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Where the Palm Grows: The Ybor City Revitalization Project

Alexandra Fitos

ABSTRACT

Increasingly there has been a new model for inner-city redevelopment and revitalization, in which an urban area is commodified and turned into a ‘festival market’ and an exclusive shopping district referred to as a 'shopertainment' area. Ybor City in Tampa, Florida, is typical of this new model of redevelopment where urban entertainment and shopping with an active nightclub and dining scene, entices new visitors to area, and most recently a growing residential population. The residential population that is developing is one of exclusivity and privilege, exceedingly far removed from Ybor City’s humble beginnings as a company town or the blighted area that was sacrificed to Urban Renewal polices of the 1940’s, 1950’s and 1960’s. Ybor City is changing into a themed city in which ethnic identity and history is being commodified and the historical and cultural capital of the area is being marketed by the city government and private developers in order to attract daytrippers, seasonal tourists, homeowners and other residents.

This thesis deconstructs the gentrifying effects that Camden, Ybor City’s first residential apartment complex, has had on the area by examining how the contemporary literature deals with gentrification. Additionally, this thesis will
examine the demographic changes in Ybor’s population as the area shifts away from residents who historically represented Ybor City, advancing the theory that Ybor City is an exclusive community that is indeed being gentrified.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

What would Jose Marti say about the current revitalization of the south Tampa neighborhood known as Ybor City? Would the Cuban lawyer-laureate, a frequent visitor to the Tampa Bay area from 1891 to until his death in 1898 (Ybor City Museum http://www.ybormuseum.org; Florida History Internet Center: http://www.floridahistory.org), approve of the amusement-park redux atmosphere of this once vibrant multicultural community and commercial center? Urban geographers have largely ignored the cultural history of Ybor City, until its recent redevelopment supported by tourism and the entertainment industries. It is important to note that Ybor City, once a planned company town, is now becoming a “new city” in its own right. It is changing into a postindustrial themed city in which ethnic identity and history have been commodified and the historical and cultural capital of the area are marketed by the local government and private developers in order to attract daytrippers, seasonal tourists, and most recently, homeowners and other residents. The community of residents developing in Ybor City is, however, one of exclusivity that no longer represents the historical demographic mix and character of the area that traditionally has been blue collar in nature.
Focus and Aims of the Study

The focus of this thesis will be to examine the recent re-development and construction boom in Ybor City. Specifically, the study’s objective is to examine how the Ybor City revitalization project is gentrifying and reinventing the image of the area in order to attract a residential population with the development of contemporary upscale housing stock. The study will focus primarily on the Camden apartment complex, which is the first of many planned housing developments in Ybor City. Some questions that are in need of answering in relation to Camden are as follows:

1. (a) What are the reasons the residents of Camden chose to live in Ybor City? (b) What specifically attracted them to the Camden apartment complex?
2. How do the residents of Camden, local business owners and others view the revitalization of Ybor City?
3. How are the new residents of Camden Ybor City constructing and projecting a sense of place?
4. How have the demographics of the original community of Ybor changed?
5. (a) Does the shifting demographics indicate a process of spatial displacement of the original inhabitants of Ybor City? (b) What are some of the reasons for this displacement?
6. Who are the main actors in the redevelopment of Ybor City, and how do they justify gentrification?
7. How does the case of Camden, Ybor City fit into the gentrification literature?
Methodology

The methodology used for this research is primarily qualitative and similar to the case study that was done by Dluhy, Revell, and Wong, (2000) and illustrates the affects of urban revitalization on a community. Their study focused on the effects of urban renewal and the construction of an interstate system through the primarily black community and cultural center of Overtown, Miami, known as the “Harlem of the South.” The example of Overtown holds important lessons for the study of urban revitalization in Ybor City. Both Ybor City and Overtown are areas that once possessed a noticeable minority immigrant population, and became the subjects of public policies that eventually led to their decline through the processes of gentrification.

The case study method used in Dluhy, Revell, and Wong’s study was mostly qualitative in nature and several of their methodological techniques were loosely followed for this study. It is important to note that the methodologies used for this thesis project were not exclusively taken from the Overtown study due to the fact that the latter cannot fully explain the range of issues that are currently shaping the revitalization of Ybor City. For instance, Overtown diverges from the Ybor City case in a number of important ways. Whereas the Overton study deals almost exclusively with the general destruction of a community, Ybor City deals primarily with the development of an urban entertainment district and
the gentrification of the housing. Consequently, the methodology was adapted to focus on these three areas that were replicated from the Dluhy, et. al. case study for this thesis:

1) The analysis of census data for Ybor City and the nearby areas using Census 2000, in order to ascertain internal demographic changes and population shifts as a way to show gentrification due to revitalization.

2) Examination of newspapers, audio-visual and other archival materials to establish the chronology of urban renewal and public policy measures that have impacted Ybor City’s redevelopment.

3) Interviews that involve the use of specific open ended questions with current residents of Ybor City and Camden, business owners and policy makers in order to document their strategies and perceptions of change and redevelopment in the area.

Additionally, this thesis used several other field methods to extract the most useful data to answer the research questions found in this chapter. The first two methods employed an ethnographic approach to data gathering and included participant observation and conducting one-on-one open-ended interviews with a small cross-section of the population that is most involved or affected by the redevelopment of Ybor City. The third method employed was document analysis, in which relevant newspaper articles, local government planning reports and local historical publications related to Ybor City were reviewed. The fourth method utilized was critical discourse and content analysis of interviews and informal conversations. This data was used to situate the study of Ybor City within the gentrification and urban restructuring literature. Additionally, maps, graphs and tables played an important role in contextualizing the study site.
The first method, participant observation, was used to familiarize the researcher with the study site by drawing out and highlighting salient issues and identifying key actors that consequently were utilized in the formulation of interviews and open-ended discussion questions with a few key players in the Ybor City redevelopment project (see appendix A). By actively participating in local events, such as attending sporting events, going to restaurants, partaking in entertainment activities (movie theaters, riding the trolley and attending shows), shopping and participating in cultural events, both independently and with a group of residents of Camden Ybor City certain trends and issues have become more apparent. Thus, by actively participating in these events, first hand, informal knowledge of Ybor City and Camden was gained. This knowledge allowed a deeper understanding of the local worldview of the residents of Camden. These interactions were the guiding force behind the formulation of concise interview questions that drew out information that was central to this thesis.

The second method used was one-on-one open-ended interviews and informal discussions with key informants identified during the first familiarizing phase of the study’s methodology. The subjects selected for interviews were active participants in the redevelopment of Ybor City. They included an economic development specialist for the Ybor City Development Corporation, local business owners on 7th Avenue, a resident of the nearby Ybor Heights neighborhood and one time candidate for Tampa City Council, and a former
Barrio Latino Commissioner who was also the founder of the Ybor City Neighborhood Association. In addition, a number of Camden Apartments residents (n=6) who are central to the redevelopment strategy in Ybor City were also be interviewed. Interviews with this group explored their motivations for choosing the Camden Apartments and Ybor City as an urban residence and entertainment destination. The interviews from local actors provided a better understanding of the economic, as well as entertainment dimensions of the revitalization project that is taking place in Ybor City.

The groups targeted for interviews were those who possessed useful information of Ybor City and are actively involved in the redevelopment of the area. The open-ended interview sessions were conducted from March 2003 to January 2004 to allow for maximum collection of interview and related data. Each interview took from 30 minutes to 1 ½ hours, depending on the length and dynamics of the conversations. In addition to the interview questions, a brief demographic survey (see appendix B) of those Camden’s residents who were interviewed was undertaken to develop a more detailed socio-economic profile of the residents. The survey that was given to interviewed Camden residents was later altered so that more residents (n=14) who were not able or willing to participate in longer interview session could contribute valuable demographic and social data (see appendix C).

The third method employed was content analysis of documents, in which relevant newspaper and magazines articles, historical records, census data, and
public records were critically examined. These sources demonstrated how Ybor City and Camden are promoting themselves and the gentrification of the area to the community. Historical records and census data provided valuable comparisons between what the city was, how it is changing due to revitalization, where it is now and possibly where it might be going in the future. The public records were additionally utilized to interpret the historical records and provide a picture of what groups of people lived or worked in and around Ybor City, as well as revealing a profile of those who are currently replacing the traditional residents and workers of Ybor City.

The fourth method employed was that of content and critical discourse analysis of the interview data and informal conversations. Interviews and conversations were cross-examined to identify underlying themes and trends that are present throughout the dataset. Once interviews and conversations were transcribed, they were linked back to the relevant literature on gentrification. This information has shed some light onto how the people interviewed perceive Ybor City’s and Tampa’s redevelopment project. More importantly, this information has demonstrated how the perceptions and behaviors of individual informants are influencing the trajectory of Ybor City as a newly gentrified neighborhood.

These sources will draw attention to the rhetoric of development and voices of those making assertions about the costs and benefits of Ybor City’s revitalization: land developers, city development officials, and a host of local beneficiaries and victims of urban revitalization. It is also necessary to explore
the practices through which these actors seek to represent and benefit from this process.

The Ybor City revitalization project is unquestionably representative of what is presently occurring or is being used as conventional practice for redeveloping depressed inner cities across the U.S. and elsewhere. Such revitalization projects as Miami’s Overtown (Dluhy, Revell and Wong 2002), West Town in Chicago (Betancur, 2002), Providence, Rhode Island (Orr and West 2002) and the comparison between Cape Town (District Six), South Africa, and Liverpool, England (Uduku, 1999), serve as relevant examples of cities that were once struggling to maintain themselves have used revitalization to bring about a renaissance. The case of Ybor City is unique in the sense that much of the original housing stock has been destroyed due to fire, neglect, and urban renewal projects, leading to a ‘clear slate’ on which residential developers can start from scratch.

By combining these methods, this study reveals how entertainment and shopping districts like Ybor City seek to develop stable residential populations through housing gentrification. In addition, there is a need to better understand how the gentrification process appears to be a self-perpetuating process which is marked by the displacement of present residents and a definitive demographic shift in favor of high-income residents and consumers. Overall, the study of Ybor City illustrates how gentrification produces areas that are exclusive in
nature and perpetuates the consumption of high-end goods, services and housing across the urban landscapes of the 21st century.

Relevance of Study

When looking at Tampa in the late 1800s and early 1900s, it could be said that there are several important dynamics that produced contemporary Tampa. A major factor was obviously the cigar industry. Cigar making brought to Tampa its first industry coupled with a significantly diverse immigrant population that colored how Ybor City and Tampa developed. Ybor City has experienced numerous lives during its 117 years of existence, from prosperity, to labor unrest, decline, transformation and finally rebirth. However, many issues confront the Ybor City of today, especially what it has become and what it could be in the future, but for now we must focus on what it is.

Currently, Ybor City is an urban entertainment and shopping center, with an active nightclub scene and a small but growing residential population. The population that is developing is one of exclusivity and privilege, exceedingly far removed from Ybor City’s humble beginnings as a company town or the blight areas that were sacrificed to urban renewal polices of the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s.

The primary relevance of this thesis lies in its attempt to deconstruct the gentrification that is taking place in Ybor City by examining related literature and posing a series of relevant interview questions to those people who hold specific knowledge of the Ybor City area. One of the study’s foci will be how the new
residents of Ybor City’s Camden Apartment complex perceive their new home and how they came about the decision to move to Ybor City. Furthermore, analyzing how the demographic population of the area is shifting away from residents that historically represented Ybor City, promoting the notion that Ybor City is becoming an exclusive community that is being gentrified.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Gentrification and the City

The word gentrification has a tendency to raise suspicion and negative emotions when used in the context of urban revitalization, especially when it involves the rehabilitation of the housing stock. The term gentrification was first coined by Ruth Glass in London during the early part of the 1960s. The phrase gentrification according to Glass (cited in Hamnett 2000, p. 331) was a reference to the “new urban gentry,” which was “paralleling the traditional eighteenth- and nineteenth-century rural gentry who comprised the class below the landed aristocracy.” Today, however, the definition of gentrification has changed and varies from scholar to scholar. As such, the body of scholarship on gentrification has grown exponentially. The term has acquired a range of different meanings to describe a wide array of urban transformations in the wake of privatization and the deregulation of metropolitan governance since the late 1980s. The aim of this study is not to provide an exhaustive account of the gentrification literature. Rather, it will focus on a few select definitions of gentrification in an attempt to shed light on recent urban transformations in the historical neighborhood of Ybor City in Tampa, Florida.
Physical Upgrading or Revitalization

One of the earliest and most influential definitions of gentrification was developed by Ruth Glass who described gentrification “as a complex process, or set of processes, involving physical improvement of the housing stock, housing tenure change from renting to owning, price rises and the displacement or replacement of the existing working-class population by the middle classes” (cited in Hamnett, 2000, p. 331). This definition, while useful, is more about the sociology than the geography of gentrification. Scholars in urban geography have focused more on the spatial and socio-economic attributes of gentrification. Most generally, the concept of gentrification is, according to Kennedy and Leonard (2001, p. 5) used “… interchangeably with urban revitalization, to describe any commercial or residential improvements in urban neighborhoods.”

According to Sean Zielenbach (2000, pp. 26-27) who has written extensively about urban gentrification, the term refers to the “physical restoration of central-city neighborhoods by and for middle and upper-income professionals.” Gentrification can be also be characterized as Smith and LeFaiivre (1984, p. 43) do as “the rehabilitation of working-class inner-city neighborhoods for upper-middle class consumption.” According Bennett (1989, p. 17) “[g]entrification is the term popularly used to describe the rehabilitation of older neighborhood by young, affluent homeowners.” Other scholars use the term more narrowly to refer to the physical upgrading of low-income neighborhoods. Still a number of
scholars have focused primarily on “… the economic actions of newcomers, namely, the renovation and upgrading of the housing stock” (Kennedy and Leonard, 2001, p. 5). According to Kennedy and Leonard (ibid, p. 6), “…gentrification has a physical as well as socioeconomic component that results in the upgrading of housing stock in the neighborhood.”

**Gentrification and Race**

Gentrification has had a disproportionate relationship to race. Thus, according to Kennedy and Leonard (2001, p. 2) the “… issue of gentrification has historically included a strong racial component – lower income African American residents are replaced by higher income white residents.” By focusing on the racial dimensions of gentrification, Kennedy and Leonard remind us that gentrification is a socio-economically differentiated process which impacts different social groups unequally. Thus, they argue that gentrification disproportionately affects minority households. In this regard, some scholars argue that gentrification usually occurs with the tacit support of public and private sector institutions and traditions. As a result, an influx of higher income White households inevitably will put pressure primarily on historically minority communities (Smith and LeFaiivre 1984; Holcomb and Beauregard, 1981). As Kennedy and Leonard (ibid, p. 5) note: “[i]n contrast to these property-focused visions of the gentrification process, others describe gentrification as the class and racial tensions and dislocation—the socioeconomic or people-based effects—that frequently accompany the arrival of new residents into a
neighborhood.” Others, such as Vigdor (2001, p. 5) agree that “gentrification often implies racial transition.” Moreover, Winters (cited in Holcomb and Beauregard 1981, p. 41) claims that “[r]acially, most immigrants to gentrifying neighborhoods are white,” further demonstrating the increased racial homogenization of gentrifying neighborhoods.

**Gentrification and Class**

Other gentrification scholars, while not discounting race, put much greater emphasis on class. Michael Lang (1982, p. 8) introduces the notion that gentrification has an element of class transformation by describing the process as “essentially private-capital-induced developments in formerly lower income areas that results in a pattern of higher rents and land and housing values.” Neil Smith (1996, p. 36), a geographer who has written extensively about gentrification, describes it more in class terms. According to this view, gentrification is a process whereby “… poor and working class neighborhoods in the inner city are refurbished via an influx of private capital and middle-class homebuyers and renters- neighborhoods that had previously experienced disinvestment and a middle-class exodus.” Along the same lines, Wyly and Hammel (1999) address gentrification by linking it to the wider political economy of urban change in recent decades. Gentrification in this wider context is an inherent part of “[c]lass transformation [which] is rooted in long-term changes in the distribution of wealth, income, and educational opportunity…” (Wyly and Hammel 1999, p. 716). From this perspective, gentrification refers to “ …
comprehensive schemes to privatize public space and exclude the city’s poor from areas now reserved for affluent residents, white-collar workers, and patrons of upscale retail and entertainment facilities” (Wyly and Hammel ibid, p. 717).

In his groundbreaking study, *The New Urban Frontier* (1996), Neil Smith recaps the New York State Real Estate Board (NYSREB) definition of gentrification. According to Smith, the NYSREB regards “[i]n simple terms, gentrification [as] the upgrading of housing and retail business in a neighborhood with an influx generally of private investment” (Smith, 1996, p. 30). The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) uses a somewhat similar definition of gentrification as “the process by which a neighborhood occupied by lower-income households undergoes revitalization or reinvestment through the arrival of upper income households” (cited in Nelson 1988, p. 4). Smith, whose definition of gentrification is stated in the previous paragraph, clearly takes issue with these definitions because they neglect to address the destructive and often detrimental nature of the gentrification process. He also adds that through gentrification, “the poorest working-class neighborhoods are getting a remake; capital and the gentry are coming home, and for some in their wake it is not entirely pretty sight” (Smith 1996, p. 32).

Other urban scholars build on Smith’s definition of gentrification by situating it within the context of capitalist rounds of investment and disinvestment. Thus, according to Kennedy and Leonard (2001, p. 5) a growing number of scholars “… frame gentrification within the decades-long process of
disinvestment and re-investment in a particular neighborhood…” all the while “suggesting that public policies and the owners of capital conspire, and enable higher income people to reap substantial profits from gentrification.” For instance, Nelson (1988) defines gentrification as a project initiated by private sector residential and commercial investors in urban neighborhoods. This process is then accompanied by inflows of households with higher socio-economic status than the neighborhood’s initial residents. Hackworth (2002, p. 815) addresses gentrification as the socio-economic process where “…the production of urban space [is] for progressively more affluent users…”

It is important to note that newly gentrified areas bring with them countless negative impacts for those who are being displaced by of higher income residents. Thus, “gentrification is no longer about a narrow and quixotic oddity in the housing market but has become the leading residential edge of a much larger endeavor: the class remake of the central urban landscape” (Smith 1996, p. 39). The benefits of gentrification mostly are enjoyed by those who control capital and the middle class. They are the ones “who are the beneficiaries not only of new living spaces but also of profitable, if comparatively small, investments” (Smith and LeFaivre 1984, p. 54). Usually, the profits and benefits of the middle classes burdens those who can least afford the inflated costs of a gentrified neighborhood (Zukin, 1998). In nearly all cases, the victims of gentrification are the poor, working classes, and the unemployed (Smith and LeFaivre ibid, p. 56). Smith’s conceptualization of gentrification brings to the table an extremely
important issue, namely, once a neighborhood becomes gentrified, a space of exclusivity is created. It is in this sense that “…who is to be invited back into the city begins to reveal the class politics involved” (Smith 2002, p. 445).

Gentrification and Socio-Spatial Displacement

One area that is often emphasized in gentrification related literature is the demographic impacts often implied by the term. For instance, Vigdor (2001, p. 5) defines gentrification as “… renewed population growth, accompanied by an inflow of high socioeconomic status households.” While this is a very narrow definition of gentrification, it is nevertheless useful because it focuses on the displacement dimension of the process. Vigdor notes that for gentrification to be defined as such it must meet, as he puts it, “… an additional necessary condition that initial residents must be displaced in the process” (Vigdor 2001, p.5).

Kennedy and Leonard (2001, p. 16) concur that for true gentrification to take place the displacement of lower income residents from their neighborhoods must occur. Similarly, Holcomb and Beauregard (1981, p. 37) define gentrification as the movement of middle- and upper-income groups into a neighborhood to refurbish old housing, which effectively displace the previous inhabitants who are usually poor minorities. Wyly and Hammel (1999, p. 716) agree by specifying the social nature of the displacement. As they note, gentrification inherently means the “…in-migration of middle-class suburbanites back to the city, and the
displacement of poor or working-class residents...” Thus, the process of gentrification can only take place when there is a significant replacement of a neighborhood’s residents with “…newcomers who are of higher income and who, having acquired homes cheaply, renovate them and upgrade the neighborhood” (Holcomb and Beauregard, p. 39).

Gentrification is marked by socio-spatial displacement. Nevertheless, the effects of the gentrification extend much deeper than just displacement and replacement as implied in the previous paragraph. Holcomb and Beauregard (1981) further describe the process of direct displacement. It is a process that “…occur[s] when homes are acquired through eminent domain or when rental leases terminate and are not renewed” (Holcomb and Beauregard 1981, p. 44). Their argument is that more people experience indirect displacement due to increasing rents and property taxes, escalating living expenses, and by covert harassment by landlords trying to clear a building before it is sold or improved. As suggested by Holcomb and Beauregard (ibid, p. 45), study after study has found that gentrification displaces “…minorities, elderly, and low-income people generally...in disproportionate numbers.” Those who are normally displaced by gentrification are “…typically long-term residents. As tenants they cannot afford the rising rents, as homeowners, they are burdened by a spurt in property values and the additional taxes that follow” (Holcomb and Beauregard ibid, p. 45). Furthermore, the costs of gentrification induced displacement are not only the
financial burden of moving expenses, security deposits, increased rent, new utilities, but increasingly social, with the loss of community ties, decreased access to friends and relatives and to medical and other social services all the while adding to the emotional trauma of displacement from a familiar location (Holcomb and Beauregard ibid, p. 46).

The gentrification process is more than just external changes in the urban landscape. It goes much deeper to include important societal transformations as well. For instance, gentrification produces major demographic shifts in local populations, which are associated with changes in the occupational, political, and consumer habits of neighborhoods. The convenience of proximity to the central business districts, the architectural aesthetics that are often found in older neighborhoods of the city, and improvements in the overall infrastructure of an area are all some of the benefits of living in a newly revitalized area (Lang, 1982). The amenities, architectural aesthetics and easy commute to downtown areas are what some would argue to be the very things that bring about socio-spatial displacement and structural changes in gentrifying neighborhoods. For instance, as Wyly and Hammel (1999, p. 716) note, gentrification “was simply the visible neighborhood expression of broader societal forces – new cultural practices and consumption preferences of the professional middle class as exemplified by ‘yuppies,’ or new conditions of the circulation of capital at the urban and regional level.” Smith (2002, p. 438) extrapolates from Ruth Glass’s definition of gentrification by noting that “once this process of ‘gentrification’ starts it goes on
rapidly until all or most all of the middle class occupiers are displaced.” The outcome of gentrification is that the socio-spatial character of a district or neighborhood is fundamentally changed (Kennedy and Leonard 2001; Smith, 2002).

The Beneficiaries of Gentrification – The New Urban Gentry

In order to fully understand the effects of gentrification is it important to know the demographic makeup of those who are gentrifying an area. Most often the new urban gentry are white and middle to upper-middle class groups. It is perhaps more relevant to ask who the “new urban gentry” are. A recent study by Vigdor (2001) about Boston offers a few answers which are consistent with Brain Berry’s (1985, p. 85) findings. Both authors offer some insights into the profile of the new urban gentry by identifying at least three common attributes. They are: (1) childless households; (2) unmarried adults; and (3) highly educated professionals. Vigdor’s (ibid, p. 4) extensive study of Boston found that the “…majority of adults … hold college degrees and the majority of workers … hold professional or managerial occupations.” This description is consistent with Holcomb and Beauregard (1981, p. 41) who describe the new urban gentry as “…resettlers [who] are typically young singles and couples without children.” or “…families with only one or two children.” The new gentry are widely regarded as the leading beneficiaries of gentrification and as a group are “distinguished by their generally high levels of education, high levels of cultural capital preferences and consumption norms” (Hamnett 2000, p. 336). This new wave of residents are
“...often less tolerant of class and culture differences between themselves and
the indigenous inhabitants and more concerned about increasing the value of
their property” (Holcomb and Beauregard 1981, p. 41).

Yet this is not a fully inclusive description of the new gentrifiers. Some
would argue that these new city dwellers are young suburbanites who are
returning to the city in what is referred to as a “back to the city” movement or
“urban renaissance.” However, according to Lang (1982) and Smith (1996), this
has not been the case. Rather than a return from the suburbs, they view
gentrification as the relocation of residents from other parts of the city to newly
gentrifying neighborhoods (Lang ibid, p. 6 and Smith ibid, p. 55). Those who are
part of the gentrification process are referred to by Smith (ibid, pp. 92-95) and
Zukin (1998, p. 830-831) as “yuppies” (i.e., young urban professionals). The
mere utterance of the term yuppie brings to mind vivid imagery of over-
consumption, speculative investment, and displacement of former inhabitants
from gentrified neighborhoods (Zukin ibid, p. 831).

A Contemporary Model of Gentrification

Hackworth (cited in Smith, 2002: 440) argues that there are three distinct
waves of gentrification in North America and Europe. The first wave began in the
1950s and can be thought of as sporadic gentrification; this was later described
by Ruth Glass in her 1963 publication London: Aspects of Change. The second
wave arose in the 1970s and 1980s “as gentrification became entwined with
wider processes of urban and economic restructuring” (Hackworth, cited in
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Smith, ibid, p. 441). This phase became known as the anchoring phase in which gentrification became an imbedded city process. The third wave emerged in the 1990s and can be thought of as gentrification generalized. Generalized gentrification is what is found in most cities today, as explained by Smith (2002, p. 441). Generalized gentrification is composed of five interrelated characteristics: “…the transformed role of the state, penetration by global finance, changing levels of political opposition, geographical dispersal and the sectoral separation of gentrification.” Smith (ibid, p. 443) also emphasizes that this latest phase of gentrification primarily is a “…new amalgam of corporate and state powers and practices has been forged in a much more ambitious effort to gentrify the city than earlier ones.”

According to Bennett (1989, p. 18), the three waves of gentrification are accompanied by four main factors that contributed to the overall attractiveness and intensification of gentrification. In no particular order of importance, the four factors include “… the substantial inflation of housing process during the 1970s…” which added appeal to investing in real estate in the central-city neighborhoods. A second factor “was the coming of age of a huge population cohort, the postwar ‘baby boom’ generation, from which many gentrifiers have been drawn.” The third factor alludes to the reorganization of urban economies that have “generated many new white-collar jobs in corporate management, firms providing … [m]any new recruits to these occupations work in the central city” and that for them living in or near downtown neighborhood is highly appealing.
The fourth and final factor, which is drawn from Zukin’s work refers to the new middle-classes nostalgia for city living and an aversion to 1950s- style suburbia, leading them to embrace the urban neighborhood as a place of residence (Bennett 1989, p. 18).

These factors and waves have led to a new model of gentrification (Smith 2002; Hackworth 2002). Increasingly, there has been a consensus that there is a shifting away from the traditional model of gentrification that was suggested by Ruth Glass. According to Neil Smith (2002, p. 439) “the key actors in Glass’s story were assumed to be middle to upper-middle class immigrants to the neighborhood…” For Smith the new “… agent[s] of the urban regeneration of thirty- five years later are governmental, corporate or corporate governmental partnerships” (2002, p. 439). Middle to upper-middle actors are no longer leading actors in the gentrification process. Hackworth (2002, p. 818) suggests a specific incident that effectively changed how gentrification was implemented. This was the recession of the 1990s which facilitated the restructuring of gentrification. Hackworth goes further and describes four distinct shifts in gentrification theory that have resulted since the recession of the 1990s. The first change that took place was found in groups that initiated gentrification. Increasingly, gentrifiers are “… corporate developers more often than before because of restructuring in the real estate industry” (Hackworth ibid, 818). Another change was the intensification of intervention by local and federal governments in the process of gentrification. This development perhaps led to
the third shift and that is the weakening of resistance to gentrification and urban redevelopment. The fourth change in gentrification was the expansion of gentrification into “… more remote neighborhoods and intensification of the pressure on ungentrified tracks of land closer to the urban core, altering the land economics that produce earlier waves of the process” (Hackworth, ibid, p. 819).

**Gentrification: “Shopertainment and Fun Cities”**

A new trend has arisen in the field of urban redevelopment in the postmodern era, the idea of a ‘themed city’ or an area that uses “history” and “cultural identity” as competitive strategies to attract visitors and tourists. Elected city leaders, land developers, local businesses, and residents have welcomed the practice of creating ‘themed cities’ or a ‘fun cities’ as a redevelopment strategy. Ybor City is a good example of this postmodern trend. John Hannigan writes about four lessons learned from urban redevelopment projects in the 1950s and 1960s which have become the basis for fun city development in the 1990s and beyond. The four lessons briefly summarized are: one, city officials and developers realized that building high rises and department stores could not alone revitalize a downtown area; two, it became increasingly clear that it is difficult to revitalize a large blighted area; three, there is a necessity for cooperation between the public and the private; and four, amenities not found in the suburbs should be offered to those visiting the city (Hannigan 1998, p. 51). These four lessons have resulted in a “new” paradigm for urban development. Inner cities have once again become a major attraction for a growing number of
tourists and suburbanites, who have disposable income and increasingly trendy lifestyles, and, given its optimal location, the inner city has once again become a popular destination (Zukin 1998, p. 834).

In a growing number of cities, in order to entice new visitors to an urban area, history, shopping, entertainment and adventure are being combined to create what is referred to as ‘festival markets’ and 'shopertainment.' These strategies are slowly replacing the architecture of function with the “architecture of play and pleasure, of spectacle and commodification, emphasizing fiction and fantasy” (Harvey cited in Hannigan 1998, p. 55). The establishment and enlargement of an exclusive residential population in newly gentrified areas goes hand in hand with the ability of “festival markets to attract the local and not so local tourist” (Smith 1996, p. 39). As the case of Ybor will show, the establishment of exclusive residential neighborhoods are emerging to both participate in and shape the newly constructed entertainment districts that are embodied in martini bars, cafes, and fancy boutiques.

Tourism and the creation of tourist locations play an important part in this commercializing and homogenizing of culture, with many benefits for the cities that choose this strategy for economic development. As Zukin (1997, p. 228) points out: “They offer a ‘clean’ image of place that attracts new businesses, especially in the services. Both materially and symbolically, they create a new landscape that diverts attention from old political battles.” Popular support and legitimacy for such projects comes from the idea that a trickle down effect or
permanent economic stability will result in areas surrounding the revitalization projects. This is often not the case, however, leaving “islands of renewal in seas of decay” (Berry 1985, p. 71). According to Gornto (cited in Hannigan 1998, p. 56), the overall result of such redevelopment projects has been that “the public must be ‘sold’ the attitude that downtown in an exciting place in which to shop, work, live and invest.”

For Hannigan (1998, p. 67), the ‘postmodern consumer’ expects a city or experience to conform to his/her liberated soul that has the freedom to move “in and out of arenas of consumption, which are fluid and non-totalizing.” In this view, the ‘postmodern consumer’ is an active participant in the ‘fantasy city’ that thrives on technological advances with "immersion in the historical, the exotic or the futurist (Hannigan ibid, p. 68). Cities are thus transforming from areas of production and industry into areas of consumption, where leisure and entertainment are offered to visitors and residents alike (Zukin 1998, p. 825). The post-industrial city, according to David Ley (cited in Smith 1996, p. 52), focuses "on consumption and amenity, not work." Consequently, the fantasy city allows those with the means to take "leisure safaris into the city center," to become day-trippers who consume "souvenir merchandise- acting as a passport stamp which confirms the tourist has come and gone" or participated in the urban experience (Hannigan ibid, pp. 61, 69).

Perhaps in the case of Ybor City, the passport stamp are the beads won from passing carnival-like parades, guyaberas (traditional Cuban shirts) and local
hand rolled cigars purchased at shops along 7th Avenue. As Kowinski (1985, pp. 75, 77) puts it, the consumer wants to be part of the “retail drama” in which “customers are not only the audience: they are the action and the actors.” As the case-study will show, Ybor City successfully provides such an integrated experience, in the quintessential “people-zoo.”

Speaking to the optimal location of inner cities, the idea that people, or consumers, can travel to a location that is relatively close in proximity without the risk associated with the urban center is "to package our fantasy experience within a safe reassuring and predictable environment" (Hannigan 1998, p. 71). Oddly enough, this packaging makes the city a destination for a sanitized escape from the suburbs.

The revitalization of the city is increasingly utilizing what Hannigan refers to as the "McDonaldization model." In other words, cities are introducing the principles of efficiency, calculability, predictability and control into the urban experience for the purpose of bringing order and standardization to the city as a way of attracting risk adverse consumers who have been reared on an apolitical discourse about the dangers of urban areas (Hannigan ibid, p. 73). The urban experience is increasingly reliant on massive suburban tourism, leading to the creation of new spaces for urban consumption by investors and furthering the homogenization of space (Zukin 1998, pp. 833-835).
Chapter 3: Ybor City Then and Now

From Guavas to Cigars: Industry in Ybor City

The history of Tampa could not be told without taking into consideration the effect that Ybor City has had on the growth and prosperity of the Tampa Bay region. Perhaps some historians would argue that Tampa’s Ybor City was misnamed and should have conceivably been named Gutierrez City, after Gavino Gutierrez. Gutierrez first came to Tampa from New York in 1883 searching for guavas orchards (Harner 1975, p. 11). Mr. Gutierrez’s trip to Tampa was inspired by his pursuit of fortunes that he believed could be created from the production of guava into jelly, paste, and pickles. However, when he arrived in Tampa, conditions were not advantageous to building an industrial facility to process the delectable fruit. It turned out that “what guava trees there were didn’t bear enough fruit to supply a housewife with her fall canning let alone supply the industrial plant” (Harner ibid, p. 11).

Even though Tampa lacked the guavas Gutierrez was searching for, he started to see a future for Tampa, a city that was struggling to develop an industrial base and maintain a population of just over 700 people (La Gaceta, April 11, 1986). Tampa’s warm climate and humidity led to Gutierrez’s conclusion that Tampa, like to the Florida Keys and Cuba, was an ideal location for the production of cigars. The second leg of his journey to Florida led him to
an old friend Don Vicente Martinez y Bor (later shortened to Ybor) who was living in the Florida Keys. During the visit Gutierrez presented Mr. Ybor a hand drawn map of the new cigar city that Gutierrez envisioned complete with “streets where only a few wagon tracks wandered through palmettos and scrub pines grew out of the sandy soil” (Harner 1975, p. 12).

At the time of Gutierrez’s visit to Don Vicente Ybor in Key West, the cigar industry was suffering from labor unrest and continual stoppages in production. It so happened that Ignacio Haya, a fellow cigar producer, was also visiting Ybor. Naturally, the three men discussed the woes of the tobacco industry (Westfall 1977, p. 58). The enthusiasm that Gutierrez displayed over his earlier visit to Tampa, despite the lack of guavas, made Ybor and Hay reconsider the potential that Tampa, a city with its newly expanded port and rail services, had as a possible site for the relocation of the cigar industry (Westfall ibid, pp. 58-60). Given the escalating tensions between cigar manufactures and laborers back in Cuba, it had been decided by Key West cigar producers that it was essential to find a new location for the cigar industry. The new location had to have adequate transportation lines to the northern cigar markets, as well as an appropriately humid climate and a fresh water supply that was necessary for the production of cigars (Valiente 1995, p. 29). Tampa held an apparent potential to support the cigar industry with its modern transportation facilities, and the promise of the new million dollar Henry B. Plant hotel, which further enticed the men gathered at
Ybor’s Key West home to make a trip and see what this sleepy little fishing village had to offer (Harner 1975, p. 13).

The notion of Tampa as a possible site for the relocation of the cigar industry grew out of and was fostered by “the promise of cash subsidies and labor peace” that the city offered to the cigar manufactures (Ingalls 1988, p. 32). The incentives that Tampa presented, along with the climatic similarities to the Keys and close proximity to Cuban tobacco, ultimately outweighed offers from other more northern cities (such as Galveston, Mobile, and Pensacola) that were vying to be chosen as the new location of the cigar industry (Westfall 1977, pp. 59-60). The newly created Tampa Board of Trade was an eager participant which was more than willingly to partake in the hardball negotiations that Vicente Ybor and his compatriots demanded in order to relocate their factories to the area.

The first essential measure taken by the Tampa Board of Trade was to negotiate with Ybor for the purchase of land. From the rough map that Gutierrez had drawn, the Board put together “forty acres northeast of Tampa where there was a freshwater well” (Westfall 1977, p. 62). The property in question had just been purchased a few months earlier by Captain John T. Lesley for $5,000 (Westfall, ibid). This property was offered to Ybor for $9,000; a price he was not willing to pay considering that he knew how much it had been purchased for by Lesley (Westfall ibid, p 62). Ybor informed the Board members “that he would purchase the land if the members would put up $4,000 of the purchase price as
an earnest of their goodwill” (Harner 1975, pp. 13-14). The Board agreed after realizing that without such an incentive they could lose the business of an industry that would change Tampa forever (Harner ibid, p. 14).

With the successful purchase of land, Ybor was able to proceed with the development of Tampa’s first modern industry: the manufacture of hand-rolled cigars. Vicente Ybor was credited with founding and developing of Ybor City since he was the first of the cigar manufacturers to purchase 40 acres of land that had a fresh-water well and ample room for workers’ homes or for the further expansion of the cigar industry (Valiente 1995). By the end of 1885, the design for a new city and industry was set into motion by Ybor, Gutierrez and Haya, who by now had purchased additional acres and were ready to advance in the construction of a Tampa based cigar industry. Gutierrez, an engineer by trade, was appointed as principal planner after having agreed to lay out a planned community for Ybor which included “a cigar factory and 50 workmen’s homes, and had allotted enough land for a factory site for Sanchez y Haya of Key West” (Tampa Tribune: December 14, 1969). On October 8, 1885 the first tree felled was “making way for the opening of streets and the clearing of land where new buildings destine to become factories, homes and commercial establishments would rise” (La Gaceta: April 11, 1989).

Vicente Ybor’s initial plan for the city was not specifically for a company town, yet as the need increased for a stable work force so did the idea that it was necessary to provide sufficient housing and amenities for those workers willing to
relocate to Tampa from the Florida Keys, Cuba, Italy and Spain. From the very beginning, Ybor City experienced a population boom which contributed to the significant growth of the Tampa Bay Area by attracting workers to build the city and those who would serve as workers in the cigar industry. The new workers increased Tampa’s population from 700 residents in the early part of 1880 to over 3,000 when Ybor City was incorporated into the city of Tampa in 1887 (National Park Service: http://www.cr.nps.gov). It is important to note that up until the middle of 1886, immigration was slower than expected primarily because of the harsh living condition in the new town. This state of affairs held true until a disastrous fire in Key West on April 1, 1886 reduced to ashes many of the factories that employed the artful cigar makers (La Gaceta: April 11, 1969). The fire additionally destroyed Ybor’s “El Principe de Gales” manufacturing plant, leading to his final abandonment of the Key West cigar industry (Westfall 1977, p. 64).

The fire produced a large number of unemployed and homeless cigar makers who either returned to Cuba or headed north to Tampa in the hope of continuing their trade. On April 11, 1886, the first group of cigar maker left the Keys, according to La Gaceta (April 11, 1969), “fifty of them all Cubans, accompanied by their wives and children” arrived at the port of Tampa docks and wasted no time finding employment. From then on, the growth of the area was nothing less than spectacular. Thus, within “five years of the day when Gutierrez
first saw Tampa, Ybor City had a population of 15,000 many which were employed by the cigar industry (Harner 1975, p. 20).

Vicente Ybor’s community was “developed with the hope of providing a good living and working environment” in order to ward-off any labor union tensions that had befallen the cigar-makers of Cuba and of the Florida Keys (Westfall 1977, p. 65). Ybor City was conceivably being modeled after George Pullman’s planned industrial communities, but “was lacking some of the more oppressive features of other company towns such as the company stores that charged inflated prices and deducted the cost of purchases from employees’ paychecks” (Ingalls 1988, p. 33). The living and working conditions in Ybor City in most respects were superior to those in most industrialized cities and perhaps even most company towns. Nevertheless, Ybor City still was a company town whose soul purpose was to “attract, hold and control labor” the average cigar worker. Yet most would agree that cigar workers “exercised enormous control over the workplace, as a result of both the nature of the labor process and the traditions surrounding the Cuban handicraft” (Ingalls ibid, p. 33).

The “company town” that emerged in and around Ybor City included factories, casitas (worker’s cottages or shotgun houses), which were not rented but owned by the residents, and a streetcar that provided transportation from Ybor City to downtown Tampa (Ybor City Museum: http://www.ybor museum.org). The casitas were built in order to attract cigar makers and “could be purchased with interest free installment payments and were considered superior to housing
available in Key West and Cuba” (Ingalls 1988, p. 32). The workers’ cottages were “built of upright boards, and were sold from $750 to $900, depending on location. Each house had two to three rooms, and families shared outdoor privies” (Westfall 1977, p. 69).

Mr. Ybor continued to be an essential actor in the further growth and development of the city. For instance, one endeavor which underlined his centrality to the growth and well-being of Ybor City was the construction of a streetcar line which he paid for himself: “el tren urbano - the city train - and it operated whenever there were people and freight to be moved. There was no schedule” (Harner 1975, p. 20). The street car system was eventually taken over by the Tampa Electric Company where after it ran for 50 years until August 4, 1946 (Tampa Tribune: December 14, 1969; In Town Magazine: October, 2002). The trolley played an important part in meeting the needs of the new inhabitants of Ybor City and the surrounding area, so much so that its eventual demise signified the beginning of the end for the cigar industry in Ybor City.

Cigar workers’ independence did not just come from their earnings which in the 1890s averaged close to “$15 to $18 for a six-day work week” (Harner 1975, pp. 27-30). With additional benefits, such as the freedom to go home for lunch or to take as many coffee breaks as necessary, these benefits were allotted to them because they were paid by the quantity of cigars produced (Harner ibid, pp. 27-30). One of the most significant incentives given to the cigar workers was that of the lectura, or a reader, that was paid for by the
workers themselves as a form of education and entertainment. “The lectura was a veritable system of education dealing with a variety of subjects including politics, labor, literature and international relations” (Ingalls 1988, p. 34). It could be argued that the role the lectura play in the education of the cigar worker further radicalized the industry and would eventually cause numerous labor problems in the 1920s and 1930s. It is important to note is that even in the factories which had both men and women workers each played an equal role, by receiving identical pay and the right to vote. For Latin society and the time period, this was an anomalous development that did not reflect conditions found outside of the cigar industry or Ybor City (Harner ibid, p. 30).

**Ybor City: Urban Decline 1920s to 1940s**

The decline of Ybor City was marked by a number of significant occurrences. The first of many events that considerably weakened Ybor City and the cigar industry was the modernization of cigar production through the introduction of machine made cigars in the 1920s (National Park Service: http://www.cr.nps.gov). The automated machines produced over a 1,000 cigars a day so that “in 1949, only 7,000 people were employed in Tampa’s cigar industry although they had the same number of cigars as had 13,000 workers 20 years previously” (Tampa Tribune: December 14, 1969). This technological development further alienated the workers who already were experiencing severe working conditions in the factories (National Park Service: http://www.cr.nps.gov). The cigar workers and buckeyes (small independent
producers) could not compete with the machines; even a most efficient worker “could only make 250 cigars a day you were good- you had to be fast to make 200” (Tampa Tribune: December 14, 1969).

The resultant loss of jobs led to the realization that work had to be sought in more secure industries outside of cigar manufacturing and perhaps that it was time to find another line of employment. The machines led to a chain of unemployment from the cigar makers at the very top to the tobacco strippers at the very bottom. In 1930, the Cigar Makers’ International Union reported that “a large number of cigar makers [were] walking the streets” (Ingalls 1988, p. 149). The decline of the hand rolled cigar industry continued for reasons that went beyond the new machines, including depressed economic conditions and stiff competition from inexpensive machine made cigars. According to Ingalls (1988, p. 158) “[p]lant closings and removals eliminated the jobs of over 4,000 cigar workers in Tampa during the early 1930s, as local production of quality cigars fell from 504 million in 1929 to 294 million in 1933.” The depression additionally assisted in broadening the popularity of cigarettes as more Americans switched to the less expensive substitute for the hand rolled cigars (Mormino and Possetta 1987, p. 289).

The beginning of World War II decreased the workforce available for the production of cigars and led the additional deterioration of Ybor City (National Park Service: http://www.cr.nps.gov). The war played a number of contradictory roles in that it both assisted in the recovery of Tampa from the Great Depression
and the final eventual demise of Ybor City as a cigar town. The first shift was related to the mobilization of other industries linked to the war effort, such as shipbuilding, industrial plants and military bases which were quick to replace Tampa’s previously dominant industry of cigar making (Mormino and Possetta 1987, p. 300). In 1931, slightly less than 25 percent of Tampa’s industrial workers were employed in the cigar industry, an amazing decline considering Tampa had been a one industry town for the previous 50 years (Ingalls 1988, p. 150).

Increasingly, it became apparent to Ybor City residents that it would be necessary to economically assimilate into other industries that were distant from the production of cigars.

As patriotic feelings rose out of the second and third generation immigrants many enlisted in the armed forces, bought war bonds and women replaced men in the war factories when they left to serve their country. The war produced an era of savings and prosperity in Tampa, so that by the end of the war many families were able to afford to live in neighborhoods outside of Ybor City (Mormino and Possetta 1987, p. 298). Those who had served in the armed forces returned with an optimistic outlook and did not see their futures in the aging dilapidated residences of Ybor City. The recent “veterans might have chosen to return to the old neighborhood, but a combination of the G.I. Bill (the closest public university was 130 miles away), and the Veterans Administration (government-subsidized loans only applied to new homes)” (Mormino and
Pozzetta ibid, p. 300) left little reason to stay in Ybor City. For veterans returning from the war, many of whom were eager to take advantage of their war time benefits, the next logical move was to West Tampa, an area that had a Latin tradition and could provide some of the same comfortable amenities that Ybor City had once provided. What resulted was that “West Tampa became Ybor City’s half way house to suburbia, offering residents decent housing, room for expansion, and a Latin infrastructure of stores, clubhouses, and ambience” (Mormino and Pozzetta ibid, p. 300). Thus, Ybor City experienced the flight of many of its residents to nearby West Tampa or the suburbs which had a modern contemporary housing stock and were more conducive to raising a family.

The final blow to Ybor City and the cigar producers came when in 1962 President Kennedy prohibited travel and trade with Cuba, limiting the supply of tobacco. This development exacerbated the already depressed conditions found in Ybor City. The few remaining cigar manufacturers and buckeyes had relied on the Cuban tobacco to flavor their famous cigars, and without access had to search elsewhere. Moreover, when Fidel Castro “nationalized the tobacco industry, much of which was financed by American capital, Cuba’s skilled tobacco planter’s and merchants left the island in droves and one of the republic’s main sources of income was ended” (Harner 1975, p. 7). In fact, the same processes that affected Cuba’s planters and merchants also affected Ybor City’s cigar makers and factories. Cuba could no long supply the tobacco needed for the “Clear Havana” industry leaving the few cigar producers to look elsewhere
both domestically and abroad in such places as Honduras, Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, and Java (Harner ibid, p. 8).

**Ybor City: Urban Renewal 1960s to 1970s**

In order to understand one of the final nails in Ybor City’s coffin, it is necessary to examine the largely unsuccessful urban renewal policies of the late 1940s to the early 1960s. Even though urban renewal plans and policies were being deployed in most depressed areas of the country, Tampa did not implement a plan for renewal until 1958. Then mayor Nick Nuccio created the Urban Renewal Agency with the thought that something had to be done to revitalize Tampa’s neglected and depressed downtown areas (Robert Kerstein, publication date unknown). It is important to note that Ybor City did not become one of Tampa’s urban renewal areas until 1965, after Mayor Nuccio wrote to the federal Urban Renewal Agency requesting that Ybor City be surveyed and studied for possible renewal action. The agency followed Mayor Nuccio’s recommendation and by November of 1964 the federal government had approved Ybor City’s proposed application for renewal (Robert Kerstein, publication date unknown). The findings and conclusions of a report produced by Hammer and Company Associates entitled “Land Utilization and Marketability Analysis, Ybor City Urban Renewal Project” state the conditions found in Ybor City at the time:

1. Far reaching social and economic changes have taken place in Ybor City in recent years which have markedly affected its traditional role within Tampa.
2. Racial transition from Latin to Negro has taken place within the Project area.

3. The exodus of Latins from the area has reduced local support for stores and shops oriented to serving this market.

4. The business district is becoming increasingly oriented to serving the recently arrived low-income residents in the area.

These conditions were further supported Tampa’s main document entitled “Urban Renewal Plan” of 1965 that would serve as a guide for Ybor City’s urban renewal program. The City of Tampa’s “Urban Renewal Plan's” main objectives had four parts:

1. To rehabilitate, clear and redevelop slum areas which always constitute a serious and growing menace, injurious to the public health, safety, morals and welfare of the residents of the City of Tampa.

2. To preserve and strengthen the distinctive qualities of this area, the social and commercial center of Tampa’s Latin heritage and present-day Latin community.

3. To assure that the new development occurring in the Project Area will enhance Ybor City’s distinct architectural qualities.

4. To create in the community a unique area that is a mixture of healthy urban functions such as in-town living, office and professional services, commercial, cultural, educational and entertainment activities that will preserve the variety and excitement of the early Ybor City.

In order to fully understand what took place in Ybor City and the surrounding areas a brief description of the federal urban renewal program is necessary. The federal urban renewal program was enacted by Congress in 1949 and made provision for the removal of inner cities blighted areas. The Housing Act of 1949 had three primary objectives: (1) reduce substandard and
other insufficient housing by means of clearing slums and blighted areas; (2) encourage housing production to remedy the housing shortages; (3) achieve a good standard of living for all American families (Anderson 1964, p. 4).

These goals were never fully realized with much of the cleared land being “sold to the private developers for about 30 per cent what it cost the city to acquire, clear and improve it” (Anderson ibid, p. 2). In reality what urban renewal produced was an area clear of slums that created “room for many luxury-housing and a few middle income projects” along with making available “inexpensive land for the expansion of colleges, hospitals, libraries, shopping areas” (Gans 1966, p. 539). Evidently, housing and other residential projects that were built were not for the dispossessed slum dwellers that could not afford to move back into the new dwellings, thus being forced to look elsewhere (Gans ibid, p. 539; Anderson ibid, p. 11).

Often times, urban renewal “created new slums by pushing relocatees into areas and buildings which then became overcrowded and deteriorated rapidly” (Gans 1966, p. 538). The removal of slums and blighted areas often had racial overtones. Anderson notes (1964, p. 8) that “two thirds of the people who are forced out of their homes are Negroes, Puerto Ricans, or members of some other minority group.” This racial element unquestionably played a role in how Ybor City was dealt with in the 1960s urban renewal project. Eventually urban renewal brought about demolition of neighborhoods surrounding Ybor City, including the predominately black residential area known as the Scrub (Tampa Tribune,
The Scrub, “Tampa’s oldest, largest, most congested and most squalid black neighborhoods,” (Greenbaum 2002, p. 287) was the first of many targeted neighborhoods and made a perfect target for slum clearance.

As such, Ybor City’s urban ecology of neglected housing stock at the end of World War II and the progressive shifting away from a Latin based community made it more permissive for the relocation of other minority groups, primarily African Americans and their families (Mormino and Pozzetta 1987, p. 300). Consequently, much of the populations in Ybor City that were affected by newly adopted urban renewal policies were African Americans. By one account, “70 per cent of the people in the residential area cleared by urban renewal were Negroes and most of the rest were elderly Latin Americans” (Tampa Tribune, December 14, 1969). It needs to be noted that the idea of urban renewal in Ybor City was not to destroy the whole city, but rather to remove dilapidate houses and the marginal population that ringed the city, saving “the business district and other valued structures” (Greenbaum 2002, p. 288).

Urban renewal in the 1960s led to the destruction of hundreds of homes in Ybor City in order to generate room for large-scale development. In the years after the adoption of urban renewal policies, Tom Fox, the director of Tampa’s urban renewal program, stated “that most of the old wooden structures in the project areas were impossible to save and had to be torn down” (Tampa Tribune December 14, 1969). Subsequently, in Ybor City alone, 550 families were displaced and roughly 1,500 unsatisfactory residences were destroyed, in
addition to 338 businesses being relocated (*Tampa Tribune*, ibid). Tony Pizzo, the unofficial historian of Ybor City, was quoted as saying that “it is beginning to look like it did when Mr. Ybor first came here” (*Tampa Tribune*, ibid). This statement is a direct reference to the unfulfilled promises of the Federal Housing Act of 1949 that pledged “that every American deserves a decent home and a suitable living environment” (Lang and Sohmer 2000, p. 291). What the Federal Housing Act of 1949 promised and what it delivered were two entirely different things; for Ybor City what it left behind was a city that was emptied of its historically significant buildings and had over 50 acres of vacant land that were never redeveloped (Mormino and Pizzo 1983, p. 180).

The goals of urban renewal in Ybor City remained largely unrealized until the latest revitalization effort (Tampa Bay History Center: [http://www.tampabayhistorycenter.org](http://www.tampabayhistorycenter.org)). What resulted from urban renewal was that “Ybor City became a wasteland; homes, businesses and factories were demolished and nothing was replaced” (Mormino and Pizzo 1983, p. 180). The detrimental effects of urban renewal were realized and the City of Tampa made several revisions to the Ybor City Urban Renewal Plan in hopes that a more precise renewal document could be constructed. The fourth and final revision to Ybor City’s Urban Renewal Plan stated that there were two causes for the revision of the document: “first, the large number of changes in the plan both minor and major consequence; second, it was discovered by experience that the plan was an unwieldy, cumbersome document which was frequently vague or
impossible to interpret” (Fourth Amendment to the Ybor City Urban Renewal Plan, Nov. 7, 1972). The revised document tried to rectify problems that were present in the Ybor City’s initial renewal plan that made it exceedingly difficult to control the effects that a vague and unclear document had on the implantation of the City of Tampa’s urban renewal policies.

The final straw that broke Ybor City’s back was the construction of the I-4 and I-275 interstate road systems. These two major roadways further contributed to the decline and destruction of the communities and neighborhoods surrounding Ybor City and additionally added to Ybor City’s deepening geographic fragmentation that was brought on by the destruction of significant buildings and other cultural artifacts. During the 1960s, hundreds of buildings in Ybor City and the surrounding African American neighborhoods were flattened. This was mainly due to interstate 275 which “sliced Ybor City in half and dropped a spur that cleared a wide path adjacent to the Central Avenue district,” (Greenbaum 2002, p. 287). Not long after that Central Avenue itself was destroyed.

The destruction that took place under urban renewal and the building of the interstate road system through some of Tampa’s most vulnerable neighborhoods was not the most advisable way to bring prosperity to the area. As summarized by Martin Anderson (1964, p. 495), several of the affects of urban renewal polices in The Federal Bulldozer were:

1. More homes were destroyed than were built.
2. Those destroyed were predominantly low-rent houses.
3. Those built were predominantly high rent homes.
4. Housing conditions were made worst for those whose housing conditions were least good.
5. Housing conditions were improved for those whose housing conditions were the best.

Clearly, urban renewal had a devastating effect on Ybor City and adjacent communities.

**Ybor City: Urban Redevelopment 1980s to 2000**

Even as Ybor City started its deep decline into slum, blight and depression, there always seemed to be some hope that it could once again become the city it was in the past, this time with tourism and entertainment at its central core and the cigar industry at its periphery. The new vision that the City of Tampa and its former residents had for Ybor City was as a destination for fun and entertainment, which was not far from what it was in its earlier times. Even in Ybor City’s previous history, it was a site to see and be seen, thus on weekends, tourists and visitors were attracted from the Anglo part of Tampa, who would come to enjoy the Cuban restaurants, cafes, shops and part-take in Latin culture (Bond 1982, p. 45). Following the opening of the streetcar, it became a common weekend practice “for the Latino Community to visit the various parks of Tampa, while residents enjoyed the foreign atmosphere of the cigar city” (Bond ibid, p. 45). A Tampa businessman, Armando Valdes Jr., was quoted as saying that “Ybor City is the only important piece of land we (in Hillsborough County) have. It can rival Disney World” (*Tampa Tribune*, December 14, 1969). If only provisionally, there had always been the expectation that Ybor City would return
to its prominence and once more become something wonderful for visitors to stopover and experience.

It is on this premise that public and private development agencies have based the recent redevelopment of Ybor City, with the historical character of Ybor City playing a significant role in the revitalization plans of the area and the expansion of the region’s tourist industry. It is important to note that Ybor City’s recognition as an area of historical significance began with its designation as a National Historic District in 1974 and the formation of the Historic Tampa/Hillsborough County Preservation Board. However, it was not until the early 1980’s that a realistic plan for the redevelopment of Ybor City was set into motion, with “a city administration willing to commit resources, and - in some respects, the most important thing - a conviction that it will happen” (Bond 1982, p. 41); this combined with the new plans set redevelopment into motion.

For Ybor City, the one definitive action was its very first comprehension plan, “Ybor City Preliminary Redevelopment Plan,” which was prepared by Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission in April of 1980. This new plan for Ybor City signified a transitioning away from the earlier urban renewal driven policies that had at the very least been ineffective and at its very worst devastated the city. This document still plays an essential role in guiding the redevelopment of Ybor City and has remained un-amended to this day (conversation with Michele Ogilvie, Senior Planner at The Planning Commission July 8, 2003). The mayor of Tampa Bob Martinez, from 1979 to 1986, was
quoted as saying that “this effort differs from the other efforts to revive Ybor City, and the difference is that money is being spent” (Bond 1982). Along with the commitment of resources, there was a comprehensive plan that was set into motion that combined the “existing strengths while re-working the worn and neglected blocks,” (Ybor City Redevelopment Agency Document, January 1983) integrating six central goals:

1. Repopulating the neighborhood.
2. Emphasizing its “Latin” heritage.
4. Developing the diversity and intrigue of its merchandizing along the commercial spine of 7th Avenue.
5. Improving the micro-climatic comfort within the city.

These six goals remain as the City of Tampa's basic tenets that underlie the entire redevelopment project that is currently taking place in Ybor City.

The fundamental idea behind the commencement of the Ybor City redevelopment project was a multi-layered strategy, with the expansion of housing options in the area at the forefront and retail space, office space, hotel development, and cultural entertainment facilities as secondary. According to the Ybor City Redevelopment Agency’s plan “market rate, or non-subsidized housing” will play a vital role in redevelopment of the area “new residents in Ybor City will produce a number of desirable effects. Area residents will undoubtedly patronize local businesses” (Ybor City Redevelopment Agency Document, January 1983). Together with the goals stated above, a consulting group hired
by the City of Tampa stated that “Ybor City would get 700 new residential units, moderately priced to attract middle-class workers from the new businesses downtown” (Bond 1982, p. 49). The effect that new residents will have consist of improvements in the “after dark” image of the area, along with creating a more stable market for the recreation and entertainment projects that were to be expanded.

**Ybor City: Benign Neglect 1980s to 1990s**

Before any redevelopment initiatives could be undertaken in Ybor City certain measures had to be enacted. One such measure was the creation of a Community Redevelopment Area that would foster interest and growth in the revitalization project that was long overdue for Ybor City. In Florida, there is one major legislative statute that was enacted and meant to assist in the redevelopment of areas that had become slum and blighted. This was the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969. Well into urban renewal policies that took place in the previous decades and perhaps as a result of these misguided events the Community Redevelopment Act’s purpose was to eliminate slum and blighted areas that “constitutes an economic and social liability imposing onerous burdens which decrease the tax base and reduce tax revenues, substantially impairs or arrests sound growth, retards the provision of housing accommodations, aggravates traffic problems, and substantially hampers the elimination of traffic hazards and the improvement of traffic facilities” [Florida Statute 163.335 (1)].
The main purpose of the Community Redevelopment Act was to allow areas that had been declared slum and blighted to expend public money, police power and other community resources as long as there was a public interest for such provisions [Florida Statute 163.335 (3)]. One of the main requirements of the Community Redevelopment Act (CRA) was that an area had to contain a substantial amount of slum and blight conditions and for Ybor City to be included in the CRA it had to make a case for its current condition of slum and blight. Briefly, reviewed are the definitions of slum and blight as provided for in the CRA:

slum area as: "area having physical or economic conditions conducive to disease, infant mortality, juvenile delinquency, poverty, or crime because there is a pre-dominance of buildings or improvements, whether residential or nonresidential, which are impaired by reason of dilapidation, deterioration, age, or obsolescence" [Florida Statute 163.340 (7)].

blighted area as: “area in which there are a substantial number of deteriorated, or deteriorating structures, in which conditions, as indicated by government-maintained statistics or other studies, are leading to economic distress or endanger life or property” [Florida Statute 163.335 (8)].

The City of Tampa’s Planning Department in May of 1988 renewed its argument towards Ybor City’s slum and blight conditions that were originally declared in September 1982 in a 1988 document entitled “Ybor City: Factors Determining Slum and/or Blight Conditions.” This report summarizes the conditions that were present in the Ybor City area in 1988 which contained approximately 62 main city blocks and had about 168 structures in the area. In a subsequent report in 2000 “Ybor City Factors Determining Conditions of Slum and/or Blight” that was released by Ybor City Development Corporation and the City of Tampa.
Department of Business and Community Services, found much of the same conditions were that reported in the 1988 report to still exist in Ybor City’s Community Redevelopment Area.
Chapter 4: Camden Property Trust in Ybor City

A New Beginning for Ybor City’s Residential Redevelopment

On the morning of May 19, 2000, a six-alarm 1200-degree fire broke out at the Camden Property Trust’s Ybor City location where a major residential complex was being constructed. The massive fire, which was one of Tampa’s worst in recent history, was caused by an untrained forklift operator who accidentally cut over hanging power lines which set a patch of grass on fire (St. Petersburg Times, May 14, 2001 p. 1.B). This accident led to the destruction of the $40 million Palm apartment complex which was the original name of this residential complex. At the time of the fire, the complex was nearly one-third complete. An investigation was conducted resulting in Camden, J&W of Texas (the building contractor), and the forklift operator being collectively fined $94,500 by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). The official infraction was that Camden “…and its subcontractors failed to operate forklifts safely and to train forklift drivers” (St. Petersburg Times, October 6, 2000 p. 1.A). Camden was also cited for not implementing a fire prevention plan, or keep fire extinguishers on site.

Tampa city officials and other important groups, such as business owners, small local investors and property owners, supporting the Ybor City redevelopment project feared that “…a key part of a multiyear plan to turn Ybor
City from a one-lane, late-night keg party for teens and twenty-somethings into an urban oasis for young professionals” (St. Petersburg Times, May 20, 2000 p. 1.B) was in danger of not being fulfilled. This fear was allayed when Camden, which is fully insured by Lloyd’s of London, chose to rebuild. At the time of the decision to rebuild, Jerry Hasara, Camden's then regional vice president, stated that, "Camden is committed to Tampa and committed to the mayor's vision of Ybor City” (St. Petersburg Times, May 23, 2000 p. 1.B).

A year after the fire, the Ybor City chamber of commerce president, Annette DeLisle, looked back on the situation and noted that it "was a very frightening day for a lot of reasons...We didn't know what was going to happen. We had put all our hopes on this one development... But we bounced back pretty well” (St. Petersburg Times, May 14, 2001 p. 1.B). The fears of city officials, business owners and developers were well founded considering how much difficulty Ybor City had experienced in its two decades of redevelopment attempts, as well as the high stakes of the city’s revitalization strategy.

**The City of Tampa’s Hope for Ybor City’s Residential Development**

As shown in previous chapters, Ybor City was devastated by the decline of by the cigar industry and federal urban renewal project. This condition was exacerbated by the City of Tampa's inability to revitalize and replace the residential housing that was destroyed decades before by the federal government. The Camden Property Trust’s involvement in Ybor City was widely regarded as a vital step in the City of Tampa’s belated attempt to jump-start the
revitalization and transformation of Ybor City from an economically and socially depressed district to a vibrant residential and entertainment district. According to the *Tampa Business Journal* (May 4, 1998) “[t]he vision of Ybor City that Tampa Mayor Dick Greco has been preaching around town for years…” was finally being realized.

The vision of Dick Greco, then mayor of Tampa, was for Ybor City to be revitalized as an historic district. At the same time, Greco, who was widely regarded as Tampa’s most pro-development mayor, actively promoted the development of two other monumental projects; namely, the Hilton Garden Inn and Centro Ybor within boundaries of historic Ybor City. The mayor’s strategy was to use historic preservation to further upper-middle class residential development within a very desirable, centrally located area inside boundaries of the city. Fernando Noriega Jr., director of Tampa's Department of Business and Community Services, stated that it was hoped that such projects as Camden Apartments, new restaurants, stores and hotels would facilitate the transformation of Ybor City “…from a weekend party spot to a true upscale residential district, with restaurants and other art uses” (*Tampa Business Journal*, February 23, 1998). With the city’s Ybor redevelopment strategy in place, Camden Property Trust was cleared to successfully bid for the five city blocks of land between Palm Avenue and 12th Avenue that the City of Tampa made available for initial redevelopment (see map 4.1 below).
The siting and construction of Camden Apartments in Ybor City was part of an integrated development plan which envisaged the development of both a residential and entertainment community. In other words, the siting and development of Camden Apartment cannot be understood without consideration for the relationship it was supposed to generate with the recently opened Centro.

Map 4.1 Camden Apartments in Ybor City

Ybor and the Hilton Gardens luxury hotel. The land the Camden Property Trust acquired from the city was the result of a public bidding process. The bidding involved three companies: Post Properties of Atlanta, Georgia; Fairfield Residential Cos. of Grand Prairie, Texas; and Camden Subsidiary Inc. of Houston, Texas. All three companies had active holdings in the rental housing.
market of the Tampa Bay area at the time, with Post Properties being considered as the forerunner of urban residential development in the U.S. (*Tampa Bay Business Journal*: February 23, 1998). Mayor Greco and Ybor City’s Economic Development Specialist, Brenda Thrower, selected Camden Subsidiary Inc. over Fairfield Residential Cos. and Post Properties primarily because Camden's redevelopment proposal was favored by the Barrio Latino, Ybor City’s architectural review board. Barrio Latino found Camden’s plans to be consistent with the architecture found in the old historic district. Camden received a second endorsement from the Ybor City Development Council because the company presented the highest bid for the land and asked for no additional concession from the city (*Tampa Bay Business Journal*, February 23, 1998; interview with Ybor City Economic Development (YCDC) Specialist, April 14, 2003). In an interview, a YCDC representative explained the bidding process thus:

“…[in] the first request for proposals we got three developers interested. We had competition for the first time… But I really have to say that Camden Property and that development was really in my opinion … market comparable because at the time you had three … first rate developers… Out of all of them Camden was the one that really had the better design, they offered 5 million dollars for the land which we split with HCC (Hillsborough Community College), 2.5 million, and they did not want concessions, and it really was a win-win situation.

Both Ybor City and Camden Properties were very pleased with the outcome of the bidding process. Both sides were confident that in the long run, Ybor City would be the eventual winner in that the development of a vibrant residential community would restore some of the area’s original charm.
The Ybor City Redevelopment Corporation

The revitalization of Ybor City as a residential and commercial community could not have occurred without the advocacy of the Ybor City Redevelopment Corporation (YCDC). The YCDC is the key force behind Ybor City redevelopment efforts. This public-private growth coalition was created in October 4, 1988 by the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Tampa. The latter was an offshoot of the Department of Business and Community Services whose main mission was to encourage and advance the redevelopment of Ybor City.

YCDC is incorporated as a not-for-profit entity that serves as a resource for the city and developers who have an interest in Ybor City’s redevelopment (YCDC web site: http://www.tampagov.net/dept_ycdc). According to an employee of YCDC, the “…corporation is more or less an advisory board and a consensus group that brings together the ideas of decision making so that we go forward to the city council as on group one voice” (Interview, April 14, 2003). Furthermore, the YCDC is the City of Tampa’s “…primary vehicle for planning, promoting development, and assisting with the redevelopment of Ybor City through public and private sector offices” (YCDC: http://www.tampagov.net/dept_ycdc).

The YCDC has a Board of Directors that includes 27 members which represent developers, property owners, and business owners. The organization has several sources of funding that consist of grants, funding from the City of
Tampa, Tax Increment Finance monies, and privately sponsored funds. It also has four employees who double as board members and include a President, Economic Development Specialist, Urban Planner and Administrative Assistant, all of whom are employees of the City of Tampa. These employees are the connectors between the City, the YCDC Board, and the community and focus “… on managing short-term issues and planning for long-range goals and objectives” (YCDC web site: http://www.tampagov.net/dept_ycdc).

Some of the significant accomplishments of the YCDC in the past ten years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• The total private and public investment in the district during the last ten years has been approximately $200 million, with $124 million development resulting from RFP's on public land.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Most historic buildings have been rehabilitated and occupied, and most vacant land has been developed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Approximately 200 new business and a total of 375 business licenses in district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over 2500 new employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• About 1 million square feet of renovated space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 YCDC Progress in Ybor City. Source: (http://www.tampagov.net/dept_ycdc)

Along with these accomplishments, the goals of the YCDC are to create and promote redevelopment enticements, such as the ad valorem tax exemptions, historic preservation tax credits, an assortment of loan programs, enterprise zone tax credits, and storm water retention reductions (YCDC web site: http://www.tampagov.net/dept_ycdc). Map 4.2 shows some of the projects that
are planned, being built, and have been completed in the Ybor City redevelopment area.

Map 4.2 Ybor City redevelopment area's major projects. Source: YCDC web site (http://www.tampagov.net/dept_ycdc)

The Camden Property Trust Company

The Camden Property Trust, the company that the City of Tampa selected to revitalize Ybor City’s decimated residential community, is classified as a REIT or Real Estate Investment Trust. A REIT is “… a company dedicated to owning, and in most cases, operating income-producing real estate, such as apartments, shopping centers, offices and warehouses” (National Association of Real Estate
Some REITs also engage in financing real estate.

Camden Property Trust was established May 25, 1993, and quickly developed into a corporate conglomerate with ownership interests in development, construction, and the management of multi-family housing rental units. The company’s 2003 financial records indicate interests in 147 multi-family apartment complexes containing over 52,274 rental units in nine U.S. states (Table 4.1). Company records also indicate that for the quarter which ended March 31, 2003, (not counting properties in lease-up and under development), the company’s residential properties had an average occupancy rate of 91.4%. Map 4.3 and Table 4.2 provide a regional picture of Camden’s national properties portfolio.

Map 4.3 Camden’s holdings by state. Source: www.camdenliving.com
Out of the total of 52,274 apartment units spread across the 147 properties, Camden has actual controlling interest in 47,335 apartments in 128 properties, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Number of Apartment Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Properties</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Number of Apartment Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Properties Under Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Camden's Property Portfolio March 31, 2003
Table 4.2 Camden’s Property Portfolio. Source: data taken from Camden Property Trust’s 2003 First Quarter Report.

According to Camden Property Trust, its spatial strategy reflects “a balanced portfolio through geographic diversification and strategic product mix” (Camden Property Trust’s 2002 Annual Report, p. 23). However, as figure 4.1 shows, Houston, Texas, Las Vegas, Nevada, and Dallas Texas, have the highest percentages of Camden’s markets at 15.70%, 15.40% and 13.70%, respectively.

![Camden’s 16 Markets by Percentages](image)

**Figure 4.1** Source: Data taken from Camden’s 2nd Quarter Earnings Report 2003, p. 12.

The specific goal of Camden’s geographic diversification strategy “…is to build a stable operational base - one that lessens the financial impact from regional..."
economic cycles and assures the Company a broad platform of opportunities from which to launch future growth” (Camden website: http://www.camdenliving.com). The full extent of this strategy is evident from Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Apartment Homes</th>
<th>% of NOI Contribution</th>
<th>Average Occupancy for 2nd Quarter 2003</th>
<th>Average Rental Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WESTERN REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
<td>5,398</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>$787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>$1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, AZ</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>$809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern, CA</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>$1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>$590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CENTRAL REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>7,739</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>$690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>$803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>$742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>$758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi, TX</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>$691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>$714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EASTERN REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>4,615</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>$711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>$743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>$675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>$656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro, NC</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>$590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.3:* Data calculated from Camden’s 2nd Quarter Earnings Report 2003, p. 12.

The company’s diversification strategy is clearly designed to protect it from the volatility in the U.S. rental market. To this end, each state market contributes just
a small percentage of Camden’s total net operating income. Table 4.4 illustrates another key aspect of the company’s diversification strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Name</th>
<th>Year Placed in Service</th>
<th>Average Size</th>
<th>Market Rental Rates</th>
<th>Amenities and Community Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camden Bay</td>
<td>1997/2001</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Bay Pointe</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Bayside</td>
<td>1987/1989</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Citrus Park</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Isles</td>
<td>1983/1985</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Live Oaks</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Preserve</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Westshore</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Woods</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Ybor City</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.4 Constructed from Camden’s Tampa Properties price and available amenities source:**
Camden’s website: [www.camdenliving.com](http://www.camdenliving.com)

The table shows how Camden uses diversification as a competitive strategy by offering a wide range of residential accommodations with customized amenities, which are accessible to potential renters via a sophisticated interactive web-based point-and-click interface, unless prospective renters have access to digital technologies they will not be able to access Camden’s housing stock. The above table also shows all of Camden’s property holdings in Hillsborough County, Florida, and demonstrates how diverse the amenities and prices are from one
property to the next. The virtue of this housing product differentiation strategy is that it enables the company to hedge against the fluctuations in the housing market while at the same time appealing to a broader range of customers in a variety of price ranges, with different lifestyle amenities.

**Camden in Ybor City**

The literature of urban revitalization suggests that redevelopment, as a rule in most areas, is associated with the construction of new or rehabilitated residential housing with the goal to attract a more stable and affluent residential community to otherwise depressed urban areas. The Camden apartment complex in Ybor City is an example of this kind of urban gentrification-based redevelopment strategy. As indicated earlier, Camden Apartments is located between 18th and 21st streets and Palm Avenue and 12th Avenue in Ybor City (see map 4.2). Camden is currently the only large scale residential rental
apartment complex in Ybor, although smaller owner-occupied housing is being planned for the near future.

The Camden Property Trust’s financial documents state that approximately $45 million were spent to construct this upscale residential rental community. The property consists of 454 middle to upper income rental units that lease from about $730 for a one-bedroom to $1245 for a two-bedroom. The residences range in floor size from 635 to 1146 square feet, respectively.

![Camden Ybor City Floor Plans](www.camdenliving.com)

**Figure 4.2** Camden Ybor City Floor Plans. Source: [www.camdenliving.com](http://www.camdenliving.com)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$593</td>
<td>$727</td>
<td>$973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough County</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$601</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>$989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Ybor City</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$815</td>
<td>$1245</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The company’s financial information indicates that Camden has an average rental price of $914 a month, making it the highest rental property in the Tampa Bay, and the second highest average rental charge for Camden’s Florida holdings (Camden’s Third Quarterly 2002 Supplemental Operating and Financial Data, 2003). Table 4.5 above shows how Camden Ybor City has consistently higher rental rates than Hillsborough County and the state of Florida. Camden when compared at the county and state level it is still 27 percent higher than the average price of a one bedroom apartment and 41 percent higher than the average 2 bedroom apartment.

Table 4.5 Fair Market Rents for Florida Hillsborough County and Camden Ybor City
Source: Data calculated from the NLIH website, July 8, 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name/ Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number of Apartments</th>
<th>3Q02Avg. Occupancy</th>
<th>Rental Rates Per Home:</th>
<th>Rental Rates Per Sq. Ft:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Club</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Fountains</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Landings</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Lee Vista</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Renaissance</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Reserve</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Bay</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Bay Pointe</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Bayside</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Citrus Park</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Isles</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Lakes</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Lakeside</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Live Oaks</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Preserve</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Providence Lakes</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Camden Ybor is aimed at upper-middle income earners in the Tampa Bay metropolitan area. Admitting to Camden Ybor’s socio-economic exclusivity, David Kubin, the company’s vice-president for development in Tampa, noted to the *Tampa Business Journal* (November 30, 1999), Camden Ybor is “…aimed more at higher-wage employees than those in the service industries.” He further noted that the apartments are specifically “… geared toward downtown professionals, particularly those who will work at new facilities in Ybor being built” (Kubin, cited in *Tampa Bay Business Journal*, April 3, 2000). Confirming an often cited aspect of urban gentrification in the scholarly literature (Smith, 1996; Marcuse, 2001)

Table 4.6 Camden’s Florida Holdings. Source: Calculated from Camden Property Trust 4th Quarter 2002 Supplemental Operating and Financial Data Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Rent (%)</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Vacancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camden Westshore</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden Woods</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camden Ybor City</strong></td>
<td><strong>843</strong></td>
<td><strong>454</strong></td>
<td><strong>In Lease-up</strong></td>
<td><strong>914</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.08</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Picture: Outside of Camden in Ybor City. Source: [www.camdenliving.com](http://www.camdenliving.com)
Kubin stated that "[t]hose are the kind of people we're going to be targeting" and that "[t]here is huge appeal for people who want to live close to where they work."

Along the lines of Kubin’s observations, the new residents of Ybor City and Camden are substantially different from those living outside of the apartment complex. Multiple conversations, interviews and observations with Camden residents suggest that most renters are typically college-educated Caucasians. These observations are reinforced by demographic information collected from Camden residents which show residents’ income levels ranging between $35,000 and $74,999. Moreover, occupationally, most of residents are employed in professional or technology-base firms. What is noticeable about a significant number of Camden residents is that many are transplants from the Northeast of the U.S. Additionally, most of them are single with no children.
Chapter 5: Analysis of Demographic Data

Ybor City and the Camden Complex

As indicated in chapter two, the term gentrification usually implies certain demographic, socio-economic, and spatial changes among the residents of urban areas. This chapter will demonstrate, using several primary sources of empirical information, how the process of gentrification has manifested itself in Ybor City. This chapter will focus on socio-spatial displacement of poor minority residents by young urban white professionals who have significantly higher income and education levels (Holcomb and Beauregard 1981; Wyly and Hammel 1999). As Brian Berry (1985: 85) and Jacob Vigdor (2001) have argued, the demographic composition of the urban gentry is most often white and middle class, but more specifically they frequently are described as: (1) childless households; (2) unmarried adults; and (3) highly educated professionals.

A Glimpse of What Exists in Ybor City

This section will briefly describe what conditions exist outside of the Camden Apartment in the surrounding Ybor City area. For this analysis, data was taken from US Census 2000 for census tracts 38 and 39 in Ybor City and for Hillsborough County. Census tracts 38 and 39 were additionally broken down into block level groups, in order to gain a demographic picture of the residents in this area.
The maps, graphs, and tables below will demonstrate who the residents of census tracts 38 and 39 are by illustrating the demographic and economic differences that exist among those who live in Camden, Ybor City and Hillsborough County. The data for the first section of this chapter does not include the residents of the Camden Apartments because it only opened after the 2000 census was completed. A supplementary demographic examination of Camden’s residents will follow the census data portion of this section.

The case study of Camden Apartments and the two selected census tracts that are being used for this demographic analysis are illustrated in map 5.1.


This map represents the area of Ybor City which contains Camden Apartment Complex, as seen in green, the 7th Avenue entertainment district and the major roads that frame tracts 38 and 39. Census tracts 38 and 39 are further broken
down so that each includes the two additional block groups that results in a
detailed picture of the study area.

The subsequent table summarizes the demographic data for Ybor City
and similar to the base map uses Census 2000 to demonstrate different
characteristics of the area. It is important to note that for the demographic
section of this chapter, Ybor City is represented by census blocks 38 and 39,
even though this does not entirely correspond to the boundaries of the city.

Table 5.1 below shows the total populations for each of the four block
groups in census tracts 38 and 39. Once again it is important to note that the
numbers below do not include the population of Camden Apartments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract</th>
<th>Block Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Median Income</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Percent Below Poverty Line</th>
<th>Percent Renter Occupied</th>
<th>Median Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>$22,734</td>
<td>87.55%</td>
<td>25.46%</td>
<td>35.47%</td>
<td>$47,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>$19,615</td>
<td>93.74%</td>
<td>28.76%</td>
<td>48.02%</td>
<td>$40,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>$11,233</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>43.59%</td>
<td>92.73%</td>
<td>$27,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>$11,205</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56.05%</td>
<td>98.80%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5.1 is based on 2000 census data and represents the number of residents
as 3,085 out of a total of 998,948 for the whole of Hillsborough County. From
these figures it can be seen that census tracks 38 and 39 have a relatively small
population when compared to the county total.

As represented in this table, the income levels found in the census tracts
within Ybor City range from $11,205 to $22,734. The median income figures for
these tracts and block groups are substantially lower when compared with those
found for the whole of Hillsborough County, which has a median income of $40,663. Table 5.1 represents the percentage of minorities and shows individuals who were classified as only Hispanic, and individuals who were only Black. The census data indicates that other ethnic groups in the area did not represent a significant proportion of the area’s residents. As the shown above the area surrounding Camden in Ybor City is marked by high minority presence. All four block groups in census blocks 38 and 39 show minority populations above 80%. This is especially high when compared to Hillsborough County which only shows 32.4% minorities.

In Ybor City, the number of residents living below the poverty line is relatively high (see table 5.1), ranging from approximately 25 to 56 percent. The tract that contains Camden has the second highest rate (43.5%) for residents living below the poverty line. This condition is significantly worse than for Hillsborough County where the equivalent number of residents living below the poverty line is only 14.5%. Additionally, from the table, it can be seen that this area has an incredibly high rate of renter occupied housing. For instance, census tract 39 block groups 1 and 2 indicate 98.8% and 92.73%, respectively. The lowest values for renter occupied housing in Ybor City (35.47%) are similar to those found in Hillsborough County (32.9%).

Finally, table 5.1 shows housing values in Ybor and that there is a connection between percentages of renter occupied housing and value of properties. In this case, census tract 39 is comprised of the two block groups
having the highest renter occupied housing stock at 92.73% and 98.8%, respectively. These very same block groups also have the lowest median housing values at $0 and $27,600. The median housing values for the whole of Hillsborough County is $97,000 compared to $0 to $47,100 for Ybor City.

The above demographic analysis of census blocks 38 and 39 (Ybor City), clearly shows that this area is predominately poor, African American and Hispanic, with a large proportion of renter occupied housing that has depressed property values. These conditions are consistent with what the gentrification literature claims is necessary for an area to be considered gentrifiable. This condition is reinforced by Ybor City’s close proximity to the city of Tampa’s urban core, its architectural aesthetic and a cultural history that is like no other part of the Tampa Bay area. The following section will show that conditions which exist in Ybor City and the surrounding area are significantly different than those inside of the Camden Apartment Complex.

**Who are the residents of Camden Ybor City?**

The primary data collected about Camden residents in Ybor City apparently reinforces the claims made in the gentrification literature. As the survey data demonstrates the new residents of Camden possess a number of characteristics that are often attributed to the gentrifying class. Authors such as Zielenbach (2000), Wyly and Hammel (1999) Smith and LeFaivre (1984), Holcomb and Beauregard (1981), and Berry (1981), have illustrated that gentrifiers tends to have significantly different demographic, socio-economic, and
lifestyle characteristics from the previous residents of newly gentrified urban neighborhoods. The next section will describe the residents of Camden by using demographic data collected from interviews and surveys of 19 Camden residents. Camden Properties refused to participate in this study so no official demographic and population figures were established for the complex and all data presented in this section was taken from surveys conducted.

A classic indicator of gentrification that is frequently cited in the literature is the substantially higher income levels of new residents from those in the surrounding area or residents who have traditionally occupied the neighborhood. Gentrification scholars such as Michael Lang (1982, p.8) speak of gentrification as a process that is supported by privately funded residential developments, which results in traditionally low income neighborhoods being transformed into areas that have a pattern of higher income, rents and land values. In the previous section, table 5.1 of median income levels show that Ybor City has relatively low median income statistics, with the average of all four block groups representing a median income of just $16,194. Yet, when Camden resident’s numbers are averaged they have a median income of $46,412. Figure 5.1 illustrates the income for 17 of Camden’s residents who indicated their approximate yearly income in the survey.
Figure 5.1 Income levels for Camden residents.

This graph of figures demonstrates a wide range of incomes with the lowest at just $7,500 to the highest at $80,000. Several the residents of Camden stated that they could not disclose their true income levels; consequently, the lower income figures represent inaccurate earnings that were reported from residents. Figure 5.2 shows median incomes for all block groups in census tracts 38 and 39, Hillsborough County and Camden Apartments.
Figure 5.2 Median Incomes for census tracts 38 and 39, Hillsborough County and Camden.

The figure also shows census tracts 38 and 39 have the lowest median income values, with Camden, Ybor City coming in at the top with $46,412. As the literature suggests and as Hackworth (2002) writes, the above data suggests that gentrification is a socio-economic process in which urban space or in this case Ybor City is increasingly being produced for more affluent consumers.

Another characteristic that is typically associated with a gentrifying area is the propensity for the residents to be of a younger age. As seen below in figure 5.3 the age distribution of those living at Camden is very close together, with the youngest respondent at 18 to the oldest at 49 with the next closest being 31 years of age.
Figure 5.3 Ages for 19 Camden Residents.

The median age for the 19 Camden respondents is 27 years old. In addition to the residents of Camden young age, survey response indicated that they are all single, having never been married and no children. This is consistent with how Holcomb and Beauregard (1981) described the new urban gentry as pioneers who are usually young singles or couples without children. Additionally, the residents who took part of the survey showed relatively high levels of education with 18 out of 19 had at least some college and 12 of those having a bachelor degree or higher (figure 5.4).
Figure 5.4 Education levels of Camden residents.

As Jacob Vigdor (2000) wrote in his study of Boston and gentrification that most adults in gentrifying neighborhoods possess high levels of education with most having university degrees and occupations that are professional or managerial in nature. The Camden residents’ survey responses provide a broad range of occupations, from a club owner to a professor to sales representatives to engineers.

From the survey responses of Camden’s residents, it can be concluded that they appear to be relatively affluent professionals with disposable income that makes Ybor City the ideal location for Camden’s inhabitants to spend and be entertained. Interestingly enough, the residents who were interviewed all indicated that they were from a region outside of the southeast region with all but one not being from the northeastern United States.
Furthermore, from the data collected it can be seen that almost all survey respondents were Caucasian with only three indicated race or ethnicity as Hispanic, and with no Blacks in the sample. This data points to what several authors (Smith and LeFaivre, 1984; Holcomb and Beauregard, 1981; Kennedy and Leonard, 2001) state about the racial dimensions of gentrification, which through their research most certainly signifies racial transition and polarization. Kennedy and Leonard (2001) assert that gentrification has a strong racial element that implies dislocation of low income minority residents, by higher income white residents. These authors argue that gentrification typically affects minorities, with the higher income white households placing pressure on minority communities in newly gentrified areas. Camden Ybor City and its residents are additionally contributing to the homogenization of the area, by appealing to a predominately white, professional, young, upper-middle class populace.
Chapter 6: Analysis of Camden Resident Interviews

Introduction

The data collected for this study are from interviews conducted with the following groups: (1) residents of Camden in Ybor City; (2) business owners on 7th Avenue; and (3) local government and community leaders in Tampa. The specific interviewees were referred to the researcher by residents, individual business owners, and city agencies with specific knowledge of the Ybor City area. The interview process focused mostly on the residents of Camden, with the primary goal to discover more about their attitudes and motives for selecting Ybor City as their new place of residence. The second largest group of interviewees were business owners on 7th Avenue who had specific knowledge about Ybor City, as well as a Tampa City official, a defeated candidate for City Council, and a resident of a casita on 6th Avenue who was also the former Barrio Latino Commissioner.

What are Camden’s Residents Saying?

A significant portion of interviews conducted for this thesis were specifically targeted at residents of Camden, Ybor City. The residents of Camden were interviewed mainly because they represent the first large group of new inhabitants in Ybor City’s housing revitalization project since the 1960s. Camden's inhabitants are one of the fundamental components of the City of
Tampa and Ybor City’s urban redevelopment strategy, which calls for the construction of contemporary residential housing to attract new people to the area. The interviews (n=6) explored the residents’ motivations for selecting Camden Apartments and Ybor City as their place of residence, along with their perceptions of safety and their general views about the surrounding area. The following section summarizes interview and survey responses (n=14) and gives a glimpse of how Camden residents intersubjectively comprehend and make meaning of Ybor City.

The corporate representatives for Camden Property Trust, Inc. were contacted to participate in the study, but they refused. In addition, they would not provide any data about their residents or Ybor City. The lack of cooperation from the Camden Property Trust made conducting interviews difficult and it was apparent that access to residents would be problematic. By lowering the number of “one on one” resident interviews to six, and adding to the demographic survey with summarized interview questions, additional residents were able to participate in the study. Instead of interviewing only six residents, the revised survey with the modified questions allowed an additional 14 residents the chance to respond to vital research questions. This group of individuals might otherwise not have been able or willing to participate in longer interviews sessions, but they were able to provide a better understanding of what was happening inside of Camden.
The principal objective of targeting Camden’s residents for interviews was to gauge their perceptions and thoughts on Camden and the Ybor City area. Not surprisingly, many of the opinions voiced by the Camden’s residents are consistent with the gentrification, shopertainment and fun city literature reviewed in Chapter 2. This literature indicates that the major reasons for gentrification include living in close proximity to work and enjoying the aesthetics of the historical architecture in Ybor City.

**Entertainment and Fun: Ybor Has It All**

A key question asked of residents was their primary motivation behind choosing Camden Apartments in Ybor City as their home. A content analysis of their responses indicates that the majority of them cited Camden’s location relative to Ybor City’s entertainment district as the number one reason for renting an apartment in the area. When asked to further expound on why the location of Camden appealed to them, several answers and patterns began to emerge.

One of the predominant responses among residents was that Camden is within walking distance of the 7th Avenue entertainment district. The 7th Avenue entertainment district has a diverse assortment of nightclubs, bars, cafes, restaurants, and boutique shops along both sides of 7th Avenue and those found in the newly rehabilitated Centro Ybor. But before moving on, it is important to understand what Centro Ybor is. According to the official Centro Ybor website:

… Centro Ybor is an entertainment destination that is destined to become Tampa Bay's favorite place to relax and have fun. Centro Ybor features an exciting mix of retailers, restaurants and
entertainment venues situated around a palm-lined plaza that captures the flavor of Tampa's historic Latin Quarter. Plus, The Cigar Museum at Centro Ybor will give you a sense of the historic heritage of Ybor City while orienting you to the sights and sounds of Ybor's present (Centro Ybor: [http://www.thecentroybor.com](http://www.thecentroybor.com)).

One Camden resident stated that the Ybor City’s amenities played a large part in his decision to select Camden Apartments:

… I wanted to be in a place that [was] proximal to fine dining, clubs, nice bars and things to do … if I was to say one reason … that attracted me was the whole Ybor culture … you know there are always things to do.

Another resident replied that “the party persona” of the area had attracted him along with the “… freedom of walking down the street … to get a haircut or a sandwich or you know that city feel …” All of the interviewed or surveyed residents from Camden alluded to the convenience of being able to participate in the local nightlife, specifically the drinking culture perpetuated by the night-club industry along Ybor City’s 7th Avenue.

The attitude of many Camden residents have regarding the convenience of living in close proximity to venues that serve alcohol is revealed in a conversation that took place between two residents during an interview:

*Interview Question: Was there one particular factor that weighed heavily in your decision to move to Ybor City?*

Resident 1: Well bars have always attracted me.
Resident 2: The fact that you do not have to drive anywhere to get drunk, you can do anything you want.
Resident 1: Honestly that was a very attractive part …
Resident 2: Why did I move here? Because I am opening a business three blocks away and I do not have to bring my car when I go out to drink to the bars.
Resident 1: Is that going to be your answer to every question?
Resident 2: That has a lot to do with why I moved here …

This attitude seems to be commonly held by every one of the residents that participated in this study, with all respondents having referenced their attendance or participation in the entertainment available in Ybor City. The comments below are fairly characteristic of many of the remarks found in the survey responses of Camden residents:

Big one bedroom. Easy location to work, fun atmosphere, included pool, washer and dryer and pets are allowed. Convenience.

To avoid DUI. Bars, clubs, beer, women.

Nice people, social, nice complex, walk to bars…no driving.

Close to Ybor and work.

Looking for an urban environment, looking to meet people within same age range, brand new apartments, close proximity to bars.

The brief interview extracts and survey responses confirm David Ley’s (1996, p.52) argument that the contemporary city focuses “on consumption and amenity, not work” to attract new residents.

The ‘fantasy city’ (Hannigan 1998, p. 68) that Ybor City is marketing is one in which new residents such as those in Camden can participate in the entertainment and shopping activities of the area without having to worry about many of the negative consequences of urban entertainment, including DUIs, personal safety, the need to find parking in the city and drive home after a night out. The unrivaled popularity and location of Camden in Ybor City addresses the demands of consumers for the convenience of living in a safe and sanitized area.
that is free from the risks of participating in the ‘fun city’ fantasy (Hannigan ibid, p. 67).

The image that Camden seeks to perpetuate is that residents can be what Irving Allen (1984, p. 37) refers to as gentrifiers, who are “resident tourists” in “… search for magic, novelty, and excitement …” which leads to “… the passive use of the city as an entertainment commodity”. The magic, novelty and excitement many Camden residents experience is in fact a key attraction of 7th Avenue among many of the residents, especially in the newly constructed entertainment complexes of Ybor City, and the adjacent Channelside District. All the interviewed residents stated that they often participate in the activities offered on 7th Avenue, and often took the trolley to Channelside and other entertainment events at St. Pete Times Forum.

**Mirage or Reality? Safety in the City**

Another key issue addressed by the residents was safety in Camden and Ybor City. An analysis of their responses indicates several specific trends. First, most of the residents defined Ybor City as the area containing Camden apartments and the adjoining entertainment district on 7th Avenue. They all, notably excluded the surrounding poverty-stricken areas of Ybor City. Second, most residents felt safe in Camden and on 7th Avenue, but felt that outside of those areas, Ybor City was a dangerous place. This second theme is well illustrated in a number of comments by residents:

Safe, just do not go north of the interstate.
I feel a lot safer in here than walking down the streets late at night … in here I feel safe, it is gated and all.

[Safe] in the apartment complex.

Safe in Camden, not as safe in Ybor.

Well, ahhh, I feel really safe in Ybor, no, sorry in Camden Apartments because it is gated and there is security that make rounds and so on… but with regards to feeling safe in Ybor, no, there are pockets where I do not feel safe.

Camden safe but I own several guns, Ybor- generally safe but normally travel in groups.

The above remarks from Camden residents illustrate many of the claims in the literature on gentrification. For instance, the residents’ remarks point to the growing tensions between new and old residents who lead markedly different lifestyles. As Allen (1984, p. 38) suggests, racial and ethnic diversity in gentrifying neighborhoods is valued by newcomers only as long as the diversity is found “… around, rather that within their neighborhood” (1984, p. 38). This sentiment is clearly echoed by the observations of the Camden residents. Regarding the matter of safety, Allen notes that “[m]any prefer that irritating aspects of other lifestyles … be softened by the haze of a certain distance.” In other words, the new residents of Camden in Ybor City prefer to live in their enclave-style apartment complex, well insulated from the ‘others’ who live nearby. This is the essence of spatial exclusivity. These remarkably candid quotes lend themselves to the construction and conceptualization of an urban space that is increasingly both spatially exclusive and socio-economically polarized.
Whether it is contact with the ‘locals’ or going out for an evening of drinking and bar hopping, by living in Ybor City, the new residents of Camden can partake in the excitement found in the area. Based on Hannigan’s “McDonaldization model” where predictability and control are used to induce order and standardization in the city, making it safe for visitors and residents to participate and experience a newly commodified city space. Residents and visitors clearly know what to expect in Ybor from the newly arriving and commonly known franchise establishments (Coyote Ugly and Subway) in Centro Ybor and those on 7th Avenue. The recent franchises are increasingly replacing locally owned and operated businesses, making Ybor City a standardized, predictable and safe area for Camden’s residents to consume whatever product the city has to offer. Third, in addition to safety issues, the comments below illustrate how many of the residents perceive the area surrounding Camden, Ybor City.

Interview Question: Was the surrounding area taken into account before you selected the Camden apartment complex?

Resident 1: Yes, absolutely.
Resident 2: Ah probably the bottom line.
Resident 1: If you go across the street there [you] can probably get killed.

Resident 3: I was a little concerned for safety and security … you don’t have to travel far to be in a less than auspicious place … when I researched the apartment and saw the amenities such as a gated garage, security gates, the 24 hour on staff security. That was what swayed me to move into these apartments among what we discussed before the aesthetic appeal of the location.
Resident 4: No, no it was not taken into consideration, what attracted me was as I said earlier the aesthetics of the place. It looked from … the outside … like a nice apartment complex. Centered in a happening area and it kind of sticks out like a sore thumb, I mean there is nothing that is comparable to that down here.

As the above comments show, the surrounding area was initially a concern for some of the residents, but their fears were allayed by the amenities, security, and their ability to participate safely in the local entertainment activities that living in Camden provided. In other words, this kind of urban built environment which is predicated on safety and spatial separation from the rest of the city’s poorer neighborhoods underscores the claims in the literature about the negative socio-spatial consequence of gentrification (Smith, 1996).

The Socio-Spatial Construction of a Safe Urban Environment

The next section of Camden’s residents’ interview and survey responses demonstrate how they view their living environment. From the residents’ responses, one can see that the risk often associated with urban living has been re-packaged within a safe and predictable environment (Hannigan 1998). Ybor City’s 7th Avenue allows residents to take part in what Kowinski (1985, pp. 75, 77) speaks of as the “retail drama” where customers are more than just the audience. Rather, they are the actors who make an area exciting, attractive, and something else which is not usually mentioned in the gentrification literature, namely, urban safety.

What is interesting to note is how different the responses were about safety in Ybor City for those who participated in the survey, as opposed to those
who were interviewed. Survey respondents were more frank about their true misgivings regarding the surrounding area. Below is a sample of some responses to the anonymous survey of residents when asked: what they thought about the surrounding area:

Horrible, need to get rid of the ghetto.

Horrible looking urban blight- looks like a DMZ.

I don’t go there because it is very unsafe, especially going up 22nd by low income housing.

7th and Palm are great, the rest is poor and should be moved out … whole area should be condos, apartments and nice houses.

Not safe at all.

It is ghetto.

The surrounding area is not very nice to the north and east of us but the south and west of our complex is historic to Tampa and much nicer.

Many of the survey respondents were surprisingly frank about the undesirability of the surrounding neighborhoods. Striking a note of racial chauvinism, one respondent even noted that there were “too many Canadians” in Ybor City. The term “Canadian” is a slang expression for African Americans, implying that they were ‘foreigners.’ This alludes to what is articulated by Holcomb and Beauregard (1981, p. 41) that the new residents of a gentrifying neighborhood are “… often less tolerant of class and culture differences between themselves and the indigenous inhabitants.”
The conversation between two residents’ further demonstrates how Camden residents regard those living outside of the safe environment of Camden Apartments:

*Interviewer: So you would say that you are safe at Camden Ybor City?*
Resident 1: I feel 100 percent safe.
Resident 2: I feel a lot safer in here then I mean walking down the streets late at night… in here I feel safe it is gated and all...
Resident 1: I have heard of things happened.
Resident 2: I have heard of things happened too.
*In the complex?*
Resident 1: To people in the complex.
Resident 2: Not that it actually happened but that it could have, but who knows if they are lying or stories ... ahhh T--- who owns the company who does the bike thing....
Resident 2: Bike taxies.
Resident 1: Well one of them got jumped by a black guy, oh sorry I did not mean to say that, it could have been anybody. I just said that because that is who he said it was ... Yah, when one of the guys asks you to go to College Hill you pretty much do not want to take them there, pretty much stay in the area.

As the above conversation shows, these two residents were all too quick to assume the race of the supposed bike taxi assailant, without even knowing for sure if the story was true and the details correct. It is reasonable to conclude from this conversation that these residents see the urban spaces outside the safe confines of Camden as both unsafe and dangerous. Those of a lower socio-economic class, as referred to by Allen (1984), are “… perennially viewed as the ‘dangerous classes,’ usually is not part of the diversity sought by the new settlers” (p. 34).
Interviewed residents were asked whether they felt that there was a large difference in the population that lives inside Camden and those outside the apartment complex in Ybor City. As established in the earlier part of this chapter, the Camden residents were predominately white, middle to upper income, and highly educated professionals. Their strong implication of their views about Ybor is that those people living in the surrounding area outside Camden are racially and economically different. They are the quintessential “other.” As the comments below indicate, many of Camden’s residents believe that those people inside the complex are more entitled to the production and use of urban space than those outside of Camden (Lefebvre, 1991):

*Interview Question: Do you feel that there is a large difference in the population that lives inside Camden and those who live outside the apartment complex in Ybor City?*

Resident 1: Yup.
Resident 2: Well there really are not too many people who live outside of Camden.
*Are you aware of the Ybor City boundaries?*
Resident 2: Well I am just saying.
Resident 1: I would say the Camden is its own little community, I would say it is more upper class than a lot of the area you come on.
Resident 2: We are the cream of the crop when you compare to what is living around here.
Resident 1: You are right, you know when you compare it to what it is like down across the highway.
Resident 2: College Hill and that area.
Resident 1: Right a lot of poverty.

Resident 3: … yes you definitely have a big difference between those who are living in the Camden and those live further
north from here on 22nd street, yes there is a definite distinction.  

*In which way?*

Resident 3: Primarily in income, secondary education, in my opinion there is a correlation between the two. The people that live further down it is beyond their means to live in this type of ahh complex.

Resident 4: A definite yes... considering the locals hop the fence and come take a swim in our pool.  

*In what way are they different?*

Resident 4: Race.  

*Race?*

Resident 4: Financial.  

Resident 5: Race and financial.  

Resident 6: Yah definitely. I mean you know being a statistician I do not have the numbers it is hard for me to know ... but I think just based on anecdotal observations yah ahhh there is a difference and I think the primary difference that at least I noticed is that when you go 21st and 22nd street bridge and it is obvious that ahhh it is very densely populated with minorities.

As Irving Allen (1984, p. 35) maintains, many of the new residents of gentrified areas are “... seeking a selective, buffered, and entertaining encounter with the social diversity of city life.” Moreover, this entertainment encounter is usually predicated upon rather regressive socio-economic attitudes about race and class and the necessity of spatial exclusivity. As seen by interview and survey responses, the new residents of Ybor City exhibit overt contempt and condescending attitudes towards those individuals who live directly outside the spatial boundaries of their apartment complex. This confirms Irving Allen’s (1984, p.37) view of urban redevelopment as having “… latent potential of driving out cultural diversity and its economics often predispose development toward
homogeneity of class and way of life.” It would appear many of those living in the Camden apartments would be content with a homogenous middle to upper class community in Ybor City. To put it provocatively, their comments openly advocate urban *apartheid* in Ybor City.

As the gentrification literature suggests, a central aspect of a gentrifying neighborhood is one in which displacement of lower income and small businesses occurs. It is perhaps too early to say if this is the case in Ybor City; however, the empirical evidence points in that direction. By asking residents a question about whether they felt that the revitalization of the area had led to displacement of inhabitants and small independent businesses, one can see how those in Camden perceive what is happening in Ybor City. Here is what one resident had to say about local displacement of residents and businesses in Ybor City:

Resident: Quite the contrary I do not see it as a displacement. To answer the business part I do not see it as a displacement however business [will] gravitate towards the populace...we may see a decline in the club[s]...but we may see an increase in the restaurateurs. Businesses will flourish here it is up to the entrepreneurial spirit and knowledge of the business owner to climate (sic) his or her business for that. When it comes to the displacement of the Ybor City residents they have been displaced in my opinion in the 50s and 60s after the cigar manufactures left, they were displaced now your going to see a third and second generation where we seen the lower income prominently African American people living here... Actually they are going to be displaced we are introducing a third generation where we are going to have more of a for lack of a better term a more Yuppie community. Now my concern is that I hope that there is not going to be a view antipathy between two strata[s] meaning the higher income and lower income …
If so what do you think would be their reason for leaving the Ybor City area?

Resident: For who?

*The previous inhabitants.*

Resident: … reason for leaving if they are renting … the land lords will increase the rent they will not be able to afford it. So they will have the sensation of being displaced because it is commonsense for the landlord to maximize his or her investment that is just how it is. If they own property it would behoove them to sell it for hopefully a substantially profit, which again will be an auspicious thing for both the seller and the person who is buying it for investment purposes … For people renting here it depends at which income you are acclimated to if the rent increases and your salary remains stagnant or perhaps or worst decreases it may spur you to want to leave to move somewhere more affordable.

*Would it be wanting to leave or having to leave?*

Resident: … well some people may see it as having to leave. If I am in a predicament where my income remains stagnant or lessens I will take it upon myself to find a better income, a better paying job. If I really like living here that much I will make sure that I can afford it this is a personal choice.

*Would you say that this is an introduction of gentrification?*

Resident: Elaborate on that term.

**Gentrification is pretty much where a lower income area becomes a higher income area and the previous residents are unable to afford housing, amenities, taxes…**

Residents: I could see how umm how the lower income families will have that displacement … most of the lower income residents of Ybor City are living in the project areas and I don’t think that those areas are going to go away, they may be revitalized but they will stay there I think that primarily the homeowners…of Ybor City are just going to take advantage of a higher market that they will sell these houses.
So you think it is to their benefit in some way?

Resident: I think it is to their benefit, I really do; again my perception of course will not be consistent with someone else’s perception but I think it is to [their] benefit, I think it befits anyone (brackets added). It benefits the person going in paying what some will consider a high rent it will benefit the person selling the properties to the investor willing to either build the complex or build a house or so on and so forth and essentially it is going to benefit the community. Because it is going to introduce a higher tax base in this case these tax monies will be reintroduced into the community to help the lower income strata…by you know revitalizing their public housing or introducing programs there.

Interestingly, most other Camden residents thought that the displacement of the original inhabitants outside of Ybor City was not a problem and several even claimed it does not exist.

The final question posed to Camden residents was whether they feel that they are playing a role in the redevelopment of Ybor City. The residents spoke mostly of their economic contributions to the redevelopment project, approximately 65 percent of the interview respondents held this view. Their responses are below:

Interview Question: Do you feel like you are playing a role in the redevelopment of the area?

Resident 1: Oh I definitely do. I am building a brand new nightclub in a building that was empty for 80 years … I think we are definitely doing something to revitalize the area I going to put a brand new club in.

Resident 2: Indirectly with the money I contribute to the community … the sandwich that I buy or the haircut that I will get… I
would not if I was commuting like I had been previous to moving here. So in that sense yes inadvertently contributing...

Resident 3: We are getting Brighthouse, TECO, we give the valet trash guy [money]. I mean all these other people are coming in and making money off of us.

Resident 4: We are adding money here, we are coming into all the businesses in Ybor by going there all the time...

Resident 3: Yah, I am spending money every single weekend if none of us lived here I would not spend three nights, four nights a week at Elmer’s ...

Resident 4: The bars make a lot of money off of Camden residents.

The residents of Camden feel that for that their most important contribution to the redevelopment project is indirect economic involvement. The money and time they spend as a result of living at Camden, is what they cite as a contributing factor to making this project successful.
Chapter 7: Analysis of What Others are Saying About Ybor City

Debating Ybor City: A Model of Sustainable Urban Redevelopment?

This chapter will focus on the views of those people not residing in Camden, Ybor City. This group includes three business owners with shops on 7th Avenue, an economic development specialist from the Ybor City Development Corporation, a failed candidate for Tampa’s City Council who also lives in the area, and a resident of a Casita on 6th Avenue that was a former Barrio Latino Commissioner. Several key issues were explored with this group of interviewees. Shown below are their perceptions, thoughts and opinions about the redevelopment of Ybor City, including the displacement of poor residents, the value of the 7th Avenue entertainment district, and the new trolley system. The group’s views regarding what was happening in Ybor City were diverse and often conflicting. Their interviews provide an alternative understanding of Ybor City’s redevelopment prospects. As before, their views regarding this issue differed greatly.

Redevelopment: Views On How And Why It All Started

The only city official, the economic specialist from the Ybor City Development Corporation (YCDC) who was willing to be interviewed, gave an interesting perspective on how the redevelopment project started and the
reasons Ybor City was selected for revitalization. The following excerpts offer a
glimpse into the reasons for Ybor’s redevelopment:

*Interview Question: What was the main reason for initiating a revitalization project?*

YCDC Official: Being a National Historic Landmark District, ah we wanted to bring something there were a lot of different factors a lot of different groups but mainly historic preservationists, the tourism folks, ah the preservation over that probably if anything. Ah, bring back ah a lot of people that were born and raised in Ybor City there is a lot of personal reasons why people wanted to bring this district back. We have a museum, we have ah all these beautiful architecture and all the old buildings, the social clubs all of that added to why Ybor should be saved.

*Interview Question: What was the initial strategy or vision for such a project?*

YCDC Official: Preserving its history, preserving its architecture, and making it a place, a destination, probably all that.

This perspective is fairly conventional (Leichenko, Coulson, and Listokin, 2001), namely, redevelopment of the area was based on the ability to retain and preserve the history of the area and to attract those who were born back into Ybor City. However, as the previous chapter has shown, this is increasingly unlikely to happen given the social attitudes of the newly gentrified residents of Camden Apartments. At any rate, the YCDC official further explains the logic behind the construction of residential housing in Ybor City in an opening monologue about the project:

YCDC Official: [I]n residential or in Community Development Areas you would think that you would need the people there first, in order to have the commercial...our scenario was totally opposite. We had to have the commercial that drove the
residential in the sense that from a development point of view, because this area became marketable the minute they (banks and financial institutions) saw other things were happening. Oh well hold on the hotels are investing and the city investing in a garage, we are doing a streetscape project and we are building a streetcar. You know this is a hot place, this is good, this is a good investment. So, that is what really drove it. I mean [Camden] is a rental community it would have been nice to have condominiums but at the time that was what we were really looking for, just to put people in the district and have a major project.

The YCDC’s perspective on the residential redevelopment of the area was that the existing commercial establishments were the driving force behind the revitalization of Ybor City as a residential community. Once the interest of investors and business owners were secured, the preservation of the historical and architectural aspects of the area could occur and new residential developments would follow. It is the classical, build-it-and-they-will-come mentality which is pervasive in the gentrification and revitalization industry today.

**The Winners and Losers of Ybor City Redevelopment**

One resident from the adjacent Ybor Heights neighborhood and a one-time candidate for Tampa’s City Council, was able to give an alternative description and chronology of how Ybor City evolved during the 1980s, 1990s, to its the current conditions:

Local Resident: To give you a brief history … in the late 1970s, a lot of artists starting moving in to take advantage of the cigar factories spaces…The [early] 80s it pretty much was a ghost town there was this blossoming underground culture the late 80s early 90s a few venues opened up there was a couple of shops that along 7th avenue … there was a blossoming subculture down here and a lot of kids would come down here because it was something new and different that they...
couldn’t get in the suburbs. It started to get popular by the mid 90s that a lot of these investors started…picking up on wow this is [the] place. Even though it was neglected for so long they saw dollars signs in there eyes because they started to see all these people coming down here and they thought well what can we do to get more people down here … instead of changing the variance so that they had mixed uses they could have fostered a true community … they decided give out something like 52 liquor licenses in a two-year period. So they converted a ghost town into a drinking mall district so people on the weekends could come down and get trashed after work and go back to their suburban homes afterwards. In the same time fostering drunk driving and the people who lived down here and the surrounding areas got even the only way they knew how. There were a lot of break-ins of cars wow look at these nice cars down here all of a sudden; a lot of stereos got ripped off and a lot of the customers who were frequenting some of the shops were getting disgusted by these bars opening up, the drunken brawls on the streets and a massive influx of people and it really was a different kind of crowd that you were getting down here before that … So there was this really bazaar dichotomy happening and then the gentrification started and the gentrification always starts by the artists, the musicians, the punks, the counter culture people who come into an area because they are risk oblivious and they are willing to live in areas that are undesirable for people who have more money and what I saw happen is that there was a community that was blossoming down here that was grassroots that was being in some way self sufficient … all of that got destroyed when it got turned into a bar district.

The view is echoed by an inhabitant of Ybor City who has been active in organizing residents in the neighborhood as the president and founder of the Ybor City homeowners association and first hand participant in the Ybor City redevelopment project as a Barrio Latino commissioner. He focuses on the multiple effects that have resulted from Ybor City’s redevelopment:

Former Barrio Latino Commissioner: I saw [the City of] Tampa turn Ybor City into a bar zone and an entertainment district; they
call it an entertainment district it is preposterous; it is a historic district, it is the central part of Ybor City. The changes I have seen, have been for both good and bad. When you go back to the mid 80s the city stepp[ed] in and created a false condition that is not part of the evolution, which was that, they removed the minimum distance requirement (a zoning term for the smallest distance allowed between businesses such as bars and nightclubs) ... it was a bad idea. I mean I am very much a purist when it comes to preservation and history ... I would love to see people build single family homes here again. I think good could come from certain kinds of high-density residential development[s]. I do think that it is unfortunate that the city has not taken into consideration in its zest for development it has not taken into consideration low and middle income individuals; there is no doubt that they are getting displaced. Now mostly, they are getting displaced by property owners, who obviously are making money as property values increase. My neighbor who lives next to me is 70, a Blackman, who grew up in this neighborhood; he was born in this neighborhood. [For] 80 years, he lives in a little shotgun next door to me, he never though that his house would be worth 100,000 or 200,000 dollars; this is almost absurd. Does it do him any good? He has got to sell the house, but he does not want to do that. So he will probably die with this highly assessed value of his property and his heirs will probably get it. Does he have better neighbors than he has ever had? Probably he does, cleaner nicer neighbors than before. So, he would probably say that gentrification in that sense is good for him. But I do think that there should have been some system in place to care of those lower middle income people, but I am not sure what that system is.

As this interviewee indicates, there are some noticeable benefits for particular residents of Ybor City. As one Camden resident acknowledged earlier, owners of property in the Ybor City area stand to gain the most from rising housing values. When the issue of residents being displacement was posed to the above group of interviewees, their answers varied. Consider the views of the economic
development specialist from the YCDC as to whether displacement of residents in Ybor City is occurring.

YCDC Official: Ah yes and no, first of all we did not have a really strong residential community ... it is interesting if you look at the south of 6th area; this was heavy commercial; there are residents all in here, [zoning] does not even recognize the residential ... There are residents that have lived down here for 80 years to 90 years; their homes have been in the families forever, a lot of these residential units are casitas and they were vacant or renters. So they were being used not necessarily as primary residences. There is a little more of a residential component but again there is a lot of rentals (pointing towards the area east of 22nd street). Ah, so do I think, yes the market values have definitely risen, yes, definitely new people can not afford it if they are buying a house today, or if they are renting; landlords are upping their rent. A lot of them own their houses out right, so in that case they sell their land. For to them, it is like their little casita which costs $20,000 and has been paid off for 30 years, is worth $200,000 now. Ah, it is if they chose to move out in many cases ... There is a whole bunch of different situations, but I cannot say if there is a strong enough residential community to make a difference. We were so blighted, and so vacant ... And a lot of them were homesteaded; some of them did not pay any property tax. They were valued under $25,000, if anything, the property values have gone up, they are outrageously high in the district, more so than the average in Hillsborough County.

As this city official makes amply clear, any displacement that has or is occurring in Ybor City is minimal and beneficial to those who have the ability to make huge profits off the sale of their residences. When asked about she thought were the residents’ reasons for leaving, the economic development official emphasized the economic investment aspects of the area.

YCDC Official: Now you can make a killing off of your property. Sure the property values. In Ybor City, right now Ybor City is considered an investment, it was an investment 5 or 6 years
ago. You had in ... 1996 you had little *casitas* that were valued at and selling at $25,000 to $30,000. Within that very short period of time, they had quadrupled into the 100’s and they are now selling for 200,000; the values have been all over the board. Ybor is hot. People want to move in here. Yes, there are people who are moving in that have not necessarily lived here before. Ah, I do not see a lot of people leaving, I feel like people are holding on to their property waiting for a windfall (laughing) to come down. It is an investment; it really is at this point. I do not think it really makes much of a difference who has lived here because there really has not been that many people who have left.

This and many other extracts with this city official represents the growing instrumentalization of urban revitalization across the U.S. She does not even bother to consider the fate of those individuals who cannot afford to buy their residences. While she recognizes that renters who are paying below market rent will more than likely have to leave when the properties they are renting are sold to an investor, she is equally sanguine about their fate. This seems to go along with what the one resident of Camden articulated in the previous chapter, namely, that any displacement of residents was counteracted by the return of investment monies in the form of taxes the city would gain and the profits the investor would retain from selling the property. As mentioned above, the YCDC representative briefly brings up the issue of those *casita* owners who are homesteaded and pay little or no taxes on their properties as a justification for displacement.

One local resident speaks about how revitalization is affecting Ybor City and the residents in his own neighborhood adjacent to Camden Apartments.
Local Resident: I think that the latest gentrification cycle probably displaced a lot of people and I think that it is still happening on the outskirts of Ybor City and south of 7th avenue … to some extent as investors start buying up a lot of the properties to the north side and what I am seeing in my neighborhood [is] it is spreading out like a bacteria and it is happening slowly we are in the midst of it … depending on how the economy goes it could speed up or slow down.

Interestingly, this resident likens gentrification and displacement to a bacterial plague that is dependent on economic factors for whether it will extend further and infect other areas or adjoining neighborhoods. YCDC’s economic specialist describes the main investors, or as some might say, the displacers, in Ybor City as “… a mix [of] investors, out of town people … a lot of wealthy people buying stuff up.” This process is clearly reflected in the demographics of the renters who live in Camden, namely, white affluent professionals, who for the most part are relocating to Ybor City from outside Florida.

Amenities and Entertainment in Ybor City

The group of individuals interviewed for this section were asked to give their opinions on the amenities of the Ybor City entertainment district, including 7th Avenue, Centro Ybor, the trolley, and the Channelside entertainment complex. Each respondent offers fascinating insights about the redevelopment strategies in Ybor City.

*Interview Question: In your opinion what value do projects such as Centro Ybor, Camden Apartments and the Trolley bring to the area?*

YCDC Official: They bring a focus, they bring international and national recognition; they totally tap into a market that is beyond the local market, which we would love for the local market to support; Ybor as well but that is the tougher battle
for the international market. But number one Camden was residential and we needed that; we did not have any of that; we did not have a rental community out here ah safe, new, you know, [a] new community. Centro Ybor brings together the national retailers; they bring an element that yes it may not be as unique to Ybor City but they have done a really good job as to creating a center for the district and mind you that this center was the dead zone at one time so there was nothing between this area; it was actually called the dead zone so that brought that and prompted our first parking garage. The street car – I cannot talk more highly of it; it is wonderful. I mean, it is really beyond Ybor City because it connects three districts that were always seen as three separate districts; now it is Ybor City, the Channel district and downtown. It takes away the seams and creates an economic development tool ah we hope to see a lot of development along the street car tracks and it is a novelty hardly any city can do this; we are so lucky to have this opportunity with the street car; they are doing wonderful, they are exceeding expectations everyday.

The YCDC’s official sees a lot of good in the amenities found in the surrounding area. For instance, amenities bring people in, make the area known, and offer an exciting original tourist attraction that blends well known international retailers with the local shopping industry.

The next view regarding the revitalization of Ybor City is from the former president of the Ybor City homeowners' association.

Former Barrio Latino Commissioner: … I think the trolley brings significant value; it connects downtown and the port with Ybor City. There was a trolley here historically…it is a people mover; it gets people out of cars, it reminds people of how we once traveled; so I really like the trolley. … in Camden I see the need for high density residential construction; it is just the way of our times; we have more humans you know and it is located ok … I would prefer to see high density residential and parking garages way out on the exterior of Ybor City almost out of the neighborhood and then you tram them in you know you do not go to Disney World and drive
up to the front door … Ahh cars have taken their toll on Ybor City; it was not designed to handle this kind of traffic; it was designed to handle some traffic but not like this ... I have mixed feelings about Camden. I, in some sense, like it because I like the idea of a large number of people … it was not many years ago that I basically knew everybody who lived here. …it is different; it has changed the dynamics so in many ways it is positive … but just something that would allow lower to middle income people there a little more accessible. Camden is not too bad, a little pricey …

While this resident has mixed feelings about Ybor’s redevelopment, he ultimately does not disapprove of ongoing attempts to change the atmosphere of the area. Thus, overall, he is positive, yet cautious about the area’s long-term viability. However, like the YCDC official, he overemphasizes the benefits of gentrification and underemphasizes the costs to the original inhabitants of the area.

The only respondent who consistently questions the self-evident benefits of Ybor City’s gentrification is a local resident from the adjacent neighborhood who failed in his recent bid to become a city council member for the Ybor Heights municipal district. His view of gentrification represents a total divergence from the optimistic assessments of the previous respondents.

Local Resident: Well, I think that the trolley was a colossal mistake. We have a public transportation system in Tampa that is 30 years behind. People still have a hard time getting to work and back because we have a sprawled out city. But the trolley was a part of a gentrification and redevelopment package that was strictly aimed at tourists and they are trying to connect the Channelside venture which is just another replica, another façade to me in a lot of ways as I have seen Ybor City when I was growing up down here. I see the Ybor City of today and I think that they just put a hologram on all the old buildings and I am waiting for someone to smash the hologram machine and everything will go back to normal and maybe it will eventually go back to
what it was. I think Centro Ybor is going to fail; I think it is going to be a ghost town or flea market in a few years because the economy cannot support it. Whoever decided to put two 16 theater Cineplexs a mile a part from each other was an idiot… It [is] doomed to failure. I think the trolley did it. If it brings value to the area it might bring some tourist dollars; it might do some good things for some of the businesses along the trolley route… but the idea of the trolley to begin with I think was misguided. I think that there needed to be much more public debate on the trolley…I think we should have been allowed to vote on it because there are a lot of areas of town that need public transportation desperately and here we are spending. The latest estimate was 50 some million on the trolley and I would like to see it expand to other parts of town. I mean it might work but it is not rapid; nobody gets to work and back; it is strictly for tourists, it is not even for the residents who live here. Our tax dollars are funding it; it is costing us more money than it brings us in value. Centro Ybor, oh my God, that is the crown jewel of gentrification right there. Centro Ybor, the people who live in the inner city cannot afford to go to Centro Ybor they cannot afford the restaurants there, the comedy club, there movies…and if they do [go] they are really having to spend a lot of their income by going. There is very little frequency by the people who live here. As far as Camden goes … I think it was in a sense one of those backroom deal[s]. They were looking at making Centro Ybor fly. How are we going to make Centro Ybor fly when the residents of Ybor City are all poor? Well, we could put in some up scale apartments and then we will have people who will go and spend their money down there; you know, its really a misguided economic development policy and in the long run I think it is going to fail but we will see nothing happens overnight and Ybor City is still changing rapidly. The problem I think that is very racist in general and what it is doing is pushing the low income residents out. It is class warfare when you get down to; it is pushing low income residents further north and east so that the middle class or the upper middle class can have this bastion where they feel safe…

This respondent offers the clearest articulation of both spatial exclusion and socio-economic displacement (Smith, 1996). He also touches on the economic
and political rhetoric which is often used to justify city redevelopment for those who have access to investment capital and professional careers. This excerpt offers a damning indictment of Ybor City as a sustainable urban redevelopment strategy.

The two final respondents, the business owners along 7th Avenue, offer the conventional view of gentrification and revitalization, that is, build-it-and-they-will-come, as well as trickle-down development.

Business Owner 1: People. Yah people, well the trolley is definitely a people carrier so you know … it has a curiosity … a lot of people are riding it so their curiosity brings them to Ybor, then hopefully, they get off and walk around. The Camdens has brought business from those places, you know, the apartments.

Business Owner 2: Well number one, they bring more people to the area. The old adage – location, location, location. The more people I can get to walk in front of my store, you are going to hear my register ring more.

This view is indicative of business owners along 7th Avenue. They equate gentrification with the economic value that these projects bring to their shops, with added business opportunities and earnings. In other words, for this group, urban revitalization is nothing more than profit and market share.

Based on the above interview extracts, it is clear that the gentrification and revitalization of Ybor City is widely seen as a positive development for the area and for the city of Tampa as a whole. Not surprisingly, the most positive view comes from the YCDC official in charge of economic development, as well from
the business community. For this group, the city is increasingly a site for those who can afford the new entertainment amenities, high income housing consumption, and global tourism. The corollary is that the poor and unemployed are increasingly viewed as obstacles to redevelopment and urban progress.

What is notable among supporters of urban revitalization is their enthusiasm for physical and an esthetic improvement to the built environment. For instance, the former Barrio Latino Commissioner speaks highly of the trolley project, but seems completely oblivious of the transportation needs of existing residents who have lived in Ybor City for generations. In the end, it was the resident of Ybor Heights who raised serious doubts about the sustainability of entertainment districts like Centro Ybor. As a matter of fact, his prediction was eerily prescient. A few months ago, the city of Tampa revealed that Centro Ybor was effectively bankrupt and in serious arrears with its payments to its creditors (St. Petersburg Times: January 9, 2004). The City of Tampa is now responsible for paying back huge amounts of money since the owners of Centro Ybor can no longer make their loan payments. And yet, in the face of the failures, the business community continues to maintain that projects like Camden Apartment and Centro Ybor are economic boons for the city of Tampa.
Chapter 8: Conclusions

It is easy to conclude from the findings in the previous chapters that Ybor City is transitioning from a blue-collar, cigar-manufacturing town into a white-collar, post-industrial entertainment and "boutique city" (Sandercock, 1997). Its Latin working class ethnic identity and history have been commodified and marketed by the local government, business owners and private developers to draw tourists, daytrippers and most recently white professional class residents.

As the first of several planned housing developments in Ybor City, Camden has become a model for the wider redevelopment and growing gentrification of the area. In this respect, Camden Apartments in Ybor City is playing a pivotal role in reshaping the geography and sociology of Ybor City. Geographically, the area is being transformed into a high-value entertainment district which is comprised of expensive hotels, boutiques, high-end consumer restaurants, and exclusive nightclubs. Sociologically, the area is becoming a magnet for white professionals with vast amounts of disposable income. In addition, many of these individuals have decided to reside in the new luxury rental condominiums adjacent to the historic and new entertainment district. We may coin a new term to describe this gentrifying class, namely, “residential tourists,” that is, individuals who reside in the same space where they are at the
same time the major consumers of urban entertainment amenities (see Judd and Fainstein, 1999).

As chapter six shows, this incipient community of urban residents is increasingly fostering an atmosphere of class and racial exclusivity. Intolerance for the indigenous lower income groups is a key characteristic of this transformation of Ybor City. In fact, the previous Latino and African American majority communities of Ybor have been progressively transformed into a new urban minority underclass as a direct effect of gentrification (Knox and Pinch, 2000). This ‘othering’ is steadily leading to what David Sibley (1995) has referred to as “geographies of exclusion.” The new residential tourists of Ybor City’s Camden Apartments no longer reflect the historical demographic make-up of the area that used to be comprised of working class, ethnic minorities.

The urban imaginary of the residents presented in the interview and survey data are seemingly consistent with the gentrification and shoptainment literature review in Chapter 2. Their socio-demographic characteristics, opinions, and views are in line with the works of Zielenbach (2000), Wyly and Hammel (1999) Smith and LeFaivre (1984), Holcomb and Beauregard (1981), and Berry (1981). These authors have demonstrated that social groups who are attracted to gentrifying neighborhoods tend to have significantly different demographic, socio-economic, and lifestyles characteristics from the previous residents of gentrified urban neighborhoods.
The residents of Camden, Ybor City noticeably exhibit what the gentrification literature points to as yuppies or the urban gentrity (Holcomb and Beauregard 1981; Wyly and Hammel 1999; Brian Berry 1985; and Jacob Vigdor 2001). Their growing presence in the city is contributing to a new round of socio-spatial displacement of poor minority residents from the inner city. The new residents bring with them distinctly different lifestyles which are marked by high levels of cultural capital preferences and consumption norms (Hamnett 2000, p. 336 and Berry 1985; Boschken, 2003). Their lifestyle is in sharp contrast to residents in the area surrounding Camden Ybor City, which are still predominantly settled by poor African American and Hispanic minorities who live well below the poverty line. The sharp dissimilarity between the residents of Camden Ybor City and those in the surrounding area is one of the hallmarks of socio-spatial polarization in the wake of gentrification and urban revitalization.

Some would disagree about how extensive the gentrification of Ybor City is, or they might argue that it is too early to conclude what result the revitalization project will produce. Yet the evidence, albeit limited, provided in this preliminary study shows that there is some support from the claim in the gentrification literature that socio-spatial exclusion and socio-demographic displacement are two of the main outcomes of this process wherever it occurs. Additionally, the new urban environment in Ybor City is not only based on exclusivity, where there is a distinct polarization between the haves and have-nots, it is also leading to
the privatization of public amenities in the city and, therefore, limiting access for those who do not possess capital.

In conclusion, it is worth mentioning that this study has obvious limitations. The main shortcoming is that it focuses on the “winners” of gentrification. Future research is needed to explore and understand the experiences of the “losers” of gentrification and urban revitalization projects. Moreover, given that this study was a primarily qualitative in nature, and that the demographic data collected from residents of Camden Ybor City, not to mention the census data, were for the most part illustrative tools and not presumed to be used for an in-depth qualitative analysis. Consequently, future research should focus on developing a fuller statistical analysis based on a much wider sample of residents to provide a more comprehensive understanding of gentrification. It is worth noting that restricted access to Camden residents did not allow for a statistically significant sample to be collected. Future research would most definitely have to address these, as well as provide an up-date of how the gentrification of Ybor City is evolving and expanding.
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Appendix A: Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Camden Residents:

1. How long have you lived at Camden Ybor City?
2. What were some of the reasons you decided to rent an apartment at Camden Ybor City?
3. Where did you move from?
4. Was there one particular factor that weighed heavily in your decision to move to Ybor City?
5. What would you say is the greatest benefit to living in Ybor City?
6. In your opinion what value do projects such as Centro Ybor, Camden Apartments and the Trolley bring to the area?
7. Was the surrounding area taken into account before you selected the Camden apartment complex?
8. Do you often take part in the entertainment and leisure activities of the Ybor City area?
9. What would you say is the activity you most frequently participate in?
10. Do you feel that there is a large difference in the population that lives inside Camden and those who live outside the apartment complex in Ybor City?
11. How safe do you feel in Ybor City and at Camden apartments?
12. Since your residency at Camden have you seen any changes to Ybor City?
13. If so, what have they been and how do you feel they are affecting the community?

14. Do you think that the city of Tampa could benefit from more revitalization projects similar to the one in Ybor City?

15. Camden Ybor City is one of the first residential apartment complexes in Ybor making you one of the initial residents of the newly revitalized Ybor City; do you feel like you are playing a role in the redevelopment of the area?

16. From what you have seen, do you feel that the revitalization of the area has led to displacement of the historical inhabitants and small independent businesses?

17. If so what do you think would be their reason?

*Interview Questions for Business Owners:*

1. How long has your business been in Ybor City?

2. Do you live in Ybor City or just work here?

3. What were some of the reasons you decided to open your business in Ybor City?

4. Was there one particular factor that weighed heavily in your decision to maintain your business in Ybor City?

5. What would you say is the greatest benefit to working in Ybor City?

6. Was the surrounding area taken into account when you selected Ybor City as a location?

7. Since your time in Ybor what changes have you seen to the area? Do you feel that they are affecting the community?

8. From what you have seen do you feel that the revitalization of the area has led to displacement of the historical inhabitants and business owners?

9. If so what do you think would be their reasons?
10. Do you think that the city of Tampa could benefit from more revitalization projects similar to the one in Ybor City?

11. Do you as a small business owner feel like you are playing a role in the redevelopment of the area?

12. In your opinion what value do projects such as Centro Ybor, Camden Apartments and the Trolley bring to the area?

13. In your own opinion how does the redevelopment of Ybor City affect your business?

14. Would you say that the City of Tampa is supportive of small businesses in the area?

15. In recent months there has been talk that Ybor City once again is on the decline, especially of the bar, nightclub and entertainment scene would you agree with this line of thought?

16. What do you see Ybor transforming into for its next stage of redevelopment?

*Interview Questions for City Officials:*

1. How was Ybor City selected for redevelopment was there a specific turning point?

2. What was the main reason for initiating a revitalization project in Ybor City?

3. What was the initial strategy or vision for such a project? What are the long-term goals of the revitalization project?

4. What support has your corporation provided to developers looking to take part in the revitalization of Ybor City?

5. Was the surrounding area taken into account when you selected Ybor City as a location?

6. From what you have seen do you feel that the revitalization of the area has led to displacement of the historical inhabitants?
7. If so what do you think would be their reason for going elsewhere?

8. With the completion of The Camden Apartment complex in Ybor City (a higher income housing development) and the flight lower income residences and small independent businesses do you feel that this is an indication of the gentrification of Ybor City?

9. Is there a way in which a more equitable redevelopment strategy could be implemented so that the area could once again foster diversity and difference, and not cater to higher income consumers and residents?

10. Do you think that the city of Tampa could benefit from more revitalization projects similar to the one in Ybor City? Are there anymore plans in the works?

11. In recent months there has been talk that Ybor City once again is on the decline, especially of the bar, nightclub and entertainment scene would you agree with this line of thought?

12. What do you see Ybor transforming into for its next stage of redevelopment?

13. In your opinion what value do projects such as Centro Ybor, Camden Apartments and the Trolley bring to the Tampa Bay Area?

**People with knowledge of Ybor City:**

1. Since your time in Ybor what changes have you seen to the area? Do you feel that they are affecting the community?

2. From what you have seen do you feel that the revitalization of the area has led to displacement of the historical inhabitants and business owners?

3. If so what do you think would be their reason for going elsewhere?

4. Do you consider that the loss of the lower income residences and small independent businesses is an indication of the gentrification of Ybor City?

5. Is there a way in which a more even redevelopment strategy could be implemented so that the area could once again foster diversity and difference, and not cater to higher income consumers and residents?
6. Do you think that the city of Tampa could benefit from more revitalization projects similar to the one in Ybor City? Is so where?

7. In your opinion what value do projects such as Centro Ybor, Camden Apartments and the Trolley bring to the area?

8. In recent months there has been talk that Ybor City once again is on the decline, especially of the bar, nightclub and entertainment scene would you agree with this line of thought?

9. What do you see Ybor transforming into for its next stage of redevelopment?

10. What would you say is the major misgivings about Ybor City's redevelopment?
Appendix B: Demographic Survey for Interviewed Camden Residents

Sex:  MALE ___ or  FEMALE ___  Age: _____________

Race/ Ethnicity: ____________________________________________

Region or county of origin ______________________________________

Martial Status:  SINGLE ___  MARRIED ____  DIVORCED _____

Children:  YES ____  or  NO ____
If yes how many? __________

Highest Level of Education (Please circle the best answer):

SOME HIGH SCHOOL
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
SOME COLLEGE
ASSOCIATES DEGREE ONLY
BACHELORS DEGREE ONLY
GRADUATE DEGREE
OTHER _____________

Occupation: _________________________________________________

Approximate Annual Income (Please circle the best answer):

$0 to 14,999 $15,000 to 24,999
$25,000 to 34,999 $35,000 to 49,999
$50,000 to 74,999 $75,000 to 99,999
$100,000 to 149,999 $150,000 or more  Other _____________

Number of years either residing, working or visiting the Ybor City area? ____________
If more than one of the above please specify ______________________________

________________________________________
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**Appendix C: Demographic Survey of Camden’s Residents who were not interviewed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex: MALE ___ or FEMALE ____</th>
<th>Age: _______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ Ethnicity: ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Status: SINGLE _____ MARRIED _____ DIVORCED _____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children: YES ____ or NO _____ If yes how many? ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highest Level of Education (Please circle the best answer):**

- SOME HIGH SCHOOL
- HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE
- SOME COLLEGE
- ASSOCIATES DEGREE ONLY
- BACHELORS DEGREE ONLY
- GRADUATE DEGREE
- OTHER _______________

**Occupation:** _______________________________

**Approximate Annual Income:** $_____________________

**How long have you been residing in Camden Ybor City? _______________

**What were some of your reasons for renting an apartment at Camden Ybor City?** _________________________________________________________________

**What would you say is the greatest benefit to living in Ybor City?** ________________________________

**What kind of entertainment and leisure activities do you take part in the Ybor City area and how often?** _________________________________________________________________

**How safe do you feel in Ybor City and at Camden apartment?** ________________________________

**What about the surrounding area?** _________________________________________________________________