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Abstract

Over the past two decades, there have been attempts to identify and understand suburban metropolitan growth patterns and the implications of this growth on both the local and regional economy. Understanding suburban metropolitan growth is important in determining the impacts that this type of growth may have on the local and regional economic status, patterns of land use and transportation, population trends, and income levels. The focus of this research is two-fold. One goal of the research is to determine whether the initial theory of metrotown still holds true. Are suburban growth centers continuing to grow into self-sufficient “mini-cities”? Do suburban growth centers continue to evolve into strong, second-tier business districts? Do they share an interdependent relationship with the central city? The second focus of this research is to attempt to identify distinguishing characteristics between local and regional economic activities within suburban growth centers. This research investigates the characteristics between local and regional economic activities within Kenwood, Ohio. The specific aims of the study are to: 1) assess the current status of the Kenwood area as a metrotown; 2) examine and analyze the major differences between local and regional activities in Kenwood, in relation to employment and land use; 3) identify and examine the changes and influences of income, land use, and transportation on the economic growth of the study area as a metrotown; and 4) identify specific factors that influence the location of economic activity within the Kenwood area. The overall criteria for evaluating the Kenwood area are based on its spatial layout and physical organization, its composition, and its local and regional economic activities.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Over the past two decades, there have been attempts to identify and understand suburban metropolitan growth patterns and the implications of this growth on both the local and regional economy. Findings from previous research conducted on the subject have had varying conclusions regarding the continued evolution of metropolitan growth as well its potential effects on the local and regional economy, including the continued stability of the central city. Some scholars (Fulton 1986) suggest that a new kind of downtown has emerged in the suburbs, far from the central city, as a center of employment, commerce, and culture. Other scholars (Leinberger 1984, 2000; Garreau 1994) indicate that suburbs have become wealthy markets within the United States, while a number of scholars agree that suburban growth centers serve an array of functions in their regional economies (Leinberger 1984, 2000; Fulton 1986; Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner 1988; Garreau 1994; Romanos, et. al. 1988, 1994, and 2006; and Lang and LeFurgy 2007).

Understanding suburban metropolitan growth is important in determining the impacts which this type of growth may have on the local and regional economic status, patterns of land use and transportation, population trends, and income levels. A study conducted by Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner (1988) examined the phenomenon of the transformation of suburban economic centers. As part of their research, they examined the growth patterns of suburban business areas within the Greater Cincinnati region and tried to identify whether these areas had evolved into self-sufficient economic growth centers exhibiting some of the same functions of the central city. This suburban growth center stage Romanos and his colleagues defined as a “Metrotown”.

1
This study of suburban business centers was the beginning of a series of studies by Romanos and his colleagues on the transformations of metropolitan suburban growth patterns (metrotowns) and associated economic activities over the last twenty years. The main conclusion from the studies showed that metrotowns continue to remain an essential element of the metropolitan region. The studies identified key suburban centers in the Greater Cincinnati region. The studies conducted by Romanos and his colleagues also found that transportation and land use were important predictors of development and growth patterns of suburban economic centers. However, the most recent study conducted (2006) revealed that within the past several years, some of the suburban growth centers in the Cincinnati metropolitan region had begun to lose significant numbers of employment; suggesting that the initial metrotown theory may no longer be valid. Instead of continuing to develop as concentrated self-sufficient economic growth centers, research data exhibited a trend of spatially dispersed areas of employment throughout the suburbs.

The focus of this research is two-fold. One goal of the research is to determine whether the initial theory of metrotown still holds true. *Are suburban growth centers continuing to grow into self-sufficient “mini-cities”? Do suburban growth centers continue evolve into strong, second-tier business districts? Do they share an interdependent relationship with the central city?* The second focus of this research is to attempt to take the Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner study of metrotowns a step further by identifying characteristics between local and regional economic activities within metrotowns, as well, as factors that distinguish those activities. In doing so, I attempt to answer the following questions, *“What types of economic activities are within suburban growth areas? What are the local and regional influences of land use and*
transportation on suburban growth? What specific factors influence the location of economic activity within a suburban growth center? What are the local and regional impacts of the economic activities of suburban growth centers? What influences does income have on these areas?"

To answer these questions the examination of several components is of importance to this research study. First, a conceptual understanding of suburban growth centers or metrotowns is necessary in understanding suburban growth centers and their impacts. The conceptual analysis also identifies metrotown stages of growth for suburban economic centers, the key factors associated with growth patterns of these centers, and implications of metrotowns. A second component, a case study analysis of a suburban growth center, which includes an assessment of population within the growth center and its surrounding areas to identify common patterns, associated with suburban growth. This includes assessments of transitions in the land use patterns and transportation networks of the case study area. Land use and transportation play a vital role and can have significant impacts on the economic development growth patterns of both urban and suburban areas. The next component is a review of economic and income data to analyze the impacts of suburban growth centers on the economic status, employment, and income levels of the study area and its surrounding neighborhoods. A brief review of the role and relationship of the City of Cincinnati as a central city is also required. Finally, an evaluation of perspectives of businesses and major property owners within the area defined in the case study, to gain a better perspective of location decision factors that can effect economic growth of metrotowns. For the purposes of this
research study the terms suburban growth centers and metrotowns will be used interchangeably and refer to self-sufficient suburban economic centers.

For this research, a case study of the Kenwood Census Designated Place (CDP) is examined to answer the research questions and to gain a better understanding of the economic effects that suburban growth centers may have on both the local and regional economy. Census designated places are settled concentrations of population that are identifiable by name but are not legally incorporated under the laws of the state in which they are located (US Census Bureau 2007). The Kenwood CDP was chosen because of its growth and its characteristic make-up. Previous research on the Kenwood area also documented it as a metropolitan center experiencing high levels of employment and commercial development and growth (Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner 1988; Romanos, et.al. 1988). Kenwood, targeted as a suburban growth area, may be evolving into an independent self-sufficient metropolitan economic center. To understand the economic activities of the area and to assess its development as an independent suburban growth center or metrotown, Kenwood’s employment and commercial growth trend requires further research.

This research investigates the distinguishing characteristics between local and regional economic activities within Kenwood. The overall aim of this case study is to examine the Kenwood area for factors to determine whether it is moving towards metrotown status and to identify local and regional economic activity that contribute to its development and future growth. Three criteria used to evaluate the Kenwood area include its spatial and physical organization and characteristics, its composition, as well as its local and regional economic activities. The specific aims of the study are to: 1) assess the current status of the Kenwood
area as a metrotown; 2) examine and analyze the major differences between local and regional activities in Kenwood, in relation to employment and land use; 3) identify and examine the changes and influences of income, land use, and transportation on the economic growth of the study area as a metrotown; and 4) identify specific factors that influence the location of economic activity within the Kenwood area.

This paper consists of four parts. Chapter 2 is a literature review describing suburban growth and the concept of metrotowns. Chapter 3 defines the research questions and the methodology for the study. Chapter 4 is comprised of a case study analysis of the Kenwood area as a suburban growth center. This section focuses on key variables of population, land use, transportation, economic and employment trends, income, and business owner’s perspectives of economic activities, necessary for economic growth. It also briefly analyzes the relationship between Kenwood and the City of Cincinnati as a central city. The final chapter provides a summary of the key findings and conclusions derived from the literature review and case study analysis.
Chapter Two: A Conceptual View of Metrotowns

Appearance and Formation of Metrotowns

Metrotowns are defined by Romanos and his colleagues as self-sufficient metropolitan areas outside the central city that contain all the functions of a city (Romanos, et. al. 1988). These areas may also be referred to as edge cities (Garreau 1991) or urban villages (Leinberger, 1984). Today it is accepted that the formation of these geographic entities may have strong influences on local and regional growth (Garreau 1991; Romanos, et. al. 2006). The study of metrotowns is important in identifying and understanding urban economic growth patterns and the implications of such growth to both the local and regional economies. Findings from previous research conducted on the subject have had varying conclusions as to how metrotowns would continue to develop as well as their potential effects on the local and regional economy, including the continued stability of the central city.

Research conducted within the past twenty years has investigated factors of change and the patterns and locations of the growth of metropolitan areas outside of the urban core (Leinberger and Lockwood 1986; Romanos, et. al. 1988, 1994, and 2006; Garreau 1991). The changes in the patterns of growth began to manifest themselves in the mid-1900s. Since then metropolitan regions throughout the United States have continued to experience transformations in the development of their landscapes, witnessing growth in their physical space occupied by metropolitan areas (Leinberger 2000). The development and growth of metrotowns represented a dramatic restructuring of America’s cities and suburbs affecting the quality of life of millions of Americans allowing them the ability to live, work, shop, and play in close proximity.
Metrotowns were the result of shifts in population and employment that began after WWII and led to metropolitan areas evolving into economic clusters of office, industrial, retail, and housing focal points among low-density metropolitan landscapes. This trend of suburban growth centers developed from changes in the following factors: 1) out of a shift from a manufacturing to a service economy; 2) the change from rail to truck; 3) the change in Americans preferences for automobile commuting over mass transit, and 4) advances in telecommunication (Leinberger 1984). Those factors, which had the most impact on the transformation of the metropolitan landscapes, were the increasing reliability and use of the automobile, in addition to economic activity and growth, both on local and regional levels. According to Leinberger (1996), prior to 1960, the downtown area contained the main concentration of export and regional serving jobs. However, beginning during WWII, and rapidly accelerating afterward, a majority of American downtowns lost their upper and high-end housing to the suburbs. Within the next two decades second, third, and fourth generation of metrocores developed providing office oriented development and industrial space outside from the central city (Leinberger 1996). The combination of freeway access and the change in employment locations has pressed the metropolitan frame farther and farther out at an ever-increasing rate (Leinberger 2000).

It was noted that this evolution in spatial patterns continued during the 1960s and 1970s leading to the transformation of metropolitan areas into multi-nucleated urban areas (Romanos, et al. 2006). During the 1960s, suburban areas experienced the expansion of retail malls, in addition industrial and office employers began to relocate from the center city to the more suburban areas (Leinberger 1996). This trend continued through the 1970s and 1980s.
In the mid 1980s, the American Planning Association noted how a new kind of downtown was emerging in the suburbs (Fulton 1986). Like the traditional downtown, this new downtown is the center for employment, commerce, and culture, but it is located far from the center of the city. Some of the new downtowns emerged almost overnight in older, traditional low-rise suburban shopping centers. Others were planned from scratch on undeveloped land. These are centers represented a shift of jobs from central cities. Not only were back office operations moving to the suburban areas, but large corporate headquarters were also beginning to relocate. This massive employment shift resulted in a completely new kind of city being created in the suburbs (Fulton 1986). These suburban metropolitan areas offered more jobs, more living space, and better schools (Barker 1999) and by the early 1990s the physical growth rate of metropolitan areas accelerated even more rapidly than it had in the previous decades (Lang and LeFurgy 2007). Fringe commercial developments sprang up in undeveloped metropolitan areas (Leinberger 2000).

By the late 1980s and early 1990s studies analyzed the development and vitality of urban villages or metrotowns (Leinberger 1986; Romanos, et. al. 1988; Garreau 1991) and suggested that metrotowns would evolve into self-sufficient centers within the metropolitan region with no dependency upon the central business district. Further findings (Romanos, et.al. 1994) predicted that some of these edge cities would stagnate, while others would flourish and become major regional economic centers.

By the mid-1990s, suburban growth centers (Garreau 1994) were becoming the richest and most promising markets within the United States. These centers were transforming the spatial distribution of America’s major cities, in terms of social, political, economic, and physical
characteristics (Romanos 1988); distinct types of employment began to develop. The variation in employment was primarily evident in the 1990s, when approximately one-third of metropolitan jobs were with companies that exported goods and services outside the metro areas. These were the highest paying jobs injecting fresh cash into the local economy. These export jobs in turn created demand for regional serving jobs. The regional serving jobs represented about a quarter of all jobs and paid only slightly less than the export jobs.

Today metrotowns have “big-city” needs that must be balanced with a suburban environment based on low density, single land use subdivisions (Lang and LeFurgy 2007). More and more people are living, working, shopping and paying taxes at the farthest edges of metropolitan areas. The suburbs or edge cities now dominate employment growth and are no longer just bedroom communities for workers commuting to traditional downtowns. Rather, they are now strong employment centers serving a variety of functions in their regional economies. According to Katz (2002), the American economy is rapidly becoming an “exit ramp” economy, with office, commercial and retail facilities increasingly located along suburban freeways. Across the largest 100 metro areas, on average, only 22 percent of people work within three miles of the city center. Moreover, more than 35 percent work more than ten miles from the central core. The suburbs are now home to one in two Americans (Katz 2002).

However, current trends in metrotown development conflict with the previously established theories (Romanos, et.al, 2006). These trends show that suburban populations have been increasing at a decreasing rate when compared to prior decades (15% growth rates in 1990 versus 21% growth rates in 1980). Additionally, this research shows that some
suburban areas became independent of the central city while others reached their growth potential, exhausted all land, and therefore developed into cities (Garreau 1991). Furthermore, diffusing economic activity in the suburbs accompanied the return of some economic activity to the central city. Additional problems facing the future of metrotowns are traffic congestion, lack of public transportation, and rapidly increasing land values. The analysis of the data found that the edge city or metrotown hypothesis no longer holds. Instead of increasing concentrations of employment and the conversion of the growth centers into “mini-central cities,” a wide dispersion of employment in all spatial units was observed in the study area (Romanos et. al. 2006).

These findings require further research to identify the local and regional economic factors that contribute to the development of metrotowns as well as how these factors may influence their future growth and vitality. It also brings us to ask the questions identified earlier, “Is the initial theory of metrotowns still valid? If so, are they truly independent of the central city? What types of economic activities are within suburban growth areas? What are the local and regional influences of land use and transportation on suburban growth? What specific factors influenced the location of economic activity within a suburban growth center? What are the local and regional impacts of the economic activities of suburban growth centers? What influences does income have on these areas?” To begin to answer these questions we must first have an understanding of the various stages in metrotown development, the land use and transportation patterns of metrotowns, and the economic activities associated with each.
Initial research on metrotowns indicated that they continue to remain an essential part of the metropolitan region. The University of Cincinnati’s School of Planning completed a series of research studies (Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner 1988; Romanos et al. 1988, 1994, and 2006) focused on the development and economic activity of metrotowns within the Greater Cincinnati region. The study of the spatial transformation of urban communities within the Greater Cincinnati Region that defined the concept of urban villages or metrotowns began in 1987 by the University of Cincinnati School of Planning, with the “Formation of Urban Villages: Definitions of the Concept and Application of the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area Final Report on Grant Research Activities” (Romanos et al. 1988). This research established the definition and concepts associated with metrotowns, including the metrotown stages of evolution. The evolution of the metrotown occurred in five stages; 1) Local Activity Area; 2) Regional Activity Area; 3) Regional Activity and Employment Center; 4) Semi-Independent Metropolitan District, and finally 5) the Metrotown. The study was the foundation of the later studies on metrotowns in the Greater Cincinnati region. The five stages as defined below are also illustrated in Figure 1. These stages will be relevant in assessing the Kenwood case study discussed in Chapter 3.

**Stage 1 - Local Activity Area:**
The Local Activity Area represents the pre-beltway period from WWII to the 1950s and 1960s, in which the suburban freeway corridors began to be established (Romanos, et al. 1988). During this stage, the land was mainly unused farmland, the central business district was still dominant, industrial activity was not present, commercial centers served local residents, and there was migration of residents from the city to the suburbs.
Stage 2 - Regional Activity Area:
In the Regional Activity Area phase, there are a wider variety of non-residential land uses, the central business district begins to lose employment to suburban areas, light industrial and warehousing appear, regional malls are established, there is a variety of retail and service oriented employment, there is a development of more mixed residential developments, and better accessibility to transportation as a result of the construction of the suburban freeways.

Stage 3 - Regional Activity and Employment Center:
The Regional Activity and Employment Center period experiences economic expansion as well as economic independence of the center from the central city. There is rapid growth and significant land speculation, the central business district faces high competition for employment opportunities, super-regional malls and infill development activities begin, the emergence of distinctive labor markets, and diverse commercial activities (i.e. office complexes, corporate headquarters, and luxury hotels), high-income housing and infill residential development occur, and transportation accessibility allows for trips from a large number of metropolitan origins towards the center.

Stage 4 - Independent Metropolitan District:
The stage of the Semi-Independent Metropolitan District encounters relative economic independence of the center city and great diversity of employment opportunities becomes apparent. An urban identity emerges, the central business district loses specialized stores and employment, warehouses disappear, new commercial structures replace old structures with specialized stores, and a full range of consumer goods, the area lacks low-income housing that leads to the shortage of low wage labor. There is also a lack of public transportation between the center city and district, which prohibits low-wage workers from seeking employment in the district. There is a high volume of internal traffic and congestion.

Stage 5 - Metrotown:
The final stage is the Metrotown. This period reflects a stage of maturity of the metrotown, by the achievement of economic independence and the establishment of a clear urban identity. The center plays a significant role within the metropolitan region. The metrotown exhibits characteristics of the central business district with mixed uses, high densities, with a combination of strip development and high-rises.
There is a dominance of tall buildings and high quality design, the central business district loses its unique central role, high technology research and development centers emerge, there are high levels of employment, office, and commercial activity, and high-income residential housing. There is also traffic congestion caused by internal movement and the recognition of pedestrian needs (Romanos, et al. 1988).

*Figure 1. Stages of Metrotown Evolution*

*Source: Based upon Metrotown, Stages of Evolution as defined by Romanos, Chifos and Fenner, 1988*

These stages are relevant in providing a conceptual view of the formation of metrotowns. They also provide the characteristics of development associated with the different phases of metrotown development. In reviewing the formation of metrotowns, an understanding of key components and implications attributed to metrotown development is
necessary. The next two sections of this chapter focus on providing an overview of these elements.

**Key Characteristics of Metrotowns**

Metrotowns are considered self-sufficient economic centers with major concentrations of employment (retail, services, finance, and wholesale); specialized services (shopping, healthcare, cultural, and entertainment); and residential development of such a size, diversity, and sophistication that they exhibit a significant degree of centrality within a metropolitan area and allow successful competition with the CBD (Romanos and Chifos 1987; Romanos, et. al. 1988). Metrotowns also may have many characteristics of a town; however, they remain part of the larger metropolitan fabric of which they evolved. They are comprised of portions of metropolitan areas that lie outside central cities (Katz and Lang 2003). These metrotowns are urban in function, but not in form. They are comprised of elements of traditional urban areas but appear suburban. For instance, they include mixed land uses, but do not necessarily encourage a pedestrian environment. They entail mostly low to mid density, automobile dependent, and dispersed development (Lang, Blakely, and Gough 2005).

**Figure 2.** Key Features of Metrotowns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key features of metrotowns and their tributary areas can be identified as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Centrality of functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clustering of high order economic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dense development manifested in a relatively compact, high density core containing both high-rise buildings and low-rise strip development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increased height, size, and architectural quality of buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. High intensity traffic patterns and traffic congestion during peak periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dependence upon large numbers of surrounding households for retail, services, entertainment, and employment (Romanos and Chifos 1987; Cervero 1986).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications of Metrotowns

There are two distinct implications regarding the continued growth and development of metrotowns remaining as essential parts of the metropolitan region. These implications are: 1) Metrotowns would evolve into self-sufficient centers within the metropolitan region with no dependency upon the central business district; and 2) Some metrotowns would die as others flourish and become major regional economic centers.

The issue of the cause and effect relationship between the economic importance of center city and suburban growth areas in terms of the growth or decline of the region continues to be a debate. Research has shown that both need each other for sustainability and growth. Although suburban growth areas thrive as independent economic generators, there is still a question about their regional connection and reliance on the central city or downtown. There are implied causal links between central cities and suburban areas (Voith, 1998).

The second implication stated that metrotowns would either become stagnant or reach their growth potential and begin to decline or die out. Research shows that metrotowns have not died out. On the contrary, they continue to flourish and grow. Metrotowns have become independent economic growth centers. Recent research also shows that some suburban areas became independent of the central city and others reached their growth potential, exhausted all land, and therefore developed into cities (Romanos 2006). Diffusing economic activity in the suburbs accompanied the return of some economic activity to the central city. The most significant dynamics that influenced the concentration of employment in the suburbs were external forces, mobility and accessibility; and labor markets and residential density were not
as significant predictors of the formation of edge cities (Bingham et. al. 1997; Romanos, et. al. 2006). Workers were now more willing to accept the transport costs associated with travel throughout the region, and the most important factor in the location decisions of firms was external. Location concentration does not confer the same benefits as before, and this has led to de-concentration of businesses and therefore, employment (Romanos, et. al. 2006).

Bingham et. al. (1997) used a mixed method approach to study the formation of edge cities in the State of Ohio. Employment and business establishments’ data for the years 1995 and 1996 were used in this multi-disciplinary study. Bingham and others (1997) found that functionally specialized edge cities were emerging in the Ohio region. The functional specializations seen in the edge cites were: retail and personal services, wholesale and social services, service centers, information and producer services, retail, and the development of edge cites along interstate corridors.

Lang (2003) also studied the locations of the dispersal of office space and employment and found that most of the office space occurs outside the downtowns (two-thirds), and that office space is scattered around in the suburbs and is not concentrated in the edge cities. The conclusion was that suburban growth centers, such as edge cities, have not successfully attracted office space, and density is not returning in the suburbs (Lang 2003; Romanos, et. al. 2006).

The most recent study conducted by the University of Cincinnati School of Planning in 2006 (Romanos, et. al. 2006) examined the development of growth areas and revealed that within the last several years, some of the metrotowns or growth corridors have actually lost significant numbers of employment. The analysis of the data found that the edge city or
metrotown hypothesis no longer holds. Instead of increasing concentrations of employment and the conversion of the growth centers into “mini-central cities”, a wide dispersion of employment in all spatial units were observed in the study area (Romanos et al 2006). Other research (Barnett 2002) indicates that a vast majority of new suburban office space is going to places that meet the metrotown definition, but in much more diffused patterns of commercial corridors.

These implications signify a need for further research on the transformation of metrotowns or suburban growth centers to assess their future growth or decline. Additional research also needs to be conducted to identify local and regional economic activities associated with these types of economic centers and to analyze the role of land use and transportation on their future development.

In the following chapter, a case study analysis of the suburban growth center of Kenwood, Ohio, will attempt to address some of the above questions. Its principal focus is to investigate the distinguishing characteristics between local and regional economic activities within Kenwood, on the assumption that, the larger the regional component of the local economy, the more is the definition of metrotowns met. As part of the case study analysis, major differences between local and regional activities in Kenwood are identified and analyzed. In addition, changes and influences of employment, income, land use, and transportation on the economic growth of the Kenwood area as a metrotown are evaluated. This includes a brief review of the role of the City of Cincinnati in relation to Kenwood as a central city. This case study analysis also identifies specific factors that influence the location of economic activity and
those necessary factors that are important in location decisions of firms and businesses to locate or remain within the Kenwood area.

The overall aim of this case study is to examine the Kenwood area for factors to determine whether it is moving towards metrotown status and to identify local and regional economic activity that contribute to its development and future growth. Three criteria will be used to evaluate the Kenwood area. These include its spatial and physical organization and characteristics, its composition, as well as its local and regional economic activities.
Chapter Three: Research Goals and Methodology

Research Questions

The overall aim of this case study is to examine the Kenwood area to determine whether it is moving towards metrotown status and to identify local and regional economic activity that contribute to its development and future growth. The Kenwood area is analyzed based upon its spatial organization and physical characteristics, composition, and local and regional economic activities. As stated in previous sections, the specific aims of the study are to: 1) assess the current status of the Kenwood area as a metrotown; 2) examine and analyze the major differences between local and regional activities in Kenwood, in relation to employment and land use; 3) identify and examine the changes and influences of income, land use, and transportation on the economic growth of the study area as a metrotown; and 4) identify specific factors that influence the location of economic activity within the Kenwood area.

Literature on the phenomenon of metropolitan growth suggests that 1) Metrotowns would evolve into self-sufficient centers within the metropolitan region with no dependency upon the central business district; and 2) Some metrotowns would die as others flourish and become major regional economic centers. The literature indicates a trend of diffusing economic activity in the suburbs accompanied the return of some economic activity to the central city (Voith 1998). In addition, metrotowns are facing problems of traffic congestion, lack of public transportation, and rapidly increasing land values (Bingham, et.al. 1997; Lang 2003). Additional research found that the metrotown hypothesis no longer holds. Instead of
increasing concentrations of employment and the conversion of the growth centers into “mini-central cities”, a wide dispersion of employment in all spatial units was observed to occur (Romanos et. al. 2006).

The focus of this research is two-fold. One goal of the research is to determine whether the initial theory of metrotown still holds true. The second focus of this research is to attempt to take the Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner (1988) study of metrotowns a step further by identifying characteristics between local and regional economic activities within metrotowns, as well as factors that distinguish those activities. Based on the implications derived from the literature on metrotowns and suburban economic growth centers, the research strives to answer the following questions:

1. Are suburban growth centers continuing to grow into self-sufficient “mini-cities”?
2. Have they become independent of the center city?
3. What types of economic activities are within suburban growth areas?
4. What are the local and regional influences of land use and transportation on suburban growth?
5. What specific factors influenced the location of economic activity within a suburban growth center?
6. What are the local and regional impacts of the economic activities of suburban growth centers?
7. What influences does income have on these areas?”

**Methodology**

**Case Study Design**

The research was performed implementing a case study design. The case study included an analysis of the study area in relation to land use and transportation, population,
employment, economic business sectors, and income trends within the last twenty to fifty years. The land use, demographic, and economic data gathered from the US Census Bureau, local businesses and property owners, and municipalities within the study area is used during the research and analysis phases of this study. The research and analysis phases includes mapping of the demographic changes and economic activity using Geographical Information Systems (GIS) techniques.

Additional data were collected using information from the National Historical Census Geographic Information Systems, Ohio Kentucky Indiana Regional Council of Governments, Sycamore Township Planning and Zoning Department, the City of Blue Ash Department of Economic Development, Applied Geographic Solutions, the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce: Cincinnati USA Partnership website, and the Cincinnati Geographic Information Systems (CAGIS).

In order to identify local and regional economic activities in the Kenwood area the location quotient technique was employed. A business survey of business and property owners in the Kenwood study area was also conducted to determine business location decisions and perspectives of the area. Both of these methods are explained in more detail below.

**Location Quotient Technique**

Employment data using the U.S. Standard Industrial Classification code from the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce Cincinnati USA database was used to determine economic activities that were local as well as those that were regional. To classify these activities, the Location Quotient (LQ) calculation method was employed to determine those employment
industry sectors which were local (non-basic) versus those that were regional (export base).

The LQ technique does not assume that all employment in each industry is basic or non-basic. Instead, LQs are calculated for all industries to determine whether or not the local economy has a greater share of each industry than expected when compared to a regional economy (Garnet, 2008). According to Garnet (2008), “…if an industry has a greater share than expected of a given industry, then that "extra" industry employment is assumed to be basic because those jobs are above what a local economy should have to serve local needs. Any employment over and above the expected percentage is therefore considered to consist of basic sector jobs because these workers are assumed to be exporting their goods and services to non-local areas. If the percentages had been identical or if the local percentage had been less than the regional percentage, then the analyst would conclude that the local area has no basic sector employment for that industry as the area can only, at best, meet their local demand and not export these goods and services.”

Location Quotient Calculation

To calculate any location quotient the following formula is applied. Note that in this formula the local economy (Kenwood CDP) is being compared to the regional economy (Greater Cincinnati Region).

**Figure 3.** Location Quotient Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Quotient</th>
<th>Local Employment in Industry I in Year T</th>
<th>Regional Employment in Industry I in Year T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Local Employment in Year T</td>
<td>Total Regional Employment in Year T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only three general outcomes are possible when calculating location quotients. These outcomes are as follows:

**Figure 4.** Location Quotient Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LQ &lt; 1.0</th>
<th>LQ = 1.0</th>
<th>LQ &gt; 1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


The LQ compares the relative size of a sector in a local area to its relative size in the region. A LQ that is less than one (LQ < 1) suggests that local employment is less than was expected for a given industry. Therefore, that industry does not even meet local demand for a given good or service, and all of this employment is considered non-basic by definition. A LQ that is equal to one (LQ = 1) suggests that the local employment is exactly sufficient to meet the local demand for a given good or service. Therefore, all of this employment is also considered non-basic because none of these goods or services are exported to non-local areas. A LQ that is greater than one (LQ > 1) provides evidence of basic employment for a given industry. When an LQ > 1.0, it can be concluded that local employment is greater than expected and the extra goods and services must be exported to non-local areas and therefore is a regional activity (McCann, 2001).

**Kenwood Business Survey**

In addition, 20 business supervisors and major property owners within the study area were surveyed. Businesses were selected at based upon a list generated from Hamilton County Auditor Records, GIS property data, and lists of businesses owners from Sycamore
Township and the City of Blue Ash. Appointments with businesses and supervisors where then set up to administer the survey. In the case that this was not possible, walk-in surveys were administered.

*Target Population, Sampling Procedure, & Mode of Administration*

**Target Population:** The target population for this project was 20 business managers and property owners within the Kenwood study area (See Figure 1: Kenwood Study Area Boundary).

**Sampling Procedure:** The sampling frame employed was convenience and purposive sampling methods. The businesses and property owners were identified using a list derived from the Hamilton County Auditor Records, GIS property data, and lists of businesses owners from Sycamore Township and the City of Blue Ash. All business and property owners targeted for the study resided within the Kenwood study area boundary (See Figure 1: Kenwood Study Area Boundary).

**Mode of Administration:** For this project in-person interview surveys of business managers and property owners within the study area was conducted. The surveys were conducted in-person at the business or location. In the event that in-person interviews could not be conducted, telephone surveys were conducted. The surveys contained a series of open-ended and close-ended questions. A survey pre-notification/introduction letter was sent to potential respondents via mail or e-mail regarding the purpose, background, and relevance of the study. Follow-up telephone calls were administered to schedule appointment times to conduct the survey interview. After completion of the survey research, a thank you letter was sent to respondents. An incentive was also offered to the respondent in the form of a copy of the final research report results.
The variables being assessed in the survey include:

- The type(s) of service(s)/product(s) businesses provide to the local and regional economy.

- The length of time the business has been located within the Kenwood study area.

- Whether the business initially established within the Kenwood study area or reason why the business relocated to the study area.

- Decision-making factors that were important in business and/or property owner’s decision to locate the Kenwood study area.

- Identifying factors that make the Kenwood area good for business.

- Identifying support services in the Kenwood area that service the businesses.

- Market area definitions by geographic area. (e.g., Geographic boundaries, such as neighborhoods, Blue Ash, Kenwood, Madeira, Montgomery, Silverton, Sycamore Twp., Cincinnati).

- Geographic boundary definitions used to describe and define the Kenwood Business District (e.g., Spatial definitions, such as streets or landmarks).

- The perceived importance of the business and/or property owners of the City of Cincinnati is, particularly its downtown area, in supporting the vitality of the Kenwood study area.

- Future plans of business and property owners to remain within the Kenwood study area.

- Future plans of business and property owners to expand within the Kenwood study area.

- The perceived future for the Kenwood study area, in terms of economic and population growth.
In addition, an interview was conducted with the Sycamore Township Planning and Zoning Administrator regarding the history of the Kenwood core area as well as the current and future developments for the area.
Chapter Four: A Case of Kenwood, Ohio

The Kenwood area is located within Sycamore Township, in Hamilton County, Ohio, within fifteen minutes from downtown Cincinnati. It is an unincorporated area, with a 2000 population of 7,423 people (US Census Bureau 2000). The Kenwood area began to develop after WWII as new subdivisions. Since then, the northern section of Sycamore Township has become home for many companies’ national and international headquarters. As population in these surrounding communities grew, the Kenwood business area witnessed spectacular growth, particularly in the 1980s with shopping mall expansions and new office complexes being constructed (Sycamore Township 2007).

Figure 5. City of Cincinnati Region and Kenwood CDP
The entire Kenwood area continued to see growth in the 1990s, with new office development and corporate headquarters, such as the Bank One Towers (now Chase Towers) relocating to the core commercial area (Cooper 1993). Today this area shows characteristics of a metrotown with dense, centralized commercial, office, and institutional developments, as well as dependence upon residential development, and high intensity traffic patterns.

Metrotowns are defined as self-sufficient metropolitan area outside the central city that contain all the functions of a city (Leinberger 1986; Romanos, et. al. 1988; Garreau 1991). Kenwood is comprised of a regional mall and commercial retail and office centers. It also has a regional hospital and surrounding medical facilities, as well as many complimentary economic activities (restaurants, hotels, recreation, and entertainment). Several major thoroughfares, including Galbraith, Kenwood, and Montgomery Roads, Interstate 71 and Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway, surround this suburban growth area. Thousands of people travel to this area daily to work and shop.

Prior to the development of the Kenwood Towne Centre as a regional mall and commercial hub, the Sycamore Plaza was the major retail center of this location. The Sycamore Plaza originally opened in 1966 as Kenwood Mall. It was built across the road from the Kenwood Plaza strip center, and served as Cincinnati’s first enclosed shopping center. Kenwood Mall occupied a 30 acre parcel at the southeast corner of the intersection of Montgomery and Kenwood Roads. The mini-mall opened in 1966 and was anchored by Cincinnati-based Shillito’s. In 1986, Shillito’s consolidated operations with corporate sister
store, Lazarus. The Kenwood Mall location was renamed Lazarus that year (Sycamore Township 2007).

**Figure 6.** The Kenwood CDP

*Source: Cincinnati Area Geographic Information System (CAGIS) and US Census Bureau, 2000.*
Following the 1988 renovation of the former Kenwood Plaza into the glitzy, super-regional, Kenwood Towne Centre, Kenwood Mall went into decline. Having a very upscale, mega-mall located directly across the road did not help the 22 year-old shopping center. When renovations at Kenwood Towne Centre were completed, the Kenwood Mall store Lazarus moved into the new town centre. The old Lazarus store became a Lazarus Furniture Gallery. The store became Macy’s Furniture Gallery in 2005 following a final round of consolidation. A major remodeling of Kenwood Mall was undertaken in the early 1990s. This $17 million renovation included the conversion of existing anchor stores and retail spaces into just 15 big box retail establishments. These included Barnes & Noble, Old Navy, Men’s Wearhouse, Len’s Crafters, and Staples. The former one-level, 1960’s-era mall was turned into a new age, three-level “power center” (Sycamore Township 2007).

Previous research on the Kenwood area documented it as a metropolitan center experiencing high levels of employment and commercial development and growth (Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner 1988; Romanos, et. al. 1988). Because of Kenwood’s extensive growth and its characteristic make-up, it was targeted as an area that may be evolving into an independent self-sufficient metropolitan center. Key findings of the studies identified major commercial centers in the Greater Cincinnati Area, of which Kenwood was one of the centers identified as important. The studies determined that it is plausible to define the Kenwood area as a Stage 4: the Semi-Independent Metropolitan District, which encounters relative economic independence of the center city and great diversity of employment opportunities. In addition, the studies acknowledged the top five contributors to growth within each metropolitan center. For the Kenwood area, the top five contributors to growth included: location/proximity to high
population areas; accessibility to regional transportation networks; high quality of image of the area; increased income of the local population; and increased population in the area. Moreover, the studies examined possible problems that each may face in the future. It was concluded that the most common problems were traffic congestion, lack of public transportation, and rapidly increasing land values. In conclusion, the studies found that Kenwood was one of the strongest centers competing in the market and was one of the most advanced, exhibiting development potential to evolve into a future metrotown (Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner 1988; Romanos et.al. 1988, 1994, and 2006).

Kenwood’s employment and commercial growth trend requires further research to better understand the economic activities and its development as a metrotown. It also identifies and assesses the distinguishing characteristics between local and regional economic activities within Kenwood; and location decisions of firms, which may have an impact on the future development and growth of the area.

**Goals and Objectives**

This study will analyze the economic activities within the study area. The overall aim of this study is to:

1. Determine whether the Kenwood area has reached metrotown status.
2. Briefly describe the role of the City of Cincinnati in relation to Kenwood as a center city
3. Conduct and complete a land use and transportation analysis of the growth area.
4. Define, describe, and distinguish local economic activities from those of regional significance and the factors that influence both.
5. Determine and describe major income pockets, if any which may influence the economic-base of the growth area.

6. Describe business community perceptions of the growth area with respect to its role in the region.

The Kenwood area was chosen because it was targeted by both past and recent research as a metropolitan center experiencing high levels of growth and development (Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner 1988; Romanos, et. al. 1988, 1994, and 2006).

**The Kenwood/ Blue Ash Corridor**

The core of the study area is its commercial district extending from Interstate 71 on the west towards the City of Blue Ash to the east. This area contains several shopping plazas and the regional mall, Kenwood Towne Centre, which plays a significant role in the economic vitality of this area. This area also contains other commercial centers such as the Sycamore Plaza, The Montgomery Road Commercial Corridor, and the Kenwood/Galbraith area that contain the Jewish Hospital and Medical Offices, and other complimentary services. The Kenwood study area also has major transportation networks, such as Montgomery Road, Kenwood Road, Galbraith Road, and Interstate 71 (See Figure 7).
Figure 7. Kenwood/Blue Ash Corridor

Source: Cincinnati Area Geographic Information Systems (CAGIS)
**Population Trend Analysis**

The Kenwood study area’s total population was 7,423 people in 2000. However, its total core market trade area population was approximately 56,000 and consisted of all of its surrounding communities, such as Blue Ash, Madeira, Silverton, Deer Park, and Montgomery. When compared to its surrounding communities, Kenwood is the smallest in both size and land area (Table 1). Since its inception, which occurred after WWII, this area has experienced both population growth and decline over the last five decades, 6, 670 in 1960, 9,368 in 1980, and 7, 423 in 2000. In the 1970s and 1980s, population growth in Kenwood peaked. However, population began to decrease slowly in the 1990s (See Figure 8). This is comparable to neighboring communities of Madeira and Silverton, including Sycamore Township all of which experienced a slight decrease in population within the last two decades. In contrast, the more affluent communities of Montgomery and Blue Ash experienced population increases.

**Figure 8.** Kenwood CDP Population Trends 1960 - 2005
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Table 1. Kenwood CDP Study Area – Comparison of Selected Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>City of Blue Ash</th>
<th>Kenwood CDP</th>
<th>City of Madeira</th>
<th>City of Montgomery</th>
<th>City of Silverton</th>
<th>Sycamore Township</th>
<th>City of Cincinnati</th>
<th>Hamilton County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>12,513</td>
<td>7,423</td>
<td>8,923</td>
<td>10,163</td>
<td>5,178</td>
<td>19,754</td>
<td>331,285</td>
<td>845,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Area in square miles</td>
<td>7.7(1)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.1 (2)</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2000 US Census unless otherwise indicated (1) City of Blue Ash, Ohio; (2) City of Silverton, Ohio

With its access to I-71, the development of Blue Ash and Montgomery, and its high income residential housing, Kenwood has become a primary focus for retail development, even assuming the status as a regional shopping center due to the size and scale of its anchor retailers, specialty shops, restaurants and entertainment (Romanos, et.al. 1994). This area also has a regional hospital, the Jewish Hospital that opened in the 1980s, along with other medical offices and facilities (Romanos, et.al. 1994). This area shows the population growth characteristics identified by metrotowns.

**Land Use**

The Kenwood study area contains a viable mix of land uses. These include both commercial and service uses and stable single-family neighborhoods. A significant portion of land uses within the study area is single-family detached dwellings. These residential areas are established on the fringes of the commercial uses along Kenwood Road and extend west and south to Deer Park corporation line, and to the rear of commercial uses along Montgomery Road. Residential land uses front onto Montgomery Road on the western section between
Kenwood Road and the Silverton corporation line. The majority of commercial uses in the study area are located along Kenwood and Montgomery Roads with commercial, office, and institutional uses extending north and west along these thoroughfares.

Since 1980, this area has grown tremendously in terms of commercial development. There have also been slight increases in multi-family and single-family uses. However, this area has experienced growth in industrial and educational uses, while there has been a significant decrease in vacant properties. This result of residential, commercial and office developments have occurred within the past two decades as well as the development and expansion of the Interstate 71 and the Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway (See Figures 9-12: Kenwood Land Use By Area 1980 and 2007).

The Kenwood study area contains four distinct developments, the Kenwood Towne Centre, the Sycamore Plaza, the Montgomery Road Commercial Corridor, and the Kenwood/Galbraith Area.

The Kenwood Towne Centre

The Kenwood Towne Centre area contains a large food chain grocery store, Kroger, as well as some office and outlet retail uses which account for approximately 1,450,000 square feet. The Kenwood Town Centre contains about 1,335,000 square feet of retail space and Safeco Insurance make up the remaining 85,000 square feet with office space (Sycamore Township 2006).

The Sycamore Plaza
The Sycamore Plaza area encompasses approximately 435,000 square feet of commercial uses along Montgomery Road, of which the plaza alone accounts for 305,000 of retail. The remaining 30,000 square feet of office uses is from the Lasik Plus Building (Sycamore Township 2006).

**The Montgomery Road Commercial Corridor**

The Montgomery Road Commercial Corridor extends along Montgomery Road from Interstate 71 to Galbraith Road. This area comprises approximately 1,015,000 square feet of commercial uses, of which 405,000 square feet is from the Kenwood Tower (Sycamore Township 2006).

Collectively between all of the commercial centers and corridors, the total retail and commercial space in this area accounts for 1,180,000 square feet and 544,000 square feet of office space, for a total of approximately 1,724,000 square feet (Sycamore Township 2006).

**The Kenwood/Galbraith Area**

This area is located at the Kenwood and Galbraith Road Intersection and is characterized by residential and institutional uses. Residential uses are located in the northeast and northwest areas of the intersection and include mature single-family residences along with an apartment complex consisting of several buildings in the middle of the Kenwood Road. The southwestern side of Kenwood/Galbraith Road is occupied by the Jewish Hospital complex. This area includes the hospital, a parking garage, and a helipad. Medical offices occupy the northwestern corner of Kenwood and Galbraith intersection. These offices serve as ancillary uses to the Jewish hospital and an assisted living facility. The Kenwood Town Centre occupies
the southeastern corner and provides additional parking for Jewish Hospital employees (Sycamore Township 2006).

**Figure 9.** Kenwood Land Use 1980

![Kenwood Land Use 1980](image)

*Source:* Cincinnati Area Geographic Information Systems (CAGIS)

**Figure 10.** Kenwood Land Use By Area 1980
Source: Sycamore Township

Figure 11. Kenwood Land Use 2007

Source: Cincinnati Area Geographic Information Systems (CAGIS)

Figure 12. Kenwood Land Use By Area 2007
Source: Sycamore Township
Figure 13. Kenwood Commercial and Retail Centers

Source: Cincinnati Area Geographic Information Systems (CAGIS)
Density

The Kenwood area has varying degrees of density. Those density patterns are measured and expressed by the concept of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) which equals gross floor area (GFA) divided by Net Site Area (NSA). The core area contains the highest density development, with a FAR ranging from .22 to .36. The Kenwood/Galbraith area have FARs that range from .04 to .23. The Kenwood/Montgomery area have FARs ranging from .16 for single-family residential areas to approximately .36 for commercial areas. Other residential areas make up approximately .07 FAR. The existing density pattern illustrates higher intensity development in the core area with decreasing intensities extending around the core area (See Figure 14: Kenwood Area Existing Density) (Sycamore Township 2006).

The Kenwood area has characteristics of land uses and densities described in the stages of evolution of metrotowns, with commercial, office, and complimentary services concentrated within the core with along major arterials with accessibility to the interstate and highways. This area has dense development manifested in a relatively compact, high density core containing both high-rise buildings and low-rise strip development This area also exhibits dependence upon large numbers of surrounding households for retail, services, entertainment, and employment with a large portion of its land use being single-family residential dwellings surrounding its commercial core.
**Transportation and Circulation**

According to the definition of metrotowns, accessibility to transportation is a key component of the development and continued growth of suburban economic growth centers. These usually exhibit high intensity traffic patterns and traffic congestion during peak periods. The Kenwood area displays these characteristics. With the auto being the primary form of transportation, the Kenwood study area is served by three major arterials of Kenwood Road (14,000 to 21,400 vehicles per day), Galbraith Road (9900 to 16000 vehicles per day), and
Montgomery Road (17,000 to 21,750 vehicles per day) as well as Interstate 71 and Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway. Connection via the interstate system is afforded via a full interchange (Montgomery/I-71) and half interchanges at Kenwood and I-71. There is also the east west connection via Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway (10,000 to 17,800 vehicles per day) accessed via Montgomery Road and Kenwood Road (Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana Regional Council of Governments 2007). There are also residential entry points into the commercial core via Kenwood, Pine, Keller, and Kugler Mill. The circulation pattern shows the importance of the Montgomery Road interchange and its inability to handle future traffic. The Montgomery Road interchange carries approximately 115,150 vehicles per day during peak times (Ohio Department of Transportation 2007). The existing circulation pattern evolved gradually as a result of growth (See Figure 15). This area is serviced by the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority’s (SORTA) bus system, which provides both local and express routes to this study area.

Figure 15. Kenwood Area Transportation Network

KENWOOD STUDY AREA TRANSPORTATION NETWORK

Source: Cincinnati Area Geographic Information Systems (CAGIS)
**Economic and Employment Trends**

Metrotowns are identified by clustering of high order economic activities and dependence upon large numbers of surrounding households for retail, services, entertainment, and employment (Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner 1988; Romanos et al. 1988, 1994, and 2006). Kenwood’s economic make-up portrays characteristics having metrotown status. Economic conditions in Kenwood area were strong during the 1980s with non-farm employment growth averaging 4,263 jobs before the downturn in the early 1990s and continued steadily decline. The unemployment rate was the highest in the 1980s (4 percent), and continue to decline throughout the last two decades (3.4 percent in 1990 and 1.4 percent in 2000). The unemployment rate has not returned to the decade low recorded in 2000, but has improved by 1.2 percent in 2006 to 2.4 percent (See Table 2 and Figures 16-17 for labor force, resident employment, and unemployment trends in Kenwood and Table 5 for non-farm employment sector change from 1980 to 2000). The sectors that exhibit the highest levels of growth are government, leisure and hospitality, and professional and business services. This implies that Kenwood is increasingly becoming more of a service oriented economic center.

**Table 2.** 2007 Kenwood CDP Labor Force Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007 Labor Force Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3,242</td>
<td>95.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Armed Forces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not In Labor Force</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From 1980 to 2000, employment in the goods producing sectors has decreased significantly by 1,276 jobs and employment in service-providing sectors declined slightly by 83 jobs. Professional and business services employment increased by 226.7 percent adding an additional 365 jobs. This is primarily a result of the growing number of administrative and support companies. Other service-providing sectors that continue to grow at a healthy pace
are leisure and hospitality and government activities, which added 91 and 72 jobs respectively.

In goods-producing sectors, the natural resources, mining, and construction and manufacturing sectors, employment has decreased by over 50 percent (See Table 4). Figure 17 shows the 2000 employment distribution in the Kenwood area by sector.

Recent data (2007) show that there are approximately 934 business establishments and 13,219 employees in the Kenwood area (See Table 3). One of the largest employers in the area is the Jewish Hospital Kenwood and Medical Center, which employs about 7,000
employees, and is part of the larger daytime employment for the entire Kenwood area (49,286
daytime employees in 3 mile trade area radius). The majority (49%) of the businesses in
Kenwood have a range of 1-4 employees (See Table 5). In addition, many of the employees in
Kenwood are employed within industrial classification sectors of services (41.6%), retail trade
(37.1%), and finance, insurance and real estate (10.9%) and include occupations such as
administrative support (2,409), professional specialty (1,997), sales workers and clerks (1,725),
and executive, management, and administrators (1,398) (See Tables 6 and 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: 2007 Kenwood Study Area CDP Business and Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Establishments</th>
<th>934</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees</td>
<td>13,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4. Employment Trends in Kenwood By Sector 1980-2000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goods Producing</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>-55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources, Mining, &amp; Construction</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>-54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Providing</td>
<td>2,987</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>-54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>226.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-farm Employment</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,263</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,437</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,199</strong></td>
<td><strong>-25.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Historic Geographic Information Systems; Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati USA Claritas Dataset - Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, Ca.*
Table 5: 2007 Kenwood Study Area CDP Total Business Establishments
By Size of Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Establishments by Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Employees</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>49.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Employees</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 Employees</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49 Employees</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99 Employees</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-249 Employees</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-499 Employees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999 Employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000+ Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6: 2007 Kenwood Study Area CDP Total Employees by Major Standard Industrial Classes (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major SIC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural, Forestry, Fishing (SIC Range 01-09)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (SIC 10-14)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (SIC 15-17)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (SIC 20-39)</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Communications (SIC 40-49)</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (SIC 50-51)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (SIC 52-59)</td>
<td>4,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance And Real Estate (SIC 60-69)</td>
<td>1,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (SIC 70-89)</td>
<td>5,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (SIC 90-98)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified (SIC 99)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,219</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7**: 2007 Kenwood Study Area CDP Total Employees by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total Employees</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive, Managers, and Administrators</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Specialty Occupations</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Professionals</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologies and Technicians</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers and Clerks</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support Workers</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, Sales, and Administrative: Field Occupations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services: Site Based</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services: Field Based</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry, and Fishing</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision, Craft, and Repair: Site Based</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Repair, and Mining: Field Based</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine Operators, Assemblers, and Inspectors</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Materials Moving Workers</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handlers, Helpers and Laborers</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, CA.*

The majority of the businesses in the Kenwood area are healthcare and social assistance (293 businesses), retail trade (213 businesses), professional service and technical assistance (107 businesses), and finance and insurance (98). Most of these businesses are located within the business core along I-71, and along the major transportation corridors of Montgomery Rd, Galbraith Rd, and Kenwood Rd (See Figure 18).
Figure 18. Kenwood CDP 2008 Business Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City: Kenwood</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RETAIL TRADE</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT OF COMPANIES AND ENTERPRISES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT AND WASTE MANAGEMENT AND REMEDIATION SERVICES</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCLASSIFIED</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH CARE AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLESALE TRADE</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SERVICES</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE AND INSURANCE</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL ESTATE</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURING</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS, ENTERTAINMENT, AND RECREATION</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND TECHNICAL SERVICES</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOMMODATION AND FOOD SERVICES</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION AND WAREHOUSING</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Claritas, 2008.

Source: Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati USA Claritas Dataset - Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, Ca.
Local and Regional Economic Activities

Local and regional economic activities in the Kenwood area were determined by calculating the location quotient (LQ) for each sector based upon the United States Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes for employment. The LQ is an index for comparing an area’s share of a particular activity with the area’s share of some basic or aggregate phenomenon. It compares relative size of a sector in a local area to its relative size in the region. A LQ that is less than one (LQ < 1) suggests that local employment is less than was expected for a given industry. Therefore, that industry is not even meeting local demand for a given good or service.

Therefore all of this employment is considered non-basic by definition. Examples of these types of sectors in the Kenwood area are agriculture, manufacturing, construction, wholesale trade, and public administration. A LQ that is equal to one (LQ =1) suggests that the local employment is exactly sufficient to meet the local demand for a given good or service. Therefore, all of this employment is also considered non-basic because none of these goods or services are exported to non-local areas. A LQ that is greater than one (LQ > 1) provides evidence of basic employment for a given industry. When an LQ > 1.0, it can be concluded that local employment is greater than expected and the extra goods and services must be exported to non-local areas. Examples of these types of industries in the Kenwood area include transportation and communications, retail trade, finance, insurance, and real estate, and services. Table 8 shows those sectors which had a location quotient less than or equal to one and those that exceeded one.
Table 8 displays those economic activities in Kenwood that are both service/non-basic (local) and non-service/basic (regional). Economic sectors, which make up the local economic activities (non-basic) include agricultural, construction, manufacturing, retail, leisure and hospitality, government, information, financial, transportation and utilities, and education. These sectors are economic activities which include smaller retail shops, small local restaurants, neighborhood and parochial schools, and municipal offices and whose impacts are distributed on a local level. Economic sectors which have more regional (basic) impacts include large scale retail and commercial developments, professional and business services, retail, finance and real estate, and services. These sectors include economic activities such as hospitals and medical offices, large retail shopping centers, large professional Class A and B office parks, as well as entertainment and hospitality activities, such as large chain, upscale, and specialty niche restaurants and retail stores. Table 4 identifies the amount of basic and non-basic activities for each sector, showing that approximately 8.5 % of employment activity is basic. This represents the amount of economic activity that is beyond the local services and serves the regional economy.
Table 8. Local and Regional Economic Sector Activities in the Kenwood CDP based on Location Quotient (LQ) Calculations for 2007 Standard Industry Classifications (SIC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employees By Major SIC</th>
<th>Kenwood</th>
<th>Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Region</th>
<th>LQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural, Forestry, Fishing (SIC Range 01-09)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>0.201835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (SIC 10-14)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (SIC 15-17)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46,831</td>
<td>0.180955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (SIC 20-39)</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>148,067</td>
<td>0.180115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Communications (SIC 40-49)</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>36,728</td>
<td>1.223782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (SIC 50-51)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57,337</td>
<td>0.165186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (SIC 52-59)</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>235,514</td>
<td>1.73032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance And Real Estate (SIC 60-69)</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>85,891</td>
<td>1.395799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (SIC 70-89)</td>
<td>5,502</td>
<td>420,767</td>
<td>1.086383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (SIC 90-98)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>53,522</td>
<td>0.249918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified (SIC 99)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5,447</td>
<td>1.69305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,219</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,098,254</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce; Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, Ca.
Table 9. Kenwood CDP Service/Non-Basic Versus Basic Employment Activities By Major SIC Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kenwood Major SIC Sector</th>
<th>Local Activities (Service/Non-Basic)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Regional Activities (Basic)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural, Forestry, Fishing (SIC Range 01-09)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining (SIC 10-14)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (SIC 15-17)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (SIC 20-39)</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Communications (SIC 40-49)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade (SIC 50-51)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade (SIC 52-59)</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance And Real Estate (SIC 60-69)</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (SIC 70-89)</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration (SIC 90-98)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified (SIC 99)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,089</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati USA Claritas Dataset - Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, Ca.*

Table 10. Local and Regional Economic Sector Activities in the Kenwood CDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sectors</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of Economic Activities</td>
<td>Retail, leisure and hospitality, government, information, financial, transportation and utilities, and education</td>
<td>Large scale retail and commercial developments, professional and business services, finance and real estate, and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Smaller retail shops, small local restaurants, neighborhood and parochial schools, and municipal offices</td>
<td>Hospitals, medical offices, large retail shopping centers, large professional Class A and B office parks, entertainment and hospitality activities, such as large chain, upscale, and specialty niche restaurants and retail stores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati USA Claritas Dataset - Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, Ca.*
**Income**

Income levels in Kenwood have increased over the last two decades. Income for non-family households tripled from $10,472 in 1980 to $30,744 in 2000. Median household income also increased by 20 percent to $53,300 in 2000 and median family income increased by 23 percent to $74,511 in 2000. Table 4 shows an increase in per capita income from $12,204 in 1980 to $32,458 in 2000.

Over the last twenty years, income distribution has changed significantly. In 1980 the majority of household incomes ranged between $10,000 and $40,000. However, a large number of households in the Kenwood area in 2007 had incomes distributed above $75,000 or more per year. Around 11.4 percent of household income distribution is between $30,000 and $40,000 per year (See Table 12). Table 13 shows that 20.9 percent of the household have a net worth ranging between $100,000 to $250,000. Approximately 17 percent of households have a net worth between $50,000 and $100,000. While 13 percent of Kenwood households exhibit a net worth ranging from $25,000 to $50,000.

**Table 11.** Income Trends in Kenwood By Household Type 1980-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>$10,472</td>
<td>$24,512</td>
<td>$30,744</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>$25,533</td>
<td>$43,458</td>
<td>$53,300</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$30,102</td>
<td>$57,054</td>
<td>$74,511</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$12,204</td>
<td>$24,791</td>
<td>$32,458</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Historic Census Geographic Information Systems Data US Census Bureau*
**Table 12**: Trend of Kenwood Household Income Distribution 1980-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10K or Less</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-78.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10K-$20K</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-74.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20K-$30K</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-65.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K-$40K</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>-39.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40K-$50K</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>-16.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50K-$75K</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>15.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75K or More</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>619.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3683</td>
<td>3306</td>
<td>3297</td>
<td>3084</td>
<td>-16.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: National Historic Census Geographic Information Systems Data US Census Bureau and Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, CA.*

---

**Table 13**: 2006 Kenwood Household Net Worth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Worth</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 or Less</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1-$5K</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5-$10K</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10-$25K</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25-$50K</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-$100K</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100-$250K</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>20.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250-$500K</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500K or More</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Applied Geographic Solutions, Thousand Oaks, CA.*
Figure 19 shows communities surrounding Kenwood that have median household incomes greater than that of Kenwood. The communities with the highest median incomes were Amberley Village ($81,492), Blue Ash ($61,591), Indian Hill ($158,742), Madeira ($59,626), and Montgomery ($89,224). These communities serve as the Kenwood business and retail area primary market customer base with the most disposable income and purchasing power.

**Figure 19.** Household Income Comparison Table by Surrounding Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood</td>
<td>$53,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amberley</td>
<td>$81,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ash</td>
<td>$61,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>$36,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Hill</td>
<td>$158,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeira</td>
<td>$59,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>$89,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton</td>
<td>$35,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Township</td>
<td>$39,913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau

**The Role of the Center City: City of Cincinnati**

One of the implications derived from the literature review was that metrotowns will become self-sufficient economic centers independent from the center city. A main theory underlying the city-suburban interdependence hypothesis is that cities contain distinctive economies and specialized functions that benefit the entire region. The compact development
of the city provides greater opportunities for agglomeration economies (Voith 1999; McBride and Albano 1998). Scholars (Voith 1998, 1999; Rappaport 2005) assert that central cities remain the most effective locations for specialized industries and unique amenities or features. These industries may include economic activities such as high-fashion retail, major medical centers, and specialized wholesale suppliers which serve thin but widely-spread markets. These types of economic activities may also need the combination of a location accessible to the entire metropolitan area and the area’s large market to thrive. These unique amenities or features (such as historic sites, waterfronts, cultural facilities, sports arenas, and period architecture) are valued not only by their residents but by nonresidents as well. Another reason why cities are important to regional economies is that their diversity encourages innovation and helps regions reinvent themselves in the face of global economic change (Voith 1998, 1999; Rappaport 2005). This also includes the diversity of languages and cultures found in cities, which may also be a crucial element in distinguishing and developing the competitive advantage of city and region in a global economy (McBride and Albano 1998). In all metro areas, cities and suburbs also depend on each other for economic growth. According to Rappaport (2005), “Cities and their suburbs share a multitude of resources, such as airports, highways, mass transit, cultural amenities, entertainment venues, air quality, potential employers, and many more.” In this section, we will briefly assess the role of the City of Cincinnati as a central city and its relationship to Kenwood, Ohio, and whether this hypothesis is valid. The City of Cincinnati serves as a major regional node of economic, educational, transportation, cultural and recreational activity for the region, of which Kenwood is included.
Cincinnati is a municipality located in southwestern Ohio, and is situated on the Ohio River at the Ohio-Kentucky border. With a 2006 population of 332,252, Cincinnati is Ohio's third largest city and the 56th largest city in the United States (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007) (See Figure 7).

Node of Regional Economic Activity

Cincinnati is home to major corporations such as Procter & Gamble, the Kroger Company, Sunny Delight Beverages Co, GE Aviation, Macy's, Inc. (owner of Macy's and Bloomingdale's), Convergys, Chiquita Brands International, Great American Insurance Company, Western & Southern Financial Group, the E. W. Scripps Company, and Fifth Third Bank. In all, there are 10 Fortune 500 companies and 18 Fortune 1000 companies headquartered in the Cincinnati area. These companies employ workers from the Kenwood area and its surrounding communities (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007). This implies that the City of Cincinnati plays an important role in the contribution to income and employment base of households residing in and around the Kenwood area.

Node of Regional Educational Activity

The City is also home to a variety of educational and research institutions, including the University of Cincinnati, Xavier University, Cincinnati State, Cincinnati Art Academy, University Hospital and Research Center, and Children’s Hospital and Research Center (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007). These institutions play an important role in attracting new investment and young professionals into the region, which will ultimately result in increased employment and income for the City and its surrounding communities (i.e., Kenwood).
Node of Regional Transportation Network and Activity

The Cincinnati-Northern Kentucky International Airport (CVG) is the major airport serving the metropolitan area and is located across the river in Kentucky. The airport is the second largest hub for Delta and the largest for its subsidiary, Comair. The city operates three other airports; Lunken Airport, a municipal airfield used for smaller business jets and private planes; a smaller airport, Cincinnati West Airport, is located in Harrison, Ohio; and lastly the Blue Ash Airport, in Blue Ash (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007).

In addition, the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority (SORTA) operates the regional passenger bus system throughout the region, and a portion of its operational funding comes from the City of Cincinnati. Cincinnati is also served by three major interstate highways. Interstate 75 is a north-south route through the Mill Creek valley. Interstate 71 runs northeast towards Kenwood and Montgomery. Interstate 74 begins at Interstate 75 west of downtown and connects to Indiana (Ohio Indiana Regional Council of Governments 2006; City of Cincinnati Department of Transportation and Engineering 2007; Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007). Interstate 71 is a major transportation connection for the Kenwood area to other areas throughout the region. The Montgomery Rd and Interstate 71 interchange acts as a stimulus in attracting new development into the Kenwood area. It is also served by numerous U.S. highways and state routes including Montgomery and Galbraith Roads which serve as major thoroughfares in the Kenwood area (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007).
Node of Regional Cultural and Recreational Activity

Cincinnati also provides art, cultural, regional tourists, and recreational attractions to the region, including Kenwood. The City provides a vast array of cultural activities such as Cincinnati Symphony Orchestra, the Cincinnati Pops, Cincinnati Ballet, the Cincinnati Opera, Aronoff Center for the Arts, Playhouse in the Park, and Riverbend Music Center. The City also provides the region with more than fifty museums and galleries, including the Cincinnati Art Museum, Lois & Richard Rosenthal Center for Contemporary Art, Taft Museum of Art, Krohn Conservatory, and the Cincinnati Museum, which includes the Museum of Natural History and Science, the Cinergy Children’s Museum, and the Cincinnati History Museum and Historical Society Library. Another major tourist attraction is the Cincinnati Zoo, which is one of the top five zoos in the nation and the second oldest. The City of Cincinnati also has major sports facilities that service the region (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007).

All of these activities contribute to attracting new local, regional, and global investment into the Greater Cincinnati region. As part of this, all surrounding communities in the region benefit economically and socially from the benefits of the City. These factors contribute in attracting large investment firms, employers, and potential highly skilled workers into the region, of which Kenwood is part. Firms in the City employ workers from the Kenwood area and vice-versa.

Therefore, on face value, it can be concluded that the City of Cincinnati is a vital asset to the Kenwood area. Its regional economic, educational, transportation, cultural, and recreational activities benefit the region in which Kenwood is included. However, it must be
noted that a more in-depth analysis is needed regarding the relationships or linkages between central cities and suburban growth areas to clearly determine the future of their relationship and true dependence upon one another. Some questions for future research include, but are not limited to, “Are these two compliments or substitutes? Does the city lose to suburban growth? What will be the future of city/suburb relationship as suburbs are increasingly creating their own central business districts, which are assuming some of the functions of downtowns, and are consequently developing their own agglomeration economies?”
Chapter Five: Study Findings and Conclusion

Overview of Current Status of the Kenwood Area

The final analysis of this study has determined that the Kenwood area has the potential to reach metrotown status. It exhibits the spatial organization and physical characteristics, composition, and economic activities that are attributed to Stage 5 Metrotowns as defined by Romanos et. al. (1988). It has achieved a stage of maturity of the metrotown showing economic independence and a clear urban identity. This area contains the metrotown features, such as, centrality of functions, clustering of high order economic activities, dense development manifested in a relatively compact, high density core containing both high-rise buildings and low-rise strip development, increased height, size, and architectural quality of buildings, high intensity traffic patterns and traffic congestion during peak periods, and dependence upon large numbers of surrounding households for retail, services, entertainment, and employment.

Spatial Organization and Physical Characteristics

Land Use

The Kenwood area is a center that plays a significant role within the metropolitan region. Kenwood exhibits land use characteristics of the central business district with mixed uses, high densities, with a combination of strip development and high-rises. The Kenwood area and its surrounding communities has developed as a medical, retail, and professional business development center with high levels of employment, office, and commercial activity,
and middle to high income residential housing (largely from the surrounding communities, i.e., Indian Hill, Montgomery, Blue Ash, Madeira). These surrounding communities serve as the Kenwood business and retail area primary customer base.

The Kenwood area and its surrounding communities has developed as a medical, retail, and professional business development center with high levels of employment, office, and commercial activity, surrounded by middle to high income residential neighborhoods. Local and regional economic activity contributes to the area’s economic stability in the Greater Cincinnati Metropolitan Area. The Kenwood area has two large-scale retail/commercial developments, the Kenwood Towne Centre and the Sycamore Plaza. Both of these areas are major regional shopping attractions. There is also the a regional hospital, medical facilities, and a assisted living facility operated by the Jewish Hospital which has both a local and regional patrons.

The Kenwood area also serves as a development center containing regional economic activities have not only a local attraction and service area but also regional attraction and service areas, such as financial institutions and banks, real estate and development offices, small and large chain restaurants and stores, small specialty shops and services, and professional offices, including dermatologist, general practitioners, insurance, and other business offices. These regional activities are surrounded by smaller complimentary services, such as smaller scale retail, commercial, and financial economic activities that serve the local base of the area.

Transportation
As stated previously accessibility to transportation is a key component of the development and continued growth of suburban economic growth centers. According to Romanos, et. al. (1988) Stage 5 of Metrotowns are characterized by high volumes of traffic patterns and congestion caused by internal movement particularly during peak hours. The Kenwood study area meets this criteria as an important transportation node served by the three major roadway arterials of Kenwood Road (14,000 to 21,400 vehicles per day), Galbraith Road (9,900 to 16,000 vehicles per day), and Montgomery Road (17,000 to 21,750 vehicles per day) as well as Interstate 71 and Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway.

There is also traffic congestion caused by internal movement and the recognition of pedestrian needs. This is evident by the traffic volumes on the major transportation connectors within the study area. For example, Montgomery Road, Kenwood Road, and Galbraith Road all receive on average 15,000 vehicles per day. However, the high volume of traffic and the density of land uses in the core have benefitted the Kenwood area in terms of serving as a catalyst for economic growth and stability for both the local and regional economic activities within the study area. More recent traffic counts show that traffic in the area has increased. For example, Kenwood Road has 25,055 – 26,652 cars per day, Montgomery Road (at Kenwood Towne Centre Entrance) has 37,256 cars per day I-71 has 149,000 cars per day.

To address the traffic problem, Sycamore Township recently made roadway improvements, including widening Montgomery Road. The Township is currently conducting another traffic study to evaluate traffic volumes and patterns on Kenwood and Galbraith Roads.

Based upon a conceptual analysis of the transformation of the Kenwood area since 1956 to 2006, it can be concluded that the Kenwood area exhibits some of the key
characteristics associated with a Stage 5 Metrotown (See Figures 20 and 21). Kenwood exhibits metrotown Stage 5 characteristics of the central business district with mixed uses, high densities, with a combination of strip development and high-rises. There is a dominance of tall buildings and high quality design, high development centers have emerged, there are high levels of employment, office, and commercial activity, and high-income residential housing. There is also traffic congestion caused by internal movement and the recognition of pedestrian needs (Romanos, et al. 1988). These characteristics are further described and compared in Table 14.

Figure 20. Revisit Stages of Metrotown Evolution

Source: Based upon Metrotown, Stages of Evolution as defined by Romanos, Chifos and Fenner, 1988

To add to this conclusion, survey results concluded that the common opinion of business and property owners in the Kenwood area was that the area had developed as a self-sufficient economic center. The majority of those surveyed felt that the Kenwood area would
continue to grow and prosper despite the continued growth or decline of the central business
district of the City of Cincinnati. The survey respondents also perceived Kenwood to be a prime
location for both regional and local business/economic activity due to its location to major
transportation networks, supporting residential neighborhoods, and retail and office
developments. These factors were essential in location decisions of businesses to locate in the
Kenwood area and are important to the future growth and development of the Kenwood area.

Figure 21. Stages of Transformation of Kenwood CDP
Kenwood Composition

The Kenwood area is composed of those activities and functions identified in the literature as key characteristics of metrotowns. It is made up of approximately 1,180,000 square feet of commercial and retail uses and 544,000 square feet of office uses. Within these land uses the Kenwood area exhibits 1) centrality of functions, 2) a clustering of high order economic activities, 3) dense development in a compact dense core, 4) increased height, size, and architectural quality of buildings, 4) intense traffic patterns and traffic congestion during peak periods, and 5) a dependence on a large number of surrounding households for retail, entertainment, and employment.

Table 14. Square Footage of Retail, Commercial, & Office of the Kenwood Study Area 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area in Square Feet</th>
<th>Retail &amp; Commercial</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood Towne Center</td>
<td>1,335,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycamore Plaza</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Road Corridor</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>405,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood/Galbraith Corridor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Square Feet</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,180,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>544,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sycamore Township Planning and Zoning Department, 2008.

Centrality of Functions

One of the key metrotown characteristics identified in the literature was the centrality of functions (See Table 14). Centrality of function refers to those economic activities and land uses being centrally located and are clustered together. For instance, the Kenwood area has several centrality of functions primarily in the medical and healthcare economic activities and
uses. The area is comprised of one major regional hospital, the Jewish Hospital, and several other medical offices and healthcare facilities. These include, but are not limited to, the Jewish Hospital Medical Center, the Jewish Hospital Assisted Living Facility, and Group Health Associates Medical Offices. There are also several smaller medical and healthcare facilities such as general care practitioners, dentists offices, as well as physicians’ offices with a variety of healthcare specializations. The Kenwood area also has a large number of retail and office located along the major transportation corridors of Kenwood, Montgomery, and Galbraith Roads. Some of these functions includeretails shops at the Kenwood Towne Centre; the Sycamore Plaza, and Montgomery Rd Commercial Corridor. There are also office complexes, such as the Chase One Towers and the newly constructed Redstone complex.

A Clustering of High Order Economic Activities

Kenwood is also includes a clustering of high order economic activities. These activities include financial services, retail, and commercial, professional and services activities. Kenwood is comprised of a clustering of financial services such as, banking and financial institutions. National City Bank, PNC Bank, Fifth Third Bank, Chase Bank, and US Bank are all located in the core area. This area also has a clustering of retail and commercial activities. For instance, the Kenwood Towne Centre, Sycamore Plaza, Montgomery Rd Commercial Corridor, and new retail development along Kenwood Road across from the Towne Centre. In addition, the Kenwood area also includes a clustering of professional and service activities. This is marked with the presence of the West Shell Towers, Chase Towers, Jewish Hospital Medical Offices, Ramada Inn, Cheesecake Factory, Trio’s, Ruby Tuesday, Max and Erma’s, Tire Discounters, Pep Boys Auto & Repair Shop, Cincinnati Bell, Sprint, Staples, Kinkos (See Table 14).
Dense Development in a Compact Dense Core

The Kenwood area encompasses dense development manifested in a relatively compact, high density core containing both high-rise buildings and low-rise strip development. This is evident by its core area. The core area contains highest density development with a floor area ratio of .22 to .36 (See Table 14). This area contains commercial, office, and other complimentary services along major transportation corridors, Montgomery Rd, Galbraith Rd, Kenwood Rd, and I-71.

Increased Height, Size, and Architectural Quality of Buildings

Kenwood area exhibits the height, size, and quality of building identified with metrotowns (See Table 14). It consists of high-rise medical and financial office buildings. These buildings also are of high architectural quality and aesthetics. Some examples of this are the Chase Towers, new office development on Montgomery and Kenwood Roads, Group Health Associates office buildings, Jewish Hospital Medical Buildings. The Sycamore Township administration has also made efforts to improve the visual appearance of the area by streetscape improvements along Montgomery and Galbraith Roads with new paving, lighting, and landscaped traffic islands. The Township has also implemented design guidelines that developers must adhere to (See Illustration 1) (Bickford, 2008).
Illustration 1. Newly Constructed Redstone of Kenwood Office Development

Intense Traffic Patterns and Traffic Congestion During Peak Periods

The Kenwood area is also comprised of major transportation arterials that have intense traffic patterns and volumes, especially during peak periods. For instance, Kenwood Road has 14,000 - 21,400 vehicles per day, Galbraith Road - 9,900 - 16,000 vehicles per day, Montgomery Road - 17,000 - 21,750 vehicles per day, Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway - 10,000 - 17,000 vehicles per day, and I-71 and Montgomery Road Interchange - 115,500 vehicles per day during peak hours (See Table 14). In addition, a recent traffic count study shows that the traffic volume has increased, in this area, particularly along Montgomery and Kenwood Roads, with Kenwood Road increasing by approximately 4,000 vehicles (25,055 –
26,652 vehicles per day), Montgomery Road (at Kenwood Towne Centre Entrance) exhibiting 37,256 cars per day, and the I-71 and Montgomery Interchange experiencing an increase to 149,000 vehicles per day.

A Dependence on a Large Number of Surrounding Households
For Retail, Entertainment, and Employment

Lastly, the Kenwood area is composed of a large number of residential households which serves as a support base for its economic activities. These neighborhoods have median household incomes ranging from $53,300 (Kenwood) to $158,742 (Indian Hills). The majority of these communities are single-family residential neighborhoods (See Table 15).
Table 15. Metrotown Characteristics of the Kenwood Study Area 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 5 Metrotown Characteristics</th>
<th>Kenwood Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Centrality of Functions**      | *Medical Offices*- Ex: Jewish Hospital, Jewish Hospital Medical Center, Assisted Living Facility, Group Health Associates Medical Offices  
*Retail & Office* - Ex: Kenwood Towne Centre; Sycamore Plaza, Montgomery Rd Commercial Corridor |
| **Clustering of High Order Economic Activities** | *Clustering of Financial Activities*: National City Bank, PNC Bank, Fifth Third Bank, Chase Bank, US Bank  
*Clustering of Retail/Commercial Activities*: Kenwood Towne Centre, Sycamore Plaza, Montgomery Rd Commercial Corridor  
*Clustering of Professional/Service Activities*: West Shell Towers, Chase Towers, Jewish Hospital Medical Offices, Ramada Inn, Cheesecake Factory, Trio’s, Ruby Tuesday, Max and Erma’s, Tire Discounters, Pep Boys Auto & Repair Shop, Cincinnati Bell, Sprint, Staples, Kinkos. |
| **Dense Development in Compact Dense Core** | Core area contains highest density development with a floor area ratio of .22 to.36. This area contains commercial, office, and other complimentary services along major transportation corridors, Montgomery Rd, Galbraith Rd, Kenwood Rd, and I-71. |
| **Increased Height, Size, and Architectural Quality of Buildings** | High-rise medical and financial office buildings of high architectural quality and aesthetics. Ex: Chase Towers, new office development on Montgomery and Kenwood Roads, Group Health Associates office buildings, Jewish Hospital Medical Buildings. |
| **Intense Traffic Patterns and Traffic Congestion During Peak Periods** | Kenwood Rd - 14,000 - 21, 400 vehicles per day  
Galbraith Rd - 9,900 - 16,000 vehicles per day  
Ronald Reagan Cross Cty Hwy - 10,000 - 17,000 vehicles per day  
Montgomery Rd - 17,000 - 21, 750 vehicles per day  
I-71 and Montgomery Rd interchange - 115, 500 vehicles per day during peak hours |
| **Dependence on Large Number of Surrounding Households for Retail, Entertainment, and Employment** | The median income in the Kenwood area is $53,300. Median incomes of surrounding communities are: $59,626 (Madeira), $61, 591 (Blue Ash), $81,492 (Amberley Village), $89, 224 (Montgomery), and $158, 742 (Indian Hills). These communities serve as the Kenwood business and retail area primary customer base. |
Differences in Local and Regional Economic Activities

Local and regional economic activities in the Kenwood area were determined by calculating the location quotient (LQ) for each sector based upon the United States Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes for employment using data from the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, Cincinnati USA Claritas dataset. Of those economic activities in the Kenwood area, 717 had a location quotient less than or equal to one. This means that those local economic activities refer to those activities that are usually sufficient to meet the local demand for goods or services. The majority of local activities in the Kenwood area come from the agriculture, construction, wholesale trade, and public administration industries. These types of activities include those low order activities such as grocery stores or convenient stores, small neighborhood retail shops, drycleaners, local restaurants or food chains, local government administrative activities. Examples of these types of activities in the Kenwood area are Sycamore Township Municipal Administration, Kroger’s, Subway, and LaRosa’s.

In comparison, those activities that had a location quotient greater than 1 made up the majority of the SIC sectors (12, 502). These economic activities are classified as those that draw income from outside of the study area and are viewed as regional attractions. The majority of regional activities in the Kenwood area come from the transportation and communications, retail trade, finance, insurance, and real estate, and services industries. These types of activities include those high order activities such as office and professional services, medical facilities, retail centers, financial activities, hospitality and entertainment, large scale franchised restaurants, or niche retail stores. In the Kenwood area these activities include the Jewish
Hospital, the Jewish Hospital Medical Center, Group Health Associates Medical, the Kenwood Towne Centre, Sycamore Plaza, National City Bank, PNC Bank, Fifth Third Bank, Chase Bank, US Bank, West Shell Realtors Towers, Chase Towers, Ramada Inn, Cheesecake Factory, Trio’s, Ruby Tuesday, Max and Erma’s, Tire Discounters, Pep Boys Auto & Repair Shop, Cincinnati Bell, Sprint, Staples, and Kinkos (See Table 16 below).

Table 16. Kenwood CDP: Number of Industries with LQ >1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Employment Sectors</th>
<th>% Local Activities</th>
<th>Total Employment Sectors</th>
<th>% Regional Activities</th>
<th>Total Economic Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LQ &lt; or = 1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12,502</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>13,219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, of those economic activities with a LQ greater than 1, the percent of services that are outside of the local service area is approximately 8.5%. This means that those industries have a greater share than expected and that "extra" industry employment is assumed to be basic because those jobs are above what a local economy should have to serve local needs. Any employment over and above the expected percentage is therefore considered to consist of basic sector jobs because these workers are assumed to be exporting their goods and services to non-local areas (See Table 9. Kenwood CDP Service/Non-Basic Versus Basic Employment Activities By Major SIC Sector on page 54).

Both local and regional economic activities are mostly service types of activities and they make up over 90 percent of the employment base for the Kenwood area. The other 10 percent are goods producing economic activities (See Table 6: Employment Trends in Kenwood By Sector 1980 -2000 on page 47).
Factors that Influence the Location of Economic Activity

Based upon the literature (Miller 2006, Romanos, et. al. 1988, 1989, and 2006) the contributors to economic growth and the location of economic activity include:

- location/proximity to large population areas;
- high density of land uses and population in the area;
- accessibility to regional transportation networks;
- high income levels and purchasing power of the local population; and
- high quality of image of the area.

Location and Proximity to Large Populations

Location and proximity to large populations is a main component of metrotown status. The Kenwood study area exhibits large population areas with a total population of 7,423 people in 2000. In addition, its total core market area population is approximately 56,000 and consists of all of its surrounding communities, such as Amberley Village, Blue Ash, Indian Hill, Madeira, Silverton, Deer Park, and Montgomery (See Figures 18 and 19). The majority of the communities surrounding Kenwood have median household incomes greater than that of Kenwood; and serve as the Kenwood business and retail area’s primary market customer base with the most disposable income and purchasing power.

High Density of Land Uses and Population

The Kenwood area has characteristics of land uses and densities described in the stages of evolution of metrotowns, with commercial, office, and complimentary services concentrated within the core with along major arterials with accessibility to the interstate and highways. This area has dense development manifested in a relatively compact, high density core containing both high-rise buildings and low-rise strip development. This area also exhibits dependence
upon large numbers of surrounding households for retail, services, entertainment, and employment with a large portion of its land use being single-family residential dwellings surrounding its commercial core.

The Kenwood area has varying degrees of density. The core area contains the highest density development, with a floor area ratio (FAR) ranging from .22 to .36. The Kenwood/Galbraith area have FARs that range from .04 to .23. The Kenwood/Montgomery area have FARs ranging from .16 for single-family residential areas to approximately .36 for commercial areas. The existing density pattern illustrates higher intensity development in the core area with decreasing intensities extending around the core area (Sycamore Township 2006).

**Accessibility to Regional Transportation Networks**

According to the definition of metrotowns, the accessibility to regional transportation is a key component of the development and continued growth of suburban economic growth centers. These usually exhibit high intensity traffic patterns and traffic congestion during peak periods. The Kenwood area displays these characteristics. With the auto being the primary form of transportation, the Kenwood study area is served by three major arterials of Kenwood Road, Galbraith Road, Montgomery Road, Interstate 71, and Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway (Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana Regional Council of Governments, 2006). This area is also served by public transportation bus system administered by SORTA.

**High Quality of Image and High Income Levels/ Purchasing Power of the Local Population**

The area also exhibits high quality of image, high-income levels, and purchasing power of the local population. The architectural quality of buildings in the Kenwood area is of a high
quality and is aesthetically pleasing. There has also been an effort made by the local
government to construct a new streetscape design along Montgomery and Galbraith that
includes new brick pavers and landscaping. In addition, Kenwood is surrounded by high-income
residential neighborhoods, which support its core retail and commercial activities. The median
household income in Kenwood was $53,300 in 2000 and median family income $74,511 (US
Census Bureau, 2000). The majority of residential households in surrounding communities
have an income distribution between $75,000 and $100,000 per year and a net worth ranging
between $50,000 to $250,000.

Local and Regional Impacts of Metrotown Economic Activities

Several local and regional impacts of metrotown economic activities include attracting
new business development and investment, increased traffic congestion, increase in land
values, and increase in population density. Because of Kenwood’s concentration of local and
regional economic activities, it has been able to attract and retain a high level of residential,
office, commercial, and complimentary developments. This continued investment in the
Kenwood area has contributed significantly to its continued growth and success. At the current
stage of development as a metrotown, it appears that the Kenwood area will continue to grow.

What does this mean for suburban growth centers in general? On a local level it implies
that the key components (i.e., centrality of functions, clustering of high order economic
activities, dense development manifested in a relatively compact, high density core, containing
both high-rise buildings and low-rise strip development, increased height, size, and
architectural quality of buildings, high intensity traffic patterns and traffic congestion during
peak periods, and dependence upon large numbers of surrounding households for retail, services, entertainment, and employment) defined by Romanos and colleagues (1988) are necessary factors for the successful growth and development of suburban economic centers. It also suggests that the key components rely on each other to support the development of a suburban growth area.

However, due to the increase in investment, communities surrounding suburban growth centers will see increased traffic congestion, land values, and population density resulting from an increase in residential and business development in these areas.

From a regional standpoint, suburban growth centers are important to the growth and stability of the region. They add to the overall regional attractiveness for commercial and residential development. These areas provide highly skilled jobs and workers which contribute to the overall regional economy.

*Location Decision Factors of Businesses: The Kenwood Business Perspective Survey Analysis*

For this study a survey of 20 business supervisors and property owners within the Kenwood study area was conducted. This included store managers and owners of retail shops, small and large specialty shops, restaurants, service and office oriented businesses, and financial institutions. The main objective of this survey was to analyze perspectives from business supervisors and property owners regarding local and regional economic activities within the Kenwood study area. Many property owners and businesses in the Kenwood area perceived Kenwood to be a prime location to conduct business. A few of the questions presented in the survey included, “How long have you located in Kenwood? Did you relocate to
Kenwood? From where and why? What factors were important in your decision to locate your business in this area? In your opinion what other factors make this location good for business? How long do you plan to stay in this location?"

Responses from the economic and business survey data gathered from this case study analysis show evidence that factors which are important to businesses in their decision to locate into a suburban growth area or metrotown include:

- Location and market area including surrounding retail, professional, and complimentary services.
- A good transportation network, proximity, and access to interstate highway system, and major transportation routes. Access to public transportation is also an important factor.
- Demographics and income of the surrounding communities was an important factor. There needs to be enough buying power in the area to attract and retain businesses and commercial and office developments.

These factors are consistent with what was defined in the literature as that were essential in the development of metrotowns. The combination of freeway access, proximity to suppliers, labor cost, climate, and skills, quality of life, are key factors on a firm’s decision to locate in the suburbs and results in the change in employment locations moving farther out in the metropolitan frame at an ever-increasing rate (Miller, 2006; Leinberger 2000). Kenwood’s location, land availability and costs, proximity to major transportation networks, population density and socio-demographic make-up (i.e., education, skills), high-income residential neighborhoods, service and retail centers, quality of life and neighborhood characters are a few of the factors influencing location decisions and have made Kenwood a prime location for businesses to locate.
Key findings of the survey are as follows:

- The majority of those surveyed (99%) have been in the Kenwood area longer than 5 years.
- The majority of those surveyed (99%) located to the area as a new business, while (1%) percent relocated from another area outside of Kenwood.
- Factors that were important to all business and property owners in the decision to locate to the Kenwood area include the following:
  - 100% - Location and Market Area, particularly the Kenwood Towne Centre and surrounding retail and professional services
  - 75% - Transportation network and proximity to Interstate 71
  - 99% - Demographics/income
- Factors that make Kenwood a good location for businesses include the following:
  - 100% - Location and Market Area, particularly the Kenwood Towne Centre and surrounding retail and professional services.
  - 85% - Transportation network and proximity to Interstate 71
  - 100% - Demographics/income
- All of the business and property owners surveyed defined the Kenwood market area to include the following surrounding communities Blue Ash, Deer Park, Madeira, Montgomery, Indian Hill, Silverton, and Sycamore Township. Some also stated that their market area extended to areas of Eastgate, Sharonville, and City of Cincinnati neighborhoods of Pleasant Ridge, Kennedy Heights, Hyde Park, Oakley, and Clifton.

**Survey Summary**
Based on information gathered from the survey of business and property owners, it was concluded that Kenwood business owners perceived that Kenwood had developed as a self-sufficient economic center. The majority of those surveyed felt that the Kenwood area would continue to grow and prosper despite the continued growth or decline of the central business district of the City of Cincinnati. It can also be determined that Kenwood is a prime location for both regional and local economic activity due to its location to major transportation networks, supporting residential neighborhoods, and retail and office developments. These factors are essential in location decisions of firms to locate in the Kenwood area and on its future growth and development.

**Metrotown Dependence on the Central City**

Although the Kenwood area is moving toward Stage 5 Metrotown status, it is still dependent on the City of Cincinnati as a central city. The central city in this instance serves the purposes of regional symbol and center of economic, culture, and tourism for the region, with many major international corporate headquarters, cultural institutions, and recreation and entertainment facilities. All of these activities contribute to attracting new investment on a local, regional, and global scale into the Greater Cincinnati region. As part of this role, all surrounding communities in the region benefit economically and socially from the assets of the City. All of these factors contribute in attracting large investment firms, employers, and potential highly skilled workers into the region, of which Kenwood is part. Firms in the City employ workers from the Kenwood area and vice-versa. Therefore, the Kenwood area is not
truly independent of the City of Cincinnati. They both depend on each other for continued growth and survival.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this research was to accomplish two main goals. One, to determine whether the initial theory of metrotowns as *suburban growth centers continuing to grow into self-sufficient “mini-cities”* was valid. *Do suburban growth centers continue evolve into strong, second-tier business districts? Do they share an interdependent relationship with the central city?* The second goal of this research was to attempt to take the Romanos, Chifos, and Fenner study of metrotowns a step further by identifying characteristics between local and regional economic activities within metrotowns, as well, as factors that distinguish those activities. In doing so, I attempted to answer the following questions, *“What types of economic activities are located within suburban growth centers? What are the local and regional influences of land use and transportation on suburban growth? What specific factors influenced the location of economic activity within a suburban growth center? What are the local and regional impacts of the economic activities of suburban growth centers? What influences does income have on these areas?”*

In reference to the first goal, this case study indicates that the hypothesis of metrotown formation and growth remains valid. Suburban growth areas are continuing to grow and become economic self-sufficient centers. This is largely a result of their location, access to transportation, population density, demographic composition, and quality of life perceptions.
The analysis of Kenwood as a suburban growth center showed that local and regional activities within these growth centers are essential to their continued growth. However, the case study findings also imply that although these suburban growth centers continue to prosper, they remain dependent on the central city for continued growth and survival. The central city and the suburban economic centers need each other for continued growth and survival. In this sense, metrotowns, although self-sufficient, are dependent on the central city and vice-versa. This was evident in the case of the Kenwood, Ohio, area and the City of Cincinnati. Although the Kenwood area is moving toward Stage 5 Metrotown status, it is still dependent on the City of Cincinnati as a central city for regional employment, cultural and recreational institutions and activities. The central city in this instance serves the purpose of a regional symbol and center of economic, cultural, and tourist activity for the region, with many major international corporate headquarters, cultural institutions, and recreation and entertainment facilities (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 2008). All of these activities contribute to attracting new investment on a local, regional, and global scale into the Greater Cincinnati region. As part of this role, all surrounding communities in the region benefit economically and socially from the assets of the City. All of these factors contribute in attracting large investment firms, employers, and potential highly skilled workers into the region, of which Kenwood is part. Firms in the City employ workers from the Kenwood area and vice-versa. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Kenwood area is not truly independent of the City of Cincinnati and the City is not independent of Kenwood. However, perceptions of central city and suburb relationships are still a matter of perplexity. For instance, although the literature identifies causal relationships between cities and suburbs (Voith, 1998), a survey of Kenwood business and
property owners indicates that perceptions of the central city importance is minimal. Of those surveyed, the majority saw no relationship or role of the City of Cincinnati in Kenwood’s success and economic growth.

The second goal of this research attempted to identify characteristics of local and regional economic activities within metrotowns, as well, as factors that distinguish those activities. This goal attempted to answer several questions pertaining to types of economic activities within suburban growth areas, the local and regional influences of land use and transportation on suburban growth, specific factors which influenced the location of economic activity within a suburban growth center, the local and regional impacts of the economic activities of suburban growth centers, and influences of income on these areas.

Findings from this case study are that both local and regional economic activities play vital roles in the success and growth of metrotown areas. These activities serve as the catalysts in attracting business and investment as well as residential development into the area. They foster job creation and sustainable employment not only for its growth area, but also for the region as a whole. Local economic activities refer to those activities that are usually sufficient to meet the local demand for goods or services and are comprised of approximately 5% (717 industries) of the economic activities in the Kenwood area. The majority of local activities in the Kenwood area come from the agriculture, construction, wholesale trade, and public administration industries. These types of activities include those low order activities such as grocery stores or convenience stores, small neighborhood retail shops, drycleaners, local restaurants or food chains, and local government administrative activities. On the other hand, regional economic activities make up approximately 95% (12, 502 industries) of economic
activities and are classified as those activities that draw income from outside of the Kenwood study area and are viewed as regional attractions. The majority of regional activities in the Kenwood area come from the transportation and communications, retail trade, finance, insurance, and real estate, and services industries. These types of activities include those high order activities such as office and professional services, medical facilities, retail centers, financial activities, hospitality and entertainment, large scale franchised restaurants, or niche retail stores. However, of those regional economic activities, only 8.5% of services were outside of the local service area, meaning that those industries have a greater share than expected. Therefore, the "extra" industry employment is above what the local Kenwood economy should have to serve local needs.

The Kenwood case study also indicates that local and regional influences of land use and transportation are also significant components in the growth and development of suburban growth centers. The Kenwood area has characteristics of land uses and densities described in the stages of evolution of metrotowns, with commercial, office, and complimentary services concentrated within the core along major arterials with accessibility to the interstate and highways. This area has dense development manifested in a relatively compact, high-density core containing both high-rise buildings and low-rise strip development. This area also shows signs of dependence upon large numbers of surrounding households for retail, services, entertainment, and employment with a large portion of its land use being single-family residential dwellings surrounding its commercial core. Location and proximity to high populations is a main component of metrotown status. The Kenwood study area revealed high population areas with a total population of 7,423 people in 2000. In addition, in 2006, its total
core trade market area population was approximately 56,000 (See Figure 22 The Kenwood Trade Market Area). Kenwood also has major transportation corridors that contribute to its growth and development as an economic center. The Kenwood study area is served by three major arterials (e.g., Kenwood, Galbraith, and Montgomery Road) and highway accessibility (e.g., Interstate 71 and Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway).

**Figure 22:** Kenwood Market Trade Area

*Source: The Kenwood Towne Centre, Applied Geographic Solution, Thousand Oak, CA.*
Specific factors, which influenced the location of economic activity within a suburban growth center, are location, proximity, and access to major transportation routes, the demographics and income of surrounding communities, and quality of life and perceptions of neighborhoods. Many property owners and businesses in the Kenwood area perceived Kenwood to be a prime location to conduct business due to its nearness to major transportation networks, supporting residential neighborhoods, and retail and office developments. These factors are essential in location decisions of firms to locate in the Kenwood area and on its future growth and development.

The local and regional impacts of the economic activities of suburban growth centers, and influences of income on these areas were also identified in the study. Several local and regional impacts of metrotown economic activities include attracting new business development and investment, increased traffic congestion, increase in land values, and increase in population density. Because of Kenwood’s concentration of local and regional economic activities, it has been able to attract and retain a high level of residential, office, commercial, and complimentary developments. This continued investment in the Kenwood area has contributed significantly to its continued growth and success. The area also shows high-income levels and purchasing power of the local population. The income level in Kenwood has increased over the last two decades. The majority of households in the Kenwood area have incomes ranging between $75,000 and $100,000 per year. The household income in Kenwood is higher than Hamilton County’s median household income of $44,652 (US Census Bureau, 2007). Furthermore, the communities surrounding Kenwood have median household incomes that are greater, ranging between $61,591 to $158,742. Some of these communities are a few
of the most affluent communities in Hamilton County and the region (i.e., Madeira, Indian Hill, Blue Ash) and serve as the Kenwood business and retail areas primary market customer base with the most disposable income and purchasing power. The households in the surrounding communities have high purchasing power with net worth’s ranging between $50,000 and $250,000.

**Key Kenwood Case Study Summary Findings**

**Highway presence and corridors have helped Kenwood to become stronger.**

Bingham et. al. (1997) used a mixed method approach to study the formation of edge cities in the State of Ohio. Bingham and his colleagues (1997) found that functionally specialized edge cities with retail and personal services, wholesale and social services, service centers, information and producer services and retail develop along interstate corridors. In addition, the most significant dynamics that influenced the concentration of employment in the suburbs were external forces, mobility and accessibility; and labor markets and residential density were not as significant predictors of the formation of edge cities (Bingham et. al. 1997; Romanos, et. al. 2006). Romanos, et. al. (2006) found that workers were more willing to accept the transport costs associated with travel throughout the region, and the most important factor in the location decisions of firms was external. Location concentration does not confer the same benefits as before, and this has led to de-concentration of businesses and therefore, employment.

However, based upon the Kenwood case study, access and presence of the interstate are important predictors of its growth and success. As noted previously, Kenwood has major transportation corridors that contribute to its growth and development as an economic center.
The Kenwood study area is served by three major arterials of Kenwood Road (14,000 to 21,400 vehicles per day), Galbraith Road (9,900 to 16,000 vehicles per day), and Montgomery Road (17,000 to 21,750 vehicles per day) as well as Interstate 71 and Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway. Specific factors, which influenced the location of economic activity within a suburban growth center, are location, proximity, and access to major transportation routes. Many property owners and businesses in the Kenwood area perceived Kenwood to be a prime location to conduct business due to its nearness to major transportation networks, supporting residential neighborhoods, and retail and office developments. These factors are essential in location decisions of firms to locate in the Kenwood area and on its future growth and development.

Metrotowns that exhibit characteristics like Kenwood seem to be able to continue to grow in size, from a Stage 3 to Stage 5 Metrotown.

There are two distinct implications regarding the continued growth and development of metrotowns remaining as essential parts of the metropolitan region. These implications are: 1) metrotowns would evolve into self-sufficient centers within the metropolitan region with no dependency upon the central business district; and 2) Some metrotowns would die as others flourish and become major regional economic centers. This is indicated by the literature. Lang (2003) studied the locations of the dispersal of office space and employment and found that most of the office space occurs outside the downtowns (two-thirds), and that office space is scattered around in the suburbs and is not concentrated in the edge cities. The conclusion was that suburban growth centers, such as edge cities, have not successfully attracted office space, and density is not returning in the suburbs (Lang 2003; Romanos, et. al. 2006).
The most recent study conducted by the University of Cincinnati School of Planning in 2006 (Romanos, et. al. 2006) examined the development of growth areas and revealed that within the last several years, some of the metrotowns or growth corridors have actually lost significant employment. The analysis of the data found that the edge city or metrotown hypothesis no longer holds. Instead of increasing concentrations of employment and the conversion of the growth centers into “mini-central cities”, a wide dispersion of employment in all spatial units were observed in the study area (Romanos et al 2006). Further research (Barnett 2002) indicates that a vast majority of new suburban office space is going to places that meet the metrotown definition, but in much more diffused patterns of commercial corridors.

Conversely, information analyzed of the Kenwood area indicates it to be a suburban growth center that is continuing to grow and develop economically. Based upon a conceptual analysis of the transformation of the Kenwood area since 1956 to 2006, the Kenwood area exhibits some of the key characteristics associated with a Stage 5 Metrotown (See Figures 19 and 20). These include mixed uses, high densities, with a combination of strip development and high-rises. There is a dominance of tall buildings and high quality design, high development centers have emerged, there are high levels of employment, office, and commercial activity, and high-income residential housing. For example, the Kenwood area consists of:

- **Medical Offices** such as the Jewish Hospital, Jewish Hospital Medical Center, Assisted Living Facility, Group Health Associates Medical Offices; **Retail & Office** (e.g., Kenwood Towne Centre; Sycamore Plaza, Montgomery Rd Commercial Corridor).
- **Clustering of Financial Activities** (e.g., National City Bank, PNC Bank, Fifth Third Bank, Chase Bank, US Bank)
- **Clustering of Retail/Commercial Activities** (e.g., Kenwood Towne Centre, Sycamore Plaza, Montgomery Rd Commercial Corridor)

- **Clustering of Professional/Service Activities** (e.g., West Shell Towers, Chase Towers, Jewish Hospital Medical Offices, Ramada Inn, Cheesecake Factory, Trio’s, Ruby Tuesday, Max and Erma’s, Tire Discounters, Pep Boys Auto & Repair Shop, Cincinnati Bell, Sprint, Staples, Kinkos)

- **High-rise medical and financial office buildings of high architectural quality and aesthetics** (e.g., Chase Towers, new office development on Montgomery and Kenwood Roads, Group Health Associates office buildings, Jewish Hospital Medical Buildings).

- **High-income residential neighborhoods** (e.g., the median income in the Kenwood area is $53,300). Median Incomes of surrounding communities are: $59,626 (Madeira), $61,591 (Blue Ash), $81,492 (Amberley Village), $89,224 (Montgomery), and $158,742 (Indian Hills). These communities serve as the Kenwood business and retail area primary customer base.

There is also traffic congestion caused by internal movement and the recognition of pedestrian needs (Romanos, et al. 1988). For example,

- Kenwood Rd – 25,055 – 26,652 vehicles per day
- Galbraith Rd - 9,900 - 16,000 vehicles per day
- Ronald Reagan Cross County Hwy - 10,000 - 17,000 vehicles per day
- Montgomery Rd - 17,000 - 21,750 vehicles per day
- I-71 and Montgomery Rd interchange - 149,000 vehicles per day during peak hours

In addition, along the corridors, Kenwood has approximately 1,724,000 square feet of retail and commercial uses, including 544,000 square feet office. According to the literature (Romanos et.al. 1988; Garreau, 1994), in order to be considered an edge city 1) the area must have more than five million square feet of office space (about the space of a good-sized downtown) and 2) the place must include over 600,000 square feet of retail space (the size of a large regional shopping mall). Kenwood exceeds the amount of square footage in terms of
retail and commercial and is moving toward the requirements for office. With the new developments, such as the Sycamore Financial Center, Kenwood Place, and the new mixed use office complex which include a new Urban Outfitters (see Illustrations 1-4). These new developments will add over 300,000 square feet in additional office and retail to the Kenwood area.

There are difference perceptions regarding the metrotown/city relationship with no clear understanding.

The issue of the cause and effect relationship between the economic importance of central city and suburban growth areas in terms of the growth or decline of the region continues to be a debate. Research has shown that both need each other for sustainability and growth. Although suburban growth areas thrive as independent economic generators, there is still a question about their regional connection and reliance on the central city or downtown. There are implied causal links between central cities and suburban areas (Voith, 1998). Voith (1998, 1999) and Rappaport (2005) assert that central cities remain the most effective locations for specialized industries and unique amenities or features. These industries may include economic activities such as high-fashion retail, major medical centers, and specialized wholesale suppliers which serve thin but widely-spread markets. These types of economic activities may also need the combination of a location accessible to the entire metropolitan area and the area’s large market to thrive. These unique amenities or features (such as historic sites, waterfronts, cultural facilities, sports arenas, and period architecture) are valued not only by their residents but by nonresidents as well. Another reason why cities are important to regional economies is that their diversity encourages innovation and helps regions reinvent themselves in the face of global economic change (Voith 1998, 1999; Rappaport 2005).
As indicated in previous sections, an analysis of the Kenwood area indicates that the City of Cincinnati and Kenwood are interdependent. Kenwood relies on the City as a central city for regional employment, cultural, institutional, and recreational activities. The central city in this instance serves the purpose of a regional symbol and center of economic, cultural, and tourist activity for the region, with many major international corporate headquarters, cultural institutions, and recreation and entertainment facilities (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, 2008). The City of Cincinnati functions as a node for *regional economic, educational, transportation, and cultural and recreational activities*. The City of Cincinnati plays an important role in the contribution to income and employment base of households residing in and around the Kenwood area. Cincinnati is home to major corporations and Fortune 500 companies and 1000 companies headquartered that employ workers from the Kenwood area and its surrounding communities (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007). The City is also home to a variety of educational and research institutions (e.g., the University of Cincinnati, Xavier University, Cincinnati State, Cincinnati Art Academy). These institutions play an important role in attracting new investment and young professionals into the region, which will ultimately result in increased employment and income for the City and its surrounding communities. In addition, the City is served by international and local airports, major interstate and highway connections, and public transportation system (e.g., CVG, Lunken, I-71, SORTA). Cincinnati also provides art, cultural, regional tourists, and recreational attractions to the region, including Kenwood. The City also provides the region with more than fifty museums and galleries, major tourist attractions, and sports facilities that service the region (Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 2007). All of these activities contribute to attracting new
investment on a local, regional, and global scale into the Greater Cincinnati region. As part of this role, all surrounding communities in the region benefit economically and socially from the assets of the City. All of these factors contribute in attracting large investment firms, employers, and potential highly skilled workers into the region, of which Kenwood is part. Firms in the City employ workers from the Kenwood area and vice-versa. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Kenwood area is not truly independent of the City of Cincinnati and the City is not independent of Kenwood.

The future prospects for Kenwood tend to be positive.

The economic trend in Kenwood appears to be positive. Since 1956, Kenwood has continued to grow and strive economically, indicating that Kenwood will continue to prosper. Its core area is along major transportation thoroughfares that allow for easy access and mobility and is a major regional attraction for commercial, office, and recreation. Interstate 71 is a major transportation connection for the Kenwood area to other areas throughout the region. The Montgomery Rd and Interstate 71 interchange acts as a stimulus in attracting new development into the Kenwood area. As of April 2008, several new office, service, and retail facilities have been developed or are in the process of construction. This is evident based on the current new development in the Kenwood area, such as the Sycamore Financial Center is which a 160,000 square feet mixed use office and retail development along Montgomery Road (See Illustration 2). In addition, the new Kenwood Towne Place development retail and office complex, near the Montgomery Road and I-71 Interchange and a new mixed-use office and retail complex which includes Urban Outfitter retail store as an anchor tenant. The new
development, both current and proposed will yield over $500,000 million dollars of investments into the Kenwood area (Bickford, 2008).

**Illustration 2.** Sycamore Financial Center

![Sycamore Financial Center](image)

Source: Sycamore Township Planning and Zoning Department, 2008.

**Illustration 3.** Kenwood Town Place

![Kenwood Town Place](image)
and office facilities, a clustering of financial activities, and professional/service activities. There are high-rise medical and financial office buildings of high architectural quality and aesthetics. Kenwood is also surrounded by economically affluent neighborhoods that support its economic activities. These communities serve as the Kenwood business and retail area primary customer base.
Based on business survey results, Kenwood is a prime area for development and business due to its location, access to major transportation, and the socio-economic characteristics of its surrounding residential neighborhoods. This may also be a result of the land use and planning policies of the Sycamore Township administration and the Kenwood Towne Centre. In the late 1990’s the Kenwood Towne Centre made a concerted effort to attract unique retail into the Centre. The Township administration picked up on this initiative and adopted land use and development policies to ensure that the Kenwood area would be develop into a center for unique retail and office development (Bickford, 2008). This uniqueness has been a marketing tool to attract developers as well as the middle and upper-end shoppers within the surrounding neighborhoods and region.

In addition to its uniqueness, the Kenwood area is also an attractive area for developers in that it has no income tax, business tax, or licensing fees. It is centrally located in which anyone can get top other destinations within a 20-minute travel time. It also is surrounded by attractive residential neighborhoods with high quality school districts, such as Sycamore Township, Madeira, and Indian Hill School districts. Moreover, the Kenwood area has a daytime population of 100,000 people during the holiday seasons.

Due to its spatial organization, composition, and economic make-up, Kenwood shows that it has and will continue to develop and move towards a Stage 5 Metrotown status. Although the Kenwood area is a unique case, there are characteristics that are transferable to other edge cities, which may be applicable in their continued growth and development as metrotowns. These include high traffic volumes, the centrality of retail, office, and commercial functions, and the support of surrounding stable residential neighborhoods.
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Appendix: Kenwood Business Survey Questionnaire
**Title of the Study:** Local and Regional Indicators of Suburban Economic Growth: An analysis and evaluation of economic activity of the Kenwood/Blue Ash Corridor

The purpose of this survey is to identify and compare perspectives of the local and regional impacts of the study area. The survey should take about 20 minutes of your time. The main objective of this survey will be to analyze perspectives from business and property owners regarding local and regional economic activities within the Kenwood/Blue Ash Corridor. This research study is a follow-up study from research conducted 15 years ago which identified Kenwood as a potential area of growth. Approximately 20-30 business owners will be asked to participate in this research study. By responding to this survey you consent to have this information analyzed and reported on anonymously. **There are no expected risks or benefits to you from completing the survey. There are no other activities planned if you do not want to complete the survey. You do NOT have to participate in this study. You may choose not to participate or you may quit participating AT ANY TIME.**

Participant ID Number: ______

1. What type(s) of service(s)/product(s) do you provide?

2. How long have you located in Kenwood?

3. Did you relocate to Kenwood? (If yes) From where and why?

4. What factors were important in your decision to locate your business in this area?

5. In your opinion what other factors make this location good for business?

6. What geographic area do you consider to be your market area? (Blue Ash, Kenwood, Madeira, Montgomery, Silverton, Sycamore Twp., Cincinnati)

7. What geographic area do you consider to define the Kenwood Business District?

8. How important do you feel the City of Cincinnati is, particularly its downtown area, in supporting the vitality of the Kenwood area?
   - [ ] Critical
   - [ ] Very Important
   - [ ] Important
   - [ ] Somewhat Important
   - [ ] Not Important

   Please explain: ____________________________________________________________________
9. How long do you plan to stay in this location?

10. What do you foresee happening in the future for the Kenwood area?

**Interviewer contact information:** If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact me at (513) 503-3690 or my faculty advisor, Professor Michael Romanos at (513) 556-4943.

**Research Participant Rights Disclaimer:** If I have questions about my rights as a research participant in this study, I may call the *Chair of the University of Cincinnati, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Institutional Review Board*, at 558-5784.

**Note:** You will receive a copy of this information sheet for your records.