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ABSTRACT

USES OF SACRED SPACES IN URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS:
A STUDY OF CEMETERIES IN UPTOWN DALLAS

Huei-Chung Cheng, MLA

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2013

Supervising Professor: Dr. Pat D. Taylor

This study examines residents’ perceptions regarding potential uses of sacred spaces. It further investigates a cemetery’s visual impact on residents in high-density urban environments. Historically, cemeteries have provided open space to urban residents, and have become intertwined with the spaces where humans live and work and they have come to provide historical significance to urban space (Harker and Merollı 2010). As rituals and methods of disposing human remains change, the ways people use cemeteries or burial spaces also change. Specifically as alternative uses for cemeteries are emerging, along with changes in attitudes toward commemoration burial sites in contemporary culture (Basmajian and Coutts 2010). The sexton, Smith rejects the idea that his facility is only for somber reflection. Rather, he sees it as an open space resource that can be used for something other than interments (Harker and Merollı 2012). Cases like Mt. Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn, New York, are primarily manicured and sculpted green spaces within those cities. They and other Contemporary cemeteries have adopted various ‘useful’ applications, yet they also remain highly complex and ambiguous spatio-temporal enclosures (Johnson 2012).

Research indicates a high demand for parklands within and around pre-existing
cemeteries in highly-developed urban areas (Basmajian and Coutts 2010). Previous cemeteries constructed on the outskirts of cities due to metropolitan expansion in these cases cemeteries come to population centers compete for the same desirable land (Basmajian and Coutts 2010; Northway 2005; Francaviglia 1971). Since 1874, a cluster of historical cemeteries Greenwood, Calvary, Emanuel historic cemeteries, and Freeman Memorial Park have existed in the Uptown area of Dallas, an area which has become a high-density vibrant, mixed-use part of the city. Occupying two city blocks in Uptown, those historical cemeteries are a green open space with activities limited primarily to burial grounds and a walking trail. The area surrounding cemeteries provides a rich opportunity to examine the perceptions of residents regarding to potential uses cemeteries can provide.

This study uses open ended interviews to gain an understanding of residents’ perceptions regarding potential uses of cemeteries. Interview questions focus on interviewee’s viewpoints of utilization of cemetery space and visual impact of cemetery to them. The study involves perceptions of people who live in the surrounding area of those cemeteries because they can provide everyday observations and perspectives to those cemeteries. The perception also gives people information about their environment, it enables people to form beliefs and make judgments about how things are in their immediate surroundings (Crane 1992).

This study establishes a better understanding of how people see potential uses for cemeteries and how to respond to existing uses of cemeteries in Uptown Dallas. After analyzing interview data, the study concludes that through better integrating the landscape of death into community life, and enhancing the burial sites, and cemeteries can better serve the neighborhood and green infrastructure, enriching sacred spaces in an urban community.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This thesis reviews residents’ perceptions regarding potential uses of cemeteries in high-density urban environments, and further evaluates uses and potential uses of cemetery spaces. Interviews and literature expose opportunities for using cemeteries and help uncover potential limitations of their uses in an urban area. Problem statements highlight issues between existing cemeteries and urban spaces as well as factors causing visual and spatial disconnections between existing cemeteries and communities. Examining perceptions of people who reside near existing cemeteries in urban area serves as a guide for developing fundamental research questions in this study.

This study investigates whether perceptions can be attributed to a change in views held by individuals or communities (Feld and Basso 1996). The way a person comprehends surroundings and the associated value placed on landscapes appear to be intimately connected with the way a person perceives landscapes. This in turn, appears to relate to an individual’s landscape experiences (Penning-Rowsell and Lowenthal 1986). Furthermore, this study analyzes opportunities and limitations from residents’ attitudes and preferences regarding uses of pre-existing cemeteries, particularly in cemeteries located in rapid changing urban communities. And, through data analysis, the study further investigates residents’ attitudes toward potential uses of cemetery spaces in urban areas.

Basso (1996) explains that shifts in perceptions reflect shifts in awareness that can change the character of a place through the thoughts associated with it. These shifts allow places to take on a new and distinct look. For example, from time to time changes in funerary landscapes such as Mt Auburn and other rural cemeteries serve as green open spaces of in
thought that for visitors to seek spaces could leave behind some of the cares of urban life, allowing them to revel in the natural beauty of the scenery, and to learn the moral lessons of the landscape and its monuments. Others enjoy park-like cemeteries seeing them as getaways from an increasingly chaotic urban environment. Giving order and rationalized efficiency to their surroundings, and to ease conflicts and bring a community together (Francis 2003).

The research method uses in this study include face-to-face interviews focusing on residents from the community in Uptown Dallas. The interviews examine residents' perceptions regarding recreational uses of cemetery spaces and evaluate uses of cemetery spaces as green infrastructure in contemporary society. Based exclusively on people’s responses, this research demonstrates the potential for more effective incorporation of perceptual aspects, and opportunities or limitations to accommodate multiple-uses of cemeteries and memorial spaces.

1.2 Problem Statement

The problem statement highlights issues between existing cemeteries and neighboring urban spaces as well as those factors causing visual and spatial disconnections between existing cemeteries and communities. Cemeteries studied in this research are like those built on the outskirts of cities, and due to an ongoing rapid urban expansion, and they are now located near population centers and compete for the same desirable land (Basmajian and Coutts 2010; Northway 2005; Francaviglia 1971). With urban sprawl and neighborhood changes, many cemeteries in the situations lose their traditional social connection with nearby neighborhoods (Schuyler 1986). Sloane(1995) indicates that when the community lacks a close connection with such cemeteries, the cemetery loses its cultural significance. Sloane broadens his study of cemeteries as cultural landscapes beyond the history of death to reveal how their establishment both correlates with, and is influenced by major transformations. Factors such as urbanization, secularization and commercialization in American cultural history, affect and reinforce changing practices and attitudes toward burial spaces (Francis 2003). As ongoing high-density developments are built along a cemetery, a cemetery loses its visibility, accessibility and
Because many cemeteries have historical significance discussions of cemetery relocations rarely surface in city planning and development (Kay 1998). As urban development and land demand increases, cemeteries are considered as an open space to accommodate low-impact activities such as walking or bird watching, and they provide an area for visual release. By extracting data on such topics from interviews, this study addresses residents’ perceptions towards use of cemeteries, and the attitudes about possible uses of cemeteries in rapid changing urban area.

1.3 Research Site

Uptown Dallas has been the site of historic cemeteries since 1874. They are Greenwood Cemetery, Calvary Cemetery, Temple Emanuel Cemetery and Freedman’s Memorial Cemetery. These properties are specific to the Uptown neighborhood and are defined by the manmade border of U.S. Highway 75 to the east and Oak Grove Avenue to the west. The northern border is Lemmon Avenue. The southern boundary is defined by the State Thomas Neighborhood district. Primary foci of developments in the area are State Thomas and West Village. These are both close to the cemetery area on its southern and northwestern sides respectively.

Uptown Dallas and the structure of its neighborhoods have seen rapid and drastic changes over past fifteen years. Due to these changes, Uptown Dallas has evolved into a high-density and vibrant mixed-use area. Occupying two city blocks in Uptown, these cemeteries serve as a green open space limited primarily to burial grounds and a walking trail. North Dallas Central Expressway and Uptown, are the primary places of burial for the African-American community between 1869 and 1907 (Velin 2010). These burial sites serve a visual tension release and green open space in the Uptown area.
Figure 1.1 Location Map of Uptown Area (www.dfwmaps 2013)
Figure 1.2 Locations of Greenwood Cemetery, Calvary Cemetery, Temple Emanuel Cemetery and Freedman’s Memorial Cemetery (Uptown Inc. 2013)

Figure 1.3 Bird’s Eye View From the South to Cemeteries in Study Site (googlemaps 2013)
Figure 1.4 Current Images of Cemeteries and Surrounding Areas in Uptown Dallas, 2012

1.4 Significance of Study

Uptown is an evolving area providing a rich opportunity to investigate residents who have close proximity views to cemeteries, and to examine their perceptions or alternative uses cemeteries can provide. This research contributes to the understanding of public attitudes and preferences regarding uses and spaces of burial sites. Currently, there are many instances where cemeteries serve as a park for people residing in urban areas, such as Oakland Cemetery in Atlanta and Highland Cemetery in Wichita, Kansas (Harnik and Merolli 2010).

There are few literary references about local residents’ attitudes and preferences of recreational uses of cemetery spaces. This study intends to bridge the gap between urban neighborhoods and existing cemeteries by assessing public perceptions regarding recreational uses of current cemetery spaces. The study also addresses preserving scenic and historical values of the cemeteries, and their visual and spatial connections with the surrounding
communities to better serve the neighborhood and provide green infrastructure while enriching heritages in urban communities.

1.5 Research Objectives

Objectives help this study to capture data and help other researchers understand public perceptions regarding to recreational uses of existing cemeteries which can contribute to future investigation. The specific objectives of the study are:

1. To encourage public awareness and evaluate uses of cemetery spaces;
2. To study how residents perceive the potential uses of cemetery spaces and to evaluate uses of cemeteries in their neighborhoods
3. To contribute to design of urban and cemetery spaces and to bring sacred spaces back into community life while simultaneously contributing to a community’s green infrastructure.

1.6 Research Questions

Questions provide an insightful view from residents’ attitudes and preferences of uses of urban cemetery spaces. The following set of research questions are posed to people who reside in the study’s residential area with the aim of assessing data and form of future investigation in research:

1. Are these cemeteries underused for secondary uses and consider as a recreational amenities within study area?
2. Do these cemeteries serve as a green infrastructure in Uptown Dallas?
3. What kind of recreational uses can cemeteries provide?
4. Are these cemeteries accessible to residents live nearby these cemeteries?

1.7 Research Methods

This study uses open ended interview questions to gain understanding of residents’ attitudes of potential uses of cemeteries and questions focusing on participants’ viewpoints of recreational uses of cemetery spaces impacts on them. This study also analyzes and compares
literature reviews of how they perceive cemetery spaces and uses of the sacred spaces in the case of Uptown Dallas. Data are collected from residents within the Dallas Uptown area, analyzing documents, inscriptions, and formal interviews. Available resources (historic documents, maps, photographs) were reviewed to help determine how people see and evaluate uses of cemetery spaces in urban neighborhoods.

1.8 Definition of Terms

Sacred space: a place is considered sacred only in so far as the site itself is "regarded with respect" (Harvey 2006).

Cemetery: is a burial ground, especially a large landscaped park or ground laid out expressly for the deposition or interment of the dead, not being a churchyard attached to a place of worship (Curl 1999). Cemetery as a ‘collective representation’, a sacred, symbolic replica of the living community that expressed many of the community’s basic beliefs and values (Francis 2003).

Urban cemeteries: form on the urban fringe of communities, and then become surrounded by expanding communities, become urban cemetery.

Urban neighborhoods: denote concepts popular with planners and social workers. Tuna (1974) defines as "they provide a framework for organizing the complex human ecology of city into manageable subareas, they are also social ideals feeding on the belief that health of society depends on the frequency of neighborly acts and the sense of communal membership" (p. 210).

Historic cemeteries: are important cultural, architectural and archaeological resources. Often a cemetery is the only remnant left from early settlements and as such is a vital link with the past. They provide quiet places to commemorate the deceased, whether it is of a most personal nature, or on a local, regional or even national scale (King 2004).

Recreational use: activity through which leisure may be experienced and enjoyed but it is also seen as a social institution, socially organized for social purposes (Cushman and Laidler 1990).
Perceptions: is mental process through which incoming sensations are filtered. The word “perception” also refers to the outcome of this process once it has passed into conscious awareness. The difference between perception and sensation is that sensation is the physical response to stimulation of human senses without any meaning (Bourassa 1991 p22-23), whereas perception assigns meaning to that stimulation.

1.9 Summary

High demand for green infrastructure and open space in urban area, as part of social and green infrastructure systems, the most important thing is to ensure that all urban cemeteries are accessible to the public (Afla and Reza 2012). Particularly cemetery spaces in the city's high-density areas is an innovated subject in landscape architecture to discuss. This is because public cemeteries could offer people other alternatives to existing recreational areas in the city (Harnik and Merolli 2010). Cemeteries can function as a preserved open space and be a part of city planning.

This study contributes to enriching uses of community places, revealing history, and respects the original burial sites. This study examines residents’ perceptions regarding potential uses of sacred space in urban neighborhoods, and further analyzes uses of cemetery spaces that are well received by people who reside near cemeteries. The study uses interviews to gain better understanding of residents’ perceptions of cemetery landscapes regarding their roles in neighborhoods on metropolitan areas while enhancing the use of burial sites. The study can result in potential opportunities while contributing green infrastructure and enriching sacred spaces in urban communities.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter is a review of literature reveals cemetery spaces seen as not only burial grounds but as public green open spaces containing historical resources and serving recreation purposes. Section 2.2 highlights the aspects of importance of cemetery spaces in urban areas. Section 2.3 discusses different functions of burial sites are changes of cemetery typology reflecting a shift in attitudes taking place. Section 2.4 explores people’s perceptions towards their surrounding environment to understand their attitude and preferences.

Section 2.5 introduces cemetery spaces within a study area and its significance history in this urban community are included. The cemetery sites Greenwood Cemetery, Calvary Cemetery, Emanuel Historic Cemetery, Freeman Memorial Cemetery of State Thomas Landmark District are introduced as a research laboratory, comprised of two city blocks approximately one mile from north of Dallas, Texas’ central business district, in the area known as the Uptown Neighborhood (UptownINC. 2012).

2.2 The importance of Cemetery Spaces in Urban Areas

The public perceives cemeteries as both a blessing and a curse (Basmajian and Coutts 2010). People in the surrounding city put sentimental feelings on the place because it is associated with historical, religious, or mythical events that contribute to the culture of its community. Community correlates to cemeteries become a visual reminders of mortality, alter the viewshed, and produce increased traffic and noise (Basmajian and Coutts 2010). Also cemetery also provide valuable open spaces and visual release, especially in dense urban neighborhoods (Basmajian and Coutts 2010; Anderson and West 2006). But in many cases in the courts have found that a cemetery constituted a nuisance usually involved an
intrusion of odor or pollutants into the surrounding air or water supplies, to the detriment of public health (Lehrer 1974).

Certain places acquire their significance with the passage of time or through specific events. “Place making” occurs unconsciously, on a daily basis, and from moment to moment within each person’s life because of the interactions each person has in various geographic locations (Schneekloth and Shibley 1995). Thomashow (1995) attests that people visit places to gain an awareness of the connections that other people have made, which awakens memories in consciousness of present and past situations. These principles of place are illustrated profoundly in creating graveyards and cemeteries, which allow the living to revisit their memories of the deceased in a specific environment.

2.2.1 Cemetery as a Sacred Place

Cemeteries have historically been seen as sacred spaces, and that aspect should not be forgotten; people are, after all, laid to rest in them. Cemeteries serve both functional and emotional purposes (Francaviglia 1971). They provide for disposal of human remains and, far more important, provide a place where the living can pay respect to the dead. Each cemetery varies in physical appearance, size and religion, but they share a common bond of serving as the final resting place for those wanting to leave a trace for their descendants (Schmitt 2009). Cemeteries are a window through which a city can view the hopes, fears and designs of generations that created it and are buried within it (Sloane 1991). “The cemetery, by definition a place of memories, became a location for memory of the community” (Sloane 1995).

Place is difficult to define and measure because it is subjective (Uslu 2010). But cemeteries have a distinguishing feature which is the extent to which they are regarded as ‘sacred’ spaces. Theorists such as Rugg (2000) caution that ‘sacredness’ is a slippery concept. The degree and manner to which a space is considered sacred is often unique to each individual. The dictionary definitions give the word a range of meanings: ‘the holy’, ‘consecrated’, implying spiritual element, to ‘protected from irreligious action’ and the more
secular meaning, ‘worthy of or regarded with reverence, awe or respect’ (Rugg 2000). Generally cemeteries are considered sacred only in so far as the site itself is ‘regarded with respect’. As Rugg (2000) notes “much of this respect rests largely on the fact that the site acts as a context for grief, and it is the bereaved that need to be protected from inappropriate activity.” To ensure that proper respect is maintained in and around the sacred site certain behaviors deemed unacceptable by society are often restricted (Thompson 2007).

Hartman (1986), and Rojek (1993) outline what they consider to be the three most intertwined reasons for grave visits: the private and personal; the overtly or inadvertently political; and the recreational. While recreation and politics can and do occasionally prompt cemetery visitation, the individual desire to remember lost loved ones remains the predominant motivation (Uslu 2010). It is through continued visitation and patronage that cemeteries come to satisfy what Rugg cites as the second requirement permanence. According to Rugg (2000) “the high incidence of visits over a protracted period of time means that the site becomes sacred and is afforded some degree of permanence.” Cemetery landscape is to a certain extent safeguarded from obliteration, and to achieve to meet perceived sanctity in the larger society (Uslu 2010). This respect for the dead is unique, more traditional places of burial, further differentiating the cemetery from other commemorative rituals. As Rugg’s (2000) work has illustrated, cemeteries remain conceptually difficult to define. Thompson (2007) concludes that

“Existing as sites of human interaction, burial landscapes are constantly shifting and evolving. Elements traditionally characteristic of the cemetery landscape can and have changed over time, shaped and defined by a dynamic and interactive system of cultural processes. The cemetery thus emerges not as a static text but as a landscape ‘in processes.”

2.2.2 Cemetery as a Preserved Ecological Space

The following literature shows how traditional cemeteries and alternative burial grounds can potentially improve a community’s natural environment. Since the relocation of cemeteries rarely happens (Kay 1998). Gilbert (1991) and Laske (1994) have identified cemeteries as areas with potentially high levels of biotic diversity and within urban matrix especially. Cemetery
in urban area as a preserved ecological space that protect habitat within the property. Barrett and Barrett (2002) cite “a paucity of research ... focused on natural or anthropocentric patches located within the urban matrix.” They call for more attention to cemeteries as repositories of natural diversity, noting that "ecological research conducted at the ecosystem and landscape levels has paid little attention to areas or systems subject to intensive human disturbance." Also extensive biological diversity and density of vegetation in cemeteries provides habitat for a variety of wildlife, moderates the urban environment, intercepts airborne particulate, and reduces storm water runoff in urban areas (Uslu 2010; McPherson and Nilson 1987).

2.2.3 Cemetery as a Green Infrastructure

Designing the cemeteries as green areas and parks dates back to olden times (Harnik and Merolli 2010). In 1997 the Portland Audubon Society published a short article, "Cemeteries as Greenspaces," in The Urban Naturalist (Rogers 1997). According to Rogers (1997),

"Virtually all remaining open spaces, including cemeteries, will increase in value to local neighborhoods and to the region. Cemeteries, especially ones owned by Metro’s Regional Parks and Greenspaces, should be managed in a way that provides multiple values, including wildlife habitat, to the community around them."

Many municipalities consider cemeteries as part of their green infrastructure and in some places residents use cemeteries for recreation (City of Baltimore, MD 2009; Harvey 2006). Cemeteries are seen as amenity open spaces as Tunnard and Pushkarev (1963) notes:

“In the metropolitan region … such occurrences as golf courses, airports, developed parks, and even cemeteries perform the same service as would natural forests or farm lands in the country. They provide almost the only open spaces noticeable in the macro landscape. They are the chief providers of visual relief from the monotony of continuous buildings; often they have the allied usefulness of making the air a little cooler and cleaner for those lucky enough to live nearby. In some cases, they are entirely or partially available for physical use, in sport or passive recreation “(p.370-371).

Some cemeteries encourage people to have recreational use of their site and maintaining extensive and collections of plants and trees for hikers, cyclists, photographers, and bird watchers and by organizing walking tours and outdoor music concerts (Uslu 2010). Cemeteries supplement community park systems and enhance adjacent public open space.
In “Cemeteries Alive: Graveyards are resurging as green spaces for the public” the authors Harnik and Merolli (2010) give examples of existing recreational uses of cemetery spaces. One example in Charlotte, North Carolina, Elmwood Cemetery, which has been home to many prominent residents since the 1850s, has for years been a place for people to walk, run, and take their dogs. The 111-acre facility sits next to a development of housing, theaters, restaurants, and shops, and there are conceptual plans to connect it to a citywide greenway network (Harnik and Merolli 2010). The urban cemetery is now a factor in promoting the health of its citizens, exposing them to light and air within the urban setting (Sloane 2000).

2.2.4 Cemetery as a Historical Resource

Cemeteries can reveal information about historic events, religions, lifestyles and genealogy (Commission 2001). The old graveyard can be looked upon as a source of history. Just as the heirloom is handed down from generation to generation, the public should look upon graveyards as a part of inherited history (Morritt 1986). Existing cemeteries frequently possess local historical and cultural significance, but properly maintaining those grounds can inflict private owners and municipal governments with substantial expenses (Basmajian and Coutts 2010; Brown 2008; Capels and Senville 2006; Meierding 1993). According to Moorehouse and Hassen (2006), “cemeteries are dynamic, reflecting changing and ethnic composition. When cemeteries are ignored and allowed to deteriorate and gravestones are destroyed, societies lose an important part of their identity.” Further Moorehouse and Hassen (2006) noted that cemeteries have been as living people rather than the dead because of the importance of their open space and the messages contained within them. These messages reflect choices; the shape of headstones, the use of symbols and the text of all convey information.

For example, the pioneer cemetery Lone Fir in Portland is the largest and most historically prominent in the region and it epitomizes the uses and debates surrounding urban burial grounds (Harvey 2006). Lone Fir is a cemetery in active use, with many new, shiny, black marble tombstones that mark the graves of Russian immigrants (Pancrazio 1996). Metro
operates the cemetery both as a burial ground and as an active green space. It has produced a walking tour of the cemetery, and an advocacy group, the Friends of Lone Fir Cemetery, provides education and interpretation via tours such as its "monumental evenings" holds throughout the spring and summer; a Midsummer Night's Living History Tour, when members dress in period costumes to share stories of people who are buried in the cemetery; and work parties to help maintain the landscape (Harvey 2006).

2.2.5 Summary

The old urban cemeteries exemplify this contradiction. Those quietly decaying from underuse can be valued by their immediate neighbors as pockets of greenery, despite their concomitant attractiveness to vandals and the homeless. However, seeking more opportunities for urban cemeteries to accommodate uses can promote local history and help keep a cemetery active.

2.3 Uses of Cemetery Spaces

From as far back as the nineteenth century, people have used cemeteries such as Mt. Auburn, near Boston, MA, and other rural cemeteries as parks and for recreational purposes where they can enjoy a calm place with the picturesque scenery. With the expansion of contemporary urban areas, a great deal of stress has been placed upon American cemeteries. Many cemeteries, which are originally at the borders of cities or towns, are now surrounded by new development (Stump 1996). Now that these sites have become more historic in scope as opposed to active cemeteries, people comment on the special qualities are unique to the place, emphatic that cemetery and park experiences are quite different (Francis 2003).

Historically, people use cemetery spaces as a park (Harnik and Merolli 2010). The following sections conclude primarily use of cemetery and integrations of public open spaces into a part of urban green infrastructure system. And find the changing attitudes along with the history of the way people view sacred spaces. They reflect people changing attitudes toward the
cemetery landscape and people responses to the pressures of urban development and the scarcity of open spaces in cities.

2.3.1 Conventional Role of Cemetery Spaces

Uslu (2009) indicates "the main functions of cemeteries are place of deposit and transformation of the dead bodies without dangers for the public health" (p.1043). They are also the place to visit for those people wanting to remember a dead person and at the same time a symbol of the historical memory of a collectivity (Fogli 2004). Rugg (2000 p.264) points out

“burial space is essentially mutable: its meaning does not remain static over time; and its significance is not uniform over all cultures. Even at a basic level, the significance of such space alters as time accrues between the living and the dead. Furthermore, individual burial sites often do not present a single landscape: some may contain separate sections with distinctive meanings and purposes.”

Wasserman (1998) defines cemetery spaces as

"Cemetery spaces as memory capes can be seen as places for ritual action, fulfilling community requirements. The memorial landscape serves intellectual, emotional, spiritual and communal functions, including: a) a place for memory, b) a place for mourning, c) a place for reflection and healing, d) a place for ceremony, and e) a place for collective action. Each of these contributes to enriching our community places, revealing their history and significance ” (p. 42).

Burial grounds can be sorted into typologies based on age, location, and ownership (Basmajian and Coutts 2010; Whyte 1968). The transformations of burial spaces and uses within cemeteries shifts from time to time. Sloane (1991) points that back to the nineteen century, changing attitudes towards germs and disease increases the public consciousness of the design and placement of cemeteries. The overcrowded churchyards and urban cemeteries become unpleasant and dangerous areas of the city. People's anxiety over interacting with the dead is replaced by sanitary concerns (Sloane 1991).

2.3.2 Recreational Uses of Cemetery Spaces

For reasons of public health and overcrowding, burial grounds begin to be located outside of population centers at that time. Cases like Mt. Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn, New York, are the primary manicured
and sculpted green spaces within cities. As methods of disposal and rituals change, the way people use the cemetery or burial spaces also change. Sloane (1991) broadened

“The study of cemeteries as cultural landscapes beyond the history of death to reveal how their establishment both correlated with, and also influenced by major transformations such as urbanization, secularization and commercialization in American cultural history, as well as affected and reinforced changing practices and attitudes toward death.”

Alternative uses for cemetery are emerging, including changes in attitudes toward commemoration burial sites in contemporary culture (Basmajian and Coutts 2010). Sloane (2000) also mentions that “Cemeteries can no longer be simply depots for cadavers. Instead they would become parklands that brought green space and light into the world of the dead.”

Uslu (2010) gives a example of Spring Grove Cemetery remains proactive in its multiple roles and functions.

"It is not simply a place for burial but one fostering in the sort of enduring commemoration. Business of memories and horticultural mission of cemetery remain alive. Its ecologically important place shelters diverse wild life. It includes fine arts, architecture, education programs and events cultivate public interest. Photographers, bird watchers, students always visit cemetery because its arboretum and burial ground importance." (p.1046)

Spring Grove is seen as an important green space in Cincinnati’s dense metropolitan area, and it serves a vibrant, busy place, more for the living than for the dead (Uslu 2010). Uslu concludes that cemeteries should be adapting to modern conditions redefining its original missions, horticulture, commemoration and landscape. The following presents the relationship between people and burial sites throughout history from churchyard period to modern memorial parks and urban cemeteries.

2.3.2.1 Churchyard

Churchyards are the primary burial place in contemporary Europe at that time and dates to 1800 has been so for several centuries. Churchyards are defined as places of burial made sacred primarily through religious associations. Sloane (1991) indicates “...at the time that churchyards begin with the arrival of Christianity. During this time Christians retained prohibition against burial of the dead in close proximity to the living.” In time however, the Church reversed
this attitude and “the dead ceased to frighten the living … the two groups coexisting in the same places and behind the same walls” (Sloane 1991).

Sloane (1991) further illustrates that “from history churchyard cemeteries that were filled to capacity were periodically exhumed to make room for new ones in the nineteen century.” The idea of the rural cemetery appeared to meet the demands of a significant change in social values involving the secularization of death and the granting of dignity to the individual life as well as the right to associative sentiment on the part of families and friends (Rogers 2001). The traditional burial practice of European is to inter their dead is in churchyards (Sloane 1991). Morritt (1986) indicates that “The style of the graveyard was intimate and fulfilled the needs of a small community. It was just a small area set aside near the church for burial purposes.” Later, in the nineteenth century, caretakers ‘beautified’ many churchyards by straightening the lines of memorials and establishing pathways for visitors (Sloane 1991). It is during this time that the burial grounds first emerged as potential sites of tourism, with landscapes increasingly design around the visitor (Thompson 2007). As populations grow so does the need for burial space, the small churchyard cemeteries give way to larger areas of land set aside purely for graveyard use (Morritt 1986).
2.3.2.2 Rural Cemetery Movement

Histories of the nineteenth century garden cemetery in Britain, Europe and America tend to emphasize the ‘novelty’ value of cemeteries, focusing on the design shift from overcrowded burial grounds to garden cemeteries (Etlin 1984; Linden-Ward 1989; Curl 1993; Kselman 1993). As the time 19th century begins, towns grow to cities, and population increases. For reasons of public health and overcrowding, burial grounds begin to be located outside of population centers, no longer on church ground at that time. The “Rural” Cemetery Movement, began in 1831 with Mount Auburn, Boston; Laurel Hill, Philadelphia (1836); Greenwood, N.Y. (1838); Lowell, Mass. (1841); Evergreen, Portland, Maine (1855); Forest Hill, Madison, Wisc. (1858); the rural cemeteries involved countless others as the country expanded (Finney 2012).

Beginning in the 1830s with opening of the famous Mount Auburn Cemetery in Cambridge, Massachusetts, a series of rural burial grounds offered a welcome resort for families seeking a weekend escape from the city (Teaford 1987). With curving lanes and
romantic landscaping, the new cemeteries presented a sharp contrast to the repetitious grid of city streets and the grim brick and stone of tenements and townhouses (Bender 1974). According to Schuyler (1984) these cemeteries are "didactic landscape whose scenery and monuments instructed city fathers in the desirability of developing parks for the growing number of urban dwellers." By the end of the nineteenth century, the role of the cemetery as a place of escape from the city had been supplanted by the establishment of parks and by the blurring of city and country as suburbia evolved (Finney 2012).

French (1979) documents:

“At an opening address of the Mount Auburn Cemetery in Boston, Joseph Story reflected society’s open-minded view of religious symbolism within the presence of the deceased: He declared that contemporary Christian attitudes and practices concerning burial were, unfortunately, not the equal of those of earlier heathen cultures, and to prove his point he briefly surveyed the burial customs of the Egyptians, Greeks, Hebrews, and others. “Our cemeteries,” he concluded, “rightly selected, and properly managed, may be made subservient to some of the highest purposes of religion and human duty. They may preach lessons, to which none may refuse to listen, and which all that live must hear.” (p. 45).

The Mount Auburn Cemetery is the first of its kind to use nature while at the same time increasing its availability to people in all social classes (French 1979). Also, the attractive features of the cemetery that once inspired feelings of terror and seclusion soon became tourist destinations, illustrated in the specific cases of Mount Auburn Cemetery in Boston and Père la Chaise in Paris (Francaviglia 1971). Although cemeteries similar to Mount Auburn with respect to the social acceptance of all classes continue to exist, some cemeteries serve as distinct indicators of the deceased population’s social class (Francaviglia 1971). In the case of Père la Chaise, the first European garden cemetery, only the social elites of France, including renowned people and artisans, were allowed to be buried there (French 1979). Traditionally, class distinctions within the cemetery are based on size of lot and size of memorial or mausoleum. Historically, the rich man’s grave is marked by a large memorial or mausoleum, the poor man’s by a small head or footstone, or perhaps by the absence of a stone (Kephart, as cited in Francaviglia 1971).
The phenomenon is denoted a burial ground located on the outskirt of city that was designed according to the romantic convention of English landscape gardening and ultimately prove to be a major influence on the design of urban parks and suburbs (Basmajian and Coutts 2010). Invention of the rural cemetery links to a complex of beliefs to the mid-nineteen century as the public intending to in response to increasing chaotic urbanization. The result is an extension of the city, whereas the rural cemetery, the park, and the romantic suburb has been designed as counterbalance to the city (Bender 1974).

Figure 2.2 Green-Wood Cemetery in Brooklyn, New York, 2012

2.3.2.3 Lawn–Park Cemetery

The inventions and widespread adopting to lawn cemetery highlights the importance of factors such as preference for modern aesthetics and the booming professions of cemetery management (Rugg 2006). The resulting flat, open plane of grass lends itself to walking and standing, diminishing options of displaying grief physically. There are few clues to allow people
to express their bereaved feelings in such a place to commune with or remember the dead (Sawatzky 2009). A bench on the edge of a field, far from a loved one’s grave does not allow for personal communion. The cemetery is no longer a space to grieve, but to visit and leave. Lawn cemeteries, with flat markers and vast mown expenses, are an aspect of the struggle by urban residents to control their increasingly chaotic environment, to give order and rationalized efficiency to their surroundings, and to ease conflicts and bring a community together according to the ideals of the ‘City Beautiful’ movement (Francis 2003). Its success also inspire a success design of the pastoral landscape concepts of New York’s Central Park and influence the wider acceptance of lawn park cemeteries (Francis 2003).

Later this trend in the physical appearance of certain sections of a particular cemetery become apparent during the Victorian period when social distinctions became less evident as a result of the expansion seen during the Industrial Revolution and the growth of the middle class (Francaviglia, 1971).

Figure 2.3 Rose Hill Memorial Park in Whittier, California, 2012
Table 2.1 Characteristics of American Cemeteries, adapted from Sloane (1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frontier Graves</td>
<td>17th-20th Century</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Site of death</td>
<td>Isolated; no design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>17th-20th Century</td>
<td>Geometric</td>
<td>Farm field</td>
<td>Small; family owned; functional design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchyard</td>
<td>17th-20th Century</td>
<td>Geometric or formal garden</td>
<td>Next to church</td>
<td>Religious ownership; functional design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter's Field</td>
<td>17th-20th Century</td>
<td>Geometric</td>
<td>City borders</td>
<td>Public ownership; functional design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town/City Cemetery</td>
<td>17th-20th Century</td>
<td>Formal garden</td>
<td>City borders</td>
<td>Family or government owned; formal design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Cemetery</td>
<td>1831-1870's</td>
<td>Picturesque, natural garden</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Private ownership; garden aesthetic; mausoleums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn-park Cemetery</td>
<td>1855-1920's</td>
<td>Pastoral, Park-like</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial; suburban aesthetic; mausoleums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Park</td>
<td>1917-present</td>
<td>Pastoral, suburban</td>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial; suburban aesthetic; mausoleums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2.4 Urban Cemetery

Previous cemeteries are constructed on the outskirts of cities because of metropolitan expansion in these cases cemeteries come to population centers compete for the same...
desirable land (Basmajian and Coutts 2010; Northway 2005; Francaviglia 1971). Ordinary urban cemeteries are increasingly viewed as amenity landscapes that provide historic, scenic, and ecological values to the communities that surround them (Harvey 2006; Jackson 1968; Howett 1977; El Nasser 1998). However, several generations of heightening taboos associated with death in Western society have led to avoidance and ignorance of the landscapes of the dead (Cook 2011). This discomfort with death transformed the position of cemeteries within communities and their ongoing maintenance and use (Cook 2011). In the book "Silent Cities", Jackson (1989) notes "In every aspect of ordinary urban cemetery's physical design, economic considerations take precedence over aesthetic concerns." Ordinary urban cemeteries can lose their role once the families no longer visit; that is, when the personal touch and the feel of human presence are gone (Jackson 1989).

2.3.3 Recreational Uses in Contemporary Cemeteries

Merolli and Harnick (2010) points that some abandoned or urban cemeteries function as parks, as sexton rejects the idea that his facility is only for somber reflection, but an open space resource that can and should be used for something other than burial. Contemporary cemeteries have adopted various ‘useful’ applications, they also remain highly complex and ambiguous spatial-temporal enclosures (Johnson 2012).

In Charlotte, North Carolina, Elmwood Cemetery, which has been home to many prominent residents since the 1850s, has for years been a place for people to walk, run, and take their dogs. Occupying 111-acres, the cemetery sits next to a development of housing, theaters, restaurants, and shops and is part of a citywide greenway network plan (Merolli and Harnick 2010).

Today, some cities have hundreds of acres of public and private cemetery grounds, and some help mitigate the shortage of urban parkland (Merolli and Harnick 2010). Figure 3.1 shows some urban cemeteries that function like parks. Others, with some modifications, could do the same. Cemeteries can provide spaces for low-impact activities such as walking and running.
(Anderson and West 2006). Some newer cemeteries also can accommodate high-speed activities such as bicycling. (Basmajian and Coutt 2010).

Table 2.2 Selected Urban Cemeteries that Function Like Parks, Adapted from Merolli and Harnick (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEMETERY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hill Cemetery</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Running, picnicking, bicycling, jazz concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Cemetery</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Running, dog walking, bird watching, bicycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cemetery</td>
<td>Portland, ME</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Running, dog walking, picnicking, bird watching, bicycling, bench sitting, trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand View Cemetery</td>
<td>Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Bicycling, cross-country team training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Cemetery</td>
<td>Wichita, KS</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Dog walking, bird watching, bench sitting, grave rubbing, docent tours, art classes, ghost hunting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park Cemetery</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Running, dog walking, picnicking, bird watching, event space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Cemetery</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Running, dog walking, picnicking, bench sitting, Halloween program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Burial park</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Running, dog walking, bicycling, grave rubbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marcus Cemetery</td>
<td>St Louis</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Running, dog walking, bird watching, bench sitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Cemetery</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dog walking, bench sitting, grave rubbing, event space, docent tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyuka Cemetery</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Running, picnicking, docent tours, theatrical performances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To review the opportunity of secondary uses of cemetery spaces that needs laws or public perceptions. While creating a recreational space may be an alternative potential, things need to be considered are the cultural values and perceptions that the public has towards cemeteries (Afla and Reza 2012). In this following section explore human’s perceptions towards their surrounding environment to understand their attitude and preferences. To understand a person’s preference for uses of cemetery spaces, it is necessary to know that people’s spatial perceptions is to a great extent influenced by the visual features and characteristics of physical space (Wills 2008). And to know a group’s cultural history and experience in the context of its physical setting by understanding their attitudes and preferences (Tuan 1974).

Wills (2008) indicates that “…our visual experience of the physical environment we inhabit therefore guides a great deal of how we perceive, remember and act in the world.” People give meanings for experiencing space as set of social settings and places (Wills 2008). Lynch (1960) introduces the term “imageability” to describe the qualities of a city which make it understandable to any citizen, again underlining the effort of the visual form of the city on
perception and memory of physical space. The experience of particular landscape depends upon the character that the observer perceives.

Environmental perception is formed through three types of information: present stimulus information, present context information, and stored stimulus information (Warr and Knapper 1968). Perception involves the sensory processes through which people gather information about the present environment (Holahan 1982).

Tuan (1974) points out "in order to understand a level of group attitudes and preferences it is necessary to know a group's cultural history and experience in the context of its physical surroundings." The intensity and quality of the experiences are perceived by their own histories and associated values (Hernando 1999; Roe and Taki 1999). Thus, a location where the dead are formally placed through time can be perceived as in a sacred space, imposing subsequent actions for people and the rituals involved. In this way, the cultural landscape emerges; it is dynamic and contains diverse physical and ideological characteristics from which meanings of ownership, identity, and even conflicting perceptions can be promoted (Tuan 1977). Monuments and the spatial socialization practices act as mnemonic tools and references of actions and identities (Taçon 1994; Roe and Taki 1999).
Figure 2.5 A Transactional Model of Human Landscape Relationships (Zube and Sell 1986)

Perception is founded on how a person perceives the world based on the distinctive way an individual's knowledge is obtained (Basso 1996). In some aspects, a cemetery serves a distinctive role in human society due to its functions such as a burial spaces that commemorates the death (Basmajian and Coutts 2010). Visually, cemeteries are a preserved open space that break the continuity of the surrounding neighborhood and announce a special realm dedicated to the departed (Rowsell 1986).

Certain places acquire their significance with the passage of time or through specific events. For example, “place making” occurs unconsciously, on a daily basis, and from moment-to-moment within each person’s life because of the interactions each person has with various geographic locations (Schneekloth and Shibley 1995). Thomashow (1995) attests that “people visit places to gain an awareness of the connections that other people have made, which awakens memories in consciousness of present and past situations. These principles of place
are illustrated profoundly in creating graveyards and cemeteries, which allow the living to revisit their memories of the deceased in a specific environment” (p.9).

Community object to cemeteries become a visual reminders of mortality, alter the viewshed, and produce increase traffic and noise.” Also in many cases in the courts have found that a cemetery constitutes a nuisance usually involved with intrusion of odor or pollutants into the surrounding air or water supplies, to the detriment of public health. On the contrary, cemetery also provide valuable open space and visual release, especially in dense urban neighborhoods (Basmajian and Coutts, 2010; Anderson and West 2006).

2.5 Study Area Selection

The cemetery spaces under investigation in this study are comprised of two city blocks approximately one mile north of Dallas, Texas’ central business district, in the area known as the Uptown Neighborhood (Uptown INC. 2012). It is a newly redeveloped urban neighborhood and comprised high-density developments, typical of a contemporary new town centers. The neighborhood is inhabited by a mix of middle-class young professionals and empty-nesters (Sturgess 2005).

2.5.1 Historical Background and Significance

Traces two major government-sponsored projects (Roseland Homes and the Central Expressway) back to the beginning in the 1940s in Uptown area and continuing through the speculative real estate “bubble” of the 1970s and the “burst” of the 1980s. Much of the community is leveled to the ground. Eventually, with the cooperation of the city government, private developers acquired large blocks of property and began to build up a new high-density, mixed-use residential/commercial area known as Uptown. These parcels of land serve the Uptown area with a mix of retail, small commercial businesses, restaurants, rental and owner-occupied residential uses. The eastern side of the study area is bound by U.S. 75. Freeman Memorial Park, Greenwood, Calvary, Emanuel historic cemeteries of State Thomas Landmark District, as a research laboratory is comprised of four parcels of land approximately one mile
north of Dallas, Texas’ central business district, in the area known as the Uptown Neighborhood (Uptown 2012). Greenwood Cemetery in Dallas established, the former name is Trinity Cemeteries back to 1875. And other two cemeteries, Calvary and Temple Emanuel, were established between 1878 and 1884.

After more than a decade of virtual abandonment, this area (re-invented as “Uptown” and honored as the “State-Thomas Historic District”) became the target for a new generation of real estate developers during the late 1990s. The creation of taxpayer-funded Tax Increment Finance Districts, Public Improvement Districts, and Historic Districts that facilitate cooperation of the city government and private developers to acquire large blocks of property and begin to build up a high-density, mixed-use residential/commercial area (Prior and Kemper 2005).

Figure 2.6 Uptown Trail Map (Uptown Inc. 2010)
2.5.2 Community Context

2.5.2.1 Demographics

The demographics of the neighborhood surrounding those cemeteries have seen many changes over the past century. The neighborhood's demographics have gone from being almost entirely made up of fairly affluent, white, second or 'country' home owners during the first half of the twentieth century, to an almost entirely lower-income, minority population following white flight and the sprawling growth of the city in the 1950's and 1960's (Smith 2005). The neighborhood has now evolved back to a predominately middle to upper-income white population within the last twenty years. This latest shift has also seen retention of some of the existing lower income, minorities in the neighborhood (Smith 2005). A closer examination of the past twenty year’s changes is needed for a better understanding of people see the cemeteries spaces can be a part of city green infrastructure system in the dense urban area and what caused the neighborhood’s overall physical state to improve as a result of massive redevelopment trends.

2.5.3 Cemeteries in Uptown Dallas

There are more than 200 discovered cemeteries in the Dallas area, but four of the city’s oldest and most historical burial grounds are in the Uptown neighborhood. They are centered around Hall Street and Lemmon Avenue, Greenwood Cemetery, Calvary Cemetery, Temple Emanu-El Cemetery and Freedman’s Cemetery contain significant pieces of the city's past. The layout of these cemeteries is described by Francaviglia (1971)

*The grid pattern, prototype for almost all city, town, and farm layouts . . . became the dominant layout in cemeteries until very recent times, the “streets” becoming walkways, the “blocks” containing several grave plots.* (p. 505)

Although each cemetery varies in physical appearance, size and religion, but they all share a common bond of serving as the final resting place for those wanting to leave a mark” (Schmitt 2009).
2.5.3.1 Greenwood Cemetery (1874)

The cemetery is located on the McKinney Avenue, adjoining the place of Mr. John H. Cole. Large gates stand at the east and west corners. There are two more entrances to cemetery which are at the corner of Hall Street and Woodside Street and on the Oakgrove Avenue. According to Wheat (2013)

“The grounds were surveyed and mapped out by Captain W. M. Johnson, our efficient city engineer, and reflected credit upon his skill and judgment (Dallas Weekly Herald 1875). Till 1896 the property of the old company transferred to the Greenwood Cemetery Association. Since then, the grounds have been improved, the unsightly growth of weeds and underbrush cut out, walks graveled and two new gates added. The name was also changed to Greenwood (Dallas Daily Times Herald 1896). Interwoven with the development in State Thomas Historic district ”(p. 4).

In this Dallas’ second oldest cemetery, markers tell stories of mayors, prominent women, street namesakes and Civil War venterans. Schmitt (2009) reports that:

“Stories reflect a wonderfully tangential quality as, for example, that of Dr. John A. Seegar, who rest here in late 1873, this dentist took on an associate who had come west for the dry air that was considered therapeutic for his tuberculosis. The densely wooded corner of Greenwood along Clyde and Woodside holds thousands of unmarked burials in two paupers’ cemeteries. One was the city’s official site. The other was supervised by the Order of the King’s Daughters. Several gravestones in the shape of sawed-off tree trunks. Woodmen of the World, the fraternal organization and life insurance company founded by Joseph Cullen Root in the late 19th century, offered free grave monuments as a benefit until the 1920s, when the cost grew prohibitive. Creative stonecutters across the country, however, continue to carve”(p. 5).
Figure 2.7 Greenwood Cemetery in Uptown Dallas, 2012

Figure 2.8 Walking Trail Across Greenwood Cemetery in Uptown Dallas, 2012
Greenwood Cemetery has the historical feel that one finds in other cemeteries of its vintage. Harvey (2003) says “Greenwood has several interesting features, including large separate site dedicated to both Union soldiers and Confederate soldiers. The trees in the old cemeteries are mature and lovely.” The cemetery’s office at Greenwood is just inside the main gate, and there is a full-time employee on-site.

2.5.3.2 Calvary Cemetery (1878)

This is Dallas first Catholic Cemetery, in use since 1878 but which no longer has any plots available. The old fence alongside of the cemetery has been replaced with a new one and the graves are well-kept. Emrich (2012) from the documents tells that

“Dallas’ early Catholic settlers were the French and Belgian residents of the Utopian community called Le Reunion. Part of the Galveston Diocese, they were ministered to by circuit riding priest based in Nacogdoches. The first mass was held in the home of carriage maker Maxime Guillot, whose grave in Calvary Cemetery is marked with a towering obelisk. His name survives on a short street one block west street of Woodall Rogers Freeway. Old Calvary Cemetery, established in 1878, largely hosts the stories of immigrants from French, Ireland, Italy, Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia, the European origins of settlers of that period. By 1926 the Dallas Diocese had established the much larger Calvary Hill Cemetery north of the current Love Field Airport, phasing out burials at old Calvary. In fact, many families moved their love ones to Calvary Hill Cemetery where large family plots were available. Few burials have occurred at old Calvary Cemetery since 1945.

Figure 2.9 Calvary Cemetery in Uptown Dallas, 2012
2.5.3.3 Emanuel Historic Cemetery (1884)

This cemetery establishes in the Uptown area within past hundred years is a Jewish cemetery and graves only for its Temple members. This cemetery has its own unique grave orientations and rituals present different landscape from other three cemeteries. In the Uptown Trail Cemetery tour handbook (2012) states that

“This cemetery is rich with unique stories of members of Dallas’ oldest Jewish congregation. A prominent starting point is the long list of the great merchants whose names have emblazoned storefronts: Linz, Kahn, Titche, Sanger and Neiman. Simon Linz and his five brothers started their namesake jewelry business in 1891. In 1924 Simon established the Linz Award, which still annually honors great community benefactors. Emanuel Meyer Kahn literally oversaw his retail operation from a raised platform in the center of the floor. Philip and Alexander, along with two other Sanger brothers, established a retail empire that served customers with Dallas’ first electric lights, first gas lights, first elevator, first escalator and (arguably) first telephone. Temple Emanu-el Cemetery, adjacent to Calvary Cemetery, was established 125 years ago to give the Jewish population a place to bury the dead. It contains its own distinctive traditions as well.

Figure 2.10 Mausoleum in Emanuel Historic Cemetery in Uptown Dallas, 2012
UptownINC. (2012) in the handbook of cemetery tour introduces history about Emanuel Historic Cemetery.

"Temple members were outstanding civic leaders as well. Dr. Emanuel Tillman founded our first public school system in 1884 and served as school board member, alderman and mayor pro tem. Reba Mallinson Wadel led local efforts to adopt Jewish refugee families fleeing Germany in the 1930s. She and fellow Temple member Henry S. Miller, Sr. were leaders of the Dallas Community Chest, forerunner of the United Way."
Mike Findley has served as the cemetery’s sexton, or Jewish cemetery manager, for 26 years. Being raised Christian, he has observed the differences between Jewish burial and Christian burials. “For one, there is no show of emotions in the rabbi during the ceremony,” Findley said. “They believe that when you’re dead, you’re dead, and your grieving period should not be shown socially.”

The families who have lost a loved one can instead partake in a ceremony during the burial in which they wear a ribbon to represent their bond with the deceased. At the end, they then tear the ribbon off to signify an end to the journey (Schmitt 2009).

2.5.3.4 Freedman’s Cemetery (1999)

According to Uptown Incorporate, its Uptown trail cemetery tour handbook (2010), a project of the Uptown Dallas Public Improvement District, and Dallas Campus News reporter Schmitt (2009), Freedman’s Cemetery’s history dates back to the former Freedman’s Town:

“In 1869, Sam Eakins, a member of the black community, purchased one acre of land for $25. During this time, blacks faced severe segregation from the white community. But Eakin’s purchase would soon bring in large crowds to visit the land, including freed slaves. The area would later act as the burial ground for the black community. Funerals strengthened the bonds between members in the community and drew more attention to the rapidly expanding area. Soon the acre of land was full and the police informed the black community they were no longer allowed to bury bodies there. They found ways around it. After acquiring three adjacent acres the community began burying the deceased in the dark of the night, according to James. In 1940, as the horse and buggy became outdated, the construction of Central Expressway began. The best path for the expressway went right through the cemetery, wiping out most of it. It is also locate on African-American community (initially known as Freedman’s Town and later as North Dallas) in Dallas, Texas.”

Marsha and Robert (2005) points the fact that

“An urban space that once contained a unified, but segregated, African-American community now is segmented into an extensive Arts District, the 43-story corporate center City Place, the State-Thomas Historic District of Victorian-era homes, and a completely rebuilt Roseland Homes public housing project, all linked to Uptown’s thousands of new apartments and hundreds of boutiques, shops, restaurants, and entertainment enterprises. This community transformation through gentrification offers an important lesson for other cities contemplating their pasts and looking toward their futures.”
Figure 2.12 Freedman's Cemetery Sculptures, 2011

Figure 2.13 Freedman's Cemetery, 2011
Freedman’s Cemetery which has five stunning bronze sculptures by David Newton. The sculpture honors the thousands of Africans and African-Americans buried in the Freedman’s Cemetery beginning in the 1850s. The outside of the entrance contains two statues of Africans pre-slavery. On the inside, a different pair of figures in chains represent the struggles of slaves in American history. These features tell people the historic background and show that period of time African American struggled through slavery, and later segregation. Emrich (2012) points that:

“Most of the original graves were callously paved over with construction of the railroad at that time and its successor freeway. This insult was remedied in part when the remains of roughly 1,500 people were more respect fully reinterred in the memorial grounds with the freeway reconstruction of the 1980s and 90s. Each grave was oriented with the occupant facing east, as was the cultural custom. Artifacts excavated during the process were compiled into an exhibit for the Museum of African-American Life and Culture in Fair Park.”
The Freedman’s Foundation—which creates the memorial in partnership with the City of Dallas—plans to add interpretive markers in character with the site architecture, so the Uptown Trails Cemetery Tour includes but does not have markers on the Memorial grounds (Emrich 2012).

Today, a memorial stands in place of the cemetery on the corner of Lemmon Avenue and North Central Expressway. The remains of more than 1,500 deceased are reburied in the memorial grounds, but the identities remain unknown (Schmitt 2009). The memorial serves as an artistic reminder of what once existed across those four acres of land. It links the past to the future, showing how far blacks have come (Schmitt 2009).

Table 2.3 Uptown Cemeteries Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery</th>
<th>Greenwood Cemetery (Formerly Trinity Cemetery)</th>
<th>Old Calvary Cemetery</th>
<th>Emanuel Temple Cemetery</th>
<th>Freedman’s Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Time</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Graves; trails</td>
<td>Graves; trails</td>
<td>Graves; mausoleum, walking Trails</td>
<td>Memorial park; sculptures; graves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Dallas’ second oldest cemetery; a number of the headstones belong to famous Dallas, many of whom have received streets named after them for their contributions to the city.</td>
<td>The first Catholic cemetery was established in 1878 as immigrants from Italy, Germany, Ireland and France came to the area.</td>
<td>The Temple Emanu-El Cemetery and Mausoleum is the only Temple-owned and operated Reform Jewish Cemetery in Dallas. It contains its own distinctive traditions as well.</td>
<td>This memorial honors former slaves buried in the Freedman's Cemetery. The cemetery was developed in the 1850's near Freedman's Town, the post-Civil War cultural, social and economic center of the African-American community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Uses</th>
<th>Funerals; visiting; walking</th>
<th>Visiting; walking</th>
<th>Funerals; visiting; walking</th>
<th>Visiting; walking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Active;</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Inactive; Dallas Landmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Greenwood Cemetery Association; a full time cemetery manager</td>
<td>Temple Emanu-El; a full time cemetery manager</td>
<td>Freedman's Cemetery Memorial Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions</td>
<td>Various/all</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Various/all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This methodology is intended to address the research questions presented in chapter one. Data inquiry and face-to-face interviews have been adopted as the main methods for collecting relevant information. Engaging public perception with urban planning is increasingly recognized not only as an ethical right but also as having functional utility (Coenen 2008, Rydin 2003). This research surveys interviewees living within the Uptown area. The research data are then analyzed and synthesized in the form of qualitative summaries which allow the study to understand the different aspects impacting people’s perceptions with regards to uses of pre-existing cemeteries in the Uptown area.

Analysis transcripts and find codes relate to people’s manners in order to know residents’ attitudes toward potential uses of cemetery spaces with surrounding urban environments. The following sections provide detailed explanations of study area selections, as well as data research design, analysis approaches, data collection methods, interview procedure and limitation of methods.

3.2 Study Area Selection

The Dallas Uptown area locates north of Downtown Dallas, has seen rapid and dramatic changes in its neighborhood in Dallas, Texas (Prior and Kemper 2005). The new upscale residential and commercial environment replaces older and decaying single- and multi-family structures to be more consistent with ones already developed in the area (Velin 2010). The City of Dallas created Tax Increment Finance (TIF) Districts for City Place and for the State-Thomas area, and in 1993 approved an Uptown Public Improvement District (PID), in
order to make available millions of dollars in incentives for a new wave of land developers in this area (Prior and Kemper 2005). Currently in the year 2013, most of the area around cemeteries has been rebuilt, primarily with apartment complexes and condominium units, as well as commercial enterprises, boutiques, art theaters, and a Wal-mart neighborhood store opened in 2005.

Undergoing a dramatic shift both demographically and structurally, Greenwood, Calvary, Emanuel historic cemeteries, and Freeman Memorial Park, retain their function and location, and serve a green open space in this area since 1874. These changing urban environments around cemeteries provide an opportunity to investigate how people perceive uses of cemeteries and expanding possible uses of the cemetery spaces in their neighborhood.

Figure 3.1 Aerial Photo of Research Area (1995 vs. 2012)
3.3 Research Design

3.3.1 Interview Techniques

This study uses questionnaires related to the basic demographic respondents and face-to-face interviews. Data are derived from interviews and related literature with the intent of finding potential uses in the area. Data from these interviews are then used to discover regularities among groups of people by comparing answers to the same set of questions asked of a large number of participants.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

The methodology factor in demographic data to include: gender, occupation, length of residence in the research site, and age of the respondent along with face-to-face interviews given to interviewees to conduct a detailed description to interview questions.

This interview examines residents’ perceptions through questions in the case of Freeman Memorial Park, Greenwood, Calvary, Emanuel historic cemeteries in Dallas Uptown area. These literature reviews relate to cemetery spaces and perceptions regarding possible uses. Data are collected from interviews of residents within Uptown area. Also integrating relative literature and documents, transcriptions, and interviews are adopted. Available secondary sources are collected to gather data related to uses of cemeteries in urban areas and different uses appear in different typology of cemeteries that can accommodate.

3.4.1 Interviews Questions

Before each interview, basic research information is explained to each of the respondents. In order to get in-depth information as to how people perceive uses of cemeteries varies ways in different aspects from cemeteries. Individuals are asked to describe the questions as the list in the following section.

(1) Are these cemeteries underused?
(2) Are these cemeteries accessible to you?
(3) Should cemeteries be part of Uptown’s recreational inventory?
(4) What kind of recreational uses can cemeteries provide?
and respondent's basic demographic profile include age, gender, occupation, and length of residency.

Each interview lasts approximately 20 to 40 minutes and is digitally recorded with HTC software. These digital files are then transcribed by the researcher. "Open-coding" procedures were adopted in the qualitative analysis of interview transcripts (Strauss and Corbin 1990). This is a process of making comparisons between individuals' responses and within respondent's narratives or answers to questions. The method is quite flexible in that it permits line-by-line analysis of phrases or single words, examination sentences or paragraphs, or inspection of an entire interview to isolate and compare dominant themes.

3.4.2 Interview Respondents

Respondents of this research are people who reside in the Uptown area and can provide an everyday observation or close distance to those cemeteries. In order to get objective results, this research approaches diverse residents' aspects according to their living places proximity to the cemeteries in the Uptown area. Information on the subject will be collected according to building proximity to the cemeteries, categorized into three types. For type A locales, adjacent to the cemeteries, the researcher will attend a monthly residents' board meeting from there respondents will be recruited. Type B locales are those buildings approximately on one block away from the cemeteries and out-of-sight cemeteries. Type C locales are those located more than two to three blocks away from the cemeteries but within the Uptown area. Participants in type B and C locales are selected from key informants who reside in those locales.

Table 3.1 Respondents and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type A locales</th>
<th>Type B locales</th>
<th>Type C locales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents (Male )</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents (Female)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Taylor and Bogdan, “it is difficult to determine how many people to interview in a qualitative study”; however, the researcher should have an idea that the researcher has reached the right number of interviews when “interview with additional people yielded no genuinely new insight” (1998, p.83). Therefore, the size of respondents is determined after the interviews that the data has begun to repeat itself.

3.5 Interview Procedure

The study examines public perceptions by asking interviewees about their viewpoints on uses and expanding uses of cemeteries. After categorizing the three types of buildings based on proximity to the cemeteries, the study starts to collect key informants and participants from monthly residents’ board meetings. The first step in this study is to obtain permission from Institutional Review Boards (IRB) approval for the protection of human subjects at The University of Texas at Arlington is obtained and informed consent forms are presented to respondents. Secondly, to contact with key informants to reach out more participants and make appointments and schedule interviews with selected participants.
This study is limited to the restriction to sixteen-to-twenty week time constraints of the university's academic calendar and the researcher's academic schedule. In addition, interviewees were asked about their perception of uses the cemetery spaces preceded to the neighborhood without being given an introductory of uses extent on the cemetery property. Also the sample size provides a limitation although the analysis is thorough. Due to limited space, not all results and findings from field interactions (otherwise considered participants of shared experiences) are included in this report.

**3.7 Summary**

Through the interviews process, this method explores various public perceptions
regarding uses of cemetery spaces, and can function through face-to-face interviews. By categorizing participants in these three proximity categories from cemetery area in this study presents different day-to-day observations towards cemetery spaces. Participants also report their personal experience to evaluate recreational uses of cemetery spaces. Interview responses are analyzed using grounded theory (Taylor and Bogdan 1998) for looking for potential uses and residents’ using experience of cemetery spaces.
CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

This study has drawn on interviews with respondents residing near cemeteries in order to gain first-hand data and comparative understanding the concepts and the meanings evoked by nearby cemeteries. Interviews are using by three categories according to locales’ proximity and faces to cemeteries as type “A,” “B,” ”C” (See Figure 4.1). Type “A” is the group of five people who live in the locales that face or adjacent to cemeteries in direct visual contact with the area. Type “B” composes eight people who live in the buildings adjacent to the area but have indirect visual contact to cemeteries or one block away from cemeteries. Type “C” are those people who live more than two or three blocks away from cemeteries but are still within the Uptown area.

Figure 4.1 Categories of Interviews
These are descriptive statistics in order to know different public attitudes toward recreational uses of cemetery spaces within urban neighborhoods. Section 4.2 the demographic of respondents gives a more complete interpretation of the data. The following section 4.3 concludes analysis of interviews. Once the interviews are completed, the notes are analyzed using the constant comparison method to explore the differences and similarities in the data (Glaser and Strauss 1999). The similarity and differences between these three types of residents are presented in this section. Once data is gathered and compared, opportunities for uses and spaces that of cemeteries can accommodate can be explored. Data are analyzed from each interview questions about the uses of cemetery spaces.

1. Are these cemetery underused?
2. Should cemeteries be part of Uptown's recreational inventory?
3. What kind of recreational uses can cemeteries provide?
4. Are these cemeteries accessible to you?

and respondent's basic demographic profile such as age, gender, occupation, and length of residency.

During interviews, respondents have other recommendations for increasing uses of cemetery spaces in section 4.4. After these steps are completed, key points from these findings are highlighted and briefly discuss in section 4.5.

4.2 Respondents Profile

From selected interview participants, the breakdown of the gender demographic is eight males and ten females for a total of eighteen interviews. The interview group’s profile is divided into three categories according to their proximity to cemeteries in the Uptown is given in Table 4.1 and Figure 4.2. Length of respondents residency (see Table 4.2) are also presented in this section.
Table 4.1 Respondents Age Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages of respondents</th>
<th>Type A locales</th>
<th>Type B locales</th>
<th>Type C locales</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-10 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60 Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2 Respondents Age

Table 4.2 Respondents Residency Profile Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributions of the length of residence of respondents</th>
<th>Type A locales</th>
<th>Type B locales</th>
<th>Type C locales</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-23 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years &lt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.3 Respondents Profile
4.3 Data Analysis

This section presents a summary of each interview's respondent to interview questions and is presented in Figure 4.4 -12. First according to A,B,C categories of each respondent's key words to interview questions are divided into three. The purpose of categorizing is to determine whether the building proximity can be a factor in determining respondents’ viewpoints of uses to cemetery spaces. Also to extract individual respondent’s perspective to cemetery space in Uptown area by graphical representations, then to compare differences and similarities from data of each interview question. Finally to summarize of those reasons from respondents and compare to related literature as important findings to this study.

4.3.1 Use Conditions of Cemetery

Other than intern people in the cemetery spaces, cemeteries also provide value as open space in contemporary urban area. Table 4.4 shows respondents visit cemetery or not. Over half of them they never go into the cemeteries. On the other hand, R-C4 has resided in this area for 17 years and has many generations buried in the cemetery. For this reason, he goes to these cemeteries often and mostly in spring or fall, but less in winter.

Some respondents relate to recreational uses of cemetery spaces to uses of park spaces. However, it should be acknowledged that the recreational use between cemeteries and public parks is not comparable as burial space has its own primary purpose, which is to house the dead (Afla and Reza 2012). This can be a flaw to this study when uses of cemetery spaces are not specified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Q1: Are these cemetery underused?</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses</strong></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A4</td>
<td>N ot sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Actually a lot people use it, you can see a lot of cars driving through it also people walking." (R-A1)
Not this one. I mean it's the oldest cemetery, I think in this area. You know not a very active down there.

I didn't see it be used for anything (R-B4).
I haven't see a single person there. And I think even the kids and whole family of that guy, already passed away. So nobody even goes to there check on their family (R-B5).
They use a lot. Yes I see a lot people (R-B6).
I walked through it. (R-B7).

To me it also under used. Because from what I know the area used to be like pool area. And they start to build these apartment to bring more people in. (R-C2).
I don't have any uses for it. I have no reason to go ... (R-C3).
I never seen anybody go in there ... have a funeral in the cemetery... as a park it is also underused... (R-C5).
No, I went there quite bit ... I have many generation there (R-C4).
I didn't know what are in there besides the graves (R-C1).

Figure 4.4 Responses to Interview Question One
Table 4.3 Respondents Visit These Cemeteries or Not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents visit or not</th>
<th>Type A locales</th>
<th>Type B locales</th>
<th>Type C locales</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5 Respondents Visit Those Cemeteries or Not

4.3.1.1 Views to Cemetery

The open spaces such as cemeteries perform the same service as a natural forest or farm land would in the metropolitan region are the chief providers of visual relief from the monotony of continuous buildings; often they have the allied usefulness of making the air a little cooler and cleaner for those lucky enough to live nearby (Christopher Tunnard 1963). These cemeteries serve as a view amenity and visual relief for people who live close to them.
Three respondents present the reason why they do not want to go into these cemeteries but consider cemeteries as a view amenity:

R-A1 never goes in these cemeteries but she enjoys seeing them and she says “it is just pretty and quiet area.” She considers a cemetery as a green amenity instead of a place to go.

R-A4 also says these cemeteries provide great scenery for her. “I used to call it my own little central park...because there are not so many green spaces and the whole thing so beautiful and green trees there...I almost couldn’t tell it’s a cemetery until some trees went down
one year ago.” She also mentions that those trees provide a screen for grave stones that she doesn't want to see.

R-B1 mentions “these cemeteries are big and have mature trees there…I have one view to the cemetery from my apartment, in spring it is densely green…it is so beautiful.” Views into these cemeteries may be as important as access and daily use (Harvey 2006).

The following section presents reasons why the respondent use cemetery spaces and also related to cemetery views:

RA-5 wants to make sure that he has cemetery view from where he lives. He also says that “I bought here because I want to live right by the cemetery. I want quiet and green spaces…I want make sure there are cemetery views from my place.”

4.3.1.2 Existing recreational uses of cemeteries

Among these cemeteries the existing Uptown cemetery trail serves as a place for people use the trail to walk around. Uptown INC., a nonprofit corporation established to promote business in the Uptown area, also holds an annual historical cemetery tour to these cemeteries. However, Greenwood and Emanu-El Cemetery prohibit jogger and walking dogs within cemetery property limit its uses.

4.3.1.3 Summary

From those respondents, people who live close to these cemeteries do not necessary use cemeteries, they see those cemeteries as a view amenity that provide them a great view. There are 11 people who do not attend to these cemeteries, most of them mention that cemeteries are not appropriate places to go and hold physical activities. Other six people they use cemetery spaces for walking and learning history about it.

4.3.2 Key Points of Question Two from Respondents

4.3.2.1 Cemetery as a Part of Recreational Inventory

The second interview question is “should cemeteries be a part of Uptown recreational inventory?” intend to know how people think recreational uses of cemeteries can be as
recreational uses of green open spaces in general that can provide spaces to support other nearby parks.

Thirteen respondents agree that cemeteries should be a part of Uptown recreational inventory in Dallas. Four respondents they do not consider that cemetery spaces can use as a park and should not be a part of Uptown recreational inventory. As Table 4.4 and Figure 4.10 show that respondents think potential recreational uses that cemetery spaces can provide.

According to their viewpoints which shows cemetery should not be included as a part of Uptown recreational inventory have reasons as follow:

R-A3 reports “I don’t think they would. In American, we think cemetery is a place to respect. If we go there, it would be a reason to see our relatives. But never thought about it can be a place to go have types of activities or celebrations.”

R-A4 doesn’t think use cemetery as other uses than intern people is appropriate. She says “I don’t know what can be there…I mean in the cemetery other than reverential sources….”

R-B4 denies as cemetery can be a part of recreational inventory as long as it is used as a cemetery but for walking purpose it is good for people live nearby.

R-C2 thinks these cemeteries should be relocated or removed in this area, he notes that “for the type of people live here, I didn’t think it is a place that people will go there have activities…”
Figure 4.8 Green Infrastructure Connectivity of Dallas Area
4.3.2.2 Summary

Comments from respondents can be divided into two groups for this question. One group of respondents think it would be nice to have some activities on the cemetery grounds...
while at the same time people who use the place also need to respect people buried there. The other group of respondents do not think these cemeteries should be a part of Uptown recreational inventory because they think users should pay their respects to people who are already buried there. And having activities in cemetery spaces is not an appropriate way to pay respects to the place and people who buried there.

4.3.3 Key Points to Question three from Respondents

In third question “what kind of recreational uses can cemeteries provide?” respondents refer uses of cemetery spaces to their previous experiences of cemetery which they visit in the previous time (see Table 4.4 and Figure 4.10).

4.3.3.1 Potential recreational Uses

The following section uses those three categories to group respondents who live in different proximity to cemetery spaces. To investigate what kind of recreational uses that people live in this area that they think is appropriate on cemetery.

Type A: R-A1 observes many people use cemetery spaces but she never go there. She says” Maybe anniversary events…it been around a long time…I think we should really start to think to put another building or houses in there….Maybe a church.” R-A2 notes “it does have historical significant that definitely can be….the cemetery is like a preserved area that they can built buildings on it.” The above two respondents mention about putting buildings on the land. R-A3 says he never thought about it can be a place to go have types of activities or celebrations on cemetery. R-A4 doesn't think recreational uses are appropriate to go on within cemeteries. She emphasizes that she cannot think about other activities than reverential sources. But she thinks it is interesting to walk around and read grave stones.

Type B: R-B1 disagrees with the idea that cemeteries should be used for recreational uses, he emphasizes that “it’s not about recreational. ….a place of absolutely silence. Places between the party zone and where I live….it creates some kind of buffer in the middle of the town.” R-B3 mentions about the Hollywood Cemetery in Los Angles where people have movies
shows and concerts at summer nights. R-B6 just moves in this area, but she has degree in University of Southern Methodist University and previous staying for 17 years she teaches in this area. For suggestions of uses of cemetery she encourages college students to research about people's lifestyle that shows a lot of information on headstones. R-B8 emphasizes the existing features that she thinks “walking trail and spots that can provide people some history about it will be nice.” As Moorehouse and Hassen (2006) notes that cemetery reveals these messages reflect choices; the shape of headstones, the use of symbols and the text of all convey information.

Type C: R-C1 and R-C2 both note that design of these cemeteries in the Uptown area does not provide proper spaces for people to go. They also mention about the design of cemetery spaces in Israel called Mount Herzl National Cemetery in Jerusalem they visited have more opportunities to have activities and different topographical changes allow cemetery spaces to have more diversity. R-C3 does not think cemeteries should provide recreational uses but she is more willing to just walk there and learn more history about it. R-C4 goes to these to visit his family buried there. He doesn't mind people have activities there. He says that this is a perfect place to reflect. R-C5 has two suggestions for the uses of these cemeteries. First a cemetery is a place of quiet and relaxation and respect. The second is the way cemeteries are set up right now, they are gated so that people cannot go insides and not invite people to go in there.

Table 4.4 Preferred Modes of Use of the Cemetery Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Uses of Cemetery Space</th>
<th>Type A locales</th>
<th>Type B locales</th>
<th>Type C locales</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Trail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Significance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnicking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Garden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy the peace</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3.2 Summary

From respondents' comments on recreational uses that cemetery spaces can provide directions of design cemetery spaces. The most popular use is walking trail which those cemeteries original have one. The second highest suggestion is historical significance of those cemetery. Respondents are more willing to go those cemetery when they are more familiar with its history. Further from those summarized comments, respondents think before propose uses of cemetery space, people who already buried there have to be respected.

4.3.4 Key Points to Question Four from Respondents

Last question to respondents is asking them “are these cemeteries accessible to you?” Two respondents do not know these cemeteries are open to public. Sixteen respondents can point out the gate opening time, especially the open time of Greenwood Cemetery. Among those respondents, eighty-eighth percent of respondents know these cemeteries are open and accessible to them, eleven percent of respondents do not think these cemeteries are open for public. Two out of all respondents say these cemeteries are not accessible to them because of they think they are privately owned. Figure 4.12 shows access points to these four cemeteries. And the conditions of these entrances of four cemeteries are shown as Figure 4.13-17.

4.3.4.1 Accessibility to Cemetery Spaces

R-B3: The respondent says “No, I don’t really want to go there.” And lack of information may cause unwilling to go using cemetery spaces.
R-C3: The respondent does not know these cemeteries are open for public so he never knows it is open to public. Other respondents never go into these cemeteries but pass by these cemeteries on the way to the shops, work, or to the Downtown Dallas.

R-C1: The respondent shares her experiences about cemetery and is more towards her feeling that she does not want to go to cemeteries because it is a sad place. Almost half of all respondents say they go to visit cemetery and walk around several times during their previous residency.

4.3.4.2 Summary

From the respondents, people who live one or two blocks away are more likely to not know about these cemeteries are open to public. One respondent has lived in this area for four years. And lacks of information also causing people not to know when cemetery is open. In a previous discussion, there are seven respondents they have been these cemeteries before, the remaining eleven respondents have not been there. Physical access points are obvious, but emotionally some respondents think a cemetery is a place to pay respects rather than going in there for some recreational activities. However, changes to accessibility increases the chances for public participation at landscape cemeteries and can be promoted by integrating burial space as part of sidewalk system.
Q4: Are these cemeteries accessible to you?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Responses**

- **R-A1**: There is an entrance just on the right hand side on the Hall Street. I might say there is another entrance on the other side (R-A1).

- **R-A2**: I haven’t been there before... You know it's open from 8 to 5 pm something like that (R-A2).

- **R-A3**: Yeah, there is gate just beside of my place, sometimes it closed sometimes it opened. (R-A3).

- **R-A4**: Yes, sure. The gate are opened early morning (R-A4).

- **R-A5**: Yes... I see cemetery keeper come in the morning raised the flag and open the gates, at night he will take down the flag and close the gates. (R-A5).

- **R-B1**: I walk around there sometimes, it’s not a regular activities, but I sometimes did that (R-B1).

- **R-B2**: There’s gate in the driveway (R-B2).

- **R-B3**: I go with my girlfriend, and we walk from that gate right at that corner (R-B3).

- **R-B4**: It was, if I want to go there. But I don’t (R-B4).

- **R-B5**: Yes, if the gates are opening (R-B5).

- **R-B6**: I never been there but you can go there (R-B6).

- **R-B7**: Yes, I used to walk through it (R-B8).

- **R-B8**: No, I don’t. It’s private. I don’t really want to go there (R-B7).

- **R-C1**: If we just go around and look around, I think we will go. Physically it is accessible for us (R-C1 and C2).

- **R-C2**: Absolutely. Even on Sunday they open. The Greenwood Cemetery keeper comes every day and opens it (R-C4).

- **R-C3**: I could walk there... I know the gate is open... I would walk there. It is close to me... I mean walk to other area and walk by it. But I will never go in there. (R-C5).

- **R-C4**: I don’t know it open to public and I never go to there (R-C3).

**Figure 4.10 Responses to Question Four**
Figure 4.11 Currently Accessible Points to Cemeteries
Figure 4.12 Entrance from Calvary Cemetery to Emanu-El Cemetery, 2012

Figure 4.13 Main Entrance to Emanu-El Cemetery on Oakgrove Avenue, 2012
Figure 4.14 Entrance to Emanu-El Cemetery on Campbell Street, 2012

Figure 4.15 Entrance to Greenwood Cemetery on the Corner of Hall Street and Woodside Street
Aside from answering the four interview questions, which mainly focus on how respondents think about recreational uses of the cemeteries, respondents also offer a few suggestions for increasing their willingness to participate in activities in cemeteries. And they not only observe human activities in the cemeteries but wildlife. Such as fox and owls habitat that use the space as cemeteries spaces.

4.4.1 Management of Space

R-B5: Comments that she does not think current conditions of these cemeteries provide enough spaces and opportunities for people to go and hang out. As she says

"... I think if they want to reuse it as a recreational purpose. They have to organize it, to do some landscape and make a park out of that. I mean don’t dig out of those burials/ graves... Maybe make some places flat, and hide the graves behind something. Either hide them with shrubs or something" (R-B5).
Later, she talks about defining a space for people to use. "People don't just find a place and go hand out. You have to find a location and define it. Define a location for people to hang out there" (R-B5).

R-C1: This respondents recalls an experience about visiting a cemetery, he mentions that a cemetery should not only provide spaces for people who passed away but also need to provide spaces for people who comes to pay respect to their loved ones. As he notes "That way can provide you already know that people already there. And people go there to mourn or to see their relatives or balancing there is the dead and there is the lives. ... just like flat stone and nice flowers.... Not just about dead dead dead people. They already dead. Maybe just make it more beautiful and people can go to visit without fear."

4.4.2 Wildlife

Two out of eighteen respondents they have found some traces of wildlife on cemeteries. R-C4: "Yeah, there used to be a family fox there. But coyote got in there. They kill them all. The family fox there for 20 years. They used to feed them let them run around. Now they are gone."
R-A4: "You know I had watched owl nesting in the trees there are wildlife that type of things."

4.4.3 Summary

These old cemeteries are mostly surrounded by the perimeter walls combining fences and gate to keep the graves safe from vandalism. But the enclosure also keeps people away. Once cemeteries are integrated into public spaces, the perimeter boundaries can then be designed to encourage people to enter or move freely through the space. High fences do not encourage interactions between cemeteries and their surrounding urban context. Perimeter walls also establish segregation between the spaces. Even though a cemetery’s main role is to keep the graves safe and intact, perimeter structures can still be erected in ways that allows for visual connection and free flow of movement with the space. R-C1 suggest that cemeteries should serve both the dead and the living and that people should be able to visit them without fear. Thus, for visitors and passersby can come to see cemeteries as a welcome refuge from
the city’s hectic lifestyle. In doing so, multiple entries can be provided in order to evoke the bond and affinity with the public.

4.5 Summary

Key points from the data are analyzed for patterns in perceptions from residents of comparative their experiences and insight views based on their daily observations to sacred spaces can construct the analysis structure.

Eighteen respondents are selected in this study and according to their living area categorized into three types (see Figure 3.1). Type A respondents have more of a chance to observe uses of cemeteries and they choose to live adjacent to cemeteries. Type B respondents have less of a chance observe activities of cemetery spaces and some of them do not even want to see the cemetery in their daily life. Type C respondents are mostly passersby to these cemeteries. They are not familiar with these cemetery, except R-C 4 whose family are buried there, but they enjoy the green spaces that cemetery provide for this area.

Thus the value of a cemetery grows with increased interest in local history and genealogy and awareness of the need to preserve natural habitats” (Harvey 2006). Some respondents note their interest in history of these cemeteries and want to see more historic interpretation when they visit there. According to Dow and Wyche (2010) once cultural understandings are established a framework can be provided for encountering space as meaningful and coherent.

This research shows that different experience of uses of cemetery spaces leads to different comments on potential uses of a sacred space. From respondents’ suggestions of possible recreational uses of cemeteries most of them are not familiar with what kind of recreational uses can cemetery accommodate. They more think about how to integrate spaces for recreational uses and also respect people who are buried there. Thus, some cemeteries promote recreational use of their grounds by maintaining extensive and well-labeled collections of plants and trees for hikers, cyclists, photographers, and bird watchers and by organizing
walking tour and outdoor chamber-music concerts (Uslu 2010). As R-B5 says define a place and people can go and use.

Accessibility issues also show in this research although the perimeters and gates of cemeteries protect graves safely from vandalism, the existing design of fences and gates give respondents a sense of unwelcome.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

This study enhances the understanding of expanding uses of cemeteries and attitudes towards old cemeteries in urban areas. For each of a summary analysis is now offered so that specific uses of grave space is contextualized alongside broader issues which link the respect and protection of graves and community ideals with the protection and constructed the natural landscapes and constitute the idea of cemetery. Section 5.3 presents key points from interview data which relate to landscape architecture field. To envision cemetery spaces which can provide uses for urban neighborhoods while evaluating the existing urban context and cemetery spaces. The proceeding section 5.4 shows possible directions for future research.

5.2 Importance of Findings

A common theme amongst participant receiving from the interview process are the recurring use of the word "respect". The word is used in contexts such as respect the people who already buried there and respect past history. Respondents perceive sacred spaces in urban area as sources of reverence and a sign of death. While exploring expanding recreational uses, respondents envision current conditions of cemeteries as fenced, gated, and unwelcoming environments. Lehrer (1974) states that people tend to attach sentimental feelings to places such as cemeteries, because of their association with historical, religious, or mythical events that contribute to the culture of its community.

Also from the findings, cemeteries in the Uptown area serve green open spaces which releasing the chaotic urban environment. These spaces also are seen as cultural reminding
people of the past. These cemeteries have their unique roles in the Uptown area and their heritage values provide clues to their design and management.

5.2.1 Design Approach

In order to understand people’s attitudes and preferences it is important and necessary to know their cultural history and context of the surroundings in which they live (Tuan 1974). Uptown is a newly redeveloped community and is composed mostly of new immigrants. They are not as attached to the area because of their short residency. For now they possess less awareness of the context but the historical significance of these cemeteries gives them a sense beginning.

More than half of the respondents never go to these cemeteries. From their comments, fences surrounding the properties do not encourage interactions between the cemeteries and their surrounding urban context. Even though a cemetery’s main role is to keep the graves safe and intact, the perimeter structures can still be erected in a way that allows for visual connection and free flow of movement with the space.

To respond to comments of enhancing a cemetery’s historic significance and the interest on their history, incorporating objects of historic significance which can present at the time of the historical event can be an important aspect of place making.

5.2.2 Ecological Concerns

Cemeteries in urban areas also provide valuable preserved green spaces for wildlife refuges. In these cemeteries mature canopy trees and lush groundcover provide wild fox family and other animals protections. Wildlife enhance the visitation experience for those people visiting cemeteries as well as for the large numbers of city dwellers who recreate in cemeteries (McPherson and Nilon 1987). Dominating with mature trees indicates the important environmental value of these cemeteries. These existing cemetery sites benefit the ecosystem by providing space for a variety of trees providing shade, blocking winds, stabilizing the soil, promoting infiltration on the site, producing oxygen, and taking up carbon dioxide (Jones 2011).
5.2.3 Culture Differences

These cemeteries show different cultural endeavor to construct the meaning and reconfigure the shape of the land through spiritual rituals that express cultural significations (Jones 2011). Greenwood Cemetery origins from family burial sites and dominate different religious. Calvary Cemetery is an old Christian cemetery that expresses early catholic culture from early European immigrations. Emanu-El Cemetery is a Jewish cemetery has its own ritual and unique expression of commemorating. Freedman's Memorial Cemetery is landmark of Dallas to memory those Africa American town once there. The diverse cultural have coexisted in the Uptown area for hundred years and continued being there serve a reminder of people about the past.

The other issue respondents mentioned is uses for cemeteries can vary from culture to culture. One example from R-A3's comment that "Mexican people do that. They bury the dead and celebrate next to the tombstone. They with their relative feast and food. But American I don't think we will do that. “This is also reveal reasons that some of respondents don't connect recreational uses directly or not to cemetery spaces.

5.3 Importance of Landscape Architecture

It is particularly important for those in the professions of landscape architecture and design to look beyond the status quo and to invest on their projects with much deeper understanding and commitment to the sacred. Landscape architects have a unique contribution to make to cemetery landscape. The sacred site contains stories of people’s past, stories of environmental transformations. Landscape architects are vital in establishing cemetery sites, preserving them, and creating a memorial design process to ensure that stories and lives are preserved, and passed on to future generations (Wasserman 1998).

As designers, it is our responsibility to convince others of this being an issue of utmost important and that the idea of place making is critical when envision a more uses with sacred place for cemeteries. The conditions of cemetery entrances in study area that locations should
relocate and be able to enhance by making use of corridor to allowing a more controlled access to cemeteries and bring visitors within the borders of these cemeteries. Cemetery spaces are not simply places for burying the dead, they also can be considered as view amenities and green buffers within urban areas. Fences and gates of cemeteries should be designed as a way to invite people in. Creating corridors to separate burial sites and activity areas is a way to pay respect for the deceased. The idea of place making is critical when utilizing space-especially the use of sacred places, such as cemeteries.

5.4 Suggestion for Future Research

The findings of this study shows there are opportunities for further investigating cemetery spaces in urban areas.
1. It is necessary to involve professionals in the landscape architectural and planning fields with their ideas/proposals for secondary use of space to an existing cemetery or find better way to integrate the cemetery into an urban community.
2. Future cemetery designers should investigate ways to increase connectivity and accessibility to cemeteries.
3. Exploring cemeteries in the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area and reviewing their green spaces’ role in the region green infrastructure system to see how it can benefit the ecological system.

5.5 Summary

The results of this study provided ideas that cemetery still plays a traditional role for people, but not open spaces. Some people are not ready to use cemetery spaces as open spaces and design of cemetery spaces also need to rethink about integrating more activities for the living and spaces to the dead. Thus, cemeteries should be adapting to modern conditions redefining its original missions, horticulture, commemoration and landscape (Uslu 2010). This study provides a rough understanding of people who reside close to cemeteries, their point of
views toward cemetery spaces and can provide some directions for designing a future new cemetery that can meet the needs.
APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL LETTER
Institutional Review Board
Notification of Exemption

February 26, 2013

Huei-Chung Cheng
Dr. Pat Taylor
School of Architecture
Box 19108

Protocol Number: 2013-0384

Protocol Title: PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS REGARDING USES OF CEMETERY SPACES IN URBAN NEIGHBORHOODS: A STUDY OF CEMETERIES IN UPTOWN DALLAS, TEXAS

Type of Review: Exemption Determination

The UT Arlington Institutional Review Board (IRB) Chair, or designee, has reviewed the above referenced study and found that it qualified for exemption under the federal guidelines for the protection of human subjects as referenced at Title 45 Part 46.101(b)(2):

- Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
  - (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, either directly or through identifiers linked to the subject; and
  - (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You are therefore authorized to begin your research as of February 26, 2013.

Pursuant to Title 45 CFR 46.103(b)(4)(iii), investigators are required to, “promptly report to the IRB any proposed changes in the research activity, and to ensure that such changes in approved research, during the period for which IRB approval has already been given, are not initiated without prior IRB review and approval except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject.” Please be advised that as the principal investigator, you are required to report local adverse (unanticipated) events to the Office of Research Administration; Regulatory Services within 24 hours of the occurrence or upon acknowledgement of the occurrence.

All investigators and key personnel identified in the protocol must have documented Human Subject Protection (HSP) Training on file with this office. Completion certificates are valid for 2 years from completion date.

The UT Arlington Office of Research Administration; Regulatory Services appreciates your continuing commitment to the protection of human subjects in research. Should you have questions, or need to report completion of study procedures, please contact Robin Dickey at 817-272-9329 or robind@uta.edu. You may also contact Regulatory Services at 817-272-3723 or regulatoryservices@uta.edu.
REFERENCES


Basingstoke: Macmillan.


BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Huei-Chung Cheng was born in Hsin-Chu, Taiwan, on November 7th, 1985. In 2008, she completed her bachelor degree from the Department of Fine Arts, Program in Landscape Architecture, at Fu-Jen Catholic University in Taipei County, Taiwan.

After two years working experience in landscape design and planning, she decided to continue her academic plan to join the School of Architecture at The University of Texas at Arlington in 2010 pursuing a master degree. She has passion about designing memorial and sacred spaces and integrating landscape design with spiritual cultural into places. Her research mainly focus on relationships between urban development and preserved sacred spaces.