further winnowed away the core of Louis Armstrong’s Perdido Street neighborhood. Two components of this plan played a particularly important role in reshaping the area. First, Moses argued that the right-of-way along the newly filled section of the New Basin Canal offered the perfect location for a highway. At the time of Moses’ report, the canal had been filled up to Claiborne Ave. Moses proposed filling in the canal an additional two miles to provide a linear corridor for a highway system. This proposal extends Bartholomew’s plan by proposing to link this highway to a new Mississippi River Bridge and a Riverfront Expressway. While this plan would require slashing into an existing neighborhood, Moses argues that only “unimportant buildings are in the way” (p. 8).
Moses’ cavalier attitude extended into the heart of Armstrong’s old Perdido Street neighborhood. Moses, like Bartholomew before him, proposed widening Saratoga Street to provide greater access to the new rail station, the Union Passenger Terminal. He argued that, “A wide boulevard should be built leading to the Municipal Auditorium, following generally Saratoga Street with the removal of the present Southern Railroad Station at Canal Street. From the Union Passenger Terminal to Canal Street a number of buildings of comparatively little value must be acquired” (p. 7). These buildings formed the heart of the landscape of the cradle of jazz.

**The End of the Reign of King Zulu: The Rise of the Civic Center**

While Moses’ plan set the template for modern landscape change in New Orleans, one addition to his plan significantly accelerated destruction of the Perdido Street neighborhood. Moses’ proposed Saratoga thoroughfare sparked the modern imagination, leading to even greater proposals for “reclaiming” the area for future civic enterprises. In 1946, the neighborhood became the proposed site for a massive Civic Center complex. In the opinion of the lead planner of the project, Brooke Duncan, the complex would serve the dual functions of ridding “the city of an unsightly section and provide necessary facilities for the expanding municipal government” (Haas 1986, p. 58). To build this complex of governmental uses, several blocks were to be cleared and Saratoga Street was to be eliminated altogether through this area, subsumed by a widened Loyola Ave. As the planner Brooke Duncan points out, removal of the “unsightly section” of the city wasn’t an unintentional side effect; this was part of the plan.
Before this plan was fully implemented, Louis Armstrong got to see the neighborhood in its full glory one more time. In 1949, Armstrong reigned as King of the Mardi Gras parade, Zulu. Zulu was started in 1909 in Louis' Perdido Street neighborhood to “parody the white krewes that otherwise dominated the festivities” (Ward and Burns 2000, p. 47). Zulu represented the height of the parade-culture that helped nurture Armstrong's musical talents in his early years. Ward and Burns (2000) describe Armstrong’s joy at being chosen their king. They say, “It was the fulfillment of a ‘lifelong dream,’ he (Armstrong) said, the most vivid possible evidence of the love and respect the men and women among whom he’d grown up in the streets of black Storyville still held for him” (p. 353). The beauty and joy of this moment is captured by a quote by Arvell Shaw, one of the band members of Armstrong’s All-Stars. Ward and Burns quote Shaw as remembering that “people from all over the world- his fans- had come to see him. I've never seen anything this beautiful in my life” (p. 353).

The beauty and strength of this moment, however, were soon relegated to memory as the epicenter of the parade route in the Perdido Street neighborhood was cleared to make way for the new civic center complex. Construction of the Civic Center cleared about three-square blocks of dense, residential and local businesses. Figure 1 shows a land use map of the area used by the City Planning Commission from 1949. A comparison of the land uses from 1929 shows that the residential population remained in the northern study blocks, but was being thinned out. Commercial uses are beginning to dominate the southern portion of the study area with a continued presence of the railroad in the western part of the area. Ominously, a new category was added for the 1949 land use map, vacant land.
As the Civic Center complex was built. The northern residential blocks were leveled. Street widening took out another block along a linear path through the neighborhood (Figure 2 and 3). This clearance took away a large portion of the clientele for the neighborhood business along South Rampart Street. This clearance was the real end to Louis Armstrong's beloved, flawed neighborhood.

**Perdido Street Gets Lost: The Success of the Growth-Coalition**

The loss of the core of Louis’ old neighborhood opened up new opportunities for the growth coalition to further alter the surrounding landscape. While Louis' neighborhood was gone, pockets of lower-income populations and the low-rise residential landscape that they inhabited still existed throughout the downtown, mostly on the western fringe of downtown. Two major planning documents created by the Central Area Committee (CAC) of the Chamber of Commerce were utilized to further transform the residential landscape into a corporate enclave: *A Prospectus for Revitalizing New Orleans* in 1957 and the 1965 *Guidelines for Growth*.

**A Prospectus for Revitalizing New Orleans 1957**

The CAC was a powerful player in the New Orleans planning community. Started in 1957 by the Chamber of Commerce, it was charged with creating a vision for a new, “revitalized”, corporate downtown. The planning department of the City of New Orleans partnered with the CAC to produce the 1957 *Prospectus for Revitalizing New Orleans*. This partnership set the tone for the corporate planning culture that reigned in New Orleans throughout the 1950s and 1960s.

The Prospectus aimed to solidify the central business district as the definitive “heart” of the city in the face of growing pressures of decentralization, “the very process which
endangers the Central Business District” (City of New Orleans Planning Department, 1957, p. 20). In the first chapter of the Prospectus titled “The Problem,” the authors argue that traffic congestion was weakening the preeminent position of the CBD in the city hierarchy. To maintain the dominant position, they argued, the CBD must be made more accessible to the growing suburban populations through extensive road building projects designed to create easier access to the heart of the city.

Their analysis follows the logical progression of the scientific doctor; a clear diagnosis will lead to a definitive cure. The authors are clear in their diagnosis. They argue that, “This traffic congestion, in turn, brings about a gradual deterioration of economic productivity, which together with a mixture of all kinds of land uses and the growing obsolescence of many structures in the Central Business District, IS THE PROBLEM!” (p.8).

The scientific rationalism continues as the authors identify in chapter three the “Extent of the Problem” with chapter subheadings of “Salvation or Suicide” and “More Parking- More People”. In chapter four, the authors take us on a tour 1950s planning “success” stories. The autocentric templates created in Atlanta, Kansas City, and Detroit are touted as the key to the salvation of the CBD.

Finally, in Chapter Five, the rubber meets the road with a five-stage conceptual plan for the revitalization of the New Orleans CBD. This five-stage plan mirrors the templates set forth by the planning success stories of Atlanta, Kansas City, and Detroit. The plan included: extensive parking facilities in the CBD “frame”, a network of “penetration streets” that are isolated from the “pedestrian preserve(s)” (p. 43), all linked to the inner- and outer-belt expressway system. While the 1950s scientific planning terminology used
to shape this vision now sounds antiquated, the results remain embedded in the contemporary landscape. A brief look at the five stages of this conceptual plan show how much of the present landscape was shaped by this plan.

Stage One involves the completion of the outer belt of the expressway system into the heart of the city (Figure 4). This plan builds on Moses’ basic template for the Expressway World continuing the proposal for a Riverfront Expressway linked to the newly constructed Pontchartrain Expressway and Mississippi River Bridge. It significantly expands the scope of Moses’ original proposals for the Claiborne corridor. Instead of the widening of Claiborne Avenue proposed in the Moses plan, the Prospectus proposes that an expressway be placed down the center of Claiborne Avenue, the center of black business in New Orleans.

Significantly, the proposal for a Claiborne Expressway was made well before the 1960s controversy over the French Quarter Expressway. A misunderstanding about the precise timeline of these proposals has crept into both the academic discourse and popular perceptions concerning the Claiborne Avenue Freeway Extension. The popular understanding of the Claiborne Avenue Freeway is that it was sited through the heart of the black community as a result of preservationists’ victory in the French Quarter Expressway conflict.

This popular misperception has, unfortunately, been repeated in otherwise excellent works on the development of the city. A case in point is Peirce Lewis’ *New Orleans- The Making of an Urban Landscape*. Both the 1976 edition and the significantly enhanced 2002 editions of the book suggest that the Claiborne Expressway was the result of shifting the French Quarter Expressway to the Claiborne corridor (p. 98, 2002 edition).
This historical inaccuracy has helped to foster a perception that preservation victories come at the expense of the black community (Borah 2004). Placing the blame for the Claiborne Expressway on preservationists shoulders has obscured the real culprit for this landscape tragedy, the complete failure of planners and the white business community to include the voices of those affected by their schemes into the “unbiased” scientific equations.

Stage 2 of the Prospectus continues the dispassionate rational planning by proposing the completion of a network of inner-belt streets to connect the outer-belt of expressways to the core (Figure 5). This stage is, once again, an extension of Moses’ original proposals from the 1940s. By the time the Prospectus was written in 1957, extensive work had already begun on creating this inner-belt system. In addition, Stage 2 also proposed a network of connector streets that would provide “penetration points for destinations within the frame area” (p. 48).

The Loyola Corridor that pushed through Louis’ old neighborhood was a component of this system. Interestingly, the inner-belt system was planned for the edges of plan seams established during the city’s 19th century growth. The Loyola edge created through Louis’ neighborhood was extended down Rampart Street at the back of the French Quarter. The Poydras Street edge that had separated industrial uses from residential uses was reinforced by the wide-autocentric template of the inner-belt system as well.

Stage 3 envisioned the “development of parking concentrations within certain areas, located adjacent to both the outer and inner belt traffic arteries” (p. 44) (Figure 6). The inner parking concentration, once again, reinforces the historic seam or edge in the New
Orleans landscape along Rampart Street. The parking concentration was planned to run the length of Rampart behind the French Quarter and into the heart of the CBD.

Stage 4 envisioned the creation of “pedestrian preserves” where the incursion of the automobile would be strictly limited (Figure 7). The penetration streets and parking concentrations identified earlier would be used to provide access to these pedestrian-oriented areas. These pedestrian areas would not be the mixed-use areas of residential and commercial favored by planners today. The pedestrian zones would be oriented exclusively towards commercial uses. In the opinion of the authors of this work, residential uses are “not compatible to a Central Business District’s core” (p. 51). To show the authors rationalism in following this ideal, they argue that “bisecting the French Quarter” with an inner belt extension along Orleans Avenue would better serve the interests of the “core of the Central Business District” (p. 51).

Finally, Stage 5 called for the creation of single-use public building complexes focused in areas “not in competition” with other interests of the Central Business District (Figure 8). This meant that these complexes would generally be focused on the edges of the core. The logic here was that these nodes would act “as an ‘anchor point’ in aiding revitalization of adjacent areas and preventing future deterioration” (p. 51). What happened, instead, was that these large, single use nodes acted to decrease pedestrian activity.

When the five stages of the Prospectus are seen together, the plan takes on its true shape, a lost space generation machine (Figure 9). Each step acts to reinforce existing seams in the landscape. When a contemporary map of lost space seams (Figure 10) is compared with the historic plan, the unfortunate success of this 1950s vision becomes
apparent. While not every aspect of this plan was carried out, the basic template of extensive parking facilities in the CBD “frame” linked by a network of “penetration streets” all combined with the inner- and outer-belt expressway system was enacted. One further plan, the Guidelines for Growth plan of 1965 by the Central Area Committee (CAC) of the Chamber of Commerce, shows how this vision was carried out in the Rampart Street Corridor.

Guidelines for Growth 1965

The modernist template of the Guidelines plan is effectively captured in its design approach. The authors argue that, “In architectural design, it has often been stated that ‘form should follow function’; this relationship is equally valid in the design of Central New Orleans” (p. 2).

The modernist credo takes shape in the specific functions envisioned for the Poydras Street area. The plan argues that Poydras Street is needed to perform three basic functions. Poydras Street should act as:

- “the uptown side of the ‘inner ring’ system of major access and distributor streets.
- A boundary between different types and intensities of land development
- A grand boulevard and vehicular ‘promenade.’” (p.12).

The vehicular promenade, intentional boundaries between land uses, and inner ring street network are all forms designed to function as a space for automobiles. The plan goes one step further by advocating intentional concentrations of parking on the outer fringes of the CBD. The authors argue that, “Major concentrations of employee parking should be located around the fringes of the core area” (p. 25). Form follows function.

The Growth Machine and Urban Planning in New Orleans
The plans created in the 1950s and 60s in New Orleans were created through a partnership between the City Planning Commission of New Orleans and the Central Area Committee of the Chamber of Commerce (CAC). The CAC not only possessed the advisory role to envision a new downtown, but also had the power of implementation through their *de facto* role as New Orleans’ main planning body. In *A Review of Transportation Planning in New Orleans* (1967), Arthur D. Little, Inc. notes that, “Because the Central Area Committee was, in effect, the planning authority, the scope of most studies was limited to a small portion of the city and reflected the special interests of that group” (p. II-7).

The clearance of the Civic Center Area and the displacement caused by the widening projects eventually allowed the growth coalition to transform much of the upper-downtown area into a high-rise corridor radiating down Poydras Street from the Superdome complex. With completion of the Civic Center complex in 1957, the widened Loyola Avenue spine resembled a blank slate, a place of modern possibilities (Figure 11). During the 1960s, Poydras Street was widened to provide a radial access point to the new Interstate system emerging along Claiborne Avenue. Plans created by the Central Area Committee of the Chamber of Commerce argue that the “very nakedness “ of the area after the widening project should be ameliorated by creating “an automobile promenade” (Brown 1966, p. 4 and 5). The axis of Louis Armstrong’s old neighborhood at the corner of Loyola and Poydras Streets was described as “best suited to low density development of a type that does not generate large amounts of pedestrian traffic. Parking structures would fit this particular qualification and at the same time
serve a vital need in this area” (p. 7). The landscape of the cradle of jazz was effectively subsumed into a landscape of automobile promenades and parking lots.

At the heart of this group’s vision for the area was the construction of the Superdome to anchor a spine of high-rises along Poydras Street. Smith and Keller (1983) emphasize the crucial role that the destruction of the Perdido Street neighborhood played in creating the central business district corporate landscape. They argue that the Superdome project “might never have been deemed economically or politically feasible if a nearby low-income gray area had not been bulldozed fifteen years earlier to construct the city Civic Center” (p. 134). They point to comments made by the head of the banking team responsible for securing financing for the Superdome project. The head of the banking team contended that Mayor Morrison’s creation of the Civic Center complex "successfully exorcised a wretched, festering slum" providing the central business district with “protection” that is “beyond measure” (quoted in Smith and Keller 1983, p. 134 and 135).

While the Superdome and the high-rise spine that it helped inspire are popularly perceived, even by pro-preservation writers, as important components in “revitalizing downtown and keeping business in the CBD” (Campanela and Campanela 2000, p. 26), the alternative future of the destroyed Perdido Street neighborhood is discounted, lost in the perceived necessity to modernize. Perdido Street now truly resembles its original Spanish meaning, the lost street.

**Conclusions**

Each of these plans sought to make major changes to the essential morphological structure of the city to enhance the power and prestige of the downtown core. These
plans set the stage for the “Houstonization” of the CBD that occurred from the 1970s to 1990s as the Superdome and the spine of high-rises along Poydras Street were erected (Brooks and Young 1993). These plans wiped away both the lower-income population of the fringe of the downtown area and the dense, narrow street landscapes that supported the growth of jazz in these areas.

The growth coalition couched questions of who would benefit from these mega-schemes in modernist language. The plans assumed that what was good for the growth coalition was good for the entire city. The negative morphological and cultural consequences of these plans were seen as the inevitable results of progress.

While economic growth and revitalization were the generic goals of New Orleans planning establishment, the impact of these goals, and the power structure that pushed them, can be read in the resulting physical landscape. This landscape represents a contested politicized realm that shows the impact of broader societal goals and aspirations in the physical transformation of vernacular spaces. Zukin (1991) argues that studying landscapes in this way links the larger political economic structures with the places that result from the intersession of these forces.

The resulting landscape in New Orleans tells in physical terms the political story of exactly what “revitalization of the central business district” meant at different times. The legacy of New Orleans’ redevelopment plans is marked by a focus on elite, private sector interests and a failure to integrate the city’s cultural assets and existing urban morphology into visions of the city’s future. The story of how the first landscape of jazz was “modernized” is just one example of a general failure of the New Orleans establishment to value and sustain the unique culture and historic fabric of the city.
My fellow Ph.D student Jake Wagner helped me work through my thoughts on this point. This geographic listing of proposals is a little difficult to follow without intimate knowledge of New Orleans geography. In general, the goal of Moses was to provide automotive linkages to create a full system for traffic to flow throughout the metropolitan area.

This map was photographed at the City Planning Office. It is, like the 1920s land use map, printed on cloth. The colors are fading from continued use by city planners. The photo was transferred to ArcView and manually enhanced to improve the visual.

Sugrue (1996) does an excellent job showing how “successful” the physical interventions turned out to be in Detroit. His Origins of the Urban Crisis shows the stark, racially-motivated highway planning that “devasted” the “most densely populated sections of black Detroit” (p. 47). This, coupled with a large urban renewal program and racially-motivated housing segregation and poverty, helped to set the stage for the Detroit riot of 1967.
Chapter 8: “Modern” Contradictions: Louis Armstrong and Robert Moses Meet on Perdido Street

The dramatic changes that swept through Louis Armstrong’s old neighborhood were not the result of catastrophic hurricane winds that sometimes buffet the region. The winds of change in this neighborhood were part of a larger ideological storm that continues to blow through our lives. This chapter explores the relevance of Marshal Berman’s conception of modernism for understanding change in Louis Armstrong’s old neighborhood. The master of the modern art form of jazz, Louis Armstrong, and the master of modern urban development, Robert Moses, conceptually meet on Perdido Street in New Orleans. Their standoff provides a template for understanding both the historic changes that swept through this neighborhood and also provides footing for understanding the contemporary winds that continue to sweep through our cities.

Introduction

By the 1970s, the landscape that Louis Armstrong had known was wiped away for the new, modern New Orleans. The central core of the CBD was effectively divided from the low-income neighborhoods that surround it. The growth coalition saw this action as necessary to provide the central business district with “protection” that is “beyond measure” (quoted in Smith and Keller 1983, p. 134 and 135).

This “protection”, however, has resulted in a downtown architectural landscape characterized by its defensive posture. The blank walls, second-floor lobbies, security guards, and pedestrian flyovers that are dominant features of the upper CBD area of New Orleans are hallmarks of defensive urbanism. Mike Davis’ critique of Los Angeles that was examined in Chapter One is echoed in the landscape of New Orleans.

At the dawn of 21rst century, the landscape of modern New Orleans is divided racially, economically, and culturally. Between 1950 and 2000, New Orleans lost two-
thirds of its white population. As Lewis (2003) notes, this was “white flight with a vengeance” (p. 125). The white exodus left behind minority neighborhoods dominated by poverty. Lewis (2003) notes that nearly half of all children in New Orleans now live in poverty.

The gleaming vision of a modern New Orleans now seems like a mirage. Hirsch and Logsdon (1992) argue that the same modern developments that were seen by 1950s planners as offering salvation helped entrench the serious divisions that plague the city today. They argue that, “The metropolitanization of New Orleans finally wrote into the city’s spatial relationships the same uncompromising racial dualism that had conditioned political and legal rights for the past century. New Orleans came to resemble other American cities, both North and South, with an increasingly black core surrounded by a ring of white suburbs” (p. 199). The new New Orleans envisioned by Mayor Morrison and the modern planners in the 1950s has come to pass.

The story of how urban planning functioned in New Orleans to accentuate the landscape divisions that have been examined in this dissertation raises serious questions about the particulars of the high-modernist project and its particular application to the historic city of New Orleans. The next two chapters examine the remnants of the modern dream to help determine how both to conceptualize a vision for the future and how to use urban planning as positive tool in realizing a renewed vision.

**Urban Planning and Managing Change**

One of the central roles of planners is to manage change (Vernez-Moudon 1986, p. xv). Contemporary planners try to fashion appropriate policies to maintain and preserve a wide range of important community features and functions. These policies range
simultaneously from the need to preserve historic districts to policies designed to minimize environmental impacts to efforts to enhance a community’s economic competitiveness. While the ambitious agenda of sustainability has been offered as a way to balance these competing economic, social, and environmental goals, the appropriate operational, management compromise has proven to be an elusive product (Campbell 1996). While the generic goal of preserving a community’s vital characteristics is now universally lauded, the underlying tensions between preservation and the imperatives of change continue to hover over planners’ decisions.

While the popular planning fad du jour can often fade fast into the ether of discarded buzzwords, some of the major challenges of managing change in the modern world are surprisingly persistent. Over the course of the last one hundred and fifty years or so, many of the same questions about the value of tradition and the modern imperative to change have been at the center of debates about urbanization. This chapter explores the changing intellectual currents regarding the value and use of city space attempting to provide a platform for understanding change in the modern world of the city. While a complete examination of modernism is far beyond the scope of this work, a brief excursion into Marshall Berman’s conception of modernism provides a useful way to understand the changing use of city space. Berman’s ideas are then brought to bear to help provide a conceptual understanding of the changes that took place in Louis Armstrong’s neighborhood in New Orleans. In many ways the changing perceptions about the proper role and importance of Louis Armstrong’s neighborhood mirror the growth and changes of modernism in the 20th Century.
The Imperatives of Time: Tradition and Change

In *All That is Solid Melts into Air*, Marshall Berman (1982) creates a compelling conceptual foundation for understanding how modernist thinking has affected how city spaces are perceived and used. In a wide-ranging exploration of the trajectory of modernist thought over the last 150 years, Berman contends that the thread that ties together these disparate eras is a continuing conflict between the value of tradition and the imperatives of change. He argues that:

To be modern, I said, is to experience personal and social life as a maelstrom, to find one's world and oneself in perpetual disintegration and renewal, trouble and anguish, ambiguity and contradiction: to be part of a universe in which all that is solid melts into air. To be a modernist is to make oneself somehow at home in the maelstrom, to make its rhythms one's own, to move within its currents in search of the forms of reality, of beauty, of freedom, of justice, that its fervid and perilous flow allows (p. 345-346).

Berman's conceptual foundation seeks to provide a bridge between our understanding of contemporary struggles with development and the wider historic record of similar conflicts. This conception of modernism helps to explain the destructive and creative powers unleashed as successive generations strive to remake their worlds. It is tempting to think that the problems of the contemporary modern world are unique; they are after all *modern* problems. Berman argues, however, that generations of people from around the world have been struggling to come to grips with the same forces, the same contradictions between development and destruction that plague us today. By giving us back our “modern roots” (p. 35), by rejoining the discussion of modernism to an understanding of the creative and destructive powers of change, Berman hopes to offer us a wider range of modern futures from which to choose.
City Streets and the Modern World

Berman’s articulation of the changing modern street is particularly useful. He points to two essential modern street settings: the 19th century Parisian boulevard of Haussmann and the 20th century expressway world of Robert Moses. Each incarnation of the street was modern, but the differing implications of these representations resulted in distinctly different modern worlds. Berman contends that the contemporary struggle to reinvent the city represents a choice between these competing modern views of city space.

In the 19th century, the modern city was being envisioned and created. Probably the greatest example of modern urbanism is the Parisian boulevard of Haussmann. These boulevards were and are the setting for a great mixing of classes and ideas. They are the archetypal public space that is at once revered and endangered in the contemporary world. While they now stand as archetypal “good” urban setting, the trauma of their creation and the social revolution that they represented are often forgotten.

Berman argues that these nineteenth-century modern boulevards uncovered “some of the deepest ironies and contradictions in modern city life” (p. 153). When Haussmann blasted his boulevards through the old slums of Paris, he opened a two-way window for the wider world to see the poverty of these areas and for the poor to see a way out. While Haussmann’s triumphant boulevards act as the setting for the new modernist city of romance and freedom, they also are the stage for a collision between the differing strata of income levels. The nineteenth-century understanding of modernism, found in many of the artistic works of the day, focused attention on these conflicts, on the promise of the future confronting the trauma of tearing away the past. These modern public spaces were the visceral setting for the trauma and triumph of the modern world.
By the twentieth century, Berman argues, the modern street of Robert Moses’ expressway world was designed to obliterate these contradictions. Emulating Le Corbusier’s vision of streets as “an obsolete notion” (Le Corbusier 1964, p. 120), the twentieth century modern street was no longer designed as a social place for mixing of people and ideas, but instead had been transformed into a single-purpose traffic conduit, a circuit to be plugged into the urban machine. Twentieth century modernism had sought to cleanse the contradictions of the mixing of poverty and wealth and revolutionary ideas and bourgeois sensibilities by destroying the setting, the place, where these contradictions lived and breathed, the street. By destroying these places of contradictions (the death of the street), the war for progress could finally be won.

The mantle of modern progress was firmly claimed by Robert Moses and his expressway world. The expressway world stood as the only modern future while the dissonant howls of protest rose without the benefit of the future on their side. Berman transforms this esoteric philosophical discussion into a meditation on the actual places and neighborhoods that grew from these ideas.

**The Lost Modern Bronx: The Power of Ideas and Jackhammers**

Berman’s description of the transformation of his own neighborhood in the Bronx by the modernism of Robert Moses’ expressway world shows the power of the modern ideas to shape and obliterate city space. Berman argues that the pillar of Moses’ power came from his ability to manipulate the meaning of modernism, to fashion himself as the only true vehicle of the modern future. Berman argues that, “For forty years, he was able to pre-empt the vision of the modern. To oppose his bridges, tunnels,
expressways, housing developments, power dams, stadia, cultural centers, was- or so it seemed- to oppose history, progress, modernity itself” (p. 294).

Berman contends that it was only during the 1960s when people began to create a countervailing ideology of progress that Moses’ machine could be challenged. Jane Jacobs’ *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* is used as the classic example of a competing modernism; a modernism of the street to challenge the expressway world. Berman argues that Jacobs’ description of the intricate ballet of street life in her *Greenwich Village* neighborhood represents, in fact, a modern vision similar to that depicted by a myriad of nineteenth century writers and artists. Berman argues that Jacobs’ articulation of the importance of street life is an integral part of modern culture. He says that, “This celebration of urban vitality, diversity and fullness of life is in fact, as I have tried to show, one of the oldest themes in modern culture” p. 316.

In Jane Jacobs’ modernism, *place*, once again, becomes a central component of social relations, a stage set in the public places of the streets necessary for the mixing of different people and ideas. In Robert Moses’ modernism, the street is swept away for the expressway world, a necessary function rather than a social place. Berman contends: “Jacobs point is that the so-called modern movement has inspired billions of dollars’ worth of ‘urban renewal’ whose paradoxical result has been to destroy the only kind of environment in which modern values can be realized” (p. 318).

**Robert Moses and Louis Armstrong Meet on Perdido Street**

While Berman’s exploration focuses on New York, the competing modern futures offered by Robert Moses and Jane Jacobs resonate far beyond Manhattan. In fact, Berman’s New York bears a striking resemblance to Louis Armstrong’s New Orleans.
Berman’s conceptualization of what it means to be modern, of the contradictions of the maelstrom of modern life, echoes down Perdido Street in both the transformative sounds of Louis Armstrong and the modernist ideological foundations of Robert Moses.

Louis Armstrong emerged from a public landscape dominated by the sounds of music. Armstrong “came of age in a city dominated by music, in public places and public spaces. Louis Armstrong’s New Orleans rattled, shook, clamored, clanged, and reverberated with parades, balls, carnivals, and funeral processions” (Bergreen 1997, p. 29). This nineteenth-century landscape was filled with “modern” contradictions. While the streets were filled with music, they were also filled with every type of vice imaginable and shadowed by a world of poverty and pain.

This is the crucial “modern” landscape that helped to fuel the visions of New Orleans’ most famous son, Louis Armstrong. If Berman and Jacobs are correct in asserting that the modern street is the crucial stage for the exploration of modern values, then it can be argued that Louis Armstrong needed the “modern” street, the nineteenth century street, to become part of a jazz culture that swept the world. Armstrong became the spirit of modernism, in part, because the modern landscape offered that possibility.

Armstrong transcended the poverty and violence of his neighborhood even as he embraced the sounds of that jazz landscape. Bergreen (1997) argues that Armstrong’s music was, “a cosmic shout of defiance, a refusal to accept the status quo, and a determination to remake the world of his childhood and by extension, the world at large, as he believed it ought to be” (p. 5 and 6). Armstrong’s liberating vision embodied tradition as it exploded its boundaries. Bergreen goes on to say that, “In so doing Louis had accomplished something far more interesting than simply renouncing his past. He
incorporated it into the expanding terrain of his new life and his music” (p. 79).

Armstrong’s ability to transform the gripping poverty of his childhood into his visionary, improvisational jazz echoes Berman’s description of the modernist’s ability to “make oneself somehow at home in the maelstrom” (p. 345). From this perspective, Armstrong was in many ways the living representation of modernism, breaking free of the past as he built on its traditions. Or as Appel (2002) argues, “To call Armstrong, Waller, et al., ‘modernists’ is to appreciate their procedures as alchemists of the vernacular who have ‘jazzed’ the ordinary and given it new life” (p. 13).

Appel (2002) does an excellent job of showing exactly how this modern process of “jazzing” worked. His discussion of Armstrong’s deconstruction of “Shine” from a racially offensive ditty into a powerful “sonic assault” (p. 142) against racism shows Armstrong’s tremendous transformative abilities. Appel argues that jazz critics have often focused on Armstrong’s trumpet playing genius, ignoring or discounting his singing. Appel argues that, “Armstrong’s singing, it is commonly believed, was an anachronistic extension of nineteenth-century minstrelsy’s ‘dark entertainer’…The caricature turns out to be splendid because it at once embodies an audience’s perception of the ‘darky’ persona and hints at the Armstrong whose singing is a powerful musical and spiritual transformation of the minstrel tradition” (p. 30 and 31).

This “powerful transformation” reaches its height with Armstrong’s reinvention of “Shine.” In Armstrong’s take of the song, he carefully avoids using the offensive term ‘shine’ until the very end of the song. At this point, Armstrong utters the term and follows it with a cascading solo that Appel suggests is aimed directly at the source of offense. Appel compares Armstrong to a “a great heavy-weight boxer- Joe Louis against
Max Schmeling- who has cornered his opponent and is now setting him up for the knockout crescendo, a brilliant ascending run whose fast, high, full-bodied clarion blows do the trick. ‘Mercy! Stop the fight!’ Fats Waller would have shouted if he had been at the piano accompanying his friend on this recording” (p. 142 and 143).

While Armstrong took this representation of individually empowered modernism to the world, the neighborhood that he grew up in was being transformed by a different current of modernism represented by the meat cleaver brutality of Robert Moses. Moses’ Arterial Plan for New Orleans (1948) was the template for New Orleans city planning for almost 25 years. This intellectual template of mega-transportation projects and a central high-rise core helped to transform the landscape of jazz into a lost landscape of parking lots. Moses and the growth coalition, of which he was a part, couched questions of who would benefit from these mega-schemes in modernist language. The plans assumed that what was good for the growth coalition was good for the entire city. The negative morphological and cultural consequences of these plans were seen as the inevitable results of progress.

This modern perception was packaged and sold to New Orleanians by both Moses and New Orleans' powerful mid-century mayor, de lesseps Morrison. Morrison sums up the twentieth century modern vision in his appropriately titled 1947 Mayor’s Report to the People. He says:

The course of mankind is never backward. It is forward and onward. Sometimes the road is rough and rocky; at times there may be detours and temporary delays, but despite the efforts of reactionary interests to turn back the march of Man, it is inevitably FORWARD. (quote in Prospectus 1957 p.3)

Morrison’s vision suffers from no ambiguity. Its truth is self-evident. The only thing standing in the way of this powerful tomorrow are "reactionary interests." In this way, the
crosscurrents of modernism resonate in the creation of the early sounds of jazz on Perdido Street and in the wrecking ball, highway construction that literally transformed Perdido Street back into its original Spanish meaning, lost.

To find Louis Armstrong, described in 1932 as “The Master of Modernism” (Appel 2002, p. 203), and Robert Moses, one of the central architects of American modern urbanism, resonating in the same place is less surprising than may originally be thought. Michael Dear (1996), echoing Berman’s views, argues that the spiritual side of modernism, represented in this case by Armstrong, and the material side of modernism, represented by Moses, were split apart. This split “between the material side of modernism and its spiritual side” resulted in contemporary modernism’s greatest flaw, “its separation of the political economy of modernization from the culture and spirit of modernization” (Dear 1996, p. 81).

While the spirit of Armstrong rose from the streets of New Orleans, these same street landscapes were destroyed to build a modern future that allowed no place for the essence of the modern spirit to grow. By rejoining the modernist debate to its nineteenth century roots, as Berman argues, the contradictions of modernization, its benefits and problems, can once again be uncovered. The questions that we ask of development in this context are not the static “bold new future” vs. obstructionist “reactionary” dichotomy that often marks the contemporary political debate. The question becomes one of appropriate futures. While the answers are not self-evident, mining the possible lost futures (Davis 1990) of the first landscape of jazz provides a window for exploring how to begin thinking in this modern way.

---

1 The impact of Moses’ planning foray into New Orleans was explored in greater depth in Chapter 7 of this dissertation.
According to Pitts (1977, p. 14), the name perdido comes from the time when the street was first constructed during the Spanish era of control of New Orleans around 1800. Pitts says that, "The name was derived from the Spanish word for 'lost', a reference to the times when flood waters from the swamp covered the street" (p. 14).
Chapter 9
Managing the Landscape of Jazz: Design Review, Lost Space, and Landscape Management on Perdido Street

One of the underlying themes of this work is that improved, contextual landscape management practices can help create and sustain the important places in modern cities. This chapter explores both the opportunities and limits of one of the important urban planning landscape management tools, design review.

Introduction

While the landscape of jazz was effectively subsumed into the modern central business district of New Orleans, key decisions regarding the future of this area remain. Several important vestiges of the jazz landscape still stand amidst the wide swath of surface parking. The Eagle Saloon, one of the central locations in the early jazz landscape, stands at the corner of Perdido and South Rampart both as a reminder of the poor planning of the past and, possibly, as a historic beacon for what this area could become.

This chapter explores how planners can help to craft a positive vision for the South Rampart Street corridor. Specifically, it highlights an important tool for managing the landscape, design review. Design review is a planning tool that encourages new development that respects the historic form around it. Instead of relying simply on the zoning’s quantitative calculations, design review attempts to explicitly include the quality of the proposed new development as a factor in “measuring” its acceptability. The use
of design review in the South Rampart Street corridor is evaluated in light of some of the unique challenges that implementation of this technique poses for this lost space area.

The challenges posed to effective use of design review extend beyond the more mundane, technical issues of proper crafting of the district legislation to the deep-seated, endemic problem of the politics of planning in New Orleans. The technical issues of crafting an appropriate design review district are examined first. This is followed by a specific focus on the political problems of effectively implementing design review in a politically charged environment such as New Orleans.

**There is a Difference Between Good Places and Lost Spaces**

The question of how to revitalize underutilized central city land has proven to be a near constant topic in the planning literature over the years. From the heroic, modernist efforts to “renew” the city to recent postmodern attempts to infuse mixed-use into the heart of the city, planners have attempted to encourage specific economic and social uses of city space.

Underlying these efforts is an ideological stance regarding the nature of good city form. In the modernist conception, the creation of enclaves of segregated uses formed the foundation for a strong city. The form of this “scientific city” (Scott, 1998, p. 313) was defined by a set of rational principles about the specific types of uses that should occur in each of the hermetically-sealed use zones. As Jane Jacobs’ (1961) attack on modernist planning made clear, however, people’s lives are messier and more interesting than the rationalists wanted to admit. Instead single-use zones, Jacobs and many others suggested a return to some of the principles of 19th century urban form designed to encourage mixed-use landscapes.
While the academic literature posits a distinct split with modernist development strategy dating back 40 years or more, the “seams” in the landscape that resulted from carving single-use districts into the existing cityscape are still evident in many central city areas (Trancik, 1986). Reacting to these lost spaces, postmodern urbanism urges a shift towards a more contextual, mixed-use urban form. Ellin (1999), however, argues that despite a shift in the underlying philosophy of good city form represented by postmodernism, the landscapes that have resulted from this shift share many of the a-contextual characteristics of their modernist counterparts. She argues that, “The rhetoric of modernity and postmodernity oppose one another, but since the underlying political economy has merely evolved rather than altered its course, many observers consider it more accurate to describe postmodernism as an evolution of modernism, rather than a rupture with it” (p.214). At the heart of the failure of postmodern urbanism to make significant changes to the landscape of modernity are the continuing political economic pressures placed on redevelopment projects.

In order to effectively weave the seams of lost space back into the current urban fabric, planning must begin to draw upon a theory of good urban form that clearly and specifically articulates the importance of form for the economic and social revitalization of the area. In a recent article in the *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, Talen and Ellis (2002) point out the impact of failing to articulate these principles. They argue that, “It seems unlikely that a good city can be achieved if planners do not have clear, durable standards for successful outcomes” (p. 36). Instead, they argue that the lack of a strong normative theory of good city form “simply cedes the field to other actors who
have no qualms about fighting for their preferences, even if they are narrow short-sighted, and in conflict with the public interest “(p. 38).

These political pressures are particularly acute in areas where the landscape is already in shambles and where the economy is weak. In such areas, urban design solutions that are perceived as “stylistic or architectural solutions to peripheral problems” (Talen and Ellis, 2002: 38) will likely be overruled. In the obliterated landscapes of many central cities, efforts to promote “good urban form”, unfortunately, are often perceived of as peripheral concerns. This is particularly troubling considering the history of modernist interventions in many of these same areas.

While there is a need for a deeper understanding of this history and the principles of good city form that were discarded in the rush to modernize, defining exactly what is meant by “good city form” has proven problematic. Talen and Ellis’ approach focuses on the articulation of a broad theory of good city form. While this certainly is an important step that planning theorists need to make, practicing planners also need functional tools to help create quality places. Design review offers just such an intermediary step. It offers an attractive and workable avenue for practicing planners to help manage the quality of urban places. This chapter utilizes a case study of the New Orleans Central Business District to help flesh out how design review can be used to help distressed areas tackle a legacy of poor design management.

**Design Review: An Important Tool for Managing the Landscape**

Design Review is an increasingly utilized regulatory tool that allows planners to systematically evaluate the quality of designs to help produce better places. Hinshaw (2000) argues that zoning, the traditional planning tool for managing spaces, has often
failed to produce quality places because it fails to effectively include quality in its regulatory framework. Hinshaw argues that, “I would submit that most zoning codes are actually ‘quality-neutral’; that is, they have an equal chance of producing bad or good development. Most codes deal in quantities of things: heights, setbacks, coverage, lot dimensions, parking stalls, etc. And uses” (p. 14). Unlike typical zoning standards that focus exclusively on exclusion of certain land uses based on quantitative measures, design review provides an avenue for evaluating the quality of design for a certain area.

Quality of place in design review is “measured” by addressing several key components of new development proposals. Hinshaw (1995) argues that, at a minimum, design review procedures should address:

- Overall Site Design
- Use of Plant Materials
- Building Orientation and Form
- Signage
- Public Spaces (p. 23).

While specific standards can be set for each of these components, the process of design review is geared more towards operating through “consensus and cooperation” (Hinshaw 1995, p. 6) depending, of course, on the specifics of the local setting.

While design review can be utilized in practically any area, it has typically been utilized in sensitive areas that require careful management (Duerksen and Goebel 1999). Design review has been used extensively in historically significant areas as well as environmentally sensitive zones. Often a design review overlay zone with special additional stipulations is created to help manage development for these special places.

To help provide a concrete example of what development in these design review zones should look like, municipalities have begun to use specific graphic
representations that help define the desired contextual development. Duerksen and Goebel (1999) note that newer design review ordinances are “characterized by increasingly sophisticated regulations that make extensive use of graphics and tables to summarize detailed information and illustrate complex concepts like ‘community character’ and ‘harmonious development.’ Such visual aids increase the likelihood of even-handed, consistent interpretations of the regulations and decrease the likelihood of court challenges” (p. 9).

One of the areas where design review has been least used is in places that have suffered from years of neglect and poor landscape management. These lost spaces (Trancik 1986), however, are some of the most important underutilized spaces in the city. Reintegrating these spaces into the fabric of the city offers tremendous opportunities for helping to create dynamic, economically vital places. Design review guidelines aimed at reintegrating distressed areas into the whole of the urban form can be used to help deal with the unfortunate legacy of neglect. The case of South Rampart Street in New Orleans can help to show how design review might be formulated specifically to help reintegrate these lost spaces into the existing urban fabric.

South Rampart Street: Emerging Conditions and Recurrent Problems

This dissertation has laid out the morphological and cultural changes that transformed the South Rampart Street area from one of the preeminent jazz landscapes into a lost, parking district. Despite the area’s current status as a surface parking district (See Chapter Three), several emerging conditions, if intelligently capitalized upon, hold out promise that the area can be revitalized.
Several significant opportunities and challenges confront any proposed revitalization plan for this area. On the positive side of the ledger, despite years of economic malaise and stagnation, the disparate districts surrounding South Rampart Street are slowly growing. The Medical District, the revitalized Warehouse District, the emerging sports complex, the proposed Downtown Development District’s Canal Street Revitalization, and the growing reach of hotels and tourism are all converging around the South Rampart Street area. While growth in each district, in and of itself, would not constitute a major advance, the disparate districts are geographically beginning to come together offering the possibility of a dynamic new center for the city. At the geographic center of these growing areas is South Rampart Street (Figure 1). Reclaiming the current lost space along Rampart Street offers a tremendous opportunity to “connect the dots,” tying the city back together.

Current planning practices in the city, however, significantly hamper the possibility of creating this new center of the city. The city’s failure to upgrade its antiquated zoning process is probably the most significant hurdle. Technically, the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance that currently governs land use in the city is flawed in several key ways. The ordinance’s basic text remains virtually unchanged since its passage in 1970. It is based on what the local Bureau of Governmental Research (2003) termed “generic suburban planning doctrines” (p. 2). The Central Business District is divided into several different zoning categories that are designed to quantitatively measure the appropriate land uses in each area. These generic doctrines, however, do not effectively “measure” the quality of new development.
These problems, in many ways, flow from the continued reliance on the now discredited modernist ideology of separated, single use districts characteristic of 1950s and 60s planning efforts. The planning efforts and zoning codes of that era created a highly technocratic, numeric description of spaces resulting in numerous “border vacuums” (Jacobs 1961). The nearly impenetrable series of tables and regulations that make up the current New Orleans CZO is a classic case of this type of ideology at work. Hinshaw’s critique of these type of codes points the way towards a more positive, place centered sensibility for creating quality places. Hinshaw (2000) argues that, “Much of what we have embedded in our codes speaks to fears that are far greater than reality. It is time that we look to our codes, make them more current, more manageable, less exclusionary, less anal-retentive. And we need considerably more flexibility to create places that are diverse, sociable, and reflective of contemporary business and technology” (p. 14).

Design Review Recommendations

To reintegrate the South Rampart Street Corridor back into the fabric of the city, a design review district must directly address the negative features of the current landscape while protecting the last few remnants of the historic past. To accomplish this, a design review overlay district specifically tailored to the needs of the South Rampart Street Corridor is proposed.

Because of the depressed surroundings of the current area, the proposed design review district needs to balance urban design provisos with targeted fiscal incentives to help reinvestment in the zone. In the current economic climate of New Orleans, several
key economic interests can be mobilized to provide reinvestment dollars while helping to reestablish more positive urban form.

The most significant economic dynamic for New Orleans currently is the growing tourist market. While overemphasis on tourism has rightly been regarded as a negative aspect of the current economic climate of the city, tourism's place-centered consumption dynamic (Fainstein and Gladstone 1999) offers the possibility of harnessing reinvestment dollars for positive changes in the urban fabric. To avoid creating a well-designed “tourist bubble” (Judd 1999) that isolates tourists from locals, creation of downtown housing with an affordability component is crucial. An overarching design review district designed to capitalize on tourism investment while balancing local needs offers a way to help create a more positive landscape for this section of downtown New Orleans. To help accomplish the broader social goals and the specific urban design improvements simultaneously requires a focused design review district designed to deal with several important issues simultaneously.

The design review district proposed for South Rampart Street would mirror traditional approaches with a focus on encouraging good urban form components designed to create walkable, compact place with multiple levels of activity. The most important and contentious contemporary negative landscape feature is the wide extent of surface parking. An effective design review overlay should, of course, include provisions to limit the extent of surface parking as well as including stipulations on landscape buffering and other masking features. Shared parking, well-designed, mixed-use parking facilities, and serious consideration of improved mass transit circulation in the CBD need to included to mitigate parking pressures. In addition, the overlay should
include provision of pedestrian sensitive designs as part of new developments in the zone. New Orleans’ subtropical climate with hot summers punctuated by intense afternoon rain make the provision of awnings both for shade and shelter from the rain important pedestrian issues.

Current zoning for the CBD, however, already includes many of these recommendations. In the current political climate of New Orleans planning, these regulations are routinely sidestepped. The political challenge is to create a design review district that creates a positive countervailing force with an economic momentum to ensure that these regulations are enforced. To help create this countervailing momentum for change, the proposed overlay district goes beyond traditional design review districts in several ways.

First, the new overlay district would attempt to positively manage the growing tourist development of New Orleans by focusing an entertainment district along the dilapidated historic spine of South Rampart Street. Because of the growing hotel conversions that have taken place several blocks away towards the Mississippi River and the growth of the Sports Complex to the immediate north, South Rampart Street is uniquely suited to provide another entertainment zone extending beyond the already oversaturated French Quarter. Not only would this help alleviate some of the tourism associated overdevelopment pressures currently plaguing the French Quarter, but a new well-designed entertainment district could also help to redevelop one of the central historic locations in the development of jazz by capturing the cultural tourist who has not traditionally been the focus of New Orleans’ sin-centered tourist trade. A jazz museum sponsored by the National Parks Service’s new Jazz Historical Park could be located in
the Eagle Saloon and adjacent lots on South Rampart Street to anchor this type of district. Just as design review districts traditionally include elements that help ensure the quality of development, the proposed overlay district can provide certain well-defined guidelines to help ensure that the entertainment district produces a landscape that draws on the jazz heritage of the area and utilizes tourism as a positive catalyst for economic development and quality urban places.

The second way the proposed overlay extends traditional design review is by explicitly incorporating an affordable housing component in the overlay. Currently, the South Rampart Street corridor sits at the seam of commercial development towards the river and an institutional zoning area to the north. The institutional area includes a government complex housing City Hall as well as a growing medical district. A portion of this institutional land could be the site for new housing that mixed market rate and affordable housing. Market rate housing has shown to be in high demand in the adjacent warehouse district, but has not to this point been directed towards this area of the central business district. Because of the presence of large, underutilized institutional land holdings in the northern part of the CBD, a possibility exists to create new housing opportunities that could be used as a catalyst to encourage more private developers to rethink the possibilities for this area. To help ensure that the new housing developments on public property will be equitable, an affordable housing stipulation for new housing on institutional land should be put in the design review overlay district.

It may seem contradictory to propose housing and an entertainment focus simultaneously, but the unique character of the South Rampart setting offers this possibility. The entertainment portion of the overlay can be focused along the historic
South Rampart Street spine where the remaining jazz landmarks are located. Housing opportunities, however, appear to exist on the other side of the wide expanse of Loyola Avenue. Because of the large institutional land use on the northern side of the area, a unique opportunity exists to marry market rate housing and affordable housing opportunities together.

A possible location for this type of combination could be the edge of the underutilized, modernist square, Duncan Plaza. The plaza was created from the remnants of the bulldozed neighborhood of Louis Armstrong when the Civic Center complex and Loyola Avenue were built in the 1950s. Like many modernist interventions, the large space is far too broad and undefined to work as a good urban park. Because the land of Duncan Plaza is owned by the city, a portion of the space could be utilized for housing. Utilizing part of the plaza for housing can help accomplish several important goals simultaneously. First, proper placement and design of the buildings can help to create a much more attractive urban amenity. This is really the traditional use of design review. Second, market rate housing, which has been in high demand in the adjacent Warehouse District, can be used to subsidize a portion of affordable housing units. These affordable units could be targeted at both the medical complex population as well as the large government workforce both of whom work within easy walking distance of these new units. A design review overlay that provided guidance on both a contextual housing component and stipulated an affordable housing component for new housing on institutional property could provide significant incentive for helping to create this new type of downtown living opportunity.
While the decision to wrap affordable housing, entertainment zoning, and the traditional components good urban design together in a design review district may be seen as stretching design review too far, these elements are crucial to help encourage new development to take place in the formerly lost space zone of South Rampart Street. For design review to be taken seriously in these zones of neglect, it must be employed flexibly, taking advantage of local conditions that can spur development while managing the types of developments that take place. Without the “carrot” of new development reliant on quality urban design, design review will not be able to offer a realistic avenue for redevelopment of lost space areas.

**The Politics of Planning in New Orleans**

While design review can be specifically tailored to offer a balanced tool for both economic development and a positive urban setting, the current political climate of New Orleans planning significantly compromises the scope of success of such a district. Despite the strong conceptual foundation that such a district would provide, politics as usual in New Orleans would likely result in process whereby the results of the design review board would be frequently overturned.

Local lawyer and author Bill Borah, probably the most eloquent and forceful critic of the current system, has identified three major changes that need to be made to help create a more coherent system of land regulation. Borah’s (1998) recipe for a new planning system includes what he calls the “holy Trinity of good planning”:

- A Master Plan with the force of law
- Regulations need to be consistent with the Master Plan
- Neighborhoods need to be legally structured into the process
The current system of planning in New Orleans does not include any of these three crucial ingredients. It is, unfortunately, characterized by an ad-hoc process where the non-binding decisions of the planning commission are consistently overturned by the City Council. A recent Bureau of Governmental Research study (2003) found that around 70% of the decisions of the planning commission are overturned by the City Council. Land use regulation power in the current system is vested in the political corridors of the City Council. In these political circles, the common practice of deference to the councilperson of the affected council district has resulted, in what the BGR report calls, “political fiefdoms over which the council member has control” (p. 3).

The politicized planning climate of the present system has created a Byzantine network of local, well-connected developers who “work” the system of city council power bases. While this system is mutually advantageous to the council and local businesses who are able to shut out competitors, it produces a closed economic climate that, for the city as a whole, is negative. The BGR Report (2003) cites conversations with local officials who argue that the present system causes out of town developers to “take their projects and dollars to another jurisdiction altogether” (p. 1).

While the overarching problem of planning in New Orleans hovers over nearly all land use problems in the city, decisions affecting the central business district are particularly important. By tradition, the CBD is designed to function as an area of importance for the whole city. While decisions affecting this core affect all of the residents of the city, the power to make these decisions has been appropriated by a narrow set of interests.

This current system of land regulation helps to foster a climate of special interest politics where a single powerful group can act to hinder important, positive change. In
the South Rampart Street corridor, parking lot owners have for years been able to circumvent regulations designed to minimize surface parking. The current zoning code puts a 5-year time limit on surface parking in some current zones of the CBD, particularly CBD-1. After this time limit is up, the owner is supposed to build a permanent structure or reapply for a surface parking permit.

This regulation, however, has been consistently sidestepped. In the South Rampart Street corridor, numerous surface parking lots have existed for thirty and forty years. The failure to effectively deal with this issue has resulted in landscape that is locked in a vicious cycle where a few lot owners are able to extract high profits while this important land at the center of the city acts as a hindrance to positive development. The politics of planning in New Orleans stand at the center of this important issue.

**Design Review in a Politically Weak Planning Climate**

As the BGR Report (2003) found, decisions by the City Planning Commission are only upheld by the City Council 30% of the time. The question of how to craft a design review ordinance that “works” in this setting provides a tremendous challenge.

At the heart of this challenge is the political question of how to alter the current dysfunctional political planning climate in New Orleans. Design review needs to be crafted with this political challenge in mind. One way to view design review in this politically contentious climate is as a way to help document the decisions of the political powerbrokers. The political record of design review decisions can provide the public and planners with powerful political ammunition regarding the failure of the political leadership to create quality places. The step-by-step process of design review creates portraits of a quality places. These “windows into lost futures” (Davis 1999, p. 67) are
powerful testaments to the importance of positive planning and political documents that need to be brought into popular political dialogue. The value of design review in this political climate is found in its ability to focus public attention on the structural failures of the system and in the incremental changes that it can affect. Using design review in this way offers the possibility of changing a discouraging pattern of failure into a long-term strategy for building quality places. While currently 70% of planning decisions are overruled by the city council, 30% are upheld. While those odds are poor for areas with strong planning cultures, a 30% success rate in New Orleans is sadly nothing to discount.
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Technical Methodology Appendix

Introduction

One of the most significant issues facing urban designers today is the problem of reintegrating lost spaces back into the fabric of the city (Trancik 1988, Ellin 1999). Ellin (1999) articulates the importance of urban design initiatives in this area when she says that, "Most of the exemplary recent urban design initiatives are engaged in healing scars left by interventions of the modern era, when the building of railroads and highways was undertaken with little consideration for the surrounding communities and natural landscapes" (p. 189). While urban designers have been focused on healing these wounds, there has been little detailed historic research that has explored the specific historical mechanisms that helped to create this negative landscape typology (Loukaitou-Sideris and Sansbury, 1995/96). The practice of urban morphology as a way to understand the historical formation of landscapes is perfectly situated to help designers understand the specific landscape history and offer design alternatives for the future. This research utilizes this contemporary urban design problem as an avenue for exploring the relevant uses of urban morphology.

One of the goals of this research is to help make the use of urban morphology techniques more relevant for urban designers. To make contextual design more than just a synonym for postmodern pastiche, readily available techniques and methods need to be transferred from historical research projects to contemporary design
professionals. One of the problems that has hampered the wider acceptance of urban morphology techniques is the lack of a clear, usable methodology. Lilley (2000) has addressed this issue by offering a conceptual template that helps to translate Conzen’s morphology concepts into a functional framework for historical morphology. The work presented here builds on Lilley’s historical conceptual framework, attempting to offer a methodology that can help make the historic fabric of the city relevant for contemporary professionals.

One of the most important sources of data available in the United States for urban morphology work is the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map collection. The Sanborn Company was hired by communities around the nation to produce detailed fire insurance maps. These maps show building footprints, building placement within a block, parcel data, and the type of construction material used in the building. For urban morphologists, this detailed data on buildings and parcels is crucial for building portraits of land use change.

While these records provide amazingly detailed snap-shots of land use, their close-up focus on a block or two of the city does not provide a larger picture of the land uses for larger areas of the city. To be effective tools for urban morphologists interested in the changing fabric of building footprints, land parcels, and street connections, a compilation map of these snap-shots is necessary. This compilation map is also a vital tool for urban designers who hope to effectively understand and reintegrate new construction to the underlying urban fabric of the community. In order to provide this wider perspective on the underlying morphology, past research utilizing Sanborn maps has undertaken time intensive CAD drawing projects where the dimensions of each of
the properties and land parcels is pain-stakingly drawn to ensure accurate representation (Vernez-Moudon 1986). This time-consuming process limits the wide-scale accessibility of the morphology methodology.

This research aimed to test a technique that could dramatically speed up this process, opening up the morphology methodology to practicing urban designers as well as academics. With advances in GIS technology and the wider use of advanced remote sensing technology such as ERDAS Imagine, the possibility of utilizing these technologies to facilitate the creation of broader morphology maps is becoming a reality. This appendix shows how the intersection of these technologies was utilized to help create a more accessible morphology methodology.

One of the difficulties encountered during this research was the lack of a highly detailed methodological guide for actually doing the specific tasks of the research. While numerous morphological studies provided excellent guidance on the theories and end-product of the research, it was often difficult to visualize the exact steps that helped produce the research. This appendix seeks to at least partially rectify this situation by providing a step-by-step account of the specific techniques used for this research. The descriptions are intentionally detailed in hopes of showing how various obstacles were confronted during the course of the research. This section is offered not as a definitive guide to morphological research, but as a type of practice tutorial guide to help students of morphology and urban designers begin to use this important methodological avenue.

**Steps for Transferring Data Into Usable GIS Data**

The first step in conducting this research was the acquisition of Sanborn maps for the study area. Maps from 1908 and 1937 were acquired from the University of New
Orleans and Tulane University. For 1908, the Sanborn maps were available in two-block close-up drawings. A series of these close-ups were photocopied to cover the entire Perdido study area. For 1937, an overview map that included almost all of the study area was available. This map was photocopied along with additional close-up maps of the missing blocks to provide coverage for the entire study area.

The second step involved transferring the data into a digital format. The Sanborn maps were scanned and saved as jpegs. These jpegs represented scaled drawings of parts of the study area. Because the scanned images were of a small geographic area (large-scale) and were drawn, resolution of the resulting images was not a big problem. Therefore, the data was accurately captured using jpegs instead of the larger file format of tiffs or bitmaps.

The third step involved transferring the data into a format that allowed for measurement in GIS. While the jpegs were accurate digital representations of the original data, they were not in a format that allowed for direct measurement using GIS. In order to measure and accurately track the morphology changes that occurred in the study area, the jpegs needed to be transferred into a GIS-friendly format. The process of transforming an existing unreferenced map into a digital file with reference map coordinates is called georeferencing (ERDAS Tour Guide 1997, p. 129). This technical modeling process involves “tying” specific points on an unreferenced map to a referenced map to produce a functioning GIS map.

**Specific Steps Utilized in Georeferencing Historical Data**

The specific steps used to georeference the Sanborn maps are covered in this section. The first step was to acquire high-quality aerial photography of the area. A
series of reference aerial photographs of the area was acquired from the New Orleans Planning Department under a student data acquisition program that allowed for use of the data for a nominal fee. The photographs acquired for the study area were high-resolution (1 pixel=.8 feet), 1993 images in State Plane Coordinates. The series of aerial photos was mosaiced together to provide complete coverage of the area using ERDAS Imagine. The basic steps outlined in the Tour Guide were followed.

The second step was to georeference the data. Using ERDAS Imagine once again, the unreferenced Sanborn maps were georeferenced one at a time to the mosaiced 1993 State Plane Coordinate aerial photograph. This process involved picking a series of points that are the same in both maps (Ground Control Points). Once a number of these points are chosen (generally around 5 to 10 for each photograph), a transformation matrix can be calculated to create a projected image usable for measurement in GIS. The basic polynomial model of order 1 was used.

The result of this process was a georeferenced image that could then be used to extract building and street morphology information by tracing over the map image and saving it as an ArcView shapefile. Unfortunately, lot information could not be accurately captured due to problems with the source data. Because the resolution of the reference data was so high (1 pixel=.8 feet), the models that resulted from this process were generally very strong.

For most of the study area, it was easy to determine accurate ground control points because the basic street morphology of the area when the Sanborn maps were produced matched the contemporary aerial photo. These accurate GCPs resulted in georeferenced historic maps that, when overlaid on contemporary maps, fit almost
exactly. While this process was generally strong, the dramatic morphological changes that occurred in parts of the study area from the time of the original Sanborn survey to the time of the 1993 aerial photograph of the area, created some accuracy difficulties. The accurate use of GCPs is based on identifying identical points in the referenced and unreferenced maps. Because of the dramatic morphological changes that occurred in part of the study area, identical points were hard to identify.

To deal with this problem, the blocks with the most intact morphology were georeferenced first. Because the series of Sanborn maps contained some overlapping information like opposing block corners, it was possible to build a series of georeferenced images one at a time. To do this, both Imagine and Arc8 were utilized simultaneously. Partially transparent images of the most geometrically accurate maps were overlaid on the aerial photograph in ArcMap. A GCP was then chosen that matched an existing feature from the partially transparent image. For example, an overlaid partially transparent image of an already georeferenced Sanborn map might show a historical block corner directly on top of the bumper of a car from the contemporary aerial photograph. With careful focus on these details and use of the measurement tools, GCPs could be established even in the morphologically altered area. This process allowed the GCP operator to pick reference points that built on the most accurate georeferenced images based on the morphologically unaltered areas. While this process allowed for the work to be successfully completed, it did result in greater error in the blocks furthest away from the morphologically unchanged area. The extent of this error, however, did not appear to significantly affect the overall use of this
methodology as the completed maps still visually fit together to create a functional portrait of past land use.

**Identifying Error in the Process**

Two main sources of error were identified during this process: 1) Sanborn maps themselves contain error; surveying done in early to mid-20th century without advanced aids resulted in maps that were not as accurate as the contemporary aerial images and 2) the rectification process also created error; because of the inherent weaknesses in Sanborn data and because of “lost space problem”, i.e. rectifying to a place that doesn’t exist anymore.

Two types of tests were employed to determine the accuracy of the rectification process. First, a basic visual inspection was made comparing the 1993 aerial data to the rectified 1908 data. Because one of the goals of this project was to help visualize morphology change, the extent to which the data lined up together was an important visual product of the rectification process. The results of this visual approximation showed some error in very large-scale, close-up shots. For example, when building data was compared between the two eras at large-scale, the data often failed to line up exactly (usually with errors of around 2 to 5 feet). When the study area was seen as a whole, however, this error was not visible. For visualizations of larger areas (3 to 5 blocks), the methodology employed here proved effective.

The second test employed to determine the accuracy of the georeferencing process is the measurement of the distances printed on the Sanborn maps themselves once they are rectified. One of the easiest distances to measure on the Sanborns is the width of streets which can be easily seen on most of the maps. The distances on each of the
rectified Sanborns was sampled and compared to the contemporary aerial photography. The results for each image are seen in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1908 Sanborn Blocks</th>
<th>Post-Rectification Accuracy of Sanborn Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RampSouth1</td>
<td>within 1 to 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RampartSouth2</td>
<td>within 2 to 3 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RampNorth1</td>
<td>within 3 to 4 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerdidoNorth2</td>
<td>within 1 to 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerdidoNorth3</td>
<td>within 1 to 2 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PerdidoNorth4</td>
<td>within 1 to 2 feet on small still existing street; about 10 feet on large &quot;lost space&quot; streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most interesting case results were the measurements taken from the image PerdidoNorth4. The error in this image was not evenly distributed. The measurements of the small still existing streets are within 1 to 2 feet (similar to the error found in the other images). The error found in the three measurements in the “lost space” area at the north end, however, show more error. One measurement that was listed as 180’ on the original Sanborn read 168.60’ after georeferencing. Another measure that was supposed to be 138’ on the original Sanborn read 129.24’ after georeferencing. Finally, another measurement that was supposed to be 135’ read 125.04’. These inaccuracies are odd because the other measurements on the same map in the same quadrants are within a foot or two of being dead on. It is difficult to know whether this is a problem with the source data or with the rectification process.

The result of this process was a georeferenced image that could then be used to extract building and street morphology information. This data was created in ArcView by tracing the building footprints of the Sanborn data and saving them as polygon themes representing the series of blocks in the study area.
Technical Notes on RMS and Its Applicability to Historic Georeferencing

While some measurement problems were identified for street distances, the tests carried out showed that the area of the rectified blocks was effectively maintained. For example, a test that is often used for rectified data is the root mean square error (RMS error). This test determines “the difference between the desired output coordinate for a GCP and the actual output coordinate for the same point, when the point is transformed with the transformation matrix” (ERDAS Filed Guide 1997, p. 326). Because the pixel distance test between the source and output data was determined to be acceptable for visualization purposes and further tested through direct measurement of the product images, the RMS test, while examined with the production of each image, was not systematically utilized in this work.

Conclusion

The use of urban morphological techniques by urban designers and planners has great promise for incorporating a deeper understanding of the historic fabric of cities into revitalization projects. While current morphological methods are often time consuming, technological advances offer the possibility of far greater applicability of the method as the time commitment and technical expertise come within the grasp of more people. The specific methodological techniques described in this appendix provide one avenue for employing these new technologies. Future research should seek to capitalize on these emerging technologies to provide wider applicability to the practicing designers and planners who help to shape the urban environment.

1 Most Sanborn maps that I have seen from around the country include clearly drawn lot lines. The New Orleans data, unfortunately, was not clearly drawn. In addition, the color-coded data available in many other places was not available. This limited the extent of data that could be extracted from the New Orleans Sanborn’s.
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