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ABSTRACT

The monumental mixed-use structure has become a common building and social type of the urban center over the last century. The delineation between public and private has been redefined with the construction of private developments that offer both private and public spaces and create varying degrees of public and private interaction. A new dialogue continues about who belongs in spaces with multiple identities. To answer questions of ownership and use, I turn to an historical overview of form and function of such urban spaces over time. I begin with Wanamaker’s department store and the birth of a downtown urban consumer culture where retailers aimed to create public and private domains in an enclosed private structure. I then use Rockefeller Center as a prime example of how the outdoor streetscape can be manipulated to place visitors and tourists into a self-contained consumer center. Finally, I examine the shops at Time Warner Center and Liberty Place as contemporary developments that combine corporate space with multiple consumer services like shopping malls, hotels, and private residences. This reading of shared spaces in Philadelphia and New York City chronicles who belongs where in the mixed-use developments of a consumer-driven culture, as well as the limits of such developments as successes and failures.
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PREAMBLE

This topic represents a culmination of my interest in identity through architectural expression, mixed-use development, and the creation of publics. As a child, my parents took me and my brothers to Philadelphia and New York quite often. I had an obsession with and anxiety of public restrooms and homeless people. At first, these two things may seem unrelated, but my fear of homeless people and inaccessible restrooms were allayed by places like the Liberty Place, the Bellevue Stratford, and Rockefeller Center. When strolling through the city, I could always count on these spaces to provide a quick respite from urban mayhem. Liberty Place, in Philadelphia, is especially emblazoned in my memory as a safe space where there were always other people like me. I never grasped that the glass rotunda and shopping mall were connected to the skyscrapers, which dominated the Philadelphia skyline. I was aware, however, that the people inside Liberty Place were of a different sort from those on the street.

When I walk through the city today, I do not walk with the same fears or anxieties—partially due to the fact that I have a mental map of public restrooms. I would like to think that I have come a long way from my 10-year-old self, both as a result of continued exposure to the city and my greater education in the Bi-College community. The observations that I made as 10-year-old, however, are proving to be remarkably helpful as I grapple with how privately-owned mixed-use developments create and delimit public spaces.
INTRODUCTION

In the dense urban landscape, collective public spaces are essential for social interaction and identity. Yet, questions of ownership and public often arise when defining who belongs in what spaces and the degree to which each space is for the greater public or for private use. Since the inception of the suburban mall and corporate office tower, public space has moved inside private large-scale buildings, creating new and sometimes challenging interactions between private and public identities in mixed-use buildings. These privately-owned structures incorporate a multiplicity of functions, users and spaces, including office, commercial, and residential zones generating complex internal spatial organization and patterns, where private funding supports the construction of spaces open to consumers. While these components coexist on the same site, it is rare that the same people frequent all these areas. Mixed-use developments are thus both public and private. Residences, hotels, and offices spaces accommodate the needs of the traveler or dweller and corporations/businesses, while the commercial and service areas of the development provide shopping, atria, and open spaces for another, wider public.

This multiplicity of interactions and identities invites an analysis of how and who uses indoor urban public spaces that are categorized as mixed-use developments. Many questions arise. How do public and private identities coexist in mixed-use developments? What do these spaces look like when public and private spaces are built side by side?

The nature of the mixed-use development must be compared with the city street. While all the mixed-use developments I examine are indoors, except for Rockefeller Center, they provide a dense environment that caters to many needs of daily life: sleep, work, play. Mixed-use developments in the suburbs—malls and office parks—emulate the density of the city without the noise, pollution, and disturbances associated with urban life that has existed since the glass-
covered galleries of the nineteenth century, at the latest. Outside of the city, developers take the urban public atmosphere and translate it into a more palatable version for the suburban public. In the city, however, the context of the mixed-use development is different. Members of the Urban Land Institute suggest that mixed-use developments help revitalize blighted areas (Schwanke 1987: 123). They also prevent downtown business districts from becoming “9-5 office canyons” (Schwanke 1987: 126). The urban mixed-use development acts as a node, which brings together people seeking different experiences. Visitors to Time Warner Center at Columbus Circle in New York City could be entering the complex to purchase groceries from the Whole Foods, to buy cosmetics at Sephora, to listen to a performance at Jazz at Lincoln Center, to dine at Per Se, to get to work, or to access their front door.

Multiple identities and levels of ownership—ranging from exclusively private to entirely public—exist in mixed-use developments. The creators of the space must take into account how each of these spaces is distinguishable as private, public, or somewhere in between. Social, structural, and visual cues help the user of the space dictate which spaces he/she can access and use. Examples of these respective cues include: knowing when and where one is allowed at certain times, placement of entrances and overall organization of the spatial components, and the presence of personnel such as security guards and information assistants. A combination of these factors regulates the interaction of the public and private sectors within a single building or complex. The participation of the public/government and the private sector in financing and designing these projects is relevant when considering who patrols these areas and what types of people are attracted to the offered services.

Definitions of public and private in both spatial and social contexts are vital to following the proposed argument. Throughout this thesis, I will be referring to the public, privately-owned
public space or publicly accessible private space, private and public sectors and spheres.

Historically, the public represented a minority of the total population, based on gender, race, and class. Over time and across place, some of these individuals and groups have gained access to the public. While discrimination on all three accounts still exists in the United States, women, ethnic minorities, and non-landowners possess political power and large constituent bases. In evaluating the case studies, I look at how these three groups are accounted for and represented. Essentially, who constitutes the public in mixed-use retail spaces?

In terms of ownership, public suggests government investment or subsidies, while private implies corporate or individual venture. In terms of sphere, the public sphere connotes male-dominated politics outside of the domestic setting, while private relates to a female-controlled domestic environment. In terms of use and audience, the public represents a consumer population of the First World capitalist system. The opposite of public, in this instance, is not private, but non-consuming individuals who are unable to use or access adequate resources or means of communication. Public space exists to accommodate the needs and desires of the consuming public. The non-consuming public has no business in these spaces. The difference between public and private space is relatively clear in terms of ownership, but less so with regard to the intended user. While most of the spaces that I investigate are considered privately-owned public spaces, they offer services and sanction to a different public. The aim of this thesis is to examine how publics are formed in publically-accessible privately-owned and maintained mixed-use developments.

Mixed-use developments force one to grapple with multiple definitions of what one may consider public and private. The public sphere is often associated with the government and politics. From a gendered standpoint, the public sphere was initially considered to be a male
domain. Conversely, the private sphere often refers to the domesticated home-life that is regulated to females. For the purposes of my research and observations, these spheres of interest and ownership will have multiple definitions according to context. The private sphere also represents the private business sector; for instance, the corporate tenants that lease the buildings and the businesses or real estate investment trusts that own and lease the spaces. Additionally, the residents of the condominiums qualify as having a private vested interest.

Hotel guests, usually tourists, are consumers of culture and entertainment. A hotel and the rooms within it, however, are not public territory, save the lobby which is a semi-public space. Semi-public places are accessible to those who fit into the appropriate typecast. Urban office buildings with cavernous lobbies have similar semi-public spaces, which act as semi-permeable barriers between the street and the office tower. In general, indoor public spaces are nebulous sites of social interaction because at any singular point there is always someone who is being excluded. It is important for one to consider how public spaces can exist within privately owned and operated spaces. Does physical enclosure affect the private/public dialogue in a space? Can an individual act under a different set on consequences in each space?

Public and private identities must be managed and accounted for through the entire design and construction process. The financial success and existence of these mixed-use developments depends on the revenues from the office spaces supplemented by retail leasing and residential sales. There are many instances of each of these building and social constructs existing without the other, but the combination of components yields a setting that is attractive to a greater public. Corporations like the visibility, retail stores like the traffic, and developers like the comfort of not having all of their eggs in the same basket.
Still, several questions and curiosities remain. Why have mixed-use developments become so popular in recent years? What contributes to their successes? I will use the framework of the public/private debate, both in social and architectural terms, to answers these questions. Before I can look at the interplay of the public and private, I need to define who constitutes the public(s) and private(s) in the case studies. Once the players have been identified, I look at how each group uses the space and interacts with the other groups. After the existing framework has been created, I examine how the architecture of the space dictates multiple functions and self-selects for its own public. Additionally, each space will be considered in its contemporary social climate.

To make this study concrete, I will examine four spaces on the East coast of the US constructed during three different time periods. A combination of factors led to these four case studies. My familiarity with and personal experiences at each site provide a depth of understanding that goes beyond theory. These structures represent broader themes: corporate identity and the creation of a consumer culture; public/private ownership and message; and excluded publics. Additionally, each example plays an important role in its historical context. The four examples include the Wanamaker building in Philadelphia, built in 1911 and renovated in the early 1990s; Rockefeller Center in New York City constructed in the 1930s and expanded in the 1970s; and Time Warner Center (completed in 2004) and Liberty Place (completed in 1989), in New York and Philadelphia, respectively.

In the first chapter titled “The Wanamaker Building and the Rise of Consumerism”, I look at the growth of consumer culture with the advent of the department store in the mid to late 1800s, in order to build a solid foundation for arguments concerning the important role of retail in mixed-use development. Wanamaker’s department store provides the best example of
consumer space as public space. The flagship store located next to Philadelphia City Hall, represented one of the largest retailers in the world with outposts in New York, Paris, and Tokyo (Appel 1911: 200). It was at this location that middle-class women, leaving the traditional private sphere, bought into a consumer culture and renegotiated boundaries of public and private. The mammoth palazzo-inspired skyscraper, completed in 1910 by Daniel Burnham, currently maintains its retail identity as a Macy’s department store, with the uppermost levels leased to corporate tenants. The transition of the space from strictly commercial to mixed-use demonstrates the shifting identities of urban public consumer spaces.

The example of Wanamaker’s segues into the second chapter, “The Birth of the Urban Mixed-Use Development: Rockefeller Center,” dealing with issues of public and private in an outdoor landscape with vertically stacked commercial and corporate operations. In this chapter, I examine how identities are mediated by the architecture and layout of a complex embedded directly into the urban fabric. Rockefeller Center is deemed to be the quintessential example of mixed-use development. Its success, exemplified by its status as a New York City cultural landmark over the past sixty years, has made it an example for developers worldwide (Ying 2007: 1).

Rockefeller Center, initially land bought by John D. Rockefeller Jr. as the site of the new Metropolitan Opera, turned out to be a successful wartime project that catered to the burgeoning corporate sector and redefined urban public space. Since its completion in 1939, the center has maintained its largest and founding tenant, National Broadcasting Company (NBC). Additionally, Radio City Music Hall and the Lower Plaza with an adjoining concourse communicate with the surrounding urban fabric, increasing popularity of this space. Rockefeller
Center represents a pivotal point in the life of the city, several years before post-war blight, and the creation of the mixed-use typology.

The third chapter, “Where Urban Meets Urbane,” focuses on Time Warner Center and Liberty Place as contemporary examples of mega mixed-use structures. Both developments are similar in form and function at first glance: two towers of office space and residences unified by a retail-dominated mid-section. Both of these structures, especially Time Warner, can be considered nodal points within the city due to their prominence in the skyline and placement in the urban fabric. Time Warner Center and Liberty Place are both consumer hubs with large public atria. While each shopping area offers some of the same stores, like J. Crew and Godiva, the socio-economic status of the average consumer differs.

While the Wanamaker building and Rockefeller Center illuminate historical precedents in urban mixed-use public spaces, Time Warner Center and Liberty Place show how the architecture (interior and exterior), marketing, and services dictate the gender, race, and class makeup of the consuming public. Over time, the accepted publics in these spaces have changed according to social climate. By comparing and contrasting different aspects of each development, I describe how these spaces create a contrived public identity that is a result of the services offered in the public area. The interaction between the consuming public and the corporate workers and residents who share these spaces is taken into account as well.

After categorizing who is included in the public and the private spaces of the four case studies, I identify excluded publics in chapter four: “Issues of Exclusion in “Publicly-Accessible” Private Space”. Excluded publics exist in all four case studies. Jane Jacobs’ theory of “Eyes on the Street” and finding a sense of security in large groups is pertinent to the creation of publics (Jacobs 2003: 115). Depending on whose eyes are looking after the street and deeming
what behaviors are appropriate and inappropriate, the social makeup of the street differs. This leads to a variation in the types of individuals included in the public. The visible public on the streets of East Harlem is much different from the public that inhabits Madison Avenue and 76th Street. In each setting, different individuals and groups are out of place and the characteristics of the public change. One is left with the sense that an all-inclusive public does not exist. For every public there is an excluded group that either creates a private identity or counterpublic that has “an awareness of its subordinate status” (Warner 2002: 119). Thus, public spaces are neither non-segregating nor non-discriminatory, but spaces where a select group of people consume together in a non-threatening environment that caters to the needs of the entertainment-seeking consumer.

Additionally, in the fourth chapter I refer to some key texts that note the complexities of spaces with multiple identities. Classic works of the early 1990s by Sharon Zukin and Mike Davis are juxtaposed to recently published pieces by Lynn Staeheli & Don Mitchell and Miodrag Mitrasinovic.

In the conclusion, I discuss the viability of urban mixed-use developments in financial and sociological terms, as well as my view of the four case studies as successes or failures through the lens of the leasing office and an urban social theorist.
CHAPTER ONE—THE WANAMAKER BUILDING AND THE RISE OF CONSUMERISM

Indoor collective public space in the urban landscape is tied to the emergence of the middle-class, an increase in leisure time, and the rise of consumerism. John Wanamaker’s revolutionary take on consumerism is manifested in his department store. As a highly religious man from a humble upbringing in Philadelphia, Wanamaker strove to provide his customers with quality goods that were reflected in the price tag. Customers could return unwanted or unsatisfactory merchandise in a reasonable amount of time to the store with proof of purchase. Wanamaker’s commitment to his customers, combined with his innovations in the world of advertising, resulted in the creation of one of the greatest global retail empires of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While it is the early history of the store that laid the foundation for its success, I focus on the Philadelphia flagship store located on the corner of Market and 13th Streets, which was completed in time for the fiftieth anniversary Jubilee celebrations in 1911.

The fourteen-story building combined old-world detailing with present-day technologies. The Philadelphia store was the largest building solely dedicated to retail in the world, approximately 2,000,000 square feet. It was a retail empire, the store of every consumer’s dreams; complete with temperature controlled rooms for fur storage, lavish lounges, elevators, a grand tea room, and festive decorations during the holiday season. Wanamaker’s claimed to provide the consumer with every thing she needed for her home and herself. Wanamaker, who viewed his flagship store much like a city, was sure that “commerce [was] the great civilizer” (Appel 1911: 132). If commerce was to be “the great civilizer,” the location of this transaction acquired a new role: one devoted to the public. The Wanamaker building was just the venue for this interaction. But who was the public?
In dramatic new ways during the mid to late nineteenth century, females constituted a public outside of the home. The department store was specifically designed to meet the new needs of the middle-class wife. The wife had the power to purchase goods, to participate in the economy, and ultimately to create the consumer culture that continues to thrive today—in principal, if not in reality, due to the recent economic crisis. The Wanamaker building was a temple to commerce and the female-dominated consumer public. The Wanamaker building and Mr. Wanamaker’s philosophies also looked beyond the gendered aspects of the public. As a concerned member of the Christian and Philadelphia communities, Mr. Wanamaker ensured that all his employees, regardless of gender, received adequate compensation, education, and welfare (Appel 1911: 121).

His store was a testament to the decision-making power of an educated public in the burgeoning consumer culture. The Wanamaker building, along with its thousands of square feet of merchandise, was equipped with lecture halls used for public seminars. He aimed to create a happy place at a profit: “a great store stands for economy, color, harmony, preparation and increased happiness” (Appel 1911: 283). Much has changed since John Wanamaker’s death in 1922, yet the National Historic Landmark he left behind continues to be a public center, as exhibited by the uninterrupted use of the Grand Court by shoppers and non-shoppers alike.

While the Wanamaker building represents the birthplace of a new public, it is also a prime example of selection and exclusion. Thomas Hine, author of *I Want That!*, makes the keen observation that department stores offer a series of contradictions when it comes to defining a public. Stores must uphold reputations as luxurious consumer paradises while not scaring away too many customers who are not part of the urban elite (Hine 2002: 135). As loci of civic display
and interaction, stores only imparted welcome to those who appeared well-groomed, even if they were unable to act the part of consumer (Hine 2002: 134).

John Wanamaker’s commitment to advertising was based on transparency and honesty as “[advertising] takes the public into partnership. It constantly sows the seeds of mutuality, which is the very heart of the Wanamaker business” (Appel 1911: 221). Wanamaker publicists sought to produce advertisements, ranging from the poetic prose to full-page newspaper spreads, that were “informative, educative, productive—in a word, scientific” (Appel 1911: 216). In Hine’s view, Mr. Wanamaker was attempting to permeate the consciousness of the greater public, including people who lacked the financial or social capital to become consumers (2002: 135).

Early forms of marketing and branding were the result of advertising campaigns adopted by department stores at the end of the nineteenth century. Architecture, as a palette for allusion and identity, was already heavily influenced by styles that represented stability, timelessness, and power. Hence Wanamaker’s choice of a Medici-esque palazzo (Figure 8) and city, state, and national governments adopting Greek and Roman temple designs. Shifting trends of branding through architecture are discussed further in the proceeding case studies.

The Philadelphia flagship store could not have survived without the existing climate of materialism in the late nineteenth century. Small specialized shops gave way to megastores, which provided convenience and an environment that catered to the whims of the consumer. Over a fifty-year period, from 1861 to 1911, Wanamaker’s department stores employed over 150,000 workers and sold over half a billion dollars in merchandise (Appel 1911: 1). The sheer number of people who took part in creating and perpetuating the Wanamaker empire make it an early example of a unified corporate mentality. An increase in consumption is directly linked to the effects of the industrial revolution and increased standards of living (Abelson 1989: 25).
With more disposable income and the role of women confined to the home, urban wives spent their time procuring goods. Consumption is a key factor in the success or failure of the mixed-use development. While Wanamaker’s was strictly a retail venture, its current reincarnation would qualify it as a mixed-use development. It is in the retail sections of these complexes and the adjacent public spaces that the consuming public is defined and makes its mark. Without the consumer, these complexes would not survive.

Today, the original structure remains standing, albeit with new tenants as a mixed-use complex. Macy’s has occupied the lower three of twelve floors of the Wanamaker Building since the May-Federated merger in 2006. The two sublevel floors have been converted into a parking garage. The upper nine levels, four of which look out onto the Grand Court, are occupied by corporate tenants (Figure 3). Amerimar Enterprises, a Philadelphia-based firm focusing on the “repositioning and redevelopment” of mixed-use complexes, has owned the building since 1997. Upon acquiring the space, which had been fully renovated in 1991, Amerimar, then in partnership with Cargill Financial Services and Angelo, Gordon & Co., gutted the fourth and fifth floors for office use (Amerimar: 1). The additional upper floors had been initially converted to office space in 1986 after Alfred Taubaum purchased the Wanamaker chain from a California-based chain. It was during this turnover that the corporate lobby facing City Hall, which is mentioned later in this chapter, was completed.

I visited the Wanamaker building on a warm Saturday in early November before lunch time. It would have been to my advantage to spend an entire weekday observing each site so that I could view the scope of daily interactions. A weekend visit still allowed me to observe how built form dictates movement in and access to spaces and what public(s) frequent these spaces. The store, which opens at 10 AM, was bustling with bodies. This can be partially attributed to
the opening debut of the Home Store on the third floor and the upcoming holiday season. I
walked through the store in its entirety, locating points of entry and exit, security personnel, and
areas of public private intersection. The Wanamaker building, while quite familiar to me, is not a
place that I previously investigated with a keen eye. The main public space is the seven-story
atrium called the Grand Court (Figure 2)—the first three of floors are at least double height (18-
30 feet). The ground floor of the court is exclusively used by and accessible to Macy’s shoppers.
While the middle of the court in kept uncluttered allowing customers to walk through store, the
perimeter holds the shop department and fashion accessories. Throughout the year, daily concerts
are performed on the world’s largest organ that towers over the court. People gravitate to the
court to listen to the thirty-minute performances. During the holiday season, beginning after
Thanksgiving, the court is used for the annual Christmas Light Show, which has been a tradition
since 1956 (Wanamaker Store Firsts 2008).

At the visitor center on the ground floor of the building one can find general information
about Philadelphia, the Wanamaker building, and Macy’s. The guide at the desk, Jennie, was
quick to provide me with information on the building. After learning that I was a student of
architectural history, she handed me a timeline including the “Wanamaker Store Firsts” and
offered a historical book for purchase. As an original employee of Wanamaker’s more than
eighteen years ago, Jennie was able to provide me with information about the transition of the
building from Wanamaker’s to it more recent incarnation as a three-story Macy’s. To couple
with my observations of the space on this particular day, I asked Jennie if it was usually this
busy. She responded that with the recent excitement and popularity of the Philadelphia Phillies,
there had been an increased number of people coming into the store looking for the restroom.
The design of the space, especially the lower level, makes the building conducive to thru foot traffic from Market to Chestnut Streets. There are three entrances on the Market and Chestnut Street sides, north and south respectively. The middle of these three entryways is set off by columns. If one did not see the entrance on Juniper Street, he/she would assume that these are the intended main points of entry. While these doors are used most frequently by Macy’s shoppers, it is the Juniper Street entrance that is designed with the corporate tenant in mind. From the ornamentation surrounding the Juniper Street entrance, the only point of entry on that side of the building, Burnham clearly intended for this to be the main point of access to the building as it faces City Hall (Figure 1). The Juniper Street entrance directs one up to a mezzanine level by way of escalators. The level accessed by the elevators bisects the double-height first level of Macy’s. On this raised platform, the corporate worker can look out through the loggia that surrounds the Grand Court (Figure 6). At the top of the escalators is the Wanamaker building corporate lobby (Figure 4). A console with two touch-television screens provides the visitor with an office directory and leasing information. From this point, one can either go to the right or left, as the plan is symmetrical (Figure 7). Two elevator banks, each fortified by its own security desk, protrude out over the Macy’s selling floor, just ending before the arches that border to the Grand Court (Figure 5). As a shopper, I was unaware that the handbag and scarf collection at Macy’s was displayed on the wall supporting the protruding elevator banks.
Figure 1: Triple-height Juniper Street entrance to corporate lobby and Macy’s

Figure 2: Looking down onto the Grand Court at 5PM on a rainy Saturday mid-November

Figure 3: Upper levels of the Grand Court at Wanamaker Building. Notice the contrast between light (Macy’s) and dark (corporate offices), separated by red line, Saturday midday.

Figure 4: Interior of corporate lobby at Juniper Street entrance

Figure 5: View of left elevator banks guarded by security desk, identical layout on opposite side. Glass banisters allow view of Macy’s and Grand Court.

Figure 6: View from corporate lobby to sales floor and Grand Court (through loggia)
The corporate entrance intersects with shopping space in an unobtrusive way. Unless Macy’s customers enter from Juniper Street, which I saw very few do, the corporate presence is tucked away on a newly constructed mezzanine level. This new space was created specifically for the corporate worker to enter the office without having to interfere with the hustle and bustle created by Macy’s consumers. The consumer never has to cross paths with the worker, yet the built form allows them to see one another from different perspectives. During the week, the upper floors of the Wanamaker building fill up with workers before the department store opens. It is only during his or her departure for lunch and home that the worker has the chance to interact with the consumer.

While I was waiting at the Visitors Center for some information on the history of the building, numerous tourists came to the desk. Macy’s offers all foreign visitors a pass for an eleven percent discount in Macy’s stores nationwide for thirty days. At noon, the organ concert began, and the Grand Court filled with eager listeners. Most of the patrons were well-dressed, often donning labels sold by Macy’s or stores of similar stature, middle-aged patrons, carrying shopping bags. Women browsed the shoe section in the Grand Court. While there are many
spaces in the building that are conducive to loitering, like unused stairwells and benches by the elevators on the second and third floors, I did not see anyone who looked out of place lounging around. Market Street, which borders the building to the north, is a more popular spot for homeless and/or jobless people. They stand against the exterior of the Pennsylvania Convention Center entrance to the Market East train station and lie on the covered benches that mark entrances to the SEPTA Market-Frankford line.

The racial makeup of customers and employees at Macy’s and of the few people I saw in the corporate lobby varied by their role. Customers were primarily white (approximately two-thirds), while sales associates were equally white and black. The security personnel, in the Macy’s and at the entrance to the corporate elevator banks, were all black and almost exclusively male. According to the 2006 US Census, Philadelphia County is 47% white and 46% black (US Census 2006). From my observations, class exclusion played a larger role in delineating the public than racial segregation. Further exploration of the links between socioeconomic class and race would bolster this point.

Market Street east of Broad Street was once a thriving hub of commerce. Lit Bros., Strawbridge and Clothier, and Wanamaker’s lined the street and were later bordered by Edmund Bacon’s Gallery project in the mid 1970s. The present landscape is much bleaker. Lit Bros., now the Mellon Independence Center, has a Ross on the ground level with offices above; Strawbridge’s closed after the May-Federated merger; and Burlington Coat Factory, Pay/Half, and Big Kmart are the anchor stores at the Gallery. The socioeconomic class of the consumers that frequent these stores is not that of the Macy’s customer. Macy’s at the Wanamaker building is the last vestige of middle class commerce on east Market Street. More upscale stores on Chestnut and Walnut Streets serve residents of Rittenhouse Square.
The location of the Wanamaker building at the intersection of Broad and Market Streets plays a role in who belongs to the public found in the Grand Court. Placed at a nodal point within Center City, the Wanamaker Building is a valuable piece of property historically and financially. Still, what separates Wanamaker’s from the other case studies is the lack of food services. Food courts and markets mark public space. While Wanamaker’s arguably serves more than just people looking for red sweaters and corporate employees, with the Christmas Light Show and organ performances, there is not a place for the non-consumer to hide. The Grand Court is a beautiful place to visit and a common indoor meeting spot for those who would normally shop at Macy’s. Despite the large numbers of tourists, a sign posted at each entrance states that photography is prohibited inside the building. While Macy’s at the Wanamaker Building is open to the public, the delineation of the public is mediated by the fact that department stores are for potential consumers. Individuals outside of the Grand Court public participate in traditions, like the organ concerts, intensely aware of their inability to engage in material-based consumption.
CHAPTER TWO—THE BIRTH OF THE URBAN MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT: ROCKEFELLER CENTER

Here was a remarkably generous environment elegantly decorated simply for public enjoyment…Here were bountiful garden displays changing with the seasons, transformed at Christmas into a spectacular celebration, all for the city…It all seemed so accessible. Anyone could wander through the air-conditioned elegance of the lobbies, winter or summer, through the galleries and down into the self-consciously festive concourse of shops. The creators of these buildings welcomed everyone. Because these were commercial enterprises, customers were essential for survival (Balfour 1978: 57).

The Urban Land Institute (ULI) in Washington DC suggests that Rockefeller Center marks the first example of a successful mixed-use development. The lead author of the *Mixed-Use Development Handbook*, Dean Schwanke qualifies the project as “one of the most innovative and successful commercial real estate developments of the century” (1987: 10). The qualities of the complex that constitute Rockefeller Center as a leading model for mixed-use developments include:

1. Addition of a new, pedestrian only street that connects the components to one another and to the street
2. All the consumer services that one needs food, shopping, and restrooms located in one space
3. Keeping up with the times
4. Accounted for spaces in all directions, buildings and spaces speak to one another
5. Extensive landscaping
6. Use of the lower plaza, very popular, speaks to the height of the skyscrapers (Schwanke 1987: 11)

Today, Rockefeller Center’s popularity remains quite high. For the recent presidential election, as televised by NBC, an electoral map of the United States was projected on the ice skating rink in the Lower Plaza and red and blue banners tracked the candidate’s progress up the front facade of 30 Rockefeller Plaza. The coverage of Rockefeller Center on election night and the mass of people who filled the plaza, speak to the publicly-accessible nature of this space. Still, this outdoor space does not act like an open city street. Rockefeller Center closes at night and access to the Christmas tree during winter nights is shut off. It is partially due to the private-
nature of the space that such events, like the tree lighting and election night special, are possible. Rockefeller Center’s infrastructural and financial independence allows it to act on its own and provide for the public as it deems fit. A stack of metal sidewalk barricades (Figure 25) located right in front of the entrance to Christie’s, exemplifies the control Rockefeller Center has over the public.

From its inception, John D. Rockefeller Jr. wanted his Center to “serve[s] in a hundred ways the industrial, the economic, and the social needs of [the] city’s population” (Crowell 1940: 11). During the Great Depression, the planning and construction of Rockefeller Center required the labor and craftsmanship of thousands of otherwise unemployed workers. The tenants who filled the multiple office towers were companies in the burgeoning communication and media sector: radio, newsprint, and television. In addition to the large corporate tenants, Rockefeller sought to create an international center (Crowell 1940: 18). The final realization of these goals and aspirations was a “city within a city” or the optimal urban mixed-use development. At the time of its completion in 1940, a total of fourteen buildings sat on the property.

In the commemorative publication upon the completion of the complex, entitled The Last Rivet, Fiorello H. LaGuardia declared “so it is I who want to thank John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Rockefeller Center for their fine cooperation and for constantly bearing in mind the public interest, the public welfare and comfort, and the relation of these to the many, many problems of the City” (Crowell 1940: 32). This direct reference to the public makes clear that the developer’s intentions were to create a space that was not closed off but was inviting to pedestrians. The most effective way to benefit from pedestrian traffic requires selectively attracting the type of people who will both enjoy the space while giving back to it. Retail provides the best solution for increasing pedestrian traffic and revenues simultaneously.
While Mr. Rockefeller considered the Center a civic institution, his son Nelson was keenly aware of how to turn this huge development into a sound financial investment (Crowell 1940: 31). Ivy Lee, the Rockefeller’s public relations consultant, knew from the outset what the primary goal of the venture was, whether opera complex or corporate center: “‘The thought is,’ wrote Lee, ‘that this will make the square and the immediate surroundings the most valuable shopping district in the world’” (Balfour 1978: 9). From the beginning, even when plans for a new Metropolitan Opera were underway, retail was to be a main component of the Center. Architect Otto Kahn was originally commissioned to build an opera surrounded by luxury shops (Balfour 1978: 9). When the plan took the shape of a corporate media center and urban culture hub, new ideas were implemented. Proponents of the Center sought to draw a large department store, namely Wanamaker’s, from its downtown location. Additionally, they hoped to launch a new railroad terminal and subway station that would connect preexisting Grand Central and Pennsylvania Stations (Balfour 1978: 35-36).

Rockefeller Center marks the premiere of the urban mixed-use development. It was not conceived of as a shopping mall or as an office park, but as a location in the city center that would cater to the public at a corporate cost and profit. The Plaza, or point of reception off of Fifth Avenue between 49th and 50th Streets, did not remain the lifeblood of the Center. It was a point of spectacle and merriment, but not of cash-flow. As Balfour clearly notes in his comprehensive book on Rockefeller Center, “by the late 1930s, the concourse shops were surviving without the help of the plaza…” (Balfour 1978: 44). The success of this risky business and real estate venture was purely a result of the commercial and corporate enterprises that belonged within Rockefeller Center. Public space attracts people, but it does not always attract wealth. This being the case, the primary ambition of the Center’s development was to promote
economic and commercial accomplishment in the depressed streets of 1930s and 40s Midtown Manhattan (Balfour 1978: 206). This view of the Center is in sharp contrast to the assumption that it was a place of equality and enlightenment in the dense urban fabric.

The idea of Rockefeller Center as cultural center was contested by Frederick Lewis Allen in the late 1930s:

Cultural center? Let us not deceive ourselves. The same logic which forced Mr. Rockefeller to build a commercial development, which dictated to him the erection of skyscrapers instead of planning a charming urban retreat, which compelled him to go on with his project even though Manhattan was overbuilt, will compel the managers of Radio City to make the best of ‘Roxyism’ (Balfour 1978: 217).

Not only is Rockefeller Center a cultural center, but it is an urban retreat as well, albeit not in the same way or with the same grace as Central Park. Commerce does not mean lack of culture just as skyscrapers are not the antithesis of an urban retreat. In fact, the layout of the buildings at Rockefeller Center mimics a smaller city within a larger city, as mentioned earlier. The block was simply made more manageable with the help of the Rockefellers, their architects and planners. Previously, the pedestrian was not able to penetrate the interior of the city block. Skyscrapers at Rockefeller Center have access to a greater amount of light, as they sit on more open-air lots, sometimes with four sides of windows. Public spaces offered a new relationship between sidewalk and car. The streets in “the city within a city” are for pedestrian traffic only. The play of height and depth, skyscrapers with lush roof gardens and subterranean plazas with water features, allows for enough variation to preclude a monotonous urban landscape.

Rockefeller Center is also an iconic center. Over the years, it has come to symbolize key aspects of New York City culture. Annual holiday traditions, such as the tree lighting, the Christmas Show, and the famed Rockettes, are products of a bygone era that continue to the present day. It was the Rockefeller’s intention to construct a space that would foster human
interaction and showcase the advancements in human communication. Television, radio, and newsprint disseminated knowledge to people across the United States. The television set and radio became essential to American post-war culture. The primary corporate tenants that Nelson Rockefeller, son of the project’s eponymous patron, acquired through his work in the Special Projects office were aimed at the goal of transforming the American media landscape. Prospective tenants also incurred many benefits by moving to the new Rockefeller complex. The entirety of any remaining leases in other buildings were fully paid off and corporations were promised to be the only tenant of their respective industry in the complex (Balfour 1978: 53). Thus, two ideas, both born out of the social climate of the Great Depression were married: financial success and a renewed public culture. Rockefeller Center was to “symbolize a technology that could bring culture to everyone. The symbol was perfect not only because of its power but also because of its financial potential: the ideal combination of commercial enterprise and popular appeal” (Balfour 1978: 21).

Since the initial completion of Rockefeller Center in 1940 there have been several expansion projects. With the growth of tenants post-World War II, like Esso and Sinclair Oil, the Center had to figure out how and where to build to meet tenant needs for fear of losing them. John D. Rockefeller Jr. oversaw the construction of a thirty-story art deco office building for Esso, the first fully air-conditioned office tower in New York City (Krinsky 1978: 104). Unfortunately, the Center was unable to accommodate Sinclair Oil, which moved just outside the complex. In 1959, the Time-Life Building opened on the Avenue of Americas, the future site of expansion for the Center—all done in the International architectural style. Shortly thereafter the McGraw-Hill Building, Celanese Building, and Exxon Building were constructed side-by-side
on Avenue of the Americas. Professor Carol Krinsky wrote that upon completion of the expansion project in 1974 there was an excess of office space in New York City (1978: 127).

Ownership of the Center has switched hands numerous times since the 1940s. In the mid-1980s, the Rockefeller family sold public shares to a real estate investment trust that mortgaged the property. In 1989, Mitsubishi invested in the Rockefeller Group, which owned eighty percent of the Center. After continued deficits, an auxiliary of the Rockefeller Group filed for bankruptcy and was taken over by Tishman-Speyer in 1995 (Holusha 1997: 2). Today, two different firms own and control the twenty-one buildings included in Rockefeller Center. The Rockefeller Group manages and co-owns all of the buildings in the expansion project on Avenue of the Americas. Tishman-Speyer manages and co-owns the original fourteen buildings bordering Fifth Avenue and Rockefeller Plaza (Figure 11).

The winter season, is perhaps the busiest time of year at Rockefeller Center. The Christmas tree at Rockefeller Plaza and Christmas Spectacular at Radio City Music Hall draw thousands of people to downtown Manhattan each day. I visited Rockefeller Center before noon on a rainy Saturday in mid-November. I approached from the southwest corner and first came upon the McGraw-Hill and other expansion project buildings. As these buildings were added later and do not share the art deco style of the rest of the complex, one does not know if these buildings are part of Rockefeller Center unless he/she happens to read the small sign proclaiming “McGraw-Hill Building in Rockefeller Center” (Figure 10). In further explanations, I only focus on the original Tishman-Speyer managed property.

Rockefeller Center is integrated into the greater urban landscape, yet highly distinguishable from its surroundings. The art deco detailing of each building, along with the signature font and identical grates around sidewalk trees, mark one’s crossover into Rockefeller
Center (Figure 24). While differing in height, and ultimately climaxing with 30 Rockefeller Center, the homogeneity of all fourteen original buildings is somewhat frightening (Figure 9). It is like being trapped in Metropolis. The Shops at Rockefeller Center line the ground floors of each building and continue to the underground concourse, where one can find a small food court and a seafood restaurant. Most of the shops, which include J. Crew, Cole Haan, The Met gift shop, and Dean & Deluca, are accessible from both the sidewalk and the ground floor of the RCA building. Throughout the entire complex, I noticed one vacant store front on 51st Street, which borders the outside of Rockefeller Center.

There are three nodes of bustling activity: the Lower Plaza and the promenade leading to Fifth Avenue (Figure 12), the RCA building lobby, and Radio City Music Hall. Each of these locations is crowded for obvious reasons: the tree, ice skating rink, and view of the RCA building; access to the Rainbow Room, observation deck, and stores; and entertainment, respectively. As Radio City Music Hall is removed further from the excitement of the Plaza, I will not continue an analysis of it independently of the Center.
Figure 11: Tishman-Speyer barricade containing the public and asserting ownership of the space.

Figure 12: Visitors lookout onto the ice skating rink in the crowded Lower Plaza. Red dot in background marks entrance to a small corporate lobby.

Figure 13: A policeman surveys the Lower Plaza and entrance to 30 Rockefeller Plaza (RCA building) as he protects the Christmas tree (not shown on left).

Figure 14: Unimposing rent-a-cop posted at Fifth Avenue and promenade to Lower Plaza.

Figure 15: NYPD interacts with visitors at the Lower Plaza.

Figure 16: Second story office window, complete desk accoutrements, above Anthropologie.
Figure 17: Benches in vacant plaza to the right of bustling Lower Plaza

Figure 18: Vacant plaza to the left of the Lower Plaza, notice the space between the barricade is large for enough a person

Figure 19: Sign posted on revolving door at Fifth Avenue entrance to International building

Figure 20: Sign reads “All NBC Universal employees must wear identification cards at all times while on premises” posted in elevator bank at Avenue of Americas entrance to the RCA building

Figure 21: Close-up view of corporate entrance, notice the detailing above the door

Figure 22: Art deco interior of small corporate lobby (guard sitting at desk to left)
The level and kind of security is a key difference between the Lower Plaza and the adjacent lobby at 30 Rockefeller Plaza. Police officers, men in overcoats with ear pieces, and rent-a-cops dispersed throughout the Lower Plaza (Figure 13). I witnessed three police officers, at one time or another, giving directions to or answering questions for tourists (Figure 15). The rent-a-cop was posted on Fifth Avenue at a busy corner leading down to the Lower Plaza (Figure 14). Inside 30 Rockefeller Plaza, a woman sat in uniform behind a desk that spanned the entire backside of the elevator bank. As I walked beyond the entrance foyer, I came upon numerous personnel wearing matching doorman uniforms. Some were guarding the main elevator banks,
which were not in full service on the weekend; others were talking to visitors or roaming the halls; and still others were posted at the visitor elevators to the observation deck. While these employees were not security personnel per se, they served the same purpose as they wandered the hall and watched for lost tourists and suspicious activity. Rockefeller Center is service oriented to the extent that it keeps the public contained.

Containment becomes even more apparent when one compares the number of people in the Lower Plaza to the number of people in the two adjacent plazas. Despite the mild mist and occasional rain, I saw no one in the nearby plazas, located less than fifty feet away from the Lower Plaza. While the plaza to the left was barricaded from the street (Figure 18), the one to the right was full of circular sleep-proof benches, but definitely geared towards urbanites as they held planters with trees and chrysanthemums (Figure 17). No one was resting on the benches. Similarly, no one was sitting on the long benches lining the fountain leading from Fifth Avenue to the Lower Plaza. These benches were flat and relatively wide; a perfect place to lie down (Figure 23). The benches in the other plaza are signs of welcome and comfort, yet people cluster in the crowded Lower Plaza. Even in the presence of police officers and well manicured pedestrian areas, people tend to travel in the company of strangers who resemble themselves.

A sense of welcoming and permeability between public spaces and private work areas is present throughout Rockefeller Center. One level above storefront displays are large windows of similar shape and size filled with coffee mugs, picture frames and pencil holders (Figure 16). The entrances to the office buildings are detailed with artwork, yet altogether camouflaged by the monotony of the limestone façade (Figure 21). I entered several of the smaller lobbies that let out onto the plazas. Four or five elevators and a desk, all with art deco ornament, greeted me on the other side of the revolving door (Figure 22). I was not the only one exploring the corporate
side of Rockefeller Center as I encountered several couples wandering in and out of the otherwise deserted lobbies. When there is not a person present to secure the point of entry into the vertical corporate world, signs and metal fencing act as deterrents (Figures 19 & 20).

During the weekdays, employees at NBC, Christie’s, and Bank of America brave the crowds to get to the workplace. There are not any secret entrances or passageways, but just a series of pedestrian-friendly paths, plazas, and concourses for workers and consumers to share. While uniform attire clearly demarcates worker from visitor, the public who visits the plazas and shops is more fully integrated with the corporate worker. I attribute this integration of identities to the close relationship between the corporate tenants and the consumers. NBC has dominated Rockefeller Center since the beginning. Rockefeller Center is NBC, as portrayed by the popular television show *30 Rock*, and NBC is Rockefeller Center. The NBC Experience Store, located at the base of the RCA building facing the Lower Plaza, realizes a flawless corporate retail strategy.

The homogeneity of the original buildings is intuitive to corporate branding as Rockefeller Center has become a capital of commerce and culture. Architect and critic, Anna Klingmann whose groundbreaking book *Brandscapes* features a cover photograph of Radio City Music Hall and the McGraw-Hill building, writes that “as global corporations increasingly act as dominant economic and cultural agents in the world, it becomes more urgent to ask how architects might make constructive use of these companies’ growing power to reshape local spaces and territories” (2007: 257). Rockefeller Center was ahead of its time in this respect. One of the most important aspects that Tishman-Speyer can change to reshape the public is the stores.

The social atmosphere of the shopping area is shaped by the physical environment. As explored in the case of the Wanamaker Building and the deterioration of the east Market Street shopping district, Rockefeller Center specifically leases to retailers that attract a specific
consumer. Families from around the US, as well as, international tourists flock to Rockefeller Center. The typical Rockefeller Center consumer, based on my observations and The Shops at Rockefeller Center marketing materials, is the tourist suburban wife from the middle to upper-middle socioeconomic level. There were no homeless people toting swollen shopping bags or groups of disruptive youth disturbing this family-friendly setting.

Just as its creators and financiers wished, Rockefeller Center has “provide[d] the maximum beauty consistent with profitability” (Krinsky 1978: xxiii). The success of Rockefeller Center as a hub of public and private coexisting identities is evidenced by other city’s attempts to create similar mixed-use developments. The installation of ice-skating rinks, mimicking the Lower Plaza, has been adopted by cities trying to revitalize commercial and cultural sectors (Krinsky 1978: 7). Developing a “city within a city” inherently demands a stable infrastructure to support the vitality of a self-contained organism. Rockefeller Center works tirelessly to maintain its image and to be a reflection of its portrayal. While partially outdoors, employees of Rockefeller Center and the New York City Police Department constantly survey the public.
CHAPTER THREE—WHERE URBAN MEETS URbane

The two contemporary mixed-use projects explored in this chapter, Liberty Place and Time Warner Center, share the same mission: to provide the consumer with a luxurious and personalized experience in the urban setting. In this chapter, I look at how the public retail areas in these complexes exist in relation to the corporate and residential components of the shared space. During my field work, I took note of the surrounding urban fabric, the people who frequented the retail areas versus the targeted client and residents, and the physical form and attributes of the space. Liberty Place and Time Warner Center are discussed in chronological order.

Liberty Place, built as a result of a competition for speculative office development, bridges the business district and the Walnut and Chestnut Street shopping district (Miller 1986: 235). Plans for the project, which began in the 1984, called for the demolition of a block of stores and movie theatres on Chestnut Street (Hine 1985: 1). Additionally, the proposed twin towers were to be taller than William Penn atop City Hall, a gentleman’s agreement that had never before been contested. The author of a 1985 article concerning the Liberty Place development comments that “Philadelphia’s personality lies in its intimacy” and that Center City is “a real neighborhood” (Hine 1985: 2). The presence of a mixed-use development in this part of town, the author feared, would end up as an oversimplification. Essentially, the city had to decide whether the financial promise of higher densities outweighed the cost of losing intimate urban fabric. Now, over twenty-years later, Liberty Place has manifested itself as a vital part of Center City.

The two Helmut Jahn designed skyscrapers (Figure 31), combined with the Westin hotel, and 1600 Market Street, cover the block between 16th and 17th Streets and Market and Chestnut
Streets. This one block in Center City alone offers numerous venues for working, living (residences and hotels), shopping, and dining. Liberty Place provides, integrates, and connects these various uses into one contiguous space. In the 1987 edition of the Urban Land Institute *Mixed-Use Development Handbook*, the Liberty Place complex has a cameo appearance as an up-and-coming mixed-use development. The description of the main components of the complex is clearly stated in the short, illustrative piece:

The development will include two very striking office towers, the first including 1.2 million square feet, a 250-room hotel tower, two levels of retail space surrounding a large, skylit public court, and a garage for some 600 cars. *Even though the project is designed to be a megastructure, each component has been set apart to maintain its distinct identity.* All three towers are set on their own corner of the site; they are joined by the central retail area, which also has its own distinct entrance, at mid-block between the first office building and hotel [emphasis added] (Schwanke, 1987: 324).

The design, intended to be a “CARE package” of culture, amusement, recreation and entertainment, did not change much from the final competition submission (Schwanke 1987: 315). The relationship between the towers through architectural detailing is enhanced further by the glass rotunda that connects the buildings on the interior of the block (Figure 27). The Shops at Liberty Place surround the rotunda and line the halls leading from the rotunda to the street (Figure 26).

Developed by the famed-area real estate mogul, Willard Rouse III, the final cost of the project exceeded $600 million as it neared completion in June of 1990. The delay of construction on Two Liberty Place was attributed to the three schedules—hotel, office, and retail—that had to be simultaneously juggled in order to meet deadlines (Warner 1990: 2). The retail area, centrally located between the two towers, was planned to have several popular clothiers, in addition to specialty shops and a food court. Several of the original tenants, including J. Crew, Godiva, and Jos. A. Bank Clothiers, remain there presently. In early 1990
before Liberty Place opened its doors, only fifty to sixty percent of the total available retail space, 150,000 square feet, was leased (Warner 1990: 1). In the current market, the Shops at Liberty Place advertise six available retail lots ranging from 321 to 12,000 square feet and two available food lots averaging 510 square feet (“The Shops at Liberty Place” 2006).

Liberty Place was the first of many skyscrapers to overshadow City Hall. Not only did it mark the beginning of a monopolization of office towers on west Market Street, but it provided an alternative, more luxurious experience for consumers compared to the Gallery at Market East. News articles written throughout the planning and construction process do not use terminology, refer to, or expect a more urbane urban experience from Liberty Place. I find this quite perplexing as the list of original retailers and presence of the Ritz-Carlton Hotel position Liberty Place as a somewhat exclusive destination. During my recent visit, I noticed that while Liberty Place currently markets itself as “a landmark Center City experience”, it does not live up to that expectation (“The Shops at Liberty Place” 2006). Current retailers, eateries, and the deserted rotunda (Figure 30) are measures of its downfall as in indoor public space.

The recent reallocation of corporate office space on the upper floors of Liberty Two for luxury residences may change the dismal atmosphere in the retail zone. The Residences at Liberty Two are marketed to wealthy urbanites looking for a “different” and unobstructed view of the city. “Give me Liberty…and a lifestyle without compromise” is the catchy slogan flashed on the official website to market the idea of living in Philadelphia’s first towering skyscrapers (“The Residences at Liberty Two” 2008). Previously designed for cubicles, the renovated space forms the top layer of a residential-office-shopping mixed-use sandwich. When the Ritz-Carlton relocated to its current spot at the southwest corner City Hall and Broad Street, Liberty Place lost some of its glamour appeal. The Residences bring back luxury in a new, modern form albeit in a
converted office tower. It will be interesting to see if the literal top-down process translates Liberty Two residents into Liberty Place shoppers.

Figure 26: Directory map of Shops at Liberty Place. Note corridors connected to rotunda (pale yellow)

Figure 27: Glass rotunda enclosing the Shops at Liberty Place

Figure 28: Empty and deserted floor space under rotunda. Note figure beyond the piano

Figure 29: Elderly disheveled woman sitting in the rotunda

Figure 30: People look down from above onto nothing

Figure 31: View of Liberty Place skyline from 13th and Arch Streets
Living sky-high does have its challenges. Presently, Liberty Two residents and corporate tenants are battling to have their identity and voice overcome the other. In the most recent news concerning Liberty Place, UNISYS proposed affixing 11-foot letters on to the side of the 38th and 39th floors (used for HVAC purposes) of Liberty Two. UNISYS, based in a Philadelphia suburb, claims Philadelphia as its global headquarters when only thirteen percent of its employees work on the three and a half floors they lease (Saffron 2008: 1). Cigna and The Residences together lease forty floors. Issues of ownership will come into play over the next months and years as the physical boundary between home and work, places of production and reproduction, continues to grow closer. It is hard to conceive of a private, home space existing inside of a public, corporate space. This collision of identities and interests is a consequence of the mixed-use development.

Inga Saffron’s sarcastic article on the debacle pays special attention to corporate ownership and the right to advertise. While Liberty Place was built on speculation, it has many loyal tenants that have called Liberty Place and Philadelphia home for much longer than UNISYS. Saffron questions why Cigna, a Philadelphia company that dates back to the end of the American Revolution, does not have its name in neon lights (Saffron 2008: 1). Buildings have the potential to be manifestations of corporate identity; just as people dress their bodies in a style of clothing that portrays a certain image and level of status, the façades and layout of buildings speak to the identity of the tenant. In a building with multiple tenants, corporations assert an identity by hijacking semi-public spaces to advertise. People who use public space, or whose private space borders publicly-accessible space, may feel infringed upon, as is the case with Liberty Two residents and UNISYS. A federal judge’s final decision will dictate the future of skyline advertising in Philadelphia.
As stated earlier, The Shops at Liberty Place are now cold and empty. Having frequented Liberty Place many times before, I had a point of comparison during my site visit on a Saturday in early November. In the center of the rotunda, where several years ago one found circular benches with potted plants dotting the vast floor space, now a semi-circular formation of metal tables and chairs line one half of the room (Figure 28). On the opposite side of the large, naturally-lit space is a lone baby grand piano. Store employees, several shoppers, and a derelict-looking woman sat at the tables. An overall sense of emptiness emanates the central public space at Liberty Place.

Besides the off-duty security guard eating his lunch, I did not notice any other human surveillance inside the shopping area. Like Rockefeller Center, but unlike Time Warner Center, the corporate entrances are located at the bottom of the office towers and not integrated with the retail space. Visitors at the Westin, office workers, and Liberty Two residents can access the shops without going outdoors by using narrow interior corridors. The positioning of the complex and its permeability with the street give Liberty Place a more urban feel. Stores with dual frontage on the city street and to the rotunda create additional entrances for consumers to access the interior public space. Once inside the rotunda, however, shoppers might mistake Liberty Place for a suburban shopping mall. Unlike the Grand Court at Wanamaker’s, the rotunda is unused and serves mainly as a passing through point. While the glass ceiling may have seemed like a good idea at first, as it brings in natural light and offers views of the towers above, it allows the buildings to cast shadows throughout the entire rotunda. Had someone been playing the piano or an engaging an audience, the amount and kinds of people in the atrium might have been much different.
Unlike the other case studies, I witnessed two different groups of people using the public space under the rotunda in entirely different ways. There was the consuming public, mostly females of varying races traveling across the space with shopping bags. The non-consuming public, a group of people who I refer to as the missing ‘other’ in preceding case studies, was present in the rotunda and food court at Liberty Place. People with blank stares on their faces sat at the metal tables, while others read books in the food court. I saw two individuals, a man and a woman, who looked particularly derelict. She was sitting in the rotunda (Figure 29) and he was going up the escalator with a cart of blankets and plastic. Some members of the latter public used the space as a public living room for reading books, people watching, and conversing with others. These types of interactions are appropriate for outdoor parks, yet when indoors they take on new meaning, such as loitering and lack of employment. The focus on consumption in mixed-use developments shifts the identity of the public, thus altering how the public uses these spaces.

If Liberty Place is an example of luxury lost and trying to be found, then Time Warner represents a mixed-use model that has successfully harnessed glamour appeal. The Time Warner Center engulfs the southwest corner of Central Park at Columbus Circle. This behemoth complex, designed by architect David Childs of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill and developed by Stephen Ross, was completed in 2004. With almost one million more square feet than the Wanamaker Building, the $1.75 billion project boosts “the most expensive hotel suite, costliest condo apartment, highest-priced sushi restaurant, and the classiest of Class A offices” (Croghan Feb 2004: 1). Symmetrical twin towers, consisting of office, hotel, and residential spaces, are connected by a massive base, the Great Room, containing over fifty retail shops and upscale restaurants (Figure 33). A Whole Foods market, Equinox fitness club, and subway lines contribute to the lively below-ground commotion.
Some critics view the Time Warner Center as an urban revitalization project, spurring development on the West Side. Before the completion of the project, rent for storefront space in the surrounding area doubled to $300 per square foot and was expected to reach $500 after the center opened (Croghan Feb 2004: 1). Journalist Alison Gregor covered Time Warner Center numerous times throughout its construction and early years. In an article for the Real Deal, written almost a year after the complex opened its doors to the public, Gregor reveals that New Yorkers may have overcome their fear of the vertical urban mall. Tommy Todd, manager of Bar Masa, found that “the customer mix is interesting. We have lots of guests coming that work in the building or neighborhood. In addition, we’ve got people that live in the neighborhood and tourists” (Gregor Jan 2004: 1). Stores located on the upper floors also found that the majority of their client base lives locally. The biggest attraction for native New Yorkers, however, is Whole Foods. “A stroke of genius,” according to Alan Napack, director of retail services at Cushman & Wakefield, as it brings people from all over the city to the complex (Gregor Jan 2004: 2).

The 59,000 square foot Whole Foods market on the first Concourse level, the largest supermarket in midtown Manhattan, is diverse in its public (“NYC’s biggest supermarket 2004: 1). The marketplace, accessible by escalator, is immediately visible upon entering the building from Columbus Circle (Figure 32). Whole Foods shoppers do not need to interact with the other shoppers/visitors. The floor of the Great Room is cut away to reveal the 248-seat eating area for Whole Foods customers (“NYC’s biggest supermarket 2004: 1). The play with depth and height makes the public areas deceptively larger than they actually are. From previous visits, I always conceived of this space as monumental and engulfing, just like the exterior. This time, however, I experienced it as open, aerated space, uninhabited by humans (Figure 36). Walkways, with semi-translucent floors, crisscross the two rows of stores and balconies overlook the Great Room.
on each level. There are lots of places to stand and view the action below. One might even equate this level of surveillance with Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon. A second floor balcony surrounds the atrium at Liberty Place too, but it does not seem to serve the same function.

The usable public space, located at the escalator landings on each floor, is filled with changing art exhibitions, which are for sale. There are very few trashcans and even fewer benches. Instead, individual stores provide sitting areas for weary customers. Water fountains, restrooms, and public telephones are located in service corridors behind glass doors and down long whitewashed hallways. One must penetrate the consumer space, ride the escalator up two levels, and locate the facilities. If one is not familiar with the space or comfortable enough to ask directions, it is difficult to access these resources. Similarly, those are who are both part of this public and an elite private can access points of entry to the interior of the building, which are off limits to most Zagat-guided consumers.

The primary public space in Time Warner Center is the main lobby and entrance foyer. While not over-sized compared to the scale of the building, the lobby spans four floors and is visually connected, by an enormous expanse of glass panels, to the sizeable outdoor plaza facing the traffic circle. Two Fernando Botero statues, a male and female couple, grace either side of the lobby and lead to the escalators. Elevator banks allowing access to Jazz at Lincoln Center and additional floors of shopping and dining are located, with security personnel, to the left of the main entrance. Jazz at Lincoln Center, which is the “world’s largest venue dedicated to jazz performance and education,” was and continues to be subsidized and supported by Coca-Cola, Mayor Blumberg, and the city government (Zagat 2007: 3). The wall facing the elevator banks on the ground floor acknowledges proponents and contributors of the project. The contributions of the government and large non-profit organizations give the illusion that Jazz at Lincoln Center
is a publicly accessible space at Time Warner Center. Even with moderately priced tickets, the spatial detachment and invisibility of the performance area makes it a more exclusive affair.

Figure 32: Holiday decorations hang in the Great Room, escalators lead to Whole Foods Market

Figure 33: Exterior view of Time Warner Center from East 59th Street

Figure 34: Side entrance to Shops at Columbus Circle and Jazz at Lincoln Center (left box), main entrance to the Mandarin Oriental Hotel (right box)

Figure 35: Guest services centrally located in the Great Room facing away from the entry way. Zagat guides placed on the sides of the desk.
Before exiting the building, I stopped at Guest Services, where a man in a suit sat behind a large desk centrally located on the ground floor, but facing away from the doors (Figure 35). My intention was to collect marketing materials and pamphlets designed for a specific client. I identified the client and saw if they were a reflection of the public I witnessed using the space.

The Time Warner Center guide is a mini Zagat Survey, which includes maps, shops, gourmet markets, restaurants, nightlife, attractions and services, and neighborhood sites. The 25-page hardcover guide is not a throwaway item. The “impressive facts about an iconic building” and helpful transit and Manhattan subway maps make this guide reusable and valuable for future visits to Time Warner Center. It is intended for the repeat consumer. Additionally, this repeat
consumer is presumably familiar with the Zagat name. If not, the entire concept of the guide is lost. The Zagat Survey, which traditionally focuses on individual cities, is not the layman’s guide to eating, shopping, and entertainment. Geared towards tourists and those less familiar with a particular location, the survey is most often used by an upper-middle class consumer looking for information beyond the average cost of an activity.

While the Shops at Liberty Place and Columbus Circle share numerous retailers, including J. Crew, Godiva, Aveda, Borders (Express at Liberty Place) and Swarovski, they do not share the same public. Their respective marketing, level of luxury, and policing policies are evidence enough of this difference in publics. At the Time Warner Center the “other” is not visible. The Shops at Columbus Circle is a self-patrolling space with just enough security personnel to ensure that no one wanders where they do not belong. When I got off the escalator on the fourth floor, the location of renowned restaurants like Masa and Per Se, I was one of seven people taking in the magnificent view of Central Park and looking at the art display. A security guard, clad in a blazer and tie, sat in a chair by the escalators. The only other security personnel that I noticed were located on the first floor in the Great Room and at the elevator bank for Jazz at Lincoln Center. It was the hustle and bustle of the mostly white, English-speaking crowd (not as many foreigners as Rockefeller Center) that acted to deter the unwanted non-consumer.

Time Warner and the Mandarin Oriental hotel make their presence known to those that exit the escalator on the third floor. The main lobbies to the Mandarin Oriental hotel, Residences, and Time Warner headquarters are located on the ground-floor with access to side streets. NB: I noticed the entrance to the hotel from the exterior of the building, but I entirely missed the corporate entrance as it is concealed on a less visible side street (Figure 34). The third floor entry
to the hotel is by keycard access (Figure 37). A man with several shopping bags was swiping in as I passed by. There was no one sitting at the desk by the elevator bank. Directly across the way are the deserted Time Warner entrance and an intercom to gain access to the residential tower (Figure 40). Sliding glass doors, which flank the Samsung Experience, give way to lone receptionist desks and dual elevator banks (Figure 38). It is unclear to me why there is an entrance when the main lobby is located on the ground floor and this entrance is clearly inaccessible to employees during non-working hours (Figure 39). Could it be that these gateways to the other zones of the building are there to promote/sell the other brands? In the Zagat guide, Time Warner uses the backside of the second page to advertise its many holdings, such as New Line Cinema, HBO, Turner, and AOL. The heading at the top of the page reads “Building Brands for a Digital World” (Zagat 2007: 2). Like Rockefeller Center’s continued relationship with NBC, the Time Warner Center relies on a powerful corporate tenant to create the brand identity for the complex.

Time Warner Center is situated at a prominent node in Manhattan. It serves as the boundary between the tourist-ridden downtown and the beginnings of the residential West Side. This complex is also an architecturally well-defined space. The limits of the complex are the limits of the monstrous building, but not of its effect on the city. As one of New York City’s largest mixed-use developments and one of the newest visible additions to the skyline, Time Warner Center is known by many, but used by a self-selected few. It has succeeded in its primary goal of revitalizing the Columbus Circle hub by catering to both local residents and tourists. Unlike Liberty Place, Time Warner Center has been able to maintain its identity as a luxurious destination. The mesh of Whole Foods market with sophisticated restaurants and high-end retailers has attracted the consuming public able to support these businesses. As the only
corporate tenant in the building, Time Warner benefits from maximum corporate exposure, but not at the cost of distracting from the commercial, cultural, or residential sectors. Despite its financial success and popularity among locals, Time Warner Center will never provide the type of public space where one goes to reflect, people watch, or read a book. It was designed for the consumer. In the next chapter, I discuss why exclusion exists in so-called public spaces.
CHAPTER FOUR—ISSUES OF EXCLUSION IN “PUBLICLY-ACCESSIBLE” PRIVATE SPACE

While many different kinds of people were visible in the lobby, it might better be called a ‘publicly accessible’ space, rather than public space per se, since it is, after all, privately-owned and controlled. Though somewhat limited by restrictions imposed by public accommodation laws that make it illegal to bar people from the lobby merely on the grounds or race, gender, or creed, the managers of Palmer House have an a priori right to exclude any and all from its property; unlike the streets, the public does not have a basic right to be present in the lobby. The lobby, thus, is a more highly controlled space of interaction, wherein a different kind of public, and a different segment of the people, can form and be seen (Staeheli 2008: xvi).

All of the publicly-accessible spaces discussed in the case studies are owned and operated by private corporations. There is nothing innately public about the spaces besides the large numbers of seemingly diverse visitors. Nor are all parts of the urban mixed-use development are publicly-accessible. While the lobbies to the Residences at Liberty Two, and the corporate offices at Time Warner Center and the Wanamaker building are somewhat open to people walking in off of the street, there is little that one can do in these spaces without moving beyond the security desk or reception area. Elevator banks, which offer complete access to the rest of the building, are closely guarded by security personnel. The rotunda at Liberty Place, Grand Court at Wanamaker’s, Lower Plaza at Rockefeller Center, and quadruple-height Great Room at Time Warner Center all provide large central spaces for public interaction. Anything that transpires in these spaces is visible to all of the other people using the space.

The controlled nature of these so-called public spaces has created an ‘other’ that while physically invisible has spawned dialogue among social scientists. Literature, spanning from the early 1990s to the present day, has chronicled the transition of space from a militarized and scary zone to a homogenized and safe zone and vice versa. The privatization of public spaces implies an increased security and level of awareness. While none of these authors deal specifically with mixed-use developments per se, I use these sources to bolster my points about the duality of
ownership and usership in privately-owned public spaces. Authors Mike Davis and Sharon Zukin, who highly criticized the increasing number of multiuse buildings that sprang up in the early 1990s, were concerned with the creation of the ‘other’: “Today’s upscale, pseudo-public spaces – sumptuary malls, office centers, culture acropolises, and so on – are full of invisible signs warning off the underclass ‘Other’” (Davis 1992: 226).

I witnessed this phenomenon in every case study except Liberty Place, where the ‘other’ presented itself due to a lack of previously claimed public space (no one else was using the space so the ‘other’ commandeered it). Compared to the other case studies, the rotunda is the largest and most poorly used indoor space. It is desolate and starving for the attention of an interior designer to make sense of its monumentality. Saskia Sassen speaking about public architecture projects as conceived by contemporary British architect David Adjaye, suggests constructing smaller, more manageable public spaces: “The making I am interested in here is of modest public spaces, constituted through the practices of people and critical architectural interventions that are on medium level scales. These are not monumentalized public spaces nor are they marked by large-scale structures. They open up a question about the current urban condition in ways that take us beyond today’s engagements with high-tech architecture, virtual spaces, simulacra, theme parks” (2006: 13). Essentially, Sassen questions the current obsession with monumentality when more intimate spaces can serve a similar role.

Exclusion is not only a result of private ownership, i.e. country clubs excluding Jews and racial minorities, but also of privately-owned publically-accessible space. Sharon Zukin uses Victor Turner’s theory of liminality to explain the social relationship between public spaces and private interests: “the museum, department store, and waterfront shopping center create liminality by opening public space to private consumption” (1991: 51). Liminality represents an
ambiguous state of existence between two defined forms. In the case of Zukin’s example, consumers participate in both the private and public spheres simultaneously. Mixed-use developments provide the physical space needed to create the environment for consumer-based liminality. The excluded ‘other’ does not have the opportunity to participate in this ironically transcendental experience.

The main source of exclusion in all privately-owned public spaces is measured by one’s ability to consume. In publicly-owned parks there is nothing to consume beyond sunlight and the beauty of nature. In mixed-use developments, where the publically-accessible component of the complex is dedicated to retail, there is no reason for non-consumers to frequent the space. Here, accessibility comes into play. In the suburbs, individuals need to make a conscious effort to enter a shopping mall, whether this entails getting on the bus or hoping into an automobile. Urban retail centers are more easily accessible to a greater number of people and thus have the potential of a more diverse public. Mixed-use developments can benefit from increased traffic depending on the range and definitions of public they serve. Author Miodrag Mitrasinovic notes in his recent book, *Total Landscape, Theme Parks, Public Space*, that “such systemic and complex definition allows for public space to be further defined in terms of ownership, modes and types of accessibility, degrees of enclosure, types and degrees of control, and its purpose” (2006: 244). Rockefeller Center emblematizes such a space as described by Mitrasinovic.

Mitrasinovic employs the term PROPASSt or privately-owned publicly-accessible space usually focused on a central theme to describe spaces, like themes parks, which beckon the masses to consume (2006: 246). Prime examples of PROPASSt include the relationships Rockefeller Center and Time Warner Center have with their primary or sole corporate partners, NBC and Time Warner, respectively. According to Mitrasinovic, a “critical mass” of consumers
and corporate “leverage” are essential to the economic success of privately developed public spaces (2006: 252). If PROPASts are dependent on the consumer and the consumer is oftentimes a ubiquitous member of the public, why are exclusionary practices so common in urban mixed-use developments? Several answers are posed to this question: namely, that PROPASts are formed by a conservative middle class with characteristically suburban values and beliefs; and secondly, that the profit-driven nature of PROPASts “exhibits a restrictive interest in human behavior and a restrictive menu of possibilities for human interaction” (Mitrasinovic 2006: 262).

The homogenization of the public in indoor publically-accessible spaces is part of a complex scheme to maximize profit. For this reason, mixed-use developments with components that cater to similar publics—i.e. the corporate worker’s salary and tastes allow her to be part of the multiple publics that coexist in her workplace—have proven to be more successful, as measured by the amount of un-leased space, usership, and overall social atmosphere. Deliberate and discriminatory exclusion based on race, class, gender, religion, etc. is socially unacceptable and against the law. Marketing to the full-service needs of a specific crowd, however, is merely good business sense.
CONCLUSION

As complex organisms, mixed-use developments—the ultimate architecturally-influenced social experiments—must meet the needs of tenants, customers, and residents. Unlike other building typologies, mixed-use developments are simultaneously markers of corporate identity, centers of commerce, and places of intimate domesticity. Architects and planners choose how groups of individuals interact based on the imposed built form. The resulting social interactions speak to the success of the architect in creating spaces that mediate a multitude of identities. Large public spaces, usually nestled in the retail component of mixed-use developments, provide the best lens for viewing whether or not these urban complexes are popular destinations and profitable ventures.

In exploring the case studies throughout the previous chapters, four main points become apparent. First, the public is an exclusive category by definition. Second, architecture mediates the physical relationship between public and private zones. Third, the private sector has the ability to form and shape its own public. Finally, class is the primary contributing factor for admission into the consuming public.

While one should not take this final point of spatial inequality as far as David Delaney in *Race, Place and the Law*, there is a racialization and segregation of space. From my findings, this segregation is more visible as classism than racism. The public used to be exclusive according to race, gender, and class. Racial minorities, women, and the poor were almost entirely excluded from the public sphere until the beginning of the twentieth century. Now it is a class war. The multiple identities of mixed-use developments are best mediated when the whole complex caters to a similarly socialized group of people.
Through the lens of the leasing office and the developer, urban mixed-use developments present a lower risk, diversified option for real estate investment. As a stunning example of early skyscraper architecture, the Wanamaker building paved the way for preservation and adaptive mixed-use redevelopment. After facing hard times from the late 1970s through the late 1980s, Rockefeller Center proved the resilience and potential of mixed-use developments as cultural and city-wide icons. The Time Warner Center continues to attract New Yorkers and tourists alike, while Liberty Place faces the challenge of realizing its marketed identity.

Mixed-use developments are also interesting cases, insofar as they represent manipulated human interaction. Like ants in an ant farm, people live, work, and play in a vertically stacked environment, which depends on the stability of the elements above and below. The corporate offices at Rockefeller Center depend on the success of the stores below both to ensure that corporate tenant rents do not increase and to uphold the overall reputation of the complex. As the commercial, office, and residential zones of the development rely on one another so heavily, architects must decide the optimal level of physical interaction between these three constituents.

Through the lens of the sociologist, urban mixed-use developments present competing identities. The tension caused by differences in preference, wealth, education between the public and private in a mixed-use development complicate marketing schemes aimed at promoting a particular and singular lifestyle. Million dollar condominiums are not built on top of shopping malls with Kmart’s and fast-food chains. Trouble arises when there is a disconnect in communication and separate publics form in adjoining spaces. The lack of people in the Liberty Place rotunda is likely a function of the loiterers who monopolize the space. These non-consumers claimed the space as their own when the consuming public neglected it.
There is a good chance that with the increasing instability of the U.S. economy mixed-use developments will represent a large portion of any future construction. I am curious to see, however, if planners and designers will look to the middle and working classes as potential clients. While one could argue that the Main Street model encapsulates mixed-use development for those of modest means, the New Urbanists have already proved with recent projects that traditional downtowns are for the highest paying bidder. There is no doubt that urban public spaces will continue to be of the privately-owned publically-accessible nature. For as Frederick Lewis Allen bluntly stated about Rockefeller Center during the 1940s: “Yes, most of the good things here are expensive. Anybody can stroll about the plaza—and does—but the best things are not for the penniless…” (Balfour 1978: 219).
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**Observational site visits**

Liberty Place, 1625 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, PA—November 1, 2008

Wanamaker Building, 1300 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA—Saturday, November 1, 2008 and Saturday, November 15, 2008

Time Warner Center, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, NY—Saturday, November 15, 2008

Rockefeller Center, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY—Saturday, November 15, 2008